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ABSTRACT

Hunter’s proposed Ed.D in Instructional Leadership is a stronger and relevant degree for the advanced preparation of school practitioners for the nation’s schools and the learning organizations that support them. Informed by the work of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, our design for the proposed Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership aims to integrate the various important strands of doctoral study focused on the professional activity of education.

Our research suggests that there is a growing need for clinically-focused doctoral training for education practitioners. Reforms at the federal, state, and local level are dramatically shifting the way education is practiced and the standards by which schools and school systems are evaluated. The rise of a new class of "Instructional Coordinators" attests to this.

Our Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership has been specifically designed to leverage the strength of our faculty across departments to meet the needs of working educators in New York City. The curriculum is calculated to give candidates the comprehensive background in current research and analytical tools they will need to succeed as leading educators in the new environment; it consists of four components spiraled throughout the five years.
1. PURPOSE AND GOALS

Hunter College School of Education proposes to offer a curriculum leading to a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) in Instructional Leadership. Drawing on the School’s strengths across departments, the program will prepare experienced educators to become effective practitioner leaders able to translate current research into practice. Graduates will work to transform K-12 education, driving better educational outcomes across larger systems as superintendents, district-level directors of curriculum or professional development, charter school network leaders, officers of educational nonprofits, coaches, department heads, teacher leaders or as adjunct faculty. The goal of the program is to prepare them for success in these roles by providing a deep grounding in the best research on educational practice; a demonstrated ability to digest, synthesize, and apply new research quickly to improve educational outcomes for students; and the skills to understand and communicate their insights effectively as leaders, to colleagues, teachers, and parents.

This is a clinical doctoral program with a very different purpose, curriculum, constituency, and set of outcomes from Ph.D.s in education, such as those offered by the CUNY Graduate Center. We have followed the ongoing Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate in designing an Ed.D. program that is distinguished from Ph.D. programs in several specific ways; our proposed Ed.D.:

- Emphasizes deep understanding of the best current knowledge and research for application in the field, as opposed to designing research and generating new knowledge
- Utilizes a cohort model to deliver primarily prescribed curriculum, as opposed to an elective-driven course of study
- Culminates in a major project involving the application of research to the analysis of a specific practical problem (e.g., the evaluation of a school district’s professional development program), as opposed to a deeply theoretically informed dissertation advancing new knowledge with implications for policy or practice
- Aims to prepare practitioner leaders as opposed to scholars

As the Letter of Intent made clear, there is a growing need for clinically-focused doctoral training for education practitioners – and there is currently no public Ed.D. program in NYC designed to meet the needs of working educators with a part-time cohort model and practice-focused curriculum. The Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership is designed to build on the quality and reputation of the Hunter College School of Education to meet this need in a unique way, providing further training and credentialing for graduates of CUNY Master’s programs in education and for other aspiring instructional leaders in K-12 education.
2. NEED AND JUSTIFICATION

The preparation of teachers, principals, and superintendents takes place at many CUNY institutions at the Bachelor’s, Master’s, and certificate levels. However, there are currently only two doctoral programs in education offered by CUNY: the Graduate Center offers a Ph.D. in Urban Education and a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology. In fact, across New York City, there is currently no public Ed.D. program with a practice-focused curriculum. Existing programs in this domain – for example, at NYU, Teachers College Columbia, and Fordham – charge about three times CUNY tuition for comparable degrees.

At the same time, the need for such a program is growing as more and more practitioners seek deeper clinical training. A doctorate is becoming much more common among superintendents and even principals of leading schools. For example, according to the American Association of School Administrators, 60% of superintendents have doctoral degrees, compared to 45% in 2000, and the numbers are even higher in large urban districts. At the same time, New York City – and the country as a whole – has seen the rise of a new kind of district- and network-level leader who specializes in instruction in roles such as director of curriculum, supervisor of literacy coaches, or overseer of instruction in a high-needs field (e.g., math and science, teaching of English as a second language, or special education). The US Department of Labor expects the number of these “Instructional Coordinator” positions to grow by 20% by 2020 – significantly faster than the average projected growth rate for all jobs in the same period of 14%. These new Instructional Coordinators need to master ever-expanding bodies of education research and best practice, meaning that they often need specialized degrees. It is therefore unsurprising that, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, the number of educational doctorates awarded annually in the U.S. (including both Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees) rose more than 25% from 2006-2011.

Simultaneously, we also recognize that teachers who do decide to move into administrative roles during their career, the knowledge and skills acquired in this program will prove valuable. There are opportunities for teachers to seek additional preparation as they too see the need for deeper clinical training. Teachers have opportunities for leadership within their schools as teacher leaders, coaches, curriculum specialists and at the secondary level as department heads. Moreover, as teacher education increases its clinical focus there are opportunities for teachers with increased expertise to participate in the teacher preparation process as adjunct faculty and as clinical professors.

This increased need for programs like the proposed Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership is driven in part by a series of fundamental changes in K-12 education that have occurred over the last few years. The school reform movement and new national and state education policies have encouraged experimentation with education practices, new research in and beyond education schools into what really works in the classroom, and a greater demand for leaders to achieve and demonstrate better student learning outcomes with rigorous evidence. To highlight a few specific, especially powerful changes that have increased the complexity of educational leadership:

• **New curriculum standards:** New York and 44 other states have adopted new Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics. In general, these standards require that teachers focus their instruction on fewer topics, explore them in greater depth, and use a different array of instructional materials with their students. They represent a fundamental change in our approach to teaching and learning – but expertise in implementing them effectively has not kept pace with demand. The proposed Ed.D. program will prepare leaders to design school-wide and system-wide solutions and trainings to ensure that all teachers handle the new curricula effectively.
• **New student assessments for college- and career-readiness:** Largely as a result of the adoption of CCSS, students will soon face more rigorous assessments based on higher standards. At every grade, testing will focus more on in-depth thinking and knowledge, with the goal that more high school graduates will be fully prepared for college and careers. Education leaders need training in how to develop system-wide plans to ensure their graduates are ready to meet this high bar of success.

• **New methods for reaching all students:** Classrooms are increasingly integrated in multiple ways, not only in terms of cultural diversity but also through the inclusion of English Language Learners (ELLs) and special education students in “traditional” classrooms. This presents considerable new opportunities and challenges, which New York State has recognized with the forthcoming introduction of a new certification exam for aspiring educators called the Educating All Students exam. All teachers and leaders now need to know how to adapt their instruction for students from different cultures, ELLs, and students with disabilities, among other groups. Leaders must be prepared to incorporate both existing knowledge on effective teaching for these groups and new research on inclusive classrooms into instructional practice in their districts, networks, or schools.

• **New teacher evaluation systems:** Simultaneously, teachers will face new forms of evaluation of their effectiveness. More granular observation systems will provide teachers with feedback about the quality of their teaching and will provide school leaders with better data about the pedagogy of their school staff. Teacher effectiveness will also be measured in part by the achievement of their students on the more rigorous state examinations – so-called “value-added data” that measures the impact of a teacher on student learning. The combination of new observation systems and value-added teaching assessments will determine whether or not individual educators are allowed to remain in the profession. As the stakes for teachers are raised and entirely new instruments of evaluation are introduced, the complexity of professional development and HR policies will continue to increase, driving greater need for deep understanding of the best thinking from the research and wide familiarity with best practices.

• **Greater transparency for schools and systems:** Practitioner leaders themselves are increasingly being held accountable for educational outcomes, as data on student performance becomes more widely available and more sophisticated. This places considerable pressure on these leaders to be able to digest large amounts of research quickly to develop effective plans to transform their systems to meet needs like the ones cited in this list. Graduates of the proposed Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership will be well prepared to handle all of these challenges.

In the wake of increased expectations for educational attainment, the rise of Instructional Coordinators, and dramatic changes to the way education works, there has been a national movement to redesign the education doctorate for practitioners. The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) has helped lead the way, working with more than 50 colleges and universities to identify the new needs and facilitate the development of new ways to address them. The CPED summarizes the goals of an Ed.D. as follows: “The professional doctorate in education prepares educators for the application of appropriate and specific practices, the generation of new knowledge, and for the stewardship of the profession.” These programs should produce “leading practitioners.”

*How we propose to meet this need*

The design of our proposed Ed.D. has been deeply informed by the work of CPED, as well as our own experience and the information provided to us by the many graduates and adjuncts who have inquired
about a possible Ed.D. program at Hunter. We have constructed a professional doctoral program that we believe will prepare graduates to take on leadership roles in educational settings that focus on support for effective instruction and curriculum. The proposed program has been shaped around the specific needs arising out of the changes described above. It is also specifically designed for individuals working in school settings who want to continue engagement in the professional practice of education while pursuing roles with increasing levels of responsibility and leadership. The leading practitioners the program produces will be equipped to improve teaching and learning and clinical practice in schools, school districts, charter-school networks, for-profit schools, technology-based educational providers, support organizations for schools, and community-based and nonprofit organizations supporting informal education.

It is clear that the need for new instructional leaders with a deeper appreciation for how to translate research into practice will continue to grow. In this context, graduates of the Hunter College Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership program will be well positioned to help transform education systems for the better in New York and around the country.
3. STUDENTS

A. INTEREST/DEMAND

Many current and former graduate students of our teacher education, counselor education, and school leader programs have expressed a strong desire for further study on schools and schooling. These individuals are interested in staying in schools and districts while they pursue a doctorate, not in leaving them, so they need a practice-based, professional doctorate that fits their full-time schedules. We have also learned from our adjunct faculty, who provide much of the clinical supervision and coaching for our teacher candidates, that they too seek further preparation in this area, often as part of a desire for an educational leadership role focused on teaching and learning.

We have conducted an initial survey of our graduate students who are already certified teachers (that is, they are currently enrolled in a program beyond their initial certification). We currently have 755 such students, of whom 93 responded to the survey. Students were asked, “How likely is it that you would be interested in pursuing an EdD of this sort at Hunter College at some point in the future?” 38% of respondents indicated they were very likely (“I would be very interested in such a program”); an additional 49% indicated that they were somewhat likely (“There is a good chance I would be interested”). A total of 87% of respondents thus indicated significant interest. As we develop the more detailed formal proposal, we will extend this survey both to better assess the level of interest among our students and graduates and to incorporate even more detailed feedback from students into the design of the proposed program.

The design of the program acknowledges that our potential students are full-time educators. Thus, we focus on part-time status and include a wide range of pedagogical and scheduling approaches, including online- and hybrid courses, intensive weekend courses, and summer experiences. These arrangements will make it possible for working educators to participate fully in a professional education doctorate. There will be opportunities for students to use their daily experience in schools to enhance and support their learning.

B. ENROLLMENT

Applicants to this proposed Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership will be drawn from graduates of teacher education and school leader programs at CUNY and other institutions. Given its educator-friendly design, the quality and reputation of the Hunter College School of Education, the close match between the newly designed curriculum and the needs of today’s educational leaders, and the reasonable CUNY tuition, we believe that candidates will strongly prefer our program to the handful of existing practice-focused education doctorates at private universities in NYC. (No similar program exists at CUNY.) Table 1 summarizes our projected enrollment for this five-year program; all students are part-time and take classes in a cohort.
Table 1: Student Enrollment Projection for 5-Year Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR 1 2015-16</th>
<th>Yr 2 2016-17</th>
<th>Yr 3 2017-18</th>
<th>Yr 4 2018-19</th>
<th>Yr 5 2019-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New students</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing students</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total enrollment during year</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attrition (at end of year)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumes that, of the first cohort of 18, 3 will leave through attrition after years 1, 2, and 3

We project a cohort of approximately 18 entering students per year. Cohort sizes for practice-focused EdDs such as the one proposed tend to be slightly smaller than this; we believe we can attract a relatively large cohort because of our reputation, cost, and the growing need for both the qualification and the expertise this program would confer. For comparison purposes, Fordham’s Urban School Leadership program admits a cohort of 8-12 once a year; Teachers College-Columbia admits a cohort of about 12 once every two years. Since this is a five-year program, once we are at scale, we would have ~81 students in the program each year.

(Note that we assume attrition of one student per cohort per year, an average of ~5% each year over the three years of coursework. This is in line with the average attrition in the first three years of doctoral programs, which the Council of Graduate Schools reports to be 5-7% overall. It is also in line with the ~5% attrition projected for Hunter’s Doctor of Nursing Practice degree, another professional doctorate in a field of growing need.)

C. ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENT

Prospective students must meet several requirements to be considered for admission:
- An education-related Master’s degree with a minimum GPA of 3.5 from a regionally-accredited institution comparable in standard and content to a Hunter Master’s degree
- A minimum of three years of experience in education
- The Graduate Record Examination (GRE)

The admissions process will evaluate transcripts from all degrees received, a resume, a personal statement, two letters of recommendation, and interviews (for selected applicants).

Transfer of Credit

We expect that some students will enter the Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership with relevant graduate credits from other programs (e.g., from a principal certification program or a specialized Master’s degree such as Hunter’s Master’s in Educational Psychology). Following Hunter’s graduate student policy, these students may request to transfer up to 12 credits for relevant graduate courses completed within the previous five years at regionally accredited institutions, including courses taken at Hunter College while enrolled in another degree program, whether or not a master's degree was awarded. Transfer of credit is subject to the approval of the department or graduate advisor and to the regulations of the Hunter program in which the student is enrolled, and students who transfer credit from another institution would be expected to maintain their cohort.
4. CURRICULUM

The Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership is designed to meet the challenges of the changing landscape of education. We have designed our curriculum around four key areas to comprehensively meet the needs of educational leaders:

- **Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum (REPAC):** In these courses, each of which specializes in a specific area such as literacy or special education, students will examine research on effective instruction and curriculum from multiple perspectives, including the lens of a content discipline, non-school influences, and the unique needs of specific groups of students. They will both gain a thorough overview of the latest research and practice in these critical fields and also become keen consumers of new education literature.

- **Research Toolkit:** In parallel with the REPAC courses, students will take a series of methodological courses to make them discriminating critics of research. The research toolkit portion of the program provides a strong preparation for the evaluation of research and the execution of applied research designed to solve problems of practice. Two of these courses are already offered as part of our Master’s in Educational Psychology; the others are adapted from courses in that program to meet the unique needs of these doctoral students.

- **Instructional Leadership Core:** Complementing the research focus of the REPAC and Research Toolkit courses, the Instructional Leadership Core will offer context on changing education policies and cultivate the professional skills required to be an effective practitioner leader. A unique feature of this program is a focus on developing proficiency in the range of professional writing required in these positions: instructional leaders need to write clearly and persuasively for diverse school-based audiences (including superiors, peers, parents, and subordinates) and, often, for community-based ones, using a range of genres and styles.

- **Special Topics electives:** There are two groups of electives in the program. There are electives in research methods both quantitative and qualitative and electives in content in instructional leadership. Students must take 6 credits of elective in research methods and 6 credits of electives in content.

- **Qualifying exam:** In the second year of the program, students will work with program faculty to define an area of specialization (e.g., special education, literacy across the subjects, Common Core curriculum development and implementation) and construct a reading list to serve as the basis for a qualifying exam taken in the third year of the program. Passing a tailored written exam designed by faculty is a requirement for entry into the dissertation phase of the program. (The mechanics of this process will be fleshed out more fully in the development of the formal proposal for this program.)

- **Dissertation Sequence:** Finally, the dissertation sequence consists of a four-course sequence that will give students a structured opportunity to develop and execute a practice-based research project. The dissertation proposal seminar will offer structured opportunities for faculty and peer support for the development of an applied research, dissertation proposal. The first dissertation advisement course is supported by direct mentorship of the dissertation chair and results in the identification of a dissertation committee and an approved proposal. The subsequent dissertation advisement courses provide sustained mentorship of the doctoral candidate in the implementation, data analysis and writing of the dissertation. There are 9 credits assigned to the dissertation sequence. Due to the professional careers of students, the 9 credit sequence acknowledges the reality and complexity of applied research in educational institutions; this approach mirrors more recent best practice for similar Professional doctorates where students require greater structure to ensure timely progress and completion. Professional Doctorate programs at institutions such as Temple University, Georgia State University, and Pace University have similar course-structured, 9+ credit dissertation models.
The tables below show the proposed curriculum for the program, first organized by the areas outlined above and then structured in a proposed sequence of study. Descriptions of these courses are given in the appendix.

Table 2: Courses by Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Leadership Core</strong></td>
<td>Introductory Doctoral Seminar in Educational Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancing Achievement through Family and Community Relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Communication for Educational Settings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Policy and School Reform</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Professional Development of Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum for Students with Special Needs (REPAC: SPED)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum on Teaching English Language Learners</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum Content Requirement 1 (REPAC: CONTENT)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum Content Requirement 2 (REPAC: CONTENT)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Toolkit</strong></td>
<td>Statistics I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative Research Methods and Measurement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative Research Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Topics</strong></td>
<td>Special Topic: Research 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Topic: Research 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Topic: Content 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Topic: Content 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissertation</strong></td>
<td>Dissertation Proposal Seminar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Advisement 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Advisement 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Advisement 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Course Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year One</td>
<td>Fall 1</td>
<td>Introductory Doctoral Seminar in Educational Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 1</td>
<td>Enhancing Achievement through Family and Community Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 1</td>
<td>Statistics I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 1</td>
<td>Professional Communication for Educational Settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 1</td>
<td>Qualitative Research Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2</td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum in Special Education (REPAC: SPED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2</td>
<td>Quantitative Research Methods and Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2</td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum in Teaching English Language Learners (REPAC: ELL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2</td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum Content Requirement 1 (REPAC: CONTENT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2</td>
<td>Education Policy and School Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2</td>
<td>Effective Professional Development of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 3</td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum Content Requirement 2 (REPAC: CONTENT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 3</td>
<td>Special Topic: Research 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 3</td>
<td>Special Topic: Research 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 3</td>
<td>Special Topic: Content 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 3</td>
<td>Special Topic: Content 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Three</td>
<td>Fall 4</td>
<td>Dissertation Proposal Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 4</td>
<td>Dissertation Advisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Four</td>
<td>Fall 5</td>
<td>Dissertation Advisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 5</td>
<td>Dissertation Advisement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. COST ASSESSMENT

A. REVENUES AND EXPENSES

The Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership program is expected to generate tuition revenue in excess of program costs. Over the first five years of the program, total tuition revenue (not including fees) is expected to be approximately $2,375,000 from new sources; the program is expected to cost approximately $1,550,000 in the same period, with an anticipated five-year surplus of more than $825,000. Beginning in the fifth year, when the program has grown to full capacity, annual tuition is expected to exceed annual costs by about $170,000 per year.

Tuition

The program will be supported primarily by tuition. Every student will be required to take a total of 60 credits over approximately 5 years. We propose that CUNY set a dedicated EdD tuition rate based on the current dedicated PhD rate (used, for example, by the CUNY Graduate Center) as well as the market for similar programs in New York City. Because of the structure of the program, a cohort based model in which the dissertation will generally be applied in nature and developed over a student’s degree as part of a student’s professional career, the tuition is charged entirely based on credits to be taken by the student. This applies to both coursework and Dissertation writing.

- **Coursework:** For the first three years of the program, while candidates are completing their coursework, we would treat all candidates as part-time students, regardless of the number of credits taken in a given semester, which we expect to range from 6-7 over the course of the program. The tuition in this period would be a Hunter EdD specific tuition of $635 per credit.

- **Dissertation:** During the fourth and fifth year, following candidates completion of the Dissertation Proposal Seminar and while candidates are completing their dissertations in the Dissertation Advisement courses, we would continue to charge per credit tuition. This common approach allows for directed support to candidates in both the content of their dissertation and their progress to their degree.

For in-state students entering in fall 2014, the total cost of degree per student is expected to be $38,100 (not including tuition raises over the course of their time in the program).

Assuming entering cohorts of 18 in-state students per year, attrition of one student per cohort each year (see Section Three for an explanation of this assumption), and substantial completion within the expected five years of the program, total five-year revenue from 2014-2019 is expected to be $2,375,000. When the program reaches full capacity (i.e., in year five), annual tuition is expected to be about $635,700 (increasing annually with 2% tuition increases).

The chart below provides more detail. Note that the ramp-up of tuition over time is based on an anticipated, averaged distribution of 16 credits taken in a student’s first year, 19 in the second, 15 in the third, and 5 credits in the fourth, and 4 credits in the final year.

![Table 4: Tuition Projection](table.png)

Costs

$2,374,262
The costs for the program will come predominantly from full-time and adjunct faculty salaries. Although the program will be taught in part by existing faculty, as discussed in Section 5 above, we plan to request three new full-time lines for faculty (one each year in the program’s first, third, and fifth years) to teach both courses in the new doctoral program and existing graduate and undergraduate courses, in the latter case freeing up existing faculty to contribute to the teaching of doctoral courses. Because the design of the program leverages Hunter’s strengths across multiple disciplines, faculty can move between their existing courses and new doctoral courses with minimal impact on current programs. Approximately 85% of the credits in the program will be taught by full-time faculty. Adjunct faculty will be hired for the remaining incremental course credits, primarily by teaching existing courses to free up full-time faculty to teach in the doctoral program; adjuncts with special qualifications may also be hired on occasion to teach a doctoral course. We also plan to request a half-time administrative assistant to support the program coordinator, faculty, and students. The total incremental costs for the program over five years (2014-2019) are expected to be approximately $1,552,000.

When the program reaches capacity (i.e., when five cohorts have entered), the total incremental course load credit is expected to be about 87 credits, including the core doctoral courses, course load credit for dissertation advisement at CUNY’s rate of 0.60 credits per semester, and administrative release of six credits annually for the program director. Of these, a portion will be taught by the new full-time faculty (primarily by freeing up existing faculty); the remainder will be taught by adjuncts. The expense once capacity is reached is expected to be about approximately $460,000 per year.

The chart below provides more detail. Advisement course load credit totals assume that one student per cohort per year will leave the program without completing and that two students will require extra time and advisement to write their dissertations (see Section Three for an explanation of our attrition assumptions).

**Table 5: Cost Projection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total credits for EdD courses</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total course load for EdD advisement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total credits administrative release</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total incremental credits for EdD program</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental FT faculty teaching (total)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course load covered by incremental FT faculty</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining course load covered by adjuncts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Faculty (salary + fringe benefits)</td>
<td>$109,458</td>
<td>$109,458</td>
<td>$199,930</td>
<td>$199,930</td>
<td>$290,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Faculty (salary + fringe benefits)</td>
<td>$8,130</td>
<td>$85,369</td>
<td>$60,978</td>
<td>$109,760</td>
<td>$97,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Staff (.5 FTE in years 1 and 2)</td>
<td>$29,925</td>
<td>$29,925</td>
<td>$59,850</td>
<td>$59,850</td>
<td>$59,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$147,513</strong></td>
<td><strong>$224,752</strong></td>
<td><strong>$320,758</strong></td>
<td><strong>$369,540</strong></td>
<td><strong>$447,817</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTPS</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$155,013</strong></td>
<td><strong>$229,752</strong></td>
<td><strong>$330,758</strong></td>
<td><strong>$377,040</strong></td>
<td><strong>$460,317</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. FACULTY

The Ed.D in Instructional Leadership has been designed to leverage the strengths of the Hunter College School of Education across departments and fit smoothly into existing course offerings, with modest requirements for new faculty. The teaching will be spread widely: given the structure of the program, no faculty member will have their entire teaching load in the doctoral program. Indeed, in designing the program and preparing this Letter of Intent, we worked closely with dozens of faculty members with a wide range of specialties. The broad curriculum thus not only serves the needs of aspiring instructional leaders but also allows the engagement of expertise across the School of Education’s three departments: Curriculum and Teaching (C&T); Educational Foundations and Counseling Programs (EF), and Special Education (SPED).

We anticipate needing to add only three new full-time faculty lines over the next five years to support the various cohorts in the doctoral program (one each year for the first, third, and fifth years). While the proposed new faculty members would not be exclusively assigned to the doctoral program, these recruitments would allow us to provide greater expertise in practice-based research among the faculty both inside the Ed.D. program and throughout the School of Education. It is our belief that the existence of the Ed.D. will also be a critical element in the successful recruitment of new faculty on any lines, since a doctoral program provides an opportunity for faculty to share their applied research expertise and to join with doctoral students on applied and practice-based research opportunities.

In addition to these new lines, additional adjunct faculty would be hired to teach select courses for existing full-time faculty to free them up to teach in the Ed.D. program for a modest portion of their courseload.

C. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

The Ed.D in Instructional Leadership will also leverage the strengths and resources of the current School of Education programs, minimizing the need for additional capital investment. We expect small equipment support for new faculty as they are appointed, and little to no marginal increase on the use of our research and instructional facilities.
6. EVALUATION

The School of Education currently has a robust infrastructure for continued assessment and evaluation of its programs. Due to the nature of teacher education and the accrediting bodies to which our multiple programs report, the School of Education has protocols in place to collect and analyze data on student performance. Each semester, faculty from over 25 programs upload examples of Key Assessments across our curriculum, and the Office of the Dean has a full-time HEO whose sole responsibility is to direct the process of developing, implementing, measuring, and analyzing our performance. Faculty are both committed and expectant that this data be used to improve and enhance the program.
Appendix A : Course Descriptions for Required Courses

**Instructional Leadership Core**

**Introductory Doctoral Seminar in Educational Research**
This course introduces students to the landscape of educational research by studying the origins of various epistemologies and their impact upon all aspects of research, including: questions asked; theoretical frameworks used; methodological design employed; specific data collection; findings, analysis, and interpretation of data; and, implications for the field of education. By engaging with a broad array of educational research, students will forge connections among research, theory, practice, and policy, to develop a sense of their own philosophical grounding and interests that will inform their future research.

**Enhancing Achievement through Family and Community Relationships**
This course examines current research on the impact of family, school, and community partnerships on student achievement. Key features of this course include an examination of how social, cultural, economic, and political forces influence such partnerships and a review of researched-based strategies for developing mutually beneficial and sustainable partnerships.

**Effective Professional Development of Teachers**
In-depth study of research and practice in professional development for educators. Students will explore the literature about effective methods, contexts, and delivery of coaching, mentoring, and professional learning for teachers and other educators. Focus on understanding the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches to professional development, and on learning how to assess the appropriateness of a professional development strategy with respect to content and the teacher population to be served.

**Education Policy and School Reform**
In this course students will explore educational policy and its effect on practice. Students will analyze current school reform and discuss policy changes facing educators at the local, state and national level. Current school reform topics to be discussed include the Common Core Standards, the rise in charter schools and the evaluation of effective teaching.

**Professional Writing**
This course explores a range of educational and school-based writing genres and writing for a variety of audiences. Resources and practices related to developing and writing grant proposals and the research process are addressed.

**Research Toolkit:**

**Statistics and Statistics Computing in Education (EDPS 701) – existing course**

**Quantitative Research Methods and Measurement**
The purpose of this course is to increase students’ understanding of quantitative research methods and design issues relevant to the pursuit of research in education, with a focus on correlational, experimental and quasi-experimental design. This course also addresses essential issues in the measurement of educational constructs, including the following topics: reliability, validation, item analysis, test bias, dimensionality, item response theory, and the use of high-stakes testing in educational policy.
Qualitative Research Methods**
The course will introduce students to qualitative research methods in education. Topics include the purposes and types of qualitative research, research ethics, designing a qualitative research study, data collection and analysis, and writing up and disseminating the results of qualitative research studies.

Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum (REPAC):

Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum in Teaching English Language Learners (REPAC: ELL)
Research on effective pedagogy, instructional practices and curriculum development for English language/Dual language learners. Emphasis is placed on several areas of inquiry: (1) Second Language Learners and Learning, to include understanding types of multilingual learners; (2) effective Instructional Practices, to include both bilingual and ESL approaches; and (3) research on Content-Language Integrated Curriculum.

Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum in Special Education (REPAC: SPED)
This course examines current research in Special Education and its implementation. A host of theoretical approaches to the teaching of students with disabilities will be addressed and critiqued. Particular attention will be paid to research on differentiating instruction and interventions that serve the needs of diverse students in urban schools.

Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum in Literacy (REPAC: Content)
This course examines current research in curriculum and its implementation along a variety of contents. A host of theoretical approaches to the teaching of particular subjects and their relation to skills development will be addressed and critiqued. Particular attention will be paid to research on instruction and interventions that serve the needs of diverse students in urban schools.

Special Topics:

Special Topics in Research Methods: This course will examine in-depth a selected research method in education. Specific topics include for example, action research, case study method and program evaluation

Special Topics in Content in Instructional Leadership: This course will examine current research regarding: 1) disciplinary subjects taught in school (e.g. literacy Math, arts and humanities), 2) the learning process; or 3) other educational processes (e.g., educational evaluation).

Dissertation Sequence:

Dissertation Proposal Seminar: This course provides an opportunity for doctoral candidates to review and practice completing the principle components of a dissertation with peer and faculty support.

Dissertation Advisement 1: This course provides an opportunity for doctoral candidates to identify an appropriate dissertation topic, identify a dissertation committee, and obtain approval for a dissertation proposal conduct under the supervision of the dissertation chair.

Dissertation Advisement 2: This course provides an opportunity for doctoral candidates to conduct applied research in the field of instructional leadership under the supervision of the dissertation chair.
**Dissertation Advisement 3:** This course provides an opportunity for doctoral candidates to conduct applied research in the field of instructional leadership under the supervision of the dissertation chair.
Appendix B : Syllabi for New Courses
1. **Header:**

   Department of CURRICULUM AND TEACHING

2. **Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>EDUC 804</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Title</strong></td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum in Arts and Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre and/or Co Requisites</strong> (specify which are pre-, co-, or both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credits</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Hours (per week)</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberal Arts</strong></td>
<td>[ ] Yes  [ X ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Requirement</strong></td>
<td>___ X_ Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Note: If course is being considered for the Common Core, please use CUNY Common Core Submission Forms [see section V/ below]. The form must be submitted along with the proposal and syllabus.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading Method</strong></td>
<td>C/NC?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Course Description:**

   This course examines current research in Arts and Humanities curriculum and its implementation. It addresses a host of theoretical and policy-oriented approaches to the teaching and learning of the arts and humanities. Particular attention will be paid to research on arts and humanities instruction and interventions that serve the needs of diverse students in urban schools.

4. **Rationale:**

   This is a new course that emphasizes deep understanding of the best current knowledge and research in the critical area of arts and humanities teaching and learning across the educational spectrum. In this course, students will learn a wide range of initiatives related to arts and humanities and its application within educational settings and contexts.

5. **Projected Enrollment 15**

6. **Consultation Statement**

   Is the proposed change likely to affect other Departments or Programs?
[ ] NO  [ ] YES – If yes, list department/program: ____________________________

Has the Department/Program been consulted?  
[ ] NO  [ ] YES

Please include letters of support when necessary.

Is this course cross-listed?  If so, please list all courses it is listed with.

7. **Sample Syllabus**

A. **Course Content and Organization:**

**COURSE SESSION OUTLINE**

_The course schedule may change based on students’ needs or at professor’s discretion. Changes will be addressed in-advance during class or via e-mail. Please be sure to check Blackboard and your e-mail the day before class to print out and read pertinent handouts or announcements._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>TOPICS</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENTS/READINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Session One | Overview of the course  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>TOPICS</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENTS/READINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Class Policies

**Late Papers:** Assignments need to be completed and turned in on time or we lose the rhythm of our work together. Assignments turned in late are subject to grade reductions.

**Work Format:** Assignments should be typed using 12-point font with one-inch margins. Please try not to go over the required page or word limit.

**Revised Work:** Please read through your work carefully before submitting, making sure that you have met the assignment requirements. As educators, we must set a high standard for mastery of the mechanics, conventions, and grammatical structure of the language; therefore, proofread for spelling, grammar, capitalization, and punctuation prior to submission. If you receive a grade of a B or lower on an assignment, you are welcome to revise and resubmit it the following week for a higher grade.

**Expectations for Written and Oral Proficiency in English:** Students are required to demonstrate a strong command of English orally and in all written communications. The Hunter College Writing center provides tutoring to students across the curriculum and at all academic levels. For more information, see http://rwc.hunter.cuny.edu. In addition, the School of Education offers a reading/writing workshop during the semester to students who need additional work honing their reading and writing skills. To register for this course, students must obtain permission either from the Chair of Curriculum and Teaching or the Associate Dean.

A. **Expected Learning Outcomes:**

Candidates will understand…

- Theories and research that describe the foundations of teaching and learning in the arts and humanities
- Theories and research in arts and the humanities related to diverse forms and forums for teaching and learning.

Candidates will be able to…

- Recognize and value diverse forms of the arts and humanities across cultures.
- Influence local, state, or national policy decisions.
Use technology to build upon their and students’ knowledge base related to the arts and humanities

B. Method of Evaluation:

Class Participation
Weekly Responses and Reflections (in-class and online) to Course Readings
Midterm Paper: Critical Analysis of an arts and/or humanities program, curriculum, or other document
Final Paper: Arts and Humanities Program Proposal with Literature Review on Best Practices

Attendance and Participation Policy
Attendance and participation in class and online are expected and required.

C. Websites:

National Standards in Arts Education: https://artsedge.kennedy-center.org/educators/standards.aspx

New York State Arts Learning Standards:
http://schools.nyc.gov/offices/teachlearn/arts/blueprint.html

New York City Department of Education Arts Education:
http://schools.nyc.gov/Academics/Arts/default.htm

D. Academic Integrity Statement: “Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.”

E. AccessABILITY Statement: “In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter College is committed to ensuring educational access and accommodations for all its registered students. Hunter College’s students with disabilities and medical conditions are encouraged to register with the Office of AccessABILITY for assistance and accommodation. For information and appointment contact the Office of AccessABILITY located in Room E1214 or call (212) 772-4857 /or TTY (212) 650-3230.”

Hunter College School of Education Conceptual Framework
The goal of the School of Education is to prepare candidates who will demonstrate, through professional commitments and practices, multiple competencies that promote effective learning.

**Evidence–Based Practices**
The School of Education grounds its course content in the best field-based research and practice. Faculty review findings from their respective disciplines to provide our candidates with the strategies needed for effective instruction. Our candidates master the theory and practice of effective pedagogy in their subject areas, and acquire the tools for reflection on and improvement of their professional work. They achieve a solid foundation in the history, philosophy, psychology, sociology and methodology of education that enriches their teaching. Candidates gain expertise in analyzing and using assessment of student performance to guide their instruction and create optimal learning environments for students.

**Integrated Clinical Experiences**
The School of Education ensures that its candidates understand and experience the realities of school contexts. We establish strong connections with partnering schools in New York City and surrounding areas. We provide extensive fieldwork with supportive supervision in these schools. Our candidates engage in carefully sequenced and comprehensively assessed clinical experiences prior to their graduation.

**Educating a Diverse Student Population**
The School of Education provides its candidates with the critical skills and understanding necessary to be responsive to the multiple challenges of all learners: students with a wide range of backgrounds, cultures, abilities and prior knowledge. We teach candidates to create humane and ethical learning communities in their classrooms and schools. They gain the ability to collaborate successfully with parents, families, community members, school faculty and staff in order to provide this support.
Use of Technology to Enhance Learning
The School of Education prepares candidates with the practical and theoretical knowledge of effective and judicious uses of technology in a variety of school settings and for a broad spectrum of learners. Formative and summative assessments of our candidates’ technology competencies are a critical component of preparing them for tomorrow’s schools. We believe that appropriate uses of educational technology enhance learning, assessment and communication.

TECHNOLOGY COMPETENCIES
The Tech Competencies, which all candidates in the School of Education must demonstrate prior to graduation, are listed below. Please be sure to use the assignments in this course as a way to complete these requirements.

**Productivity:** The competent teacher can...
1. Produce and manage learning documents (creates standard educational publications such as parent newsletters and handouts for students)
2. Analyze quantitative data (completes administrative work such as putting student test scores into a spreadsheet and analyzing them, as well as preparing curriculum materials)
3. Organize information graphically (uses graphic organizer programs, as well as general tools such as word processors or presentation programs, to create digital representations)

**Research:** The competent teacher can...
4. Use effective online search strategies (chooses the most appropriate research tools and databases, and applies the most effective search techniques)
5. Evaluate and compare online information and sources (knows the difference between authoritative and untrustworthy sources, how to ascertain authorship, and how to find sources)
6. Save and cite online information and sources (knows a variety of methods for bookmarking and saving valuable online resources and uses accepted protocols for citing online sources)

**Communication:** The competent teacher can...
7. Communicate using digital tools (uses email, instant messaging, mobile phones, and text messaging for communicating with students, parents, and colleagues)
8. Collaborate online for learning (takes advantage of the tools listed above plus blogs, wikis, chats, audio and videoconferencing to bring outside resources into the classroom)
9. Publish learning resources online (creates resources including a website, wiki, online posting of student projects, and podcasting)

**Media:** The competent teacher can...
10. Differentiate instruction with digital media (has an awareness of assistive technologies for disabled students as well as an ability to use a computer to prepare all students)
11. Capture and edit images, audio, and video (uses digital still and video cameras, edits their output on a computer, and produces learning materials that range from simple slide...
shows to the archiving of student presentations and performances)
12. **Produce digital multimedia educational experiences** (combines media from a wide array of sources into a useful presentation of academic content)

**Presentation:** The competent teacher can...
13. **Create effective digital presentations** (uses common tools for preparing slide shows, videos, and podcasts)
14. **Deliver digital multimedia presentations** (uses devices such as computers, projectors, and screens)
15. **Employ new media devices for learning** (incorporates a variety of digital devices such as SmartBoards and iPods to extend learning opportunities for students outside of school)
Course Prefix and Number | 80 809
--- | ---
Course Title | Case Studies in Education: Institutions, Schools, Programs, Classrooms, and Individuals.
Pre- and/or Co-Requisite | Unknown
Credits | 3
Contact Hours | 3
Liberal Arts | NO
Core Requirements | Not Applicable
Professor | 
Office Hours | 
Phone | 
E-mail | 
Grading Method | Unknown

Course Description
This course examines case study as a research design in educational contexts. The unit of study can include institutions, schools, programs, and individuals. A variety of topics will be explored, including becoming familiar with types of case studies, conceptualizing case study research, creating research questions, generating data, use of analytic methods, and application of case study findings to leadership and practice. In addition, the course will feature related, sometimes overlapping, methodological approaches such as portraiture and narratives. The course engages students in substantial study and critique of current and “classic” cases in educational research based on candidates’ fields of interest. Particular attention will be paid to ethical considerations in conducting case study research in urban schools and communities.

Writing Requirement
(1) Midterm Paper: Book Review of Relevant Case Study on Special Topic (5-8 pages) and (2) Final Paper: Mini Case Study and Presentation (15-20 pages). Library/electronic research is required using APA formatting.

Rationale
This proposed course is part of a new academic program. Please refer to the overall objectives.

Projected Enrollment: Unknown

Consultation Statement
Is the proposed change likely to affect other Departments or Programs? NO
Has the Department/Program been consulted? YES
Is this course cross-listed? NO
Sample Syllabus

Hunter College School of Education Conceptual Framework
The goal of the School of Education is to prepare candidates who will demonstrate, through professional commitments and practices, multiple competencies that promote effective learning.

Evidence–Based Practices
The School of Education grounds its course content in the best field-based research and practice. Faculty review findings from their respective disciplines to provide our candidates with the strategies needed for effective instruction. Our candidates master the theory and practice of effective pedagogy in their subject areas, and acquire the tools for reflection on and improvement of their professional work. They achieve a solid foundation in the history, philosophy, psychology, sociology and methodology of education that enriches their teaching. Candidates gain expertise in analyzing and using assessment of student performance to guide their instruction and create optimal learning environments for students.

Integrated Clinical Experiences
The School of Education ensures that its candidates understand and experience the realities of school contexts. We establish strong connections with partnering schools in New York City and surrounding areas. We provide extensive fieldwork with supportive supervision in these schools. Our candidates engage in carefully sequenced and comprehensively assessed clinical experiences prior to their graduation.

Educating a Diverse Student Population
The School of Education provides its candidates with the critical skills and understanding necessary to be responsive to the multiple challenges of all learners: students with a wide range of backgrounds, cultures, abilities and prior knowledge. We teach candidates to create humane and ethical learning communities in their classrooms and schools. They gain the ability to collaborate successfully with parents, families, community members, school faculty and staff in order to provide this support.

Use of Technology to Enhance Learning
The School of Education prepares candidates with the practical and theoretical knowledge of effective and judicious uses of technology in a variety of school settings and for a broad spectrum of learners. Formative and summative assessments of our candidates’ technology competencies are a critical component of preparing them for tomorrow’s schools. We believe that appropriate uses of educational technology enhance learning, assessment and communication.
Course Content and Objectives/Expected Learning Outcomes
Candidates will understand…
- Ways of conceptualizing case study research and its origins in the social sciences.
- Types of case studies including single and multi-case, cross-case and longitudinal cases.
- Contextual issues and boundaries necessary for building case study research.
- Tasks and processes required to formulate appropriate case study research problems.
- Ethical dilemmas and issues related to the case study research process.

Candidates will be able to…
- Reflect on their positions and subjectivities on the case study research process.
- Critique and evaluate the rigor of relevant case studies in their field of study.
- Design relevant strategies for investigating questions appropriate to case study research, including data collection, analytic methods, and generating findings and implications for instructional leadership and practice.
- Display positive dispositions related to their own reading and writing and pursue the development of individual professional knowledge and behaviors.
- Use technology in order to build upon their knowledge base of building cases in educational contexts.

Methods of Evaluation
1. Class Participation
2. Weekly responses and reflections (in-class and online) to course readings
3. Midterm Paper (25%): Book Review on Case Study Research (4-5 pages)
Library/electronic research is required using APA formatting.
5. Discussant (15%): Everyone will choose a published case study report of a peer reviewed journal article to share with the rest of the class. This should illustrate case study research in your areas of research interests (see suggested readings). You will post a scanned copy of this material on our Blackboard site. You will lead a discussion of the material and subsequently submit a 2-page assessment of the case using the guidelines we develop together in class.

Required Course Texts

Examples of Books for Review


**Suggested Readings** (available on Blackboard)

**Case Study/Theory:**


Case Study/Research:


**Attendance and Participation Policy**
Attendance and participation in class and online are expected and required.

**Academic Integrity Statement**
“Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The college is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.”

**Class Policies**
- **Late Papers:** Assignments need to be completed and turned in on time or we lose the rhythm of our work together. Assignments turned in late are subject to grade reductions.
- **Work Format:** Assignments should be typed using 12-point font with one-inch margins. Please try not to go over the required page or word limit.
- **Revised Work:** Please read through your work carefully before submitting, making sure that you have met the assignment requirements. As educators, we must set a high standard for mastery of the mechanics, conventions, and grammatical structure of the language; therefore, proofread for spelling, grammar, capitalization, and punctuation prior to submission. If you receive a grade of a B or lower on an assignment, you are welcome to revise and resubmit it the following week for a higher grade.
- **Expectations for Written and Oral Proficiency in English:** Students are required to demonstrate a strong command of English orally and in all written communications. The Hunter College Writing center provides tutoring to students across the curriculum and at all academic levels. For more information, see http://rwc.hunter.cuny.edu. In addition, the School of Education offers a reading/writing workshop during the semester to students who need additional work honing their reading and writing skills. To register for this course, students must obtain permission either from the Chair of Curriculum and Teaching or the Associate Dean.

**Access and Accommodations for Students with Disabilities**
In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter is committed to ensuring educational access and accommodations for all its registered students. Hunter College’s students with disabilities and medical conditions are encouraged to register with the Office of AccessABILITY for assistance and accommodation. For information and appointment contact the Office of AccessABILITY located in Room E1214 or call (212) 772-4857 /or TTY (212) 650-3230.

**COURSE SESSION OUTLINE**

The course schedule may change based on students’ needs or at professor’s discretion. Changes will be addressed in advance during class or via e-mail. Please be sure to check Blackboard and your e-mail the day before class to print out and read pertinent handouts or announcements. All classes will be set up in a seminar format—where instructor and students will share their understanding and expertise in the topics that are listed below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>TOPICS</th>
<th>READINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Study Methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Session One** | Considering the Case: An Introduction | Dyson & Genishi, Chapters 1&2  
Flyvbjerg, “Five Misunderstandings about Case Study Research”  
Compton-Lilly, “Case Studies” |
| **Session Two** | Case Study Design  
Researcher Reflexivity | Dyson & Genishi, Chapter 3  
Merriam, Chapter 3 (Designing the Study and Selecting a Sample)  
Chiseri-Strater, “Turning in upon ourselves: Positionality, subjectivity and reflexivity in case study and ethnographic research” |
| **Session Three** | Approaches to Data Collection | Dyson & Genishi, Chapter 4  
Merriam, Part II (Collecting Qualitative Data) |
| **Session Four** | Approaches to Data Analysis & Reporting Findings | Dyson & Genishi, Chapters 5&6  
Merriam, Part III (Analyzing and Reporting Qualitative Data) |
| **Session Five** | Ethics and Case Study Design | TBD |
| **Session Six** | Single & Multi-Cases | Stake, Chapter 1-3  
Small, “How many cases do I need?” |
| **Session Seven** | Cross-Case Analysis | Stake, Chapters 4-5  
Borman et. al, “Cross-case analysis” |
| **Session Eight** | Step by Step Case Studies | Choose One:  
Stake, Chapters 6-8  
**Book Review Due** |
| **Session Nine** | Longitudinal Case Studies | Compton-Lilly, “Reading capital in two immigrant families: Longitudinal case studies” |
| **Session Ten** | Choice Topics | Discussant Articles TBD |
| **Session Eleven** | Choice Topics | Discussant Articles TBD |
| **Session Twelve** | Choice Topics | Discussant Articles TBD |
| **Session Thirteen** | Choice Topics | Discussant Articles TBD |
| **Session Fourteen** | Mini case study oral presentations |          |
| **Session Fifteen** | Mini case study oral presentations | **Mini Case Paper Due** |
Course Prefix and Number | EDF 831
--- | ---
Course Title | Dissertation Advisement I
Pre-and/or Co-Requisite | Dissertation Proposal Seminar (Pre-Requisite)
Credits | 2.0
Contact Hours | 2
Liberal Arts | NO
Core Requirements | Not Applicable
Professor | 
Office Hours | 
Phone | 
E-mail | 
Grading Method | Unknown

Course Background and Description

Dissertation Advisement I is a customized course of study taken immediately after Dissertation Seminar. The purpose of this course is to provide individualized support to doctoral students as they continue to engage with components of their dissertation to develop a robust proposal. The dissertation proposal must minimally consist of the first three chapters that include the following components: (1) the background of the problem to be investigated; (2) research question(s); (3) a theoretical framework, where appropriate; (4) a literature review; (5) selected research methods to collect data; (6) tentative description of intended analysis. In addition, it should be sufficient to be the basis of creating an IRB research proposal.

Course Format

This course consists of a weekly scheduled meeting with the dissertation adviser to help craft the elements of dissertation proposal that will be defended by the end of the semester. Students must successfully defend their dissertation proposal in order to proceed to Dissertation Advisement II.

Projected Enrollment: Unknown

Consultation Statement
Is the proposed change likely to affect other Departments or Programs? NO
Has the Department/Program been consulted? YES
Is this course cross-listed? YES EDUC 831; SPED 831
Hunter College School of Education Conceptual Framework
The goal of the School of Education is to prepare candidates who will demonstrate, through professional commitments and practices, multiple competencies that promote effective learning.

Evidence–Based Practices
The School of Education grounds its course content in the best field-based research and practice. Faculty review findings from their respective disciplines to provide our candidates with the strategies needed for effective instruction. Our candidates master the theory and practice of effective pedagogy in their subject areas, and acquire the tools for reflection on and improvement of their professional work. They achieve a solid foundation in the history, philosophy, psychology, sociology and methodology of education that enriches their teaching. Candidates gain expertise in analyzing and using assessment of student performance to guide their instruction and create optimal learning environments for students.

Integrated Clinical Experiences
The School of Education ensures that its candidates understand and experience the realities of school contexts. We establish strong connections with partnering schools in New York City and surrounding areas. We provide extensive fieldwork with supportive supervision in these schools. Our candidates engage in carefully sequenced and comprehensively assessed clinical experiences prior to their graduation.

Educating a Diverse Student Population
The School of Education provides its candidates with the critical skills and understanding necessary to be responsive to the multiple challenges of all learners: students with a wide range of backgrounds, cultures, abilities and prior knowledge. We teach candidates to create humane and ethical learning communities in their classrooms and schools. They gain the ability to collaborate successfully with parents, families, community members, school faculty and staff in order to provide this support.

Use of Technology to Enhance Learning
The School of Education prepares candidates with the practical and theoretical knowledge of effective and judicious uses of technology in a variety of school settings and for a broad spectrum of learners. Formative and summative assessments of our candidates’ technology competencies are a critical component of preparing them for tomorrow’s schools. We believe that appropriate uses of educational technology enhance learning, assessment and communication.
Course Content and Objectives/Expected Learning Outcomes

Students will:
- Meet weekly with dissertation advisor
- Develop a manageable plan with advisor that will chart weekly goals and objectives
- Select a dissertation committee
- Review and expand their existing work developed in Research Seminar.
- Continue to develop academic writing skills, particularly within the genre of dissertation writing
- Develop cohesion among the following dissertation components: (1) the background of the problem to be investigated; (2) research question(s); (3) a theoretical framework, where appropriate; (4) a literature review; (5) selected research methods to collect data; (6) tentative description of intended analysis.
- Provide dissertation committee members drafts of work, as needed
- Elicit feedback, as appropriate, from peers within the doctoral cohort
- Utilize technology as a research tool to access databases of scholarly publications
- Prepare and submit a dissertation proposal that will be defended by the end of the semester
- Be ready to submit an IRB research proposal

Methods of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Weekly Meetings</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft of Three Chapter Proposal</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Three Chapter Proposal to be Presented to Committee</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grades

Grades are defined as follows:
- A+ Rare performance. Reserved for highly exceptional. rare achievement. 100-97.5
- A Excellent. Outstanding achievement. 97.4-92.5
- A- Excellent work, but not quite outstanding. 92.4-90.0
- B+ Very good. Solid achievement expected of most graduate students. 89.9-87.5
- B Good. Acceptable achievement. 87.4-82.5
- B- Acceptable achievement, but below what is generally expected of graduate
- C+ Fair achievement. above minimally acceptable level. 79.9-
- C Fair achievement. but only minimally acceptable. 77.4-70.0
- F Failure 69.9-0.0

Source: CUNY
Required Course Texts:

Selected published articles that are a result of robust dissertation scholarship.

Course Requirements
Student must:
- Make every attempt to attend weekly meetings. If anticipating an absence, notify the advisor.
- Come prepared to each weekly meeting with questions
- Provide progress of work at each weekly meeting
- Develop a Dissertation Committee
- Complete their three chapter proposal and successfully defend it before the end of the semester

Guidelines for Written Work
All written work must be or have:
- Word-processed
- White paper
- Double-spaced
- Black ink
- 12-point, normal font
- 1-inch margins
- Numbered pages
- Stapled
- A reference page
- Correct grammar and spelling
- Compliant with APA style. For free, short APA online tutorials, please go to: http://apastyle.apa.org

Academic Integrity Statement
“Hunter College regards acts of dishonesty (e.g. plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the value of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.’’

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY STATEMENT – from the Hunter College Senate. Any deliberate borrowing of the ideas, terms, statements, or knowledge of others without clear and specific acknowledgment of the source is intellectual theft known as plagiarism. It is not plagiarism to borrow the ideas, terms, statements, or knowledge of others if the source is clearly acknowledged via a full citation (Graduate Catalog, Hunter College).
Expectations for Written Proficiency in English
Students must demonstrate consistently satisfactory written English in coursework. The Hunter College Writing center provides tutoring to students across the curriculum and at all academic levels. For more information, see http://rwc.hunter.cuny.edu. In addition, the School of Education offers a reading/writing workshop during the semester to students who need additional work honing their reading and writing skills. To register for this course, students must obtain permission either from the Chair of Curriculum & Teaching or the Associate Dean.

Access and Accommodations for Students with Disabilities:
We recommend that all HC students with disabilities explore the support services and register with the OFFICE FOR ACCESS and ACCOMMODATIONS. HC students with disabilities are protected by the American with Disabilities Act (ADA), which requires that they be provided equal access and reasonable accommodations. In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter is committed to ensuring this educational access and accommodations. For information and assistance, contact the OFFICE OF ACCESSIBILITY in Room E1124 or call (212) 772-4857 or TTY (212) 650-3230.

Schedule
Student will meet weekly with their advisor for approximately 2 hours per week.
HUNTER COLLEGE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHING  
Proposal for New Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>EDF 830</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Dissertation Proposal Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- and/or Co-Requisite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Hours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Requirements</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Background and Description
This course is a seminar designed to provide students with a general overview of the structure and components of a dissertation proposal. It serves as common ground for all cohort members to prepare for highly individualized work with a dissertation advisor in subsequent semesters. Throughout this course, students will focus upon the following components: (1) the background of the problem to be investigated; (2) formulating a research question(s); (3) developing a theoretical framework; (4) conducting a literature review; (5) choosing research methods to collect data; (6) analyzing findings; and (7) generating implications. These elements will be taught in relation to a “traditional” five-chapter dissertation, along with variations and expansions of this structure. In addition, students will review and become certified in appropriate IRB requirements. A major goal of this seminar is to individualize support with view to preparing each student to develop a topic for approval that will continue to be worked upon with a dissertation advisor during the following semester.

Course Format
This course is a seminar and its success is contingent upon open, informed, and productive dialogues among all class participants. It focuses on issues of understanding and preparing for all elements of a dissertation proposal. As such, it requires all members to engage in active thinking related to assigned readings, class discussions, and shared peer work as elements of dissertation plans emerge.

Rationale
This proposed course is part of a new academic program. Please refer to the overall objectives.

Projected Enrollment: Unknown

Consultation Statement
Is the proposed change likely to affect other Departments or Programs? NO
Has the Department/Program been consulted? YES
Is this course cross-listed? YES EDUC 830; SPED 830
Hunter College School of Education Conceptual Framework

The goal of the School of Education is to prepare candidates who will demonstrate, through professional commitments and practices, multiple competencies that promote effective learning.

**Evidence–Based Practices**

The School of Education grounds its course content in the best field-based research and practice. Faculty review findings from their respective disciplines to provide our candidates with the strategies needed for effective instruction. Our candidates master the theory and practice of effective pedagogy in their subject areas, and acquire the tools for reflection on and improvement of their professional work. They achieve a solid foundation in the history, philosophy, psychology, sociology and methodology of education that enriches their teaching. Candidates gain expertise in analyzing and using assessment of student performance to guide their instruction and create optimal learning environments for students.

**Integrated Clinical Experiences**

The School of Education ensures that its candidates understand and experience the realities of school contexts. We establish strong connections with partnering schools in New York City and surrounding areas. We provide extensive fieldwork with supportive supervision in these schools. Our candidates engage in carefully sequenced and comprehensively assessed clinical experiences prior to their graduation.

**Educating a Diverse Student Population**

The School of Education provides its candidates with the critical skills and understanding necessary to be responsive to the multiple challenges of all learners: students with a wide range of backgrounds, cultures, abilities and prior knowledge. We teach candidates to create humane and ethical learning communities in their classrooms and schools. They gain the ability to collaborate successfully with parents, families, community members, school faculty and staff in order to provide this support.

**Use of Technology to Enhance Learning**

The School of Education prepares candidates with the practical and theoretical knowledge of effective and judicious uses of technology in a variety of school settings and for a broad spectrum of learners. Formative and summative assessments of our candidates’ technology competencies are a critical component of preparing them for tomorrow’s schools. We believe
that appropriate uses of educational technology enhance learning, assessment and communication.
Course Content and Objectives/Expected Learning Outcomes

Students will:
- Review and complete IRB training for potential researchers
- Utilize technology as a research tool to access data bases of scholarly publications
- Analyze scholarly writing, including actual dissertation proposals and dissertations — and published articles derived from dissertations
- Self-analyze their own and peer writing abilities within the genre of educational scholarship
- Identify and describe the elements of a dissertation proposal and dissertation
- Develop writing and formatting skills in the preparation of their proposal and dissertation.
- Engage with each other in critical collaboration to explore their interests in relation to the dissertation component being taught
- Present and discuss their on-going ideas in regard to developing all aspects of their dissertation proposal
- Create a folder that will help plan a tentative outline of their first three chapters of their proposal defense
- Begin drafting of IRB application

Methods of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRB Completion/Printed Certification</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background and Question Assignment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotated Plan of Literature Review Assignment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative/Emerging Theoretical Framework Assignment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative Description of Methods Assignment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative Description/Justification of Mode of Analysis Assignment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Depth Analysis of a Published Dissertation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Next Semester: Final Binder &amp; Next Steps</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Participation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An explanation of each assignment is given after in the appendix of this outline.

Grades

Grades are defined as follows:
- **A+** Rare performance. Reserved for highly exceptional, rare achievement. 100-97.5
- **A** Excellent. Outstanding achievement. 97.4-97.5
- **A-** Excellent work, but not quite outstanding. 97.4-90.0
- **B+** Very good. Solid achievement expected of most graduate students. 89.9-87.5
- **B** Good. Acceptable achievement. 87.4-82.5
- **B-** Acceptable achievement, but below what is generally expected of graduate students. 82.4-77.5
- **C+** Fair achievement, above minimally acceptable level. 79.9-77.4
- **C** Fair achievement, but only minimally acceptable. 77.4-70.0
- **F** Failure. 69.9-0.0

Source: CUNY
Required Course Texts:

A self-selected dissertation in their area of interest

Selected published articles that are a result of robust dissertation scholarship.

Course Requirements
Students must:
- Make every attempt to attend all class seminars. If anticipating an absence, notify the instructor.
- If classes are missed, be responsible for obtaining class notes and materials.
- More than two absences may jeopardize passing this seminar.
- Come prepared and ready to fully engage in all class activities.
- Be supportive of other seminar members.
- Complete all required work and reading assignments on time.

Guidelines for Written Work
All written work must be or have:
- Word-processed
- White paper
- Double-spaced
- Black ink
- 12-point, normal font
- 1-inch margins
- Numbered pages
- Stapled
- A reference page
- Correct grammar and spelling
- Compliant with APA style. For free, short APA online tutorials, please go to: [http://apastyle.apa.org](http://apastyle.apa.org)

Academic Integrity Statement
“Hunter College regards acts of dishonesty (e.g. plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the value of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.’’

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY STATEMENT – from the Hunter College Senate. Any deliberate borrowing of the ideas, terms, statements, or knowledge of others without clear and specific acknowledgment of the source is intellectual theft known as plagiarism. It is not plagiarism to borrow the ideas, terms, statements, or knowledge of others if the source is clearly acknowledged via a full citation (Graduate Catalog, Hunter College).
Expectations for Written Proficiency in English
Students must demonstrate consistently satisfactory written English in coursework. The Hunter College Writing center provides tutoring to students across the curriculum and at all academic levels. For more information, see http://rwc.hunter.cuny.edu. In addition, the School of Education offers a reading/writing workshop during the semester to students who need additional work honing their reading and writing skills. To register for this course, students must obtain permission either from the Chair of Curriculum & Teaching or the Associate Dean.

Access and Accommodations for Students with Disabilities:
We recommend that all HC students with disabilities explore the support services and register with the OFFICE FOR ACCESS and ACCOMMODATIONS. HC students with disabilities are protected by the American with Disabilities Act (ADA), which requires that they be provided equal access and reasonable accommodations. In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter is committed to ensuring this educational access and accommodations. For information and assistance, contact the OFFICE OF ACCESSIBILITY in Room E1124 or call (212) 772-4857 or TTY (212) 650-3230.
Tentative Schedule

Seminar # 1:

What Are the Components of a Dissertation?

Topics include:
- Dissertation as Research—the sum of its parts
- Institutional Review Board for Human Participants
- IRB/Citi Training: https://www.citiprogram.org/

Seminar # 2:

What Are Some Ethical Considerations within Research?

Topics include:
- Issues within IRB Training
- Researching in Contexts
- Documents needed for permission to conduct research

Seminar # 3:

How Should I Identify a Topic?

Topics include:
- Choosing your topic
- Criteria for choice
- Original and replication studies
- Writing the background/context of your topic

Due: IRB Completion/Printed Certification

Seminar # 4:

How Can I Generate a Research Question?
Topics include:
- Professional passions/interests
- Narrowing the focus
- Overarching and sub questions

Seminar # 5:

**How Can I Plan a Review of the Literature?**

Topics include:
- Determining parameters
- Sorting processes
- Utilizing technology

Due: Background and Question Assignment

Seminar # 6:

**How Can I Organize a Review of the Literature?**

Topics include:
- Organizational strategies
- Analysis of research
- Grouping of findings
- Ordering of findings

Seminar # 7:

**What Should I Consider When Determining My Theoretical Framework?**

Topics include:
- Degrees of objectivity and subjectivity
- Positivism and post-positivism
- Considering paradigms and their relationship to theoretical frameworks
Due: Annotated Plan of Literature Review Assignment

Seminar # 8:

**How Do I Build My Theoretical Framework?**

Topics include:
- Knowing your world view
- Using compatible theories
- Framing the research issue

Seminar # 9:

**How Are Methods Intricately Connected Other Elements of My Research?**

Topics include:
- Context/Background of problem and methods
- Research question and methods
- Theoretical framework and methods
- Data analysis of methods

Due: Tentative/Emerging Theoretical Framework Assignment

Seminar # 10:

**How Can I Choose the Most Appropriate Methods?**

Topics include:
- Compatibility with overall research
- Advantages and limitations of all methodological choices
- Combining methods
- Collecting data
Seminar # 11:

What Are Some Approaches to Analysis in the Context of Varying Research?

Topics include:
  - Sampling data analyzed within educational research
  - Making choices
  - Applying the choices

Due: Tentative Description of Methods Assignment

Seminar # 12:

What Are Some Ways I Can Analyze the Data?

Topics include:
  - Multiple approaches to analysis
  - Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed Findings

Seminar # 13:

How Can I Generate Implications From My Research Findings?

Topics include:
  - Practice
  - Policy
  - Theory
  - Research

Due: Tentative Description/Justification of Mode of Analysis Assignment.
Seminar # 14:

Reviewing Components of a Dissertation

Topics include:
   The parts in relation to the whole
   Analyzing published dissertations
   Discussing articles based on dissertations

Due: In-Depth Analysis of a Published Dissertation

Seminar # 15:

Preparation for Dissertation Advisement

Topics include:
   Sharing “in progress/in process” research plans
   Next steps next semester

Due: Final binder of all dissertation elements and a plan of “next steps” to be used with advisor next semester.
APPENDIX: ASSIGNMENTS

Note: There are many ‘small’ assignments for this class. This is in order to allow students to capture their thinking as they proceed through each element of a dissertation. All assignments are cumulative and should be placed in a binder that will be both peer-reviewed and professor-reviewed at the end of the semester. This binder will be the starting point of the following semester’s Dissertation Advisement with each student’s chosen advisor. We fully understand that conceptualizing, drafting, and writing a dissertation is a recursive rather than linear process.

1. IRB Completion/Printed Certification (10%)

Students will complete selected units within Citi training that provides a rationale, history, and procedural information pertaining to IRBs. A certificate of completion will be presented to the course instructor.

2. Background and Tentative Research Question Assignment (10%)

Students will describe the background of the problem, and generate their research questions. Length: 2-3 double spaced pages.

3. Annotated Plan of Literature Review Assignment (10%)

Students will create a plan of their literature view, identifying key related areas—justifying their choices in a short narrative. Length: 2-3 double spaced pages.

4. Tentative/Emerging Theoretical Framework Assignment (10%)

Students describe their theoretical framework based upon their world-view and cultural context. Length: 2-3 double spaced pages.

5. Tentative Description of Methods Assignment (10%)

Students describe their tentative choice of methods, describing why they are appropriate, and citing literature that has utilized these approaches. Length: 2-3 double spaced pages.

6. Tentative Description/Justification of Mode of Analysis Assignment (10%)

Students describe their tentative choice of analysis, describing this specific approach(es) is
potentially useful, and citing literature that has utilized these approaches.
Length: 2-3 double spaced pages.

7. In-Depth Analysis and Critical Evaluation of a Published Dissertation (25%)

Over the course of the semester, students will identify and read a dissertation whose topic is related
to their own interest—and conduct an in-depth analysis of all components. Criteria for analysis and
critical evaluation will be provided.
Length: 10-15 pages

8. Preparation for Next Semester: Final Binder & Next Steps (10%)

As mentioned, the goal of the course is to familiarize students with all components of a dissertation
and help them prepare for working with their adviser in the next semester. The final binder will
include all assignments listed above, as well as (a) a self-reflective statement and (b) a plan for “next
steps” in continuing to build the dissertation.
Length of additional components: 4-5 pages

9. Class Participation (5%)

Participation by everyone is vital for an interesting, stimulating, and balanced seminar. Please be
present and on time. Participation includes: preparing your thoughts (via response to readings),
reading “outside” of class texts, sharing ideas, respectfully challenging the ideas of others, supporting
and encouraging peers with feedback for their research “in progress,” etc.
1. Header: Department of Curriculum & Teaching  
Proposal for a New Course

2. Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>EDUC 808</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Action Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre and/or Co Requisites (specify which are pre-, co-, or both)</td>
<td>ED$ 803 Qualitative Research Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Hours (per week)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>[ X ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Requirement (Note: If course is being considered for the Common Core, please use CUNY Common Core Submission Forms [see section VI below]. The form must be submitted along with the proposal and syllabus.)</td>
<td>X Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Common Core: (also indicate category below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ English Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Math and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Life and Physical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Scientific World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Creative Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ U.S. Experience in its Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ World Cultures and Global Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Individual and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Method C/NC?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Course Description:
The purpose of this course is to explore various aspects of a movement in education and educational research in which educators (e.g., P-12 teachers, school administrators, etc.) actively participate in making change in their practice through conducting systematic inquiry and research. The course will provide a broad overview of the epistemological, political, and methodological issues associated with the idea of practitioner research.

4. Rationale:
This is a new special topics course related to research methodology for the doctoral program. It will help students design practitioner-based research studies that will lead to classroom, school, or district level changes. Students will use practitioner-based research strategies (e.g., observations, interviewing, and document analysis) to complete an action research project that will address an issue of immediate salience to their professional contexts.

5. Projected Enrollment 15

6. Consultation Statement
Is the proposed change likely to affect other Departments or Programs?
[ X ] NO [ ] YES – If yes, list department/program: ____________________________
Has the Department/Program been consulted?  [ ] NO  [ ] YES
Please include letters of support when necessary.
Is this course cross-listed?  If so, please list all courses it is listed with.

7. Sample Syllabus

   A. Course Content and Organization:

   COURSE REQUIREMENTS

   Projects: Students must complete two projects for the course. The first project will require
students to work in small learning communities in which they collaborate to examine the
methodology and findings of a published book in which action research is used. This project will
be worth 20% of the course grade. The second project will be an action research project, paper,
and presentation developed by each individual student and will be worth 50% of the course
grade. Further details on the projects will be provided during the semester.

   Academic participation: Short formative assessments will be posted on Blackboard. This
component will be worth 10% of the final grade. Students will also be required to keep a
reading log journal in which they record their thoughts on course readings and in-class
discussion. This log will be turned in 3 times throughout the semester and is worth 20% of
final grade.

   COURSE POLICIES

   Attendance: All students are expected to attend and arrive on time for all classes. Reading and
preparing for class are important. If absent, students are responsible for obtaining class
notes and/or handouts from their classmates even though the absence may be excused.

   Make-up examinations: NO make-up examinations, except for extreme circumstances.

   Incomplete course grade: NO “incomplete” course grade will be granted in this course,
except for extreme situations and at the instructor’s discretion.

   Assistance with writing: Completion of course projects are highly dependent on effective
writing skills. If you need assistance with writing, please utilize the Hunter College
Writing Center.

   CONTENT OUTLINE AND SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Course Readings</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Required Reading(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Getting started with action</td>
<td>Falk &amp; Blumenreich, Chapters 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Planning for action research</td>
<td>Fecho, “Is this English?” Chapters 1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Action research and instructional</td>
<td>Fecho, “Is this English?” Chapters 4-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tools and methods for generating data</td>
<td>Cochrane-Smith &amp; Lytle, Chapters 4-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Data collection tools</td>
<td>Cochrane-Smith &amp; Lytle, Chapters 7-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Positioning as a teacher researcher</td>
<td>Cochrane-Smith &amp; Lytle, Chapters 10-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Analyzing Data</td>
<td>Compton-Lilly, <em>Reading Families</em>, Chapters 5-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Analyzing Data, Part 2</td>
<td>Falk &amp; Blumenreich, Chapter 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Classroom discourse analysis and action research</td>
<td>Gallas, “Sometimes I Can Be Anything,” <em>Intro- Chapter 6</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Launching inquiry from children's questions</td>
<td>Gallas, “Sometimes I Can Be Anything,” <em>Chapters 7-afterword</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Collaborating for action research</td>
<td>Brookline Teacher Research Seminar, <em>Regarding Children’s Words</em>, <em>Intro</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Writing your research</td>
<td>Falk &amp; Blumenreich, <em>Chapters 8</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Posing new questions</td>
<td>Falk &amp; Blumenreich, <em>Chapters 9-10</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Student Project Presentations</td>
<td>Falk &amp; Blumenreich, <em>Chapters 9-10</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Readings are to be completed BEFORE the class for which they are assigned. Additional required readings will be assigned for some sessions approximately one week before they are due, and announced on Blackboard.*

**B. Expected Learning Outcomes:**

There are a number of central issues and themes that are currently being discussed and debated in action research that would be addressed in this course:

1. **What is practitioner research?** Is it “real” educational research or is it a form of professional development?

2. **If it is "real" research, what are the criteria that can help us determine the quality and trustworthiness of the research?** Who should be making these judgments about practitioner research?
3. What tools and methods do practitioner researchers use to collect, generate, and analyze data about their teaching and classrooms?

4. How does engaging in the process of action research have an impact on the researcher, his or her teaching, and the context of his or her work?

5. How do practitioner researchers view the relationship between theory and practice?

C. Method of Evaluation:

**EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Component</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Research Book Critique</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Research Project, Paper, and Presentation</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Log</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Assessments</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADING SYSTEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>97.5 – 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87.5 – 89.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>77.5 – 79.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>92.5 – 97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>82.5 – 87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>70.0 – 77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90.0 – 92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80.0 – 82.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0 – 69.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Required Readings:


E. Recommended Readings:


Other Information On Action Research
1. Electronic Journals that publish practitioner research studies and articles about practitioner research
   - Networks- http://education.ucsc.edu/faculty/gwells/networks
   - The Ontario Action Researcher- http://nipissingu.ca/oar
   - AR Expeditions http://www.arexpeditions.montana.edu/docs/about.html
2. Print journals that publish action research studies and papers about action research (complete sets of these 2 journals are available in 574a TEB).
   - Action Research (Sage Publications)
   - Educational Action Research (Triangle Publications).
   - Studying Teacher Education (Carfax)

Other Readings on Action Research


F. **Academic Integrity Statement:** “Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.”

G. **AccessABILITY Statement:** “In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter College is committed to ensuring educational access and accommodations for all its registered students. Hunter College’s students with disabilities and medical conditions are encouraged to register with the Office of AccessABILITY for assistance and accommodation. For information and appointment contact the Office of AccessABILITY located in Room E1214 or call (212) 772-4857 /or TTY (212) 650-3230.”

**Conceptual Framework, Hunter College School of Education**

The School of Education’s mission is to prepare deeply thoughtful, knowledgeable and highly effective teachers, administrators and counselors. Our vision is a research-based, clinically grounded, culturally competent and technology-rich program for preparing all our candidates. We are focused on enabling candidates to achieve substantive learning gains for the students and schools they will serve. Our goal is to prepare educators who will demonstrate, through their professional commitments and practices, those multiple competencies that promote effective learning. See [http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/school-of-education](http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/school-of-education)
1. **Header:**

   Department of Special Education
   Proposal for a New Course

2. **Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>SPED 800</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Title</strong></td>
<td>Introduction to Doctoral Studies: Theory and Research in Curriculum and Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre and/or Co Requisites</strong> (specify which are pre-, co-, or both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credits</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Hours (per week)</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberal Arts</strong></td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ X ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Requirement</strong></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Note: If course is being considered for the Common Core, please use CUNY Common Core Submission Forms [see section VI below]. The form must be submitted along with the proposal and syllabus.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading Method</strong></td>
<td>C/NC?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Course Description:**

   This course provides a brief overview of theory and research in curriculum and teaching. Students will consider how their own positionality influences ways in which they read and interpret educational research. Conversely, students will also understand how a researcher’s positionality influences all aspects of their research, including: questions asked; theoretical framework adopted; methodologies chosen; data collection; analysis and interpretation of data; results or findings; and implications. Students will also engage in studying selected influences of curriculum history, particularly post 1945-present. These influences include: The Cold War, Civil Rights Movement, The War on Poverty, No Child Left Behind, and the Standards Movement. This course will serve as a beginning to cultivating student interests in developing their own research studies by weaving together theory, research, practice, and policy within education.

4. **Rationale:**
This course provides an introduction and orientation to the various research perspectives that permeates research in the field of education. In addition the role of the researcher as a variable within the investigative process is interrogated.

5. **Projected Enrollment**

6. **Consultation Statement**
   Is the proposed change likely to affect other Departments or Programs?
   [ X ] NO   [ ] YES – If yes, list department/program: ____________________________
   Has the Department/Program been consulted?   [ ] NO   [ ] YES
   Please include letters of support when necessary.
   Is this course cross-listed? If so, please list all courses it is listed with.

7. **Sample Syllabus**
   A. **Course Content and Organization:**
   This course is a seminar, a dialogue between the instructor and the class participants focused on issues of mutual interest. It requires that all members of the seminar engage in active thinking and analysis of assigned materials, their own knowledge base, their values, and the information presented by the instructor and their peers. In addition the seminar introduces students to the research perspectives of faculty associated with the doctoral program.

**Course Requirements**

Students must:

- Make every attempt to attend all class seminars. If anticipating an absence, notify the instructor.
- If classes are missed, be responsible for obtaining class notes, handouts, etc.,
- More than two absences may jeopardize passing this seminar.
- Come prepared and ready to fully engage in all class activities.
- Be supportive of other seminar members.
- Complete all required work and reading assignments on time.

**Guidelines for Written Work**

All written work must be or have:

- Word-processed
- White paper
- Double-spaced
- Black ink
- 12-point, normal font
- 1-inch margins
- Numbered pages
- Stapled
- A reference page
- Correct grammar and spelling
Compliant with APA style. For free, short APA online tutorials, please go to: http://apastyle.apa.org

Schedule

Seminar(#1:)

Background to the Program; Overview of Course

Question to discuss: *What is theory and research in curriculum and teaching?*

Seminar(#2:)

Topic: Contemplating our position as readers and researchers within education

Question to guide reading: *What constitutes each researcher and reader’s positionality?*

Sample Readings:


Seminar(#3:)

Topic: Research Paradigms: Ontologies, Epistemologies, Methodologies

Questions to guide reading: *What are the relationships between ontology, epistemology, and methodology within research?*
Sample Readings:


Due: Response #1

---

**Seminar (#4):**

**Topic: Curriculum Histories**

Questions to guide reading: *Who renders curriculum history? How do versions differ?*

Sample Readings:


Seminar # 5:

Topic: Curriculum Histories

Question to guide reading: How does the Curriculum shape citizens?

Sample Reading:


Due: Response #3


Seminar # 6:

Topic: Major Influences on the Curriculum I: The Cold War, Civil Rights, The War on Poverty

Question to guide reading: From where does school reform come?

Sample Reading:


Due: Response #4

**Seminars(#7(&8:(!**

**Topic: Major Influences on the Curriculum II: No Child Left Behind, Standards, and Testing**

Question to guide reading: *What/who has forged the current curriculum?*

Sample Readings:


**Seminar(#9:(!**

**Topic: Contemporary Curriculum Inquiry**

Question to guide reading: *What are some major issues in the contemporary landscape of curriculum and teaching? Where do you currently stand in relation to them?*

Sample Readings:


**Seminars**(10;15):**SpecialTopics**(15)

Invited faculty will present their research and the frameworks associated with the research. Each faculty member will provide the focus question and readings for their session.

Due: Final Paper Seminar 15

**B. Expected Learning Outcomes:**

Students will:

- Begin to form a community of scholar-practitioners who collaborative in developing each other’s knowledge and skills through active engagement in all aspects of the doctoral program

- Become part of the larger intellectual community through awareness of and participation in activities related to organizations, conferences, and professional publications

- Develop the ability to produce academic writing that is engaging, well structured, fluid, and consistent with guidelines of the American Psychological Association (APA)

- Comprehend the origins and implications of various epistemologies and paradigms for research into curriculum and teaching

- Relate research on curriculum and teaching to broader historical context that includes social, cultural, and political issues

- Actively read several texts representing multiple viewpoints about educational issue—and formulate a position based upon interpretations of theories/research presented

- Engage with and discuss implications of various forms of research into curriculum and teaching

**C. Method of Evaluation:**
Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Paper/Response to Readings #1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Paper/Response to Readings #2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Paper/Response to Readings #3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Paper/Response to Readings #4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Participation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Research Paper</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A detailed explanation of each assignment is given after in the appendix of this outline.

Grades

Grades are defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>Rare performance. Reserved for highly exceptional, rare achievement.</td>
<td>100-97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Excellent. Outstanding achievement.</td>
<td>97.4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Excellent work, but not quite outstanding.</td>
<td>92.4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Very good. Solid achievement expected of most graduate students.</td>
<td>89.9-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Good. Acceptable achievement.</td>
<td>87.4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>Acceptable achievement, but below what is generally expected of graduate students.</td>
<td>82.4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>Fair achievement, above minimally acceptable level.</td>
<td>79.9-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Fair achievement, but only minimally acceptable.</td>
<td>77.4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>69.9-0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CUNY

D. Required Readings:

Texts:


E. **Recommended Readings:**

**Texts:**


**Articles:**


F. **Academic Integrity Statement:** “Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.”

G. **AccessABILITY Statement:** “In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter College is committed to ensuring educational access and accommodations for all its registered students. Hunter College’s students with disabilities and medical conditions are encouraged to register with the Office of AccessABILITY for assistance and accommodation. For information and appointment contact the Office of AccessABILITY located in Room E1214 or call (212) 772-4857 /or TTY (212) 650-3230.”

**Expectations for Written Proficiency in English**

Students must demonstrate consistently satisfactory written English in coursework. The Hunter College Writing center provides tutoring to students across the curriculum and at all academic levels. For more information, see [http://rwc.hunter.cuny.edu](http://rwc.hunter.cuny.edu). In addition, the School of Education offers a reading/writing workshop during the semester to students who need additional work honing their reading and writing skills. To register for this course, students must obtain permission either from the Chair of Curriculum & Teaching or the Associate Dean.

**APPENDIX: ASSIGNMENTS**
1. Four Mini-Papers: Response to Readings/Reflections (12.5% each)

These short papers will 2 pages
In their papers, each student should:

- answer a question posed that is the focus of a seminar session
- focus on personal reactions to the readings and their applicability to schools
- include questions raised as a result of engaging with the material
- feature important points the authors are making, including a quotation that should be discussed
- use the information to serve as a springboard for conversations in the seminar
- in general, capture his/her own thinking, and help develop an individual “voice”
- linked the paper to other readings in the course, where appropriate
- in sum, critique readings with an eye to their strengths and weaknesses

Students should not:

- summarize the readings
- be acritical

2. Class Participation (10%)

Participation by everyone is vital for an interesting, stimulating, and balanced seminar. Please be present and on time. Participation includes: preparing your thoughts (via response to readings), reading “outside” of class texts, sharing ideas, respectfully challenging the ideas of others, supporting and encouraging peers with feedback for their research papers, etc.

3. Research Paper: (40%)

The purpose of this assignment is for all seminar members to write a paper relevant to an area of their interest pertaining to the broad area of curriculum. The paper will include sections upon history, theory, research, practice, and policy as it relates to a major area in contemporary education. Examples of topics include, but are not limited to: urban education, charter schools, common core standards, multicultural curricula, inclusive education, education of second language learners, specific effective pedagogical method(s), small schools movement.

An outline for the structure of the paper will be provided, along with a rubric. Each student will conference with the professor to receive permission (and support) in their topic of choice. Length will be approximately 8 pages.
1. Department of Educational Foundations & Counseling Programs

Proposal for a New Course

2.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>EDF 804</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Analysis of Major Issues in Contemporary Education Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre and/or Co Requisites (specify which are pre-, co-, or both)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Hours (per week)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ X ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Requirement</td>
<td><em><strong>X</strong></em> Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Common Core: (also indicate category below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ English Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Math and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Life and Physical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Scientific World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Creative Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ U.S. Experience in its Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ World Cultures and Global Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>___ Individual and Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Course Description

For hundreds of years, ever since the United States Constitution omitted any explicit reference to Education, the policies that shape our PK-12 education system have been largely debated and resolved at the state and local levels. To be sure, the Supreme Court of the United States has intervened – most often through the first amendment (on the ‘separation’ of church and state) and the fourteenth amendment (equal protection under the law) – on issues of segregation and the public funding of aspects of religious schools. Congress has also provided funding (largely through Title 1 grants to the states) to support the education of especially disadvantaged students. But the basic funding structures were state and local (even today, only about 7 cents on the education dollar come from Washington DC); the policies around testing, curricula, the hiring and firing of teachers, the preparation of teachers and principles, and all other major aspects of our PK-12 practices were locally resolved.
In the last several decades, much has changed. Since the publication of a now famous report “The Nation at Risk” in 1984; through the passage of the No Child Left Behind legislation, to the Federally funded “Race to the Top” and not excluding findings from the Supreme Court that have (largely) validated voucher programs of school choice, actions in Washington DC have profoundly altered our education policies across the country. A deep concern for the relative performance of American students by contrast to their international peers combined with massive evidence of an ever-persisting performance gap between affluent and underprivileged students, especially from our African American and Hispanic families, have prompted waves of reform efforts, many of them driven from the US Dept. of Education.

After a brief review of the history of education reform efforts, we will study the major debates and policy initiatives that have shaped the contemporary structures of American public education. We will seek to understand what is at stake in these initiatives, the evidence behind their adoption and resistance to them.

4. **Rationale:** (Justification)

In preparing future senior practitioners, it is critically important that they have a sophisticated grasp of the policy environments in which they will work. This course will prepare them to be:
- Expert consumers of the research base upon which policy is built
- Critical evaluators of policy outcomes; and
- Sophisticated readers of the policy environment

5. **Projected Enrollment:** 15-20

6. **Consultation Statement**
   - Is the proposed change likely to affect other Departments or Programs?  
     [ x ] NO  [ ] YES – If yes, list department/program: 
   - Has the Department/Program been consulted?  
     [ ] NO  [ x ] YES
   Please include letters of support when necessary.
   - Is this course cross-listed?  If so, please list all courses it is listed with.

7. **Sample Syllabus**

   **A. Course Content and Organization:**
   This course is a seminar, a dialogue between the instructor and the class participants focused on issues of mutual interest. It will be essential that the readings have been completed prior to each class so that everyone can contribute. Class contributions will constitute 30% of the final course grade. A fully-developed paper will constitute another 30%. The remainder will be made up of three short responses to reading assignments and one group presentation. An integral part of the course is to have students select a final paper topic early in the course that they will build upon throughout the semester. Students will receive ongoing individualized and collective help in scaffolding this process.

   **Course Requirements**
   Students must:
Make every attempt to attend all class seminars. If anticipating an absence, notify the instructor.
If classes are missed, be responsible for obtaining class notes, handouts, etc.,
More than two absences may jeopardize passing this seminar.
Come prepared and ready to fully engage in all class activities. Such engagement must be regarded as an integral commitment in taking the class.
Be supportive of other seminar members.
Complete all required work and reading assignments on time.

**Guidelines for Written Work**
All written work must be or have:
- Word-processed
- White paper
- Double-spaced
- Black ink
- 12-point, normal font
- 1-inch margins
- Numbered pages
- Stapled
- A reference page
- Correct grammar and spelling
- Compliant with APA style. For free, short APA online tutorials, please go to: [http://apastyle.apa.org](http://apastyle.apa.org)

**Schedule**

**Seminar # 1: An Overview of the History of Education Reform**

**Question to discuss:**

Is there an overarching trend in America’s efforts to reform public education?

**Reading:**


**Seminar # 2: Education in a Democracy**

**Question to Discuss:**

What are the fundamental issues?
Readings:


Seminar # 3: The Condition of American K-12 Education

Question to discuss:

Is there a crisis in American education?

Readings:

2. Commentary on TIMMS results:
   http://edr.sagepub.com/content/41/8/294
   http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/29/american-math-scores_n_4175031.html
3. OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2009 results:
5. Commentary on NAEP results:
   http://dianeravitch.net/2013/11/08/naep-nonsense-dont-believe-the-hype/

Due: Response to readings #1

Seminar # 4: The Economic Argument

Question to Discuss:

Can education overcome poverty? At scale?
Readings:


Seminar # 5: Curriculum and Testing Part 1

Question to Discuss:

The teaching and assessment of knowledge in the United States – why do we teach and test the way we do?

Readings:

4. Education Next article on high-stakes testing: [http://educationnext.org/examining-high-stakes-testing/](http://educationnext.org/examining-high-stakes-testing/)

Seminar # 6: Curriculum and Testing Part 2

Question to Discuss:

How do some of America’s international peers tackle curriculum and testing?

Readings:

2. England's national curriculum overview: [http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/parents/national_curriculum_key_stages/](http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/parents/national_curriculum_key_stages/)
Seminar # 7: From “Nation at Risk” to “No Child Left Behind”: Thirty years of Federal and State policy

Question to discuss:

What were the assumptions underpinning major policy initiatives? Are they plausible?

Reading:


Due: Response to readings #2

Seminar # 8: Race to the Top Part 1

Question to Discuss:

“Race to the Top” is the collective name given to the largest discretionary grant in K-12 education ever provided by the USDOE – some $4.5 billion dollars to date through several rounds of state and now district funding. Is this initiative a wise use of your tax dollars?

Readings:

1. *Information on Race to the Top from the USDOE*:
   
   
   A Program description from the USDOE’s website: [http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html)

2. *Criticisms*: Two prominent critiques of the Race to the Top program:


   [http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/rick_hess_straight_up/2012/10/thomas_friedman_looo ves_race_to_the_top_should_you.html](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/rick_hess_straight_up/2012/10/thomas_friedman_looves_race_to_the_top_should_you.html).

3. A video of NYS’s presentation to the Race to the Top evaluators of the state’s successful RTTT application: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aR-XujveV9w](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aR-XujveV9w).

Seminar # 9: Race to the Top Part 2

Question to Discuss:

Section D: Preparation of Effective Teachers and Principals

Readings:

2. Finland and Singapore’s preparation of teachers:
   - [http://www.aspeninstitute.org/sites/default/files/content/docs/education/SingaporeEDU.pdf](http://www.aspeninstitute.org/sites/default/files/content/docs/education/SingaporeEDU.pdf)

3. CAPE new regulations on the Accreditation of Programs of Teacher Prep Programs:
   - [http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/02/commrpt.pdf](http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/02/commrpt.pdf)

**Seminar # 10: Common Core Standards**

**Question to Discuss:**

The United States, differently from other industrialized nations, has no national curriculum. But 45 states have recently agreed to adopt a single set of K-12 academic “standards” in ELA and Mathematics. What are the key concepts behind these standards? Are they intellectually coherent and/or persuasive?

**Readings:**


**Seminar # 11: Teacher Evaluation Part 1**

**Question to Discuss:**
Historically, teacher evaluation has been carried out by school principals in a wide variety of ways. As a consequence in part of Federal leverage (using such incentives as Race the to Top dollars that we will be discussing later in the semester), many states are transforming the way teachers are evaluated. Is this entire program of educational reform misguided? Imperfect? Necessary?

Readings:

1. *Pre-value-added sample:* An example of what best-practice evaluation looked like before the new value-added and observational policies: 
2. *NYS teacher evaluation law:* Key details of the NYS law are summarized in the attached document “School Reform – NYS teacher eval law overview.”
3. Washington DC Teacher evaluation findings:
4. Finland’s approach: http://whatsupfinland.org/english/the-finnish-educational-miracle/
   http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/us-students-show-incremental-progress-on-national-test/2013/11/07/1c01fe0-4726-11e3-bf0c-cebf37c6f484_story.html

Due: Response to readings #3

Seminar #12: Teacher Evaluation Part 2

Question to Discuss:

What is the quality of empirical research around the use of Value Added data to hold teachers accountable?

Readings:

1. *MET study of evaluation teacher effectiveness:* Justification for the use of value-added can be found in the so-called “MET Study.” (Please focus on reading pages 1-15.)
2. *A critique:* A thoughtful critique of the MET study - and by direct implication, the use of value-added data for teacher evaluation:

Seminar #13: Charter Schools

**Question to Discuss:**

Charter schools now educate some 5% of America’s public school students, and the figures rise every year. Increasing the number of charter schools was a critical component of the USDOE’s requirements for states competing for Race to the Top funds. Why are they so controversial? What’s the evidence of effectiveness?

**Readings:**

1. **Basic “state of play” of charter schools:**

2. **Research on charter school performance:** Please see the following piece, which has embedded links to two of the most discussed research findings on the performance of charter schools.

3. **Review of books by charter leaders:** I have reviewed two recent books by two of the best-known charter school leaders. See two attached documents:
   - “School Reform – Review of new books by charter school leaders,” a pre-production proof of my review from Education Next.
   - “School Reform – Excerpt from Mission Possible,” an excerpt from the volume by Eva Moskowitz reviewed above.

4. **Research on KIPP:** KIPP is perhaps the best-known charter school network:
   - A piece summarizing the most recent “negative” research:
   - A response from KIPP:

Seminar # 14: Vouchers and private schools

**Question to Discuss:**

**Readings:**
1. Pierce vs. sisters on private education (supreme court decision)
   http://www.redefinedonline.org/2012/02/why-it-matters-that-compulsory-education-can-mean-private-schools/

2. Use of vouchers in Milwaukee and Florida
   http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/iesp/featured/voucher

Seminar #15: Group Presentations: Advice to the Secretary of Education on Priorities for Education Reform

B. Expected Learning Outcomes:

   Students will:
   Acquire a background in the history of American Education Policy.
   Learn about the major issues in contemporary education policy.
   Develop the ability to analyze scholarly perspectives of differing viewpoints on these major issues.
   Recognize the connection between different theoretical orientations and empirical findings.
   Discuss implications for educational practices within school buildings and classrooms
   Analyze the complex issues involved in policy trade-offs.
   Describe ethics applicable to the choices faced by education policy makers.
   Acquire skills in scholarly writing and presentation for professional audiences

C. Method of Evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Paper/Response to Readings #1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Paper/Response to Readings #2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Paper/Response to Readings #3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Participation in Discussions</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Presentation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Project: Paper</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A detailed explanation of each assignment is given after in the appendix of this outline.

**Grades**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>Rare performance. Reserved for highly exceptional, rare achievement.</td>
<td>100-97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Excellent. Outstanding achievement.</td>
<td>97.4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Excellent work, but not quite outstanding.</td>
<td>92.4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Very good. Solid achievement expected of most graduate students.</td>
<td>89.9-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Good. Acceptable achievement.</td>
<td>87.4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>Acceptable achievement, but below what is generally expected of graduate students.</td>
<td>82.4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>Fair achievement, above minimally acceptable level.</td>
<td>79.9-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Fair achievement, but only minimally acceptable.</td>
<td>77.4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>69.9-0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CUNY

**D. Required Texts:**


F. **Academic Integrity Statement** (required): “Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.”

G. **AccessABILITY Statement**: “In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter College is committed to ensuring educational access and accommodations for all its registered students. Hunter College’s students with disabilities and medical conditions are encouraged to register with the Office of AccessABILITY for assistance and accommodation. For information and appointment contact the Office of AccessABILITY located in Room E1214 or call (212) 772-4857 /or TTY (212) 650-3230.”

**Expectations for Written Proficiency in English**

Students must demonstrate consistently satisfactory written English in coursework. The Hunter College Writing center provides tutoring to students across the curriculum and at all academic levels. For more information, see [http://rwc.hunter.cuny.edu](http://rwc.hunter.cuny.edu). In addition, the School of Education offers a reading/writing workshop during the semester to students who need additional work honing their reading and writing skills. To register for this course, students must obtain permission either from the Chair of Curriculum & Teaching or the Associate Dean.
APPENDIX: ASSIGNMENTS

1. Three Mini-Papers: Response to Readings/Reflections (10% each)
   These short papers will be no more than 1 to 2 pages
   Papers should:
   - focus on your reaction to the readings and their applicability to schools.
   - include questions that you raise as a result of engaging with the material
   - contain an important point the authors is making and/or a quotation you would like to discuss
   - serve as a springboard for conversations in the seminar
   - in general, capture your own thinking, and help develop your “voice”
   - be linked to other readings in the course, where appropriate
   Papers should not be:
   - summaries of the readings
   - acritical
   - overly demanding of your time

2. Class Participation (30%)
   Participation by everyone is vital for an interesting, stimulating, and balanced seminar. Please be present and on time. Participation includes: preparing your thoughts (via response to readings), reading “outside” of class texts, sharing ideas, respectfully challenging the ideas of others, supporting and encouraging peers with feedback for their research papers, etc.

3. Group Presentation (10%)
   This requirement will be discussed early in the course. In brief, teams will present their recommendations on education priorities for the Secretary of Education within a 15-minute time slot and will answer questions from an audience of peers. A peer review protocol will be used to provide feedback. Guidelines and suggestions for the presentation will be provided.

4. Research Paper: A Scaffolded Project throughout the Course (30%)
   The purpose of this assignment is for all seminar members to write a substantive paper to demonstrate an acquired knowledge of a particular research base and the ability to write within the academic genre. The paper should be focused upon answering a specific question. See some example on the following page.

   For the purpose of this seminar, we will use the following approach: (1) original idea generated; (2) outline developed; (3) paper drafted and written, (4) panel presentation based on paper, and final paper handed in (approximately 15-20 pages, double-spaced). Note: Students will meet individually with professor when developing their paper. In addition, peer-editing is strongly encouraged, independently of class time.
1. Header: Department of Educational Foundations & Counseling Programs
Proposal for a New Course

2. Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>EDF 810</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Mind, Brain, and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre and/or Co Requisites (specify which are pre-, co-, or both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Hours (per week)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Requirement (Note: If course is being considered for the Common Core, please use CUNY Common Core Submission Forms [see section VI below]. The form must be submitted along with the proposal and syllabus.)</td>
<td>X Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Core: (also indicate category below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life and Physical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Experience in its Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Cultures and Global Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Method C/NC?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Course Description:
This course provides students with knowledge from the neuro and cognitive sciences that can be applied in practice. This course begins with an introduction to mapping the physical features of the brain before leading into contemporary research on “brain-based” research and educational curricula and programs. Students will engage in examining research and separate “nureomyth” from “neuroscience” in order to be informed by new knowledge from the science of learning.

4. Rationale:
Mind, Brain, and Education (MBE) is a rapidly expanding area of study within education. In addition to the special interest group Brain, Neuroscience and Education under the auspices of the American Education Research Association (AERA), MBE programs have recently formed at Harvard, Cambridge, Dartmouth, Columbia, and Johns Hopkins to name a few. It is clear that educational leaders need to understand this developing field of study in order to participate in its future direction and be intelligent, critical consumers of its claims.

5. Projected Enrollment 15
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6. **Consultation Statement**
   Is the proposed change likely to affect other Departments or Programs?  
   [ X ] NO   [ ] YES – If yes, list department/program: ________________________________
   Has the Department/Program been consulted?  [ ] NO   [ ] YES
   Please include letters of support when necessary.
   Is this course cross-listed?  If so, please list all courses it is listed with.

7. **Sample Syllabus**
   
   **A. Course Content and Organization:**
   
   **COURSE OUTLINE**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings and Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   | 1       | **Introduction:**  
     What is the Mind? What is the Brain? How do these concepts relate to Education? |                                                              |
   | 2       | Mapping the Mind and Brain                                          | Mapping the Mind (2010), Rita Carter  
   |         |                                                                     | Online Interactive Neuroanatomy Atlas                          |
   | 3       | Making Connections between Brain Research and Education  
   |         | Neruomyths and neuroscience                                         | Mind, Brain, and Education (2010),  
   |         |                                                                      | Chapters 1, 2, 3, & 12                                          |
   | 4       | Basic Cognitive Processes: Memory and Attention                     | The Memory Process: Neuroscientific and Humanistic Perspectives (2010), Eds. Nalbantian, Matthews, McClelland  
<p>|         |                                                                      | In Search of Memory (2007), Eric Kandel                         |
| 5       | Complex Cognitive Processes: Metacognition in Education            | Dunlosky &amp; Metcalfe (2009)                                    |
|         |                                                                      | Mind, Brain, and Education (2010): Chapter 4                   |
| 7       | Brain and Cognitive Development                                     | How the Brain Learns (2011), David Sousa                       |
| 8       | Reading and Writing on the Brain                                     | Mind, Brain, and Education (2010): Chapters 6 &amp;7               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Technology and Cognition</td>
<td>“What is Literacy?” James Gee Article critique DUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mind, Brain, and Education</em> (2010): Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Motivation and the Growth Mindset</td>
<td>Dweck’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Arts, Music, and Creativity</td>
<td><em>The Age of Insight</em> (2012), Eric Kandel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mind, Brain, and Education</em> (2010): Chapter 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptions (Misconceptions)</td>
<td>Moser et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan &amp; Williams (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>English Language Learners and Students</td>
<td>*Approaches to Writing Instruction for Adolescent English Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with Special Needs</td>
<td>Learners* (2005), Panofsky, Pacheco, Smith, Santos, Fogelman,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harrington, Kenney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Writing Instruction for Adolescents with Learning Disabilities” (2008), Linda Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Evidence-Based Strategies for Reading Instruction of Older Students with Learning Disabilities” (2008), Roberts et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Connecting the Mind and Brain to Education</td>
<td>Class presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Connecting the Mind and Brain to Education</td>
<td>Class presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Expected Learning Outcomes:**

Students who successfully complete this course should be able to:

1. describe major theories, models, and theorists presented in the course
2. critique research studies in the fields of neuro and cognitive sciences
3. evaluate known “brain-based” educational curricula or programs
4. propose future research studies

**C. Method of Evaluation:**
Course Grading

*Grading* in the course must follow the School of Education’s policies stating that (a) no auditing, pass/fail, or credit/no credit grading is permitted; (b) students first try to resolve differences with the instructor before submitting in writing appeals of grades; and (c) grades of “IN” (incomplete) must be changed to letter grades within one year or they remain on the record.

Grading System (from the Hunter College Graduate Catalog)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>97.5 – 100%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>92.5 – 97.4%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90.0 – 92.4%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87.5 – 89.9%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>82.5 – 87.4%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80.0 – 82.4%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>77.5 – 79.9%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>70.0 – 77.4%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>77.0 – 69.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignments

1. **Ongoing Responses to Course Readings (20%)**:
   You will be expected to read and respond to the readings via course Blackboard site. Discussion board will pose a question or prompt to respond to and your response should demonstrate (1) your familiarity with the readings and (2) an appropriate response to the given question or prompt.

2. **Critique an Article Professing “Brain-Based” Practices and/or Approaches in and Educational Setting (20%)**:
   For this assignment you will need to (1) Identify an article that clearly uses a brain-based orientation to make claims about a topic related to education; (2) Offer a synopsis of the claims this article is making; (3) Critique these claims based on course discussions and readings; (4) Offer refutation or support of this article from your own perspective on brain-based educative practices and beliefs.

3. **Research Report (40%)**:
   Choose a topic that you are interested in learning more about (examples: impact of stress, sleep, nutrition, or emotion on education; connections between brain research and pedagogical strategies, etc.). Research this topic in further depth than we have in the course and present your findings in a report.

4. **Class Presentation (20%)**:
   Present your research findings to the class in an interactive manner of your choosing (i.e., poster project, demonstration, power-point, digital video, etc.). Be prepared to answer any questions posed by your peers.

D. **Required Readings**:
   See course outline above for readings

E. **Recommended Readings**:
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F. **Academic Integrity Statement:** “Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.”

G. **AccessABILITY Statement:** “In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter College is committed to ensuring educational access and accommodations for all its registered students. Hunter College’s students with disabilities and medical conditions are encouraged to register with the Office of AccessABILITY for assistance and accommodation. For information and appointment contact the Office of AccessABILITY located in Room E1214 or call (212) 772-4857 /or TTY (212) 650-3230.”

**HUNTER COLLEGE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**
**DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHING**

**HUNTER COLLEGE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**
The goal of the School of Education is to prepare candidates who will demonstrate, through their professional commitments and practices, multiple competencies that promote effective learning.
Evidence–Based Practices
The School of Education grounds its course content in the best field-based research and practice. Faculty review findings from their respective disciplines to provide our candidates with the strategies needed for effective instruction. Our candidates master the theory and practice of effective pedagogy in their subject areas, and acquire the tools for reflection on and improvement of their professional work. They achieve a solid foundation in the history, philosophy, psychology, sociology and methodology of education that enriches their teaching. Candidates gain expertise in analyzing and using assessment of student performance to guide their instruction and create optimal learning environments for students.

Integrated Clinical Experiences
The School of Education ensures that its candidates understand and experience the realities of school contexts. We establish strong connections with partnering schools in New York City and surrounding areas. We provide extensive fieldwork with supportive supervision in these schools. Our candidates engage in carefully sequenced and comprehensively assessed clinical experiences prior to their graduation.

Educating a Diverse Student Population
The School of Education provides its candidates with the critical skills and understanding necessary to be responsive to the multiple challenges of all learners: students with a wide range of backgrounds, cultures, abilities and prior knowledge. We teach candidates to create humane and ethical learning communities in their classrooms and schools. They gain the ability to collaborate successfully with parents, families, community members, school faculty and staff in order to provide this support.

Use of Technology to Enhance Learning
The School of Education prepares candidates with the practical and theoretical knowledge of effective and judicious uses of technology in a variety of school settings and for a broad spectrum of learners. Formative and summative assessments of our candidates’ technology competencies are a critical component of preparing them for tomorrow’s schools. We believe that appropriate uses of educational technology enhance learning, assessment and communication.
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1. **Header:**
Department of Curriculum and Teaching
Proposal for a New Course

2. **Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>EDUC 807</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Title</strong></td>
<td>Professional Communications for Educational Settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre and/or Co Requisites</strong> (specify which are pre-, co-, or both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credits</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Hours (per week)</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberal Arts</strong></td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ X ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Requirement</strong></td>
<td><em>X</em> Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Note: If course is being considered for the Common Core, please use CUNY Common Core Submission Forms [see section VI below]. The form must be submitted along with the proposal and syllabus.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading Method</strong></td>
<td>C/NC?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Course Description:**
This course explores a range of educational and school-based writing genres and writing for a variety of audiences. Resources and practices related to developing and writing within a variety of genres from traditional print publications to new media outlets will be introduced, explored and, most importantly, enacted.

4. **Rationale:**
This is a new course that focuses on the importance of effective written communication for a range of stakeholders and contexts critical to leadership roles in the field of education.

5. **Projected Enrollment**

6. **Consultation Statement**
Is the proposed change likely to affect other Departments or Programs?
[ X ] NO [ ] YES – If yes, list department/program:

Has the Department/Program been consulted?
[ ] NO [ ] YES

Please include letters of support when necessary.
Is this course cross-listed? If so, please list all courses it is listed with.
7. Sample Syllabus

A. Course Content and Organization:

COURSE OUTLINE

Session 1: Introduction

Assignments:
Select a piece of writing in the educational sphere that you judge to be strong, influential, or provocative. Upload to Blackboard site with a brief introduction. Read at least 3 other articles submitted by peers.
The article should be from a peer reviewed journal, a highly regarded website or a position paper from a specific area in education and within the last 3 years.
Participate in a discussion board about the 3 articles you have read and highlight controversial issues, positive contributions to a body of knowledge and practical implications which impact on actual practice.

Session 2: Journal Articles
What are the components of an article for publication in a peer reviewed journal?
Define and describe:
Literature Review
Methods Section
Participants
Results
Implication for Practice and Discussion Sections
Brief in class activity on writing a literature review using APA style.

Sessions 3 and 4: Grants, Reports
Show sample grants which were actually funded.
Break down the components of writing a grant proposal which include:
Abstract
Needs Section including a literature review
Goals and Objectives written with measurable outcomes
Program Description
Timeline and Responsibilities
Support Staff (if necessary)
Budget
Budget Justification
References
Identifying Funding Source
Readings: Selected chapters from Henson

Session 5: **Op Eds and Position Statements**
Sample Op Ed articles will be evaluated.
In class activity to select a current topic from a journal or newspaper in education and write an Op Ed piece of 150 words or less in response to the article.
Peer groups will be set up to review and critique each others Op Ed piece.

Session 5: **Pre-writing Strategies and Drafting**

Session 6: **Giving and Receiving Feedback**

Session 7: **Technology and Effective Communication**

Session 8: **Peer Feedback** Session 9:

**Editing Workshop** Session 10:

**Individual Conferences** Session 11:

**Peer Feedback**

Session 13: **Guest Writers” Roundtable**

Session 14: **Individual Conferences**

Session 15: **Progress and Next Steps**

B. **Expected Learning Outcomes:**

1. To read and analyze a range of educational writing genres such as peer reviewed journals, writing grants, writing proposals for academic conferences, writing professional materials for teachers and writing for parents and community members.
2. To identify and write for the range of audiences encountered as an educational leader.
3. To complete a relevant writing projects, from drafting through publication.
4. To identity personal strengths and needs as writer, focusing on grammatical and editorial skills that support effective writing at all levels: word usage, sentence construction, paragraph organization, and section development.

C. Method of Evaluation:

Course Grading
Grading in the course must follow the School of Education’s policies stating that (a) no auditing, pass/fail, or credit/no credit grading is permitted; (b) students first try to resolve differences with the instructor before submitting in writing appeals of grades; and (c) grades of “IN” (incomplete) must be changed to letter grades within one year or they remain on the record.

Grading System (from the Hunter College Graduate Catalog)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>97.5 – 100%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>92.5 – 97.4%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90.0 – 92.4%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87.5 – 89.9%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>82.5 – 87.4%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80.0 – 82.4%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>77.5 – 79.9%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>70.0 – 77.4%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>69.9% – 77.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignments

1. Connective essay: How does my personal experience connect to my research interests? This essay will focus on the intersection of your personal story as an educator with your research interests for your dissertation. You can explore personal/professional experiences that led you to this research topic, and why you care about it, in the context of professional sphere. The topic should be relevant to an area of need in your school and/or classroom and the possible plan for a Suggested length: 4-6 pages.

2. Article for publication. You will write a brief article on a topic of professional interest, targeted for a professional audience, and intended for publication (in a professional newsletter, bulletin, peer reviewed journal, etc.). The article will be revised throughout the semester, and submitted for publication by the conclusion of the course. The article can be a practice-based report, a case study or the write up of a conference proceeding. Suggested length: Dependent on journal or place of submission.

3. Report/grant application/curriculum materials. You will select an additional project, in consultation with the instructor to complete during this course. This project should expand your writing repertoire and serve as a building block for your dissertation. Suggested length: variable

D. Required Readings:


E. **Recommended Readings:**


F. **Academic Integrity Statement:** “Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.”

G. **AccessABILITY Statement:** “In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter College is committed to ensuring educational access and accommodations for all its registered students. Hunter College’s students with disabilities and medical conditions are encouraged to register with the Office of AccessABILITY for assistance and accommodation. For information and appointment contact the Office
of AccessABILITY located in Room E1214 or call (212) 772-4857 /or TTY (212) 650-3230.”

HUNTER COLLEGE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHING

HUNTER COLLEGE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
The goal of the School of Education is to prepare candidates who will demonstrate, through their professional commitments and practices, multiple competencies that promote effective learning.

Evidence-Based Practices
The School of Education grounds its course content in the best field-based research and practice. Faculty review findings from their respective disciplines to provide our candidates with the strategies needed for effective instruction. Our candidates master the theory and practice of effective pedagogy in their subject areas, and acquire the tools for reflection on and improvement of their professional work. They achieve a solid foundation in the history, philosophy, psychology, sociology and methodology of education that enriches their teaching. Candidates gain expertise in analyzing and using assessment of student performance to guide their instruction and create optimal learning environments for students.

Integrated Clinical Experiences
The School of Education ensures that its candidates understand and experience the realities of school contexts. We establish strong connections with partnering schools in New York City and surrounding areas. We provide extensive fieldwork with supportive supervision in these schools. Our candidates engage in carefully sequenced and comprehensively assessed clinical experiences prior to their graduation.

Educating a Diverse Student Population
The School of Education provides its candidates with the critical skills and understanding necessary to be responsive to the multiple challenges of all learners: students with a wide range of backgrounds, cultures, abilities and prior knowledge. We teach candidates to create humane and ethical learning communities in their classrooms and schools. They gain the ability to collaborate successfully with parents, families, community members, school faculty and staff in order to provide this support.
Use of Technology to Enhance Learning
The School of Education prepares candidates with the practical and theoretical knowledge of effective and judicious uses of technology in a variety of school settings and for a broad spectrum of learners. Formative and summative assessments of our candidates’ technology competencies are a critical component of preparing them for tomorrow’s schools. We believe that appropriate uses of educational technology enhance learning, assessment and communication.
1. Header: Department of Special Education Program
Proposal for a New Course

2. Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>SPED 801</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum for Students with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre and/or Co Requisites (specify which are pre-, co-, or both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Hours (per week)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ x ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Requirement</td>
<td>x Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Note: If course is being considered for the Common Core, please use CUNY Common Core Submission Forms [see section VI below]. The form must be submitted along with the proposal and syllabus.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Method</td>
<td>Letter grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Course Description:
Throughout history, society has responded to students with disabilities in many ways—from placing them in specialized schools to providing no education whatsoever. Grounded within the Civil Rights Movement, the institution of special education evolved as society’s response to children and youth with disabilities who had traditionally experienced a significantly inferior education in comparison to their non-disabled counterparts. In 1975, with the passage of P. L. 94-142, The Education of All Handicapped Children Act, children and youth with disabilities came to enjoy the same rights as children without disabilities, being guaranteed a “free and appropriate” public education. However, the institution of special education has always inspired disagreement among various constituents in society, including parents, policy makers, theoreticians, researchers, educators, and people with disabilities. It has offered hope to countless families whose disabled children. It also guarantees an education to all citizens, reduces the number of students with disabilities dropping out of school, increases the number
attending college, and develops many forms of innovative pedagogy. Critics have pointed out special education’s relationship to: stigmatizing difference; maintaining racial stratification in schools; segregating many migrant and indigenous children; diluting the curriculum; and contributing to the “school-to-prison pipeline” in which three-quarters of those incarcerated have significant struggles in literacy.

Given these tangled issues, some questions that they raise include: Who defines disability within schools? Who benefits? Who is disadvantaged? Where and how should students with disabilities be educated? What constitutes effective teaching practices and curriculum for students with disabilities? Whose responsibility are they? What are some differences among scholars who look at disability as scientific fact versus those who view it as a natural form of human variation? Most importantly, in what ways does how to understand disability impact upon creating and executing research upon students with disabilities?

This course provides the opportunity to consider disability in the context of schools and society—with view to engaging with, and critiquing, existing research in the fields of special education and disability studies in education (DSE). We will be mindful of how the disposition and paradigm of researchers influences all aspects of their work including: problems identified; questions asked; methods used; analysis employed; findings or results; interpretations, and: implications. This course focuses on the nature of evidence-based practice involving students with disabilities within specific contexts. The course is designed to provide a foundation for the course work, independent scholarship, and educational research that students will undertake in the process of completing the doctoral degree.

4. **Rationale:**
This is a new course designed to emphasize deep understanding of the best current knowledge and research about the education of students with special needs. This course will provide a foundation to prepare effective practitioner leaders.

6. **Consultation Statement**
Is the proposed change likely to affect other Departments or Programs?
[ X ] NO    [ ] YES – If yes, list department/program: ______________________
Has the Department/Program been consulted?    [ ] NO    [ ] YES
Please include letters of support when necessary.
Is this course cross-listed? If so, please list all courses it is listed with.

7. **Sample Syllabus**

A. **Course Content and Organization:**

**Course Format**
This course is a seminar, a dialogue between the instructor and the class participants focused on issues of mutual interest. It requires that all members of the seminar engage in active thinking and analysis of assigned materials, their own knowledge base, their values and the information presented by the instructor and their peers. As teaching and learning are collaborative processes, students and instructors share responsibility for the success of this class as a learning
experience. The course has been designed as four interlocking units. First, students become familiar with the historical context of students with disabilities in schools, and the issues they raise. Second, students analyze specific research methodologies used when studying effective practices for students with disabilities. Third, participants in the seminar will collectively decide upon three major issues pertaining to the education of students with disabilities (e.g. inclusion, differentiating instruction, working with parents) and analyze the results/findings of research pertaining to the major issues. Finally, students pursue a topic of their own choosing and review contemporary research to present a synthesis of their findings in the format of (1) a panel presentation and (2) a fully developed paper. An integral part of the course, therefore, is to have students select a topic early in the course that they will build upon throughout the semester. Students will receive ongoing individualized and collective help in scaffolding this process.

**Schedule**

**Seminar # 1:**

**Background to the Course; Overview**

Question to discuss: “What is Disability? What is ‘Special’”?

Sample Readings:


**Seminar # 2:**

**Perspectives of Difference and Disability Within and Beyond Special Education**

Question to guide reading: “In what ways does viewing disability or difference influence practice in schools?”

Sample Readings:


Seminar # 3:

**Perspectives of Difference and Disability:**

Question to guide reading: “Who ‘owns it’?”

Sample Readings:


Due: Response to readings #1

Seminar # 4:

**Models of Research in Special Education/Disability:**

Question to discuss: What are the current models of research found in peer-reviewed journals?

Sample Readings:


Due: Idea for panel/paper.

**Seminar # 5:**

**Qualitative Research:**

Questions to discuss: How can qualitative research contribute to classroom practice?

Sample Reading:


Due: Response to readings #2

**Seminar # 6:**

**Single Subject Design:**

Question to guide discussion: What are the benefits of single subject design in special education/disabilities studies? What are the pitfalls?

Sample Readings on Single Subject design studies chosen by the students.

Due: Response to readings #3

**Seminar # 7:**

**Group Design:**

Question to guide discussion: How can we design randomized treatment studies and correlation studies in special education/disabilities?

Sample Readings on group design TBA

Due: Response to readings #4
Seminar # 8:

**Collectively Selected Topic #1 e.g. Inclusive Education**

Sample Readings:
TBA- customized to topic

Seminar # 9:

**Collectively Selected Topic #2 e.g. Working with Parents**

Sample Readings:
TBA- customized to topic

Seminar # 10:

**Collectively Selected Topic #3 e.g. Differentiating Instruction**

Sample Readings:
TBA- customized to topic

Seminar # 11:

**Main Topic(s): Panel Presentations TBA**

Due: Presentations

Seminar # 12:

**Main Topic(s): Panel Presentations TBA**
Due: Presentations

Seminar # 13:

Main Topic(s): Panel Presentations TBA

Due: Presentations

Seminar # 14:

Main Topic(s): Panel Presentations TBA

Due: Presentations

Seminar # 15:

Main Topic(s): Plenary Session: Debriefing the Seminar Content—Debating Researching students with Disabilities: Newly Acquired Knowledge and Further Questions.

Due: Final Paper

B. Expected Learning Outcomes:

Course Objectives

Students will:

1. Analyze major laws pertaining to special education (including The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and its reauthorizations, the No Child Left Behind Act, etc.)
2. Debate various theories of understanding dis/ability (medical model, social model, charity model, civil rights model, etc.)
Recognize the connection between different theoretical orientations toward disability and how these shape particular approaches to research
Discuss implications for educational practices within school buildings and classrooms
Analyze the complex issues involved in inclusive education
Explore ways to advocate for, and with, students with disabilities and their parents
Develop a basic understanding of the role of scientific inquiry as a basis for special education—and the issues that raises
Understand the basic principles of research methodology that are used in generating a knowledge base for special education and DSE
Develop skills for critically reading research articles based on group, single subject, mixed methods, and qualitative designs
Describe ethics applicable to the conduct of researching children and youth with disabilities
Acquire skills in scholarly writing and presentation for professional audiences
Assess and articulate what constitutes effective practices for students with disabilities in particular contexts

C. Method of Evaluation:

Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Paper/Response to Readings #1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Paper/Response to Readings #2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Paper/Response to Readings #3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Paper/Response to Readings #4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Participation in Discussions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Presentation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Project: Paper</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100

A detailed explanation of each assignment is given after in the appendix of this outline.

Grades

Grades are defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>Rare performance. Reserved for highly exceptional, rare achievement.</td>
<td>100-97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Excellent. Outstanding achievement.</td>
<td>97.4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Excellent work, but not quite outstanding.</td>
<td>92.4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Very good. Solid achievement expected of most graduate students.</td>
<td>89.9-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B Good. Acceptable achievement. 87.4-
B- Acceptable achievement, but below what is generally expected of graduate students. 82.4-
C+ Fair achievement, above minimally acceptable level. 79.9-
C Fair achievement, but only minimally acceptable. 77.4-
F Failure 69.9-0.0

Source: CUNY

D. Required Readings:

Sample Texts:


Sample Articles: [Note: to be divided up so students can take the lead in discussions]


E Recommended Readings:

**History**


**Policy**


**Theory**


**Research**


**Practice**


G. Academic Integrity Statement: “Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.”

H. AccessABILITY Statement: “In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter College is committed to ensuring educational access and accommodations for all its registered students. Hunter College’s students with disabilities and medical conditions are encouraged to register with the Office of AccessABILITY for assistance and accommodation. For information and appointment contact the Office of AccessABILITY located in Room E1214 or call (212) 772-4857 /or TTY (212) 650-3230.”

**Course Requirements**

Students must:
- Make every attempt to attend all class seminars. If anticipating an absence, notify the instructor.
- If classes are missed, be responsible for obtaining class notes, handouts, etc.,
- More than two absences may jeopardize passing this seminar.
- Come prepared and ready to fully engage in all class activities.
- Be supportive of other seminar members.
- Complete all required work and reading assignments on time.

**Guidelines for Written Work**

All written work must be or have:
- Word-processed
- White paper
- Double-spaced
- Black ink
- 12-point, normal font
- 1-inch margins
- Numbered pages
- Stapled
- A reference page
- Correct grammar and spelling
Expectations for Written Proficiency in English

Students must demonstrate consistently satisfactory written English in coursework. The Hunter College Writing center provides tutoring to students across the curriculum and at all academic levels. For more information, see http://rwc.hunter.cuny.edu. In addition, the School of Education offers a reading/writing workshop during the semester to students who need additional work honing their reading and writing skills. To register for this course, students must obtain permission either from the Chair of Curriculum & Teaching or the Associate Dean.

APPENDIX: ASSIGNMENTS

1. Four Mini-Papers: Response to Readings/Reflections (10% each)
These short papers will be no more than 1 to 2 pages
Papers should:
- focus on your reaction to the readings and their applicability to schools.
- include questions that you raise as a result of engaging with the material
- contain an important point the authors is making and/or a quotation you would like to discuss discussed
- serve as a springboard for conversations in the seminar
- in general, capture your own thinking, and help develop your “voice”
- be linked to other readings in the course, where appropriate

Papers should not be:
- summaries of the readings
- acritical
- overly demanding of your time

2. Class Participation (10%)
Participation by everyone is vital for an interesting, stimulating, and balanced seminar. Please be present and on time. Participation includes: preparing your thoughts (via response to readings), reading “outside” of class texts, sharing ideas, respectfully challenging the ideas of others, supporting and encouraging peers with feedback for their research papers, etc.

3. Panel Presentation (15%)
This requirement will be discussed early in the course. In brief, students will present their research paper (either completed or in progress) within a 15-minute time slot and will answer questions from an audience of peers. A peer review protocol will be used to provide feedback. Guidelines and suggestions for the presentation will be provided.
4. Research Paper: A Scaffolded Project throughout the Course (35%)

The purpose of this assignment is for all seminar members to write a substantive paper to demonstrate an acquired knowledge of a particular research base and the ability to write within the academic genre. The paper should be focused upon answering a specific question. See some example on the following page.

For the purpose of this seminar, we will use the following approach: (1) original idea generated; (2) outline developed; (3) paper drafted and written, (4) panel presentation based on paper, and final paper handed in (approximately 15-20 pages, double-spaced). Note: Students will meet individually with professor (before or after class, during office hours, or via Skype or phone) when developing their paper. In addition, peer-editing is strongly encouraged, independently of class time.

Possible Topics (to consider for presentation and paper include, but are not limited to):

**Historical/Cultural Based**

What are some different perspectives on how disability is perceived and defined (e.g. medical, social, rights based, charity-based)—and what are the implications for classroom practice?

What is the history of a specific disability group (children who are Blind, or Deaf, or Learning Disabled, or have Attention Deficit Disorder)—and how have both perceptions of them and approaches to ‘best practices’ changed over time?

**Practice Based**

What are best pedagogical practices in the inclusion of students with specific disabilities (e.g. severe and multiple, or dyslexia, or developmentally delayed, etc.)?

What are best practices in collaborative team teaching?

What works in managing a class of diverse learners at the elementary, middle school, or high school level?

How has the concept of Universal Design been used successfully in classrooms?

What does the research literature say about effective practices to support professional development for in-service educator in schools about teaching students with disabilities in classrooms?
Research Based

To what degree has the field of special education’s adherence to positivism/scientific-based knowledge base helped or hindered it’s growth?

What are the benefits and drawbacks of using three different methodological approaches (e.g. single subject design, mixed methods, narrative inquiry) to researching students with disabilities?

What does research literature say about a specific problematic area within education such as: the overrepresentation of minority students in special education, the stigmatization of “disability” in school and society, or the misclassification of English Language Learners? In addition, what are some recommended best practices to counter the issue?

Policy Based

What has been the major gains achieved for students with disabilities through legislation? What areas still need addressed? Based your response upon a review of the research literature.

Is the recent emphasis on standards-based education and the “common core” a great equalizer for students with disabilities? Based upon a review of the research literature, describe why you agree or disagree.

Should all teachers be certified in teaching students with disabilities? Based upon a review of the research literature, describe why you agree or disagree.

Theory Based

In what ways does a person’s theoretical grounding influence his or her approach to conceiving of, executing, and interpreting research? Illustrate your answer by an analysis of two specific examples of disability-related studies located within distinctly different paradigms.

What are the major differences between scientific and socio-cultural interpretations of disability? What are their implications for research and practice?

In what ways does researching disability as it intersects with one or more other markers of identity such as social class, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, etc. complicate and enrich our understandings of it? What are some implications for teaching in classrooms?
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3. Course Description
In-depth study of research and practice in professional development for educators. Students will explore the literature about effective methods, contexts, and delivery of coaching, mentoring, and professional learning for teachers and other educators. Focus on understanding the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches to professional development, and on learning how to assess the appropriateness of a professional development strategy with respect to content and the teacher population to be served.

4. Rationale
This is a new course is for the EdD. This course will support the development of the core understandings of instructional leadership focused on professional learning and the main tenets of supporting professional learning.

5. Projected Enrollment 15
6. Consultation Statement
Is the proposed change likely to affect another department or program?

[ X ] no    [   ] yes  If yes, list the department/program_________________________

Has the department/program been consulted?  [   ] no   [ X] yes

7. Sample Syllabus

A. Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. The students will acquire an understanding of adult development models that impact personal and professional change.

2. The students will be able to self evaluate intra and interpersonal capacities that impact professional performance.

3. The students will acquire knowledge of transformational/distributed leadership developmental change.

4. Students will be able to use social and emotional competencies skills for development of self and others.

5. Students will be able to promote a safe and caring climate and culture.

6. Students will be to describe, enact and support others to facilitate a variety of effective professional learning models.

7. Students will be able to analyze and synthesize the research on effective learning models and their impact.

8. Students will be able to conduct action research to analyze their own professional development practices.

B. Course Objectives and Content:

I. Adult Learning
   A. Principles of Adult Learning Theory
   B. Andragogy versus Pedagogy
   C. Factors that affect adult learning
   D. Theory and practice of emotional intelligence on leadership
   E. Peer networks and safe learning spaces

II. Managing Self and Others During the Professional Development Process
   A. Exploring Mental Models
B. Giving and Receiving Feedback
C. Self and Other Awareness and Regulation Strategies
D. Conversations that Promote Reflection, Insight and Growth
E. Building Peer Learning Networks for affective and cognitive learning

III. Research on Professional Learning

A. Types of professional development programs across disciplines
B. Impact on teacher knowledge/content, instructional practice/teaching and student learning/achievement
C. Getting to know the research base (i.e. facilitating discussions, targeted learning goals, analysis of teacher conversations, establishing community, mentoring conversations, etc.)

IV. Preparing Teacher Leaders: A System’s Approach

A. Scalability and sustainability of professional learning
B. Models of teacher leader preparation
C. Models and skills of coaching
D. Exploring Distributive Leadership Theory and Practice

C. Required Readings

Textbooks:


Journal Articles:


D. Recommended Readings


E. Method of Evaluation

Formative Assessment:

1. Critique of professional development
   a. Using the course text(s), readings and handouts, students will assess their most recent professional development experience. This may include, but is not limited to, district and school-based professional development, local, state and national conferences and mandated trainings.

   b. Students will write a critique explicitly detailing the strengths and weaknesses of the professional development program using the features of effective professional development outlined in Trumbull, E., & Gerzon, N. (2013). Professional development on formative assessments: Insights from Research and practice. San Francisco: WestEd.

   c. In their analysis, students will include adaptations and/or changes to promote reflective practices that are intended to enhance teachers’ instructional practices and student learning. Students will provide support for their changes by referencing research and in-class discussions.

   d. In the conclusion section of the analysis, students will discuss how the professional development experience has/has not impacted their professional growth.

   e. When appropriate, students will include the professional development description, agenda and any supporting documents from the session.

2. Research based analysis of mentoring a teacher: A Case Study

   a. The teacher leader will first write an account of their assumptions about teaching and learning. They will identify a teacher in his/her induction years at their school and co create a professional growth plan for the teacher. The teacher leader will document the experience and provide evidence of teacher and student growth over the semester.

3. Professional Learning Community Activity

   The majority of our readings will be journal articles or book chapters. We want you, however, to have an opportunity to read one book that examines a particular model of professional development or set of issues related to professional development or
teacher learning. I have selected four texts, all of which are written or edited by highly regarded scholars in the field. We will divide the class into small groups, or book clubs. Each group will take responsibility for reading the book, meeting as a group to discuss it, selecting key selections for the rest of us to read, and leading the class in an hour-long discussion of the readings and the book in its entirety. You may choose to provide an orientation to or brief presentation of your book club selection, but the bulk of your time should be spent engaging us in a discussion of your book club selection. I will have some of the books available for perusal in my office, but you will be responsible for getting a copy of your group’s book.

4. Reflective Process

Throughout the semester, students will respond to weekly prompts regarding their personal process and perceptions of others while coaching another to grow professionally. This online process will allow for individual reflection and feedback from a peer group as well as the instructor.

Professional Learning Community Book Selections


Grading

Points:

1. Critique of Professional Development  30
2. Case Study  30
3. Book Club  20
4. Process Reflection  20

Total  100
F. Academic Integrity Statement

Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.
Proposal for a New Course
in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching
School of Education, Hunter College of CUNY

1. Course Number: ECC 801  Title: Research and Practice in Early Childhood Education Hours: 45 (REPAC: Early Childhood) Credits: 3

2. Pre-and/or Corequisites (and/or other special conditions)

3. Course Description: Overview of the historical and social influences on early childhood research and practice. Candidates will gain a comprehensive understanding of the significant policy, programmatic and pedagogical factors affecting the formal, symbolic and societal curricula, within and across early childhood education and care settings.

4. Rationale: This course will provide Ed.D. candidates with information on the varieties of communities of practice within the field of early education. Candidates will gain knowledge on leadership and administration in early childhood settings; in-depth understandings of approaches to early learning and curriculum designs, and will become familiar with assessment tools used to measure program quality. Issues of professionalism, teacher effectiveness and student engagement will be areas of focus, as well as research and practice related to building partnerships with children, families, teachers and administrators in the birth to eight age group. The strengths inherent in the diversities of linguistic, cultural, ethnic and socio-economic groups will provide a backdrop for rich explorations of best practices in early education.

5. Projected Enrollment: 15 doctoral/pre-doctoral candidates

6. Consultation Statement
   Is the proposed change likely to affect another Department or Programs?
   [ ] NO  [ ] YES- If yes, list department/program
   If yes, list department/program ____________________

7. Sample Syllabus

   A. Course Content and Organization

   1. An overview of the discipline of early childhood education
      (Sessions 1-3)
        - Chapter 1- What is early childhood education? Video Clip: “Teaching first grade”
        - Chapter 2-The Wonder of Children: Development and Dispositions.
          Video Clip: Designing developmentally appropriate days
      • Journal Articles to be located.
2. **How do we create the conditions for successful early learning?**
   *(Sessions 4-7)*
   
   **Selected readings:**
   - Hernandez, L.A. (Early Education Specialist) *Hopes, Dreams and Intentions*
   - Takanishi, R. (Foundation for Child Development) *Pre-K-Third Grade: A Paradigm Shift*
   - Wolff, J.A., (School Principal, MA). *The Leadership Role of elementary School Principals*
   - Mann, T. (Frederick Patterson Institute) *Culturally Responsive Perspectives*
   - Brunson Day, C. (National Black Child Development Institute) *Racial Identity*

3. **Who are the children and families we serve (Sessions 8-10)**
   - Part I- Considerations for Sociocultural Teaching
   - Part II- Working with Diverse Students and Families
   - Delgado-Gaitan, C. (2004) *Involving Latino Families In Schools: Raising achievement through home-school partnerships*

4. **Working with teachers and leaders in early education settings (Sessions 11-15)**


**Expected Learning Outcomes**

Candidates will understand the factors that influence systems of early childhood education and care. Candidates will be able to critically examine current topics and issues affecting early childhood professionals, families and young children.

Candidates will demonstrate positive dispositions related to leadership in the field of early education and develop skills and abilities to assist teachers, parents, administrators to better understand their own roles in the growth and development of children in the birth to age eight range.

Candidates will use technology and appropriate assessment and evaluation tools to improve practice in the field of early education.

**Assignments/Papers Due**

1. **Book reviews of selected texts**: Candidates will choose a book from a list provided by the professor in different sections of the course syllabus and write a review of the text, summarizing the main points, discussing the strengths or uses of the book, offering praise, constructive or critical feedback.

2. **Position Paper**: Students will carry out a close examination of a contemporary issue in early childhood education, for example, the concept of quality in early childhood, kindergarten readiness, Universal Pre-K Programs, kindergarten red-shirting or grade retention, or the importance of investing early to create long-term gains. Students will take a position on a topic of their choosing in each of the blocks in the syllabus, then carry out a review of the literature, using peer-reviewed work, to substantiate their point of view.

**Course Requirements**

Class Attendance/Participation in discussions on line and in class
Readings and Responses
Book Reviews
Position Papers/Presentation/Reviews of the Literature on Specific topics.

**Recommended Readings**

Readings and reviews of current peer-reviewed journals, blogs, position papers and books will be assigned, will be added as the course progresses.
Class Policies

**Academic Integrity Statement:** Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.”

**AccessABILITY Statement:** In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter College is committed to ensuring educational access and accommodations for all its registered students. Hunter College’s students with disabilities and medical conditions are encouraged to register with the Office of AccessABILITY for assistance and accommodation. For information and appointment, contact the Office of AccessABILITY located in Room E1214 or call (212) 772-4857 or TTY (212) 650-3230.”
1. **Header:** Department of Curriculum & Teaching

2. **Table**

**Proposal for a New Course**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>EDUC 801</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Title</strong></td>
<td>Research on Curriculum and Teaching of English Language Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre and/or Co Requisites</strong> (specify which are pre-, co-, or both)</td>
<td>No Pre- and/or Co-requisites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credits</strong></td>
<td>3 cr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Hours (per week)</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberal Arts</strong></td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ X] No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core Requirement**

(Note: If course is being considered for the Common Core, please use CUNY Common Core Submission Forms [see section VI below]. The form must be submitted along with the proposal and syllabus.)

[ X] Not Applicable

____ English Composition
____ Math and Quantitative Reasoning
____ Life and Physical Science
____ Scientific World
____ Creative Expression
____ U.S. Experience in its Diversity
____ World Cultures and Global Issues
____ Individual and Society

**Grading Method C/NC?**

3. **Course Description:**

The focus of this course is on effective curriculum and instruction supporting the academic, social, and emotional development of ELLs. Topics and assignments provide a direct connection of research to programming, and policy for ELLs in P-12 school contexts. Analysis of research on ELL education, including review of quantitative and qualitative studies of instruction and curriculum for ELLs will provide the foundation for the course content. This course will prepare doctoral students to critically evaluate educational research on ELLs, deeply understand the core components of quality instruction for ELLs in P-12 classrooms, and be able to clearly identify appropriate methods for addressing and improving instruction and curriculum for ELLs. Topics and assignments are designed to provide theory that directly connects to the design of instructional models of and curricula for ELL instruction.

4. **Rationale:**

Rapid demographic change over the past few decades has had an enormous impact on U.S. schools which have experienced an unprecedented increase in the numbers of English-language learners (ELLs). From 1998 to 2008 the number of ELLs increased by 51 percent, while the general population of students grew by just 7 percent (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011). Despite growing numbers, there is continued debate on how to best educate our rapidly changing school population and how to adapt instruction to best meet the needs of ELLs and support their social, emotional, and academic development.

This course will provide students with a critical foundational knowledge of the research on effective practice and curriculum in teaching ELLs. Drawing upon research topics such as: processes of second language learning, first and second language literacy and language development, social, emotional and cultural developmental contexts for ELLs, models of effective instruction for ELLs, curricular planning for language and content development in ELL education, teacher professional development approaches for ELL pedagogy, assessment of ELLs and future research directions and gaps in current knowledge, students will gain deep expertise that will enable them to make informed decisions as education leaders.

1. **Projected Enrollment:** 15
2. **Consultation Statement:** Is the proposed change likely to affect other Departments or Programs? [ X ] NO [ ] YES – If yes, list department/program: Has the Department/Program been
consulted? [ ] NO [ X ] YES Please include letters of support when necessary. Is this course cross-listed? If so, please list all courses it is listed with.

Sample Syllabus
A. Course Content and Organization:
This course is a survey of the research investigating the development of language, literacy, and content knowledge in English language learners. Topics to be discussed include: Cross-linguistic relationships between languages, literacy and language development, socio-cultural contexts and literacy development, language of instruction and effective instruction, content area knowledge, professional development, assessment and future research directions and gaps in current knowledge. Research reviews and empirical research will provide the foundation for the course content as well as student led discussions. This course will prepare doctoral students to be able to critically review research with ELLs in their field, select appropriate assessments when conducting research, understand the unique features of second language acquisition that influence language and academic development, and identify the social and cultural contexts that influence language and academic development and how to account for this variance in research design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Subtopic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Second Language Acquisition Theories and Research</td>
<td>Development of L1 and L2, error analysis, performance analysis, and inter-language; understanding of dual language acquisition, the implications of research regarding first and second language teaching and learning from multiple perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Research on Instructed Learning Environments for ELLs</td>
<td>Review of research outcomes related to the instruction of language in the classroom; and the roles of teaching schools, and communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Models of Education for ELLs</td>
<td>Evidence of language outcomes and trajectories associated with different instructional practices and program models that address the needs of linguistically diverse learners; the goals, benefits, and limitations of various types of education models (e.g., ESL, pull-out, push-in, co-teaching, dual language, immersion, transitional, developmental, maintenance, early-exit, late-exit); research findings of the effectiveness of various models of educational practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Historical and Socio-Political Contexts of ELL Education</td>
<td>Current requirements, laws, and guidelines related to ELLs Learning Standards for students in native-language and English content areas; requirements for bilingual education programs (e.g., the New York State Learning Standards for students in native-language and English language arts, ESL, and other content areas; requirements for bilingual education program entry and exit; No Child Left Behind Act, Title III; CR Part 154).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Research Methods for Investigating ELL Learning</td>
<td>Multilingual qualitative and quantitative measures; developing features of action research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Research on Content and Language Integrated Instruction for ELLs</td>
<td>Instructional practices and resources to meet the needs of individual second language learners; issues and concepts related to the integration of language development and content-area learning in the classroom (e.g., academic language proficiency in the native language and English, language modification, cultural/multicultural perspectives).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assessment of ELL Learning</td>
<td>Assessment of both the home language and English will be measured in multiple languages. Examine key concepts surrounding the assessment of ELLs, including validity, reliability, and stakes testing. Review of various purposes and types of tests and achievement tests, norm-referenced, and criterion-referenced aspects of testing each of the...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Identification and Instruction for ELLs in Special Education</td>
<td>Disproportionate representation, referral, assess education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Professional Development for ELL Instruction</td>
<td>Pre- and in-service professional development of past professional development efforts aimed at their effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Multilingualism and Multiculturalism in the Schools</td>
<td>Concepts associated with culture and cultural differences; cross-cultural interactions; in differences; benefits of multilingualism and multiculturalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Research Methods for Investigating ELL Education- Analyzing the Data and Presenting Findings</td>
<td>Identification of critical gaps in ELL education, problem, collect and analyze data, and share findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of this course student will be required to complete, although not limited to, the following:

(A) **Article Presentations**
You will be assigned to present two published journal articles to class on two different occasions, the first in small groups and the second individually. The articles should investigate some aspects of research on ELL educational practices and the presenter should provide a critical analysis of the empirical study conducted in the article. The presenter should also provide the rest of the class with an organized, concise, and easy-to-follow handout that highlights the major points of the presentation as well as provide a citation of the article(s) presented. The handout (and presentation slides, if any) must be submitted to the instructor. The presentation should position the article’s research question(s) within the context of previous research on the topic. Also, the study’s methodology and results should be summarized. The implication of the findings should be critically examined and situated in relation to the other readings and methodological issues discussed in class. The presentation should include 2-3 questions that the rest of the class can discuss in pairs or small groups.

An article presentation schedule will be arranged during the first session. These articles to be presented are pre-class required reading for all.

All paper assignments must be typed, double-spaced, paginated, 1-inch margins, 12-point, Times New Roman with your full name shown in the header. All in-text citations and references should follow the APA style. See [http://www.apastyle.org/learn/tutorials/basics-tutorial.aspx](http://www.apastyle.org/learn/tutorials/basics-tutorial.aspx) for more details about APA style.

(B) **Annotated Bibliography**
You will review 15-25 empirical studies related to a chosen aspect of ELL education, which you will later draw upon in crafting your Curriculum and Practice Proposal. Each annotation should include the following evaluative criteria:
- Worth of the research question
- Comprehensiveness of relevant literature
- Design of the study
- Analysis of the results
- Discussion of the results
- Conclusions drawn

(C) **Curriculum and Practice Proposal**
Your final paper should be a 12 to 15 page proposal for an educational innovation for a P-12 school setting, based upon empirical study of some aspect of effective ELL curriculum and instruction. Your proposal should include the following:
- a statement of the educational problem affecting ELL students (i.e. what the ELL educational problem is in a particular context, and why you have chosen to investigate it)
- an extensive review of relevant literature
- an overview of the innovation, including an account of:
  - participants/needed personnel
  - expected resource needs
  - overall design for implementation
  - instruments to be used to collect data
Expected Learning Outcomes: **Students will be able to make research-informed decisions about curriculum and instruction for ELLs based upon:**

1) An understanding of second language acquisition theories and research, inclusive of error analysis, performance analysis, and inter-language; understanding of dual language acquisition, and the learning/teaching of language and be able to apply critical analytical implications of research regarding first and second language teaching and learning from multiple perspectives.

- 2) Ability to use language acquisition knowledge to identify features of a supportive classroom-learning environment that includes opportunities for interaction in English and home languages; demonstrate knowledge of the philosophical, theoretical, and research bases for education of ELLs; the roles of teachers; and the expectations of students, families, schools, and communities

- 3) Ability to use language acquisition knowledge to identify features of a variety of instructional practices that produce language outcomes through articulated program models that address the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse learners; demonstrate knowledge of the characteristics, goals, benefits, and limitations of various types of education models/programs (e.g., ESL, pull-out, push-in, co-teaching, dual language/two-way bilingual, translanguaging, structured immersion, transitional, developmental, maintenance, early-exit, late-exit); research findings of the effectiveness of various models of education of ELLs

- 4) Ability to identify current requirements, laws, and guidelines related to ELLs (e.g., the New York State Learning Standards for students in native-language and English language arts, ESL, and other content areas; requirements for bilingual education program entry and exit; No Child Left Behind Act, Title III; CR Part 154)

- 5) Knowledge of past and current second language teaching methodologies and their applicability in developing instructional practices and resources to meet the needs of individual second language learners; demonstrate knowledge of issues and concepts related to the integration of language development and content-area learning in the classroom (e.g., academic language proficiency in the native language and English, language modification, cultural/multicultural perspectives)

- 6) Knowledge of the ongoing nature of assessment and multiple ways to assess level appropriate language proficiencies by implementing purposeful measures; reflective assessment practices including: analysis of assessment results, adjustment of instruction based on assessment results, and use of success and failure to determine the direction of instruction; an ability to interpret and communicate the results of student performances to all stakeholders and provide opportunity for discussion of the information and interpretation

- 7) Ability to apply knowledge of terms, definitions, and concepts associated with culture and cultural diversity (e.g., cultural relativism, transmission, and universalism; cross-cultural interactions; intragroup vs. intergroup similarities and differences) and an understanding of the benefits of multilingualism and multiculturalism in a global society

- 8) Ability to identify critical gaps in ELL education, structure an empirical investigation of the problem, collect and analyze data, and share findings with all stakeholders

**Method of Evaluation:**

(A) **Article Presentations**

You will be assigned to present two published journal articles to class on two different occasions, the first in small groups and the second individually. The articles should investigate some aspects of research on ELL educational practices and the presenter should provide a critical analysis of the empirical study conducted in the article. The presenter should also provide the rest of the class with an organized, concise, and easy-to-follow handout that highlights the major points of the presentation as well as provide a citation of the article(s) presented. The handout (and presentation slides, if any) must be submitted to the instructor. The presentation should position the article’s research question(s) within the context of previous research on the topic. Also, the study’s methodology and results should be summarized. The implication of the findings should be critically examined and situated in relation to the other readings and methodological
issues discussed in class. The presentation should include 2-3 questions that the rest of the class can
discuss in pairs or small groups.
An article presentation schedule will be arranged during the first session. These articles to be presented are
pre-class required reading for all.
All paper assignments must be typed, double-spaced, paginated, 1-inch margins, 12-point, Times New
Roman with your full name shown in the header. All in-text citations and references should follow the
APA style. See http://www.apastyle.org/learn/tutorials/basics-tutorial.aspx for more details about APA
style.

(B) Annotated Bibliography
You will review 15-25 empirical studies related to a chosen aspect of ELL education, which you will later
draw upon in crafting your Curriculum and Practice Proposal. Each annotation should include the
following evaluative criteria:
- Worth of the research question
- Comprehensiveness of relevant literature
- Design of the study
- Analysis of the results
- Discussion of the results
- Conclusions drawn

(C) Curriculum and Practice Proposal
Your final paper should be a 12 to 15 page proposal for an educational innovation for a P-12 school
setting, based upon empirical study of some aspect of effective ELL curriculum and instruction. Your
proposal should include the following:
- a statement of the educational problem affecting ELL students (i.e. what the ELL educational problem is in a particular context, and why you have chosen to investigate it)
- an extensive review of relevant literature
- an overview of the innovation, including an account of:
  - participants/needed personnel
  - expected resource needs
  - overall design for implementation
  - instruments to be used to collect data
  - procedures to be followed in using these instruments
- a statement about the theoretical and practical relevance of the proposal

D. Required Readings:
New York: Routledge
E. Recommended Readings:
programs on beginning reading. Journal of Educational Psychology, 102 (2), 341-355.
Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Language Disorders. Dual Language Development and Disorders: A Handbook on Bilingualism and
Educating the Other America (pp.139-162). Baltimore: Brookes.
Lyon, E. G. (2013). Learning to Assess Science in Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: Tracking Growth in


F. Academic Integrity Statement (required): “Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.”

G. AccessABILITY Statement: “In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter College is committed to ensuring educational access and accommodations for all its registered students. Hunter College’s students with disabilities and medical conditions are encouraged to register with the Office of AccessABILITY for assistance and accommodation. For information and appointment contact the Office of AccessABILITY located in Room E1214 or call (212) 772-4857 /or TTY (212) 650-3230.”

The advantages offered by the proposal and/or the needs met by the course (i.e., student, departmental, community, job market needs): This course will prepare doctoral students to be able to critically review language and literacy research with ELLs in their field, select appropriate assessments when conducting literacy or language research, understand the unique features of second language acquisition that influence language and literacy development, and identify the social and cultural contexts that influence language and literacy development and how to account for this variance in research design. Due to the large and increasing population of ELLs in P-12 schools, this course is critical for the knowledge base of doctoral candidates as well as for their work in P-12 school contexts. This course will prepare doctoral students to be able to critically review research with ELLs in their field, select appropriate assessments when conducting research, understand the unique features of second language acquisition that influence language and academic development, and identify the social and cultural contexts that influence language and academic development and how to account for this variance in research design. Furthermore, students will build expertise in the effective methods related to the instruction and assessment of ELLs.

The way in which the proposed course relates to other courses within the department of origin: This course synthesizes the research, curriculum, and methods for teaching ELLs and applies the scholarship to an action research project and literature review appropriate at the doctoral level.

The way in which the course relates to courses in other departments, divisional or interdisciplinary programs (if appropriate, possibilities for interdisciplinary use might be given): This course interconnects several programs within the school of education: TESOL, Bilingual Education, Literacy, and Special Education.

Justification for any substantial overlap with other courses in the college curriculum, indicating the unique/specific focus of the course proposed: No such overlap exists.
List of courses, if any, which are to be withdrawn when the new course is adopted. (Note: Dropping courses requires a separate proposal - see Section VI on page 5.) None.

School of Education Mission
The Hunter College School of Education is dedicated to the preparation of deeply thoughtful, knowledgeable and highly effective teachers, administrators and counselors. Our commitment is to educating these candidates — future professionals who will make a significant impact on the academic achievement, as well as the intellectual, social and emotional development of their students.

The Conceptual Framework of the HC School of Education

Evidence-Based Practices
The School of Education grounds its course content in the best field-based research and practice. Faculty review findings from their respective disciplines to provide our candidates with the strategies needed for effective instruction. Our candidates master the theory and practice of effective pedagogy in their subject areas, and acquire the tools for reflection on and improvement of their professional work. They achieve a solid foundation in the history, philosophy, psychology, sociology and methodology of education that enriches their teaching. Candidates gain expertise in analyzing and using assessment of student performance to guide their instruction and create optimal learning environments for students.

Integrated Clinical Experiences
The School of Education ensures that its candidates understand and experience the realities of school contexts. We establish strong connections with partnering schools in New York City and surrounding areas. We provide extensive fieldwork with supportive supervision in these schools. Our candidates engage in carefully sequenced and comprehensively assessed clinical experiences prior to their graduation.

Educating a Diverse Student Population
The School of Education provides its candidates with the critical skills and understanding necessary to be responsive to the multiple challenges of all learners: students with a wide range of backgrounds, cultures, abilities and prior knowledge. We teach candidates to create humane and ethical learning communities in their classrooms and schools. They gain the ability to collaborate successfully with parents, families, community members, school faculty and staff in order to provide this support.

Use of Technology to Enhance Learning
The School of Education prepares candidates with the practical and theoretical knowledge of effective and judicious uses of technology in a variety of school settings and for a broad spectrum of learners. Formative and summative assessments of our candidates’ technology competencies are a critical component of preparing them for tomorrow’s schools. We believe that appropriate uses of educational technology enhance learning, assessment and communication.

Expectations for Written Proficiency in English
Students must demonstrate consistently satisfactory written English in coursework. The HC Writing Center provides tutoring to students across the curriculum and at all academic levels. For more information, see http://rwc.hunter.cuny.edu.

Attendance Policy
Professionalism is a fundamental expectation of teachers and those preparing to be teachers. Consistent attendance, punctuality, cordiality, and attentiveness to tasks and speakers are required. Failure to meet these standards of professionalism will result in penalties that affect the final total of points in this course. If you miss a class, you are responsible for obtaining class notes, handouts, etc. from another student. Please notify me in advance via e-mail if you are going to miss a session.
1. Department of Curriculum & Teaching
Proposal for a New Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>EDUC 803</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum in Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre and/or Co Requisites (specify which are pre-, co-, or both)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Hours (per week)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>[ ]Yes [X]No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Requirement</td>
<td>X Not Applicable Common Core: (also indicate category below) English Composition Math and Quantitative Reasoning Life and Creative Expression U.S. Experience in its Diversity World Cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Method C/NC?</td>
<td>Letter Grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Course Description
The course will examine the current research on effective mathematical teaching, assessment practices, student learning, and curriculum design. Students will synthesize research and engage in research explorations focused on problems of practice.

4. Rationale
The course will examine the current research on effective mathematical teaching, assessment practices, student learning, and curriculum design. Students will synthesize research and engage in research explorations focused on problems of practice.

5. Projected Enrollment 15

6. Consultation Statement
Is the proposed change likely to affect another department or program?
[X ] NO [ ] YES If yes, list the department/program_________________________
Has the department/program been consulted? [ ] NO [ ] YES
Please include letters of support when necessary.

7. Sample Syllabus
A. Course Content and Organization:
Course Objectives:
The overall goals for this course are to
1. Deepen students’ knowledge of mathematics learning and instructional theories and models
2. Expose students to research on teacher learning, instruction, and development
3. Develop capability to enacting professional development
4. Support teacher leaders and coaches in schools
Week 1: Introduction and discussions of major issues in math learning in school
Week 2: Math standards (Common Core); NCTM standards
Week 3: Mathematics learning theories and research (constructivism, sociocultural)
Week 4: Mathematics learning theories and research (emergent perspective)
Week 5: Research of teachers’ math & instructional knowledge (PCK)
Week 6: Research of children’s mathematical thinking (selected topics from PreK-12)
Week 7: Research of children’s mathematical thinking (misconceptions)
Week 8: Linking children’s mathematical thinking to instruction
Week 9: Conducting action research
Week 10: Research and models of professional development
Week 11: Working with math teachers and coaches
Week 12: Role of video in math teacher learning
Week 13: Lesson study
Week 14: Linking professional development, teaching and student learning
Week 15: Presentation of action research project and peer evaluation

B. Expected Learning Outcomes:
Students successfully completed this course should be able to:
- analyze current research and theories of mathematics learning and instruction.
- evaluate research regarding professional development and learning models.
- enact others to facilitate a variety of effective professional learning models.
- conduct action research to analyze a problem of practice related to mathematics in the field and conduct action research to study the problem.

C. Method of Evaluation:
Readings:
Course readings will be listed by week on the Course Calendar and Readings. All readings will be posted by week in the Materials section of the Coursework site. Please note that additional readings may be assigned during the quarter. These readings will also be posted on Coursework, if possible. If that is not possible, other ways of accessing them will be provided.

The work we will do in this seminar depends on reading actively and carefully. Below I suggest several sets of general questions for us to bring to our reading. In addition, I may provide more specific guiding questions for some weeks, to help focus our reading and discussions.

- What is the author’s purpose? Who is the author? Why was the work written? To whom was the author speaking and why?
- What is the author trying to say? What are the author’s key arguments or theses? What are the author’s assumptions? What sorts of evidence and methods are used? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the author’s argument?
- How do the author’s arguments fit within various communities of discourse? In what community or communities does the author locate him or herself? How does the author’s work connect with your understanding of the work of others who address similar issues or topics?
- How do the author’s assumptions and ideas fit with your own understanding? How might your reading of the work be affected by your own values, beliefs, and commitments? 1. Response to Readings (25 points) One of the best ways to prepare for class discussions is to think and write about the readings before class. For at least 5 of the class sessions, please post a 1-2 page response to the readings on our Blackboard site (Forum: Weekly Responses to Readings) by the Sunday evening before the class session for which they are assigned. You may do this either individually or in small study groups. The response should capture your questions, comments, and concerns about the readings. They will be very helpful in planning our class discussions.

2. Misconception in mathematics paper (25 points)
For this paper, you will identify a concept in PreK-12 grades mathematics that is often misunderstood by students. First, you should discuss the common misconceptions students have and provide specific
examples. Section, you should examine research regarding the common misconceptions. Third, you should describe some ways that teachers may correct or PREVENT these misconceptions. Fourth, your paper should include at least 7 peer-reviewed, empirical articles to support your assertions about the misconceptions and ways to address them. The paper should be between 7-8 double-spaced pages. Please follow APA guidelines.

3. Final Project Analysis of Mathematics Professional Development Program (50 Points) For this project you will study in-depth a professional development program (or set of programs with similar foci) of your choosing and write a paper describing and analyzing that program(s). Be sure to select a program for which research has been conducted and reports of that research are available. Your paper should address the following topics:

- Nature of the mathematics professional development program
- Underlying assumptions about mathematics teaching and teacher learning
- Summary of research conducted on the professional development program (research questions, methods, findings, conclusions)
- Your analysis of strengths and limitations of the professional development program
- Your analysis of strengths and limitations of the research on the PD program
- Suggestions for future program development and research I anticipate that the papers will be approximately 12-15 pages in length. They should be written in either APA or Chicago style. APA style, described in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, is the format used in the large majority of educational publications, including most of the readings for this course. Chicago style, described in the Chicago Manual of Style, is used in chapters from yearbooks of the National Society for the Study of Education. Possible professional development programs to study: (This list is meant to be suggestive, not exhaustive. I encourage you to identify a PD program in your area of interest.)
  - Video Cases for Mathematics Professional Development; Learning and Teaching Geometry (Seago and colleagues)
  - Cognitively-Guided Instruction (original: Carpenter, Fennema, Franke & colleagues; more recent incarnations: Franke & Kazemi, Phillips & colleagues)
  - Video clubs (Sherin, van Es, and colleagues)
  - Partnerships for Reform in Secondary Science and Mathematics (PRiSSM; Nelson, Slavit & colleagues)
  - The Danielson Group: Promoting Teacher Effectiveness and Professional Learning

EVALUATION

Course grades will be based on the two assignments and class participation/reading responses. These factors will be weighted as follows (100 points possible):

Reading response paper Final project

GRADING METHOD

A+ = 97.5 – 100%  A =92.5–97.4%  A- =90.0–92.4%
B+ = 87.5 – 89.9%  B =82.5–87.4%  B- =80.0–82.4%
C+ = 77.5 – 79.9%  C =70.0–77.4%  F =0–69.9%

D. Required Readings:
Mathematics Learning Theories

B+ = 87.5 – 89.9%  B =82.5–87.4%  B- =80.0–82.4%
C+ = 77.5 – 79.9%  C =70.0–77.4%  F =0–69.9%
25 points 25 points 50 points

1. Constructivism

2. Socio-constructivism / emergent perspective


Westport, CT: Ablex...


**Students’ Mathematical Thinking as a Basis for Teacher Learning**


**The Role of Video in Mathematics Teacher Learning**


**Lesson Study**


Linking Professional Development, Teaching and Student Learning


Working with Mathematics Teacher Leaders & Coaches


Mathematical Misconceptions


PCK


E. Recommended Readings:

F. Academic Integrity Statement:
Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.
G. AccessABILITY Statement:
“In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter College is committed to ensuring educational access and accommodations for all its registered students. Hunter College’s students with disabilities and medical conditions are encouraged to register with the Office of AccessABILITY for assistance and accommodation. For information and appointment contact the Office of AccessABILITY located in Room E1214 or call (212) 772-4857 /or TTY (212) 650-3230.”
1. **Header:** Department of Educational Foundations & Counseling Programs  
   **Proposal for a New Course**

2. **Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>EDF 802</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Title</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative Methods and Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre and/or Co Requisites (specify which are pre-, co-, or both)</strong></td>
<td>Introduction to Statistics and Statistical Computing (EDPS 701)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credits</strong></td>
<td>4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Hours (per week)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberal Arts</strong></td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ X ] No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Core Requirement**   | _X_ Not Applicable _ Common Core: (also indicate category below)  
  ____ English Composition  
  ____ Math and Quantitative Reasoning  
  ____ Life and Creative Expression  
  ____ U.S. Experience in its Diversity  
  ____ World Cultures  |
| **Grading Method C/NC?** |          |

3. **Course Description:** The purpose of this course is to increase students’ understanding of quantitative research methods and design issues relevant to the pursuit of research in education, with a focus on correlational, experimental and quasi-experimental design. This course also addresses essential issues in the measurement of educational constructs, including the following topics: reliability, validation, item analysis, test bias, dimensionality, item response theory, and the use of high-stakes testing in educational policy.

4. **Rationale:** This is a new course in the research toolkit for the doctoral program. It will help students to prepare practitioner leaders and will assist in a major project involving the application of research to the analysis of a specific practical problem.

5. **Projected Enrollment** 15

6. **Consultation Statement**

   - Is the proposed change likely to affect other Departments or Programs? [ X ] NO [ ] YES – If yes, list department/program: Has the Department/Program been consulted? [ ] NO [ ] YES

Please include letters of support when necessary. Is this course cross-listed? If so, please list all courses it is listed with. No

7. **Sample Syllabus**

   **A. Course Content and Organization:**

   **COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

   **Projects:** Students must complete two projects for the course. The first project will require each student to examine the methodology and statistics of one or more published research articles and will be worth 20% of the course grade. The second project will focus on a research question developed by each individual student and will be worth 25% of the course grade. Further details on the projects will be provided during the semester.
**Exams:** There will be two in-class exams; the first exam will be worth 20% of the grade and the final worth 25% of the final course grade. Exams will consist of questions which address the conceptual underpinnings of the material as well as application problems which require calculations or appropriate use of computer output.

**Academic participation:** Short formative assessments will be announced in class and/or on Blackboard most weeks. Some of these will be Blackboard-based—students should be prepared to access the Blackboard site frequently. Some assessments will require work with peers. This component will be worth 10% of the final grade.

**COURSE POLICIES**

**Attendance:** All students are expected to attend and arrive on time for all classes. Reading and preparing for class are important. If absent, students are responsible for obtaining class notes and/or handouts from their classmates even though the absence may be excused.

**Make-up examinations:** NO make-up examinations, except for extreme circumstances.

**Incomplete course grade:** NO “incomplete” course grade will be granted in this course, except for extreme situations and at the instructor’s discretion.

**Assistance with writing:** Completion of the research proposal and research article critiques are highly dependent on effective writing skills. If you need assistance with writing, please utilize the Hunter College Writing Center.

**CONTENT OUTLINE AND SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings*</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stating research problems and questions, identifying variables, and formulating hypotheses; Research ethics; Literature search</td>
<td>Chs. 2-4</td>
<td>Human subject training certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>Ch. 6 and supplementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Measurement: reliability &amp; validity</td>
<td>Chs. 7-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Measurement: NRT &amp; CRT and applications in current policy</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Measurement: technical methods for analyzing test scores: FA, IRT, DIF, item analysis</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Data exploration: assumptions, outlier analysis, missing cases</td>
<td>Ch. 5 and supplementary</td>
<td>Article Critique Part I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Exam 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Statistical methods for non-experimental designs: MR</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Statistical methods for non-experimental designs 2: MR</td>
<td>Supplementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Research design: Experimental design w/validity issues</td>
<td>Ch. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Statistical methods for experimental designs: ANOVA &amp; ANCOVA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Article Critique Part II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Readings are to be completed **BEFORE** the class for which they are assigned. Additional required readings will be assigned for some sessions approximately one week before they are due, and announced on Blackboard.

**B. Expected Learning Outcomes:**
The primary goals of this class are to introduce fundamental concepts, principles, and applications of: (1) sampling theory, (2) measurement theory, and (3) statistical methods for non-experimental, experimental, and quasi-experimental designs. By the end of the course, students should be able to:

1) Interpret and **critically** evaluate the quality of sampling and measurement practices used in available data sets and published articles.
2) Interpret and **critically** evaluate research studies employing analytic techniques covered in the course;
3) Determine the appropriate analytic approach for their own research questions and available data;
4) Explore data and implement appropriate analytic techniques in the statistical software, SPSS;
5) Specify and estimate models, evaluate model fit, conduct model comparisons and hypothesis testing, and interpret analysis results in real data settings; and
6) Effectively articulate for both technical and non-technical audiences their analytic process, findings, and implications in the context of the original research question(s).

**C. Method of Evaluation:**

**EVALUATION**
Exam 1Final examArticle critique Research project Academic Participation

**GRADING SYSTEM**
A+ = 97.5 – 100% A =92.5–97.4% A- =90.0–92.4%
D. Required Readings:
20% 25% 20% 25% 10%
B+= 87.5 – 89.9% B =82.5–87.4% B- =80.0–82.4%
C+ = 77.5 – 79.9% C =70.0–77.4% F =0–69.9%


The course makes reference to the Research Methods Knowledge Base, an online resource:
Additional required articles will be assigned for some sessions, announced on Blackboard, and will be accessible online through the Hunter library.

Students will need access to a good statistics textbook covering topics through ANCOVA and multiple regression, such as the text used in their Statistics I course.

**Software:**
All statistical analyses will be conducted in SPSS, which is the statistical software package licensed by Hunter College. This will provide students with opportunities to process and apply the statistical methods discussed in class.

**E. Recommended Readings:**
Suggested online resources (in addition to The Research Methods Knowledge Base http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/):

- ITEMS are instructional modules intended to improve the understanding of educational measurement principles by providing brief instructional units on timely topics in the field, modules developed for use by college faculty and students as well as by workshop leaders and participants, available online at https://ncme.org/pubs/items.cfm
- NAEP (National Assessment of Educational Progress). http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard
- NCES (National Center for Education Statistics) Surveys: http://nces.ed.gov/surveys
- Practical Assessment Research and Evaluation is a searchable peer-reviewed electronic journal, with short introductory-level articles on topics like assumptions in multiple regression. http://pareonline.net

- Purdue OWL guide to APA style: http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/section/2/10/
- UCLA Resources to help you learn and use SPSS: http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/spss

Selected Articles:


F. Academic Integrity Statement: “Hunter College regards acts of academic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating on examinations, obtaining unfair advantage, and falsification of records and official documents) as serious offenses against the values of intellectual honesty. The College is committed to enforcing the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and will pursue cases of academic dishonesty according to the Hunter College Academic Integrity Procedures.”

G. AccessABILITY Statement: “In compliance with the ADA and with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Hunter College is committed to ensuring educational access and accommodations for all its registered students. Hunter College’s students with disabilities and medical conditions are encouraged to register with the Office of AccessABILITY for assistance and accommodation. For information and appointment contact the Office of AccessABILITY located in Room E1214 or call (212) 772-4857 /or TTY (212) 650-3230.”

Conceptual Framework, Hunter College School of Education The School of Education’s mission is to prepare deeply thoughtful, knowledgeable and highly effective teachers, administrators and counselors. Our vision is a research-based, clinically grounded, culturally competent and technology-rich program for preparing all our candidates. We are focused on enabling candidates to achieve substantive learning gains for the students and schools they will serve. Our


147
goal is to prepare educators who will demonstrate, through their professional commitments and practices, those multiple competencies that promote effective learning. See http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/school-of-education
### Appendix C: Program Scheduling

#### Table 1b: Graduate Program Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term: Fall 1</th>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Prerequisite(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introductory Doctoral Seminar in Educational Research</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancing Achievement through Family and Community Relationships</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term: Spring 1</td>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Prerequisite(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics I</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Communication for Educational Settings</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term: Summer 1</td>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Prerequisite(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative Research Methods</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term: Fall 2</td>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Prerequisite(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum in Special Education (REPAC: SPED)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative Research Methods and Measurement</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term: Spring 2</td>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Prerequisite(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum in Special Education (REPAC: SPED)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum Content Requirement 1 (REPAC: CONTENT)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term: Summer 2</td>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Prerequisite(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Proposal Seminar</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term: Fall 3</td>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Prerequisite(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum Content Requirement 1 (REPAC: CONTENT)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Topic: Research 1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term: Spring 3</td>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Prerequisite(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Topic: Research 2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Topic: Content 1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term: Summer 3</td>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Prerequisite(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Topic: Content 1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term: Fall 4</td>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Prerequisite(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Advisement</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term: Spring 4</td>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Prerequisite(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Advisement</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term: Fall 5</td>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Prerequisite(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation Advisement</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term: Spring 5</td>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Prerequisite(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Prerequisite(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Policy and School Reform</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Professional Development of Teachers</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Professional Development of Teachers</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term credit total</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credits: 60.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identify any comprehensive, culminating element(s) (e.g., thesis or examination), including course number if applicable:

Students will take a qualifying examination and will need to pass in order to proceed to the Dissertation Phase.
Appendix D : Faculty Teaching Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>FT/PT</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>R/E</th>
<th>Articles in Refereed Journals in the past 5 yrs</th>
<th>Any Dissertation Load in the previous 5 yrs.</th>
<th># of Advisers</th>
<th>% FTE Time to Proposed Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex/M/F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David M. Steiner</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherryl Browne</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrie Lisa</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Patti</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Connor</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Trief</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy P. Chen</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Bonner</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gess LeBlanc</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Koellner</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Baecher</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Shieble</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Shieble</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Collins</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Sonu</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Wirtz</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody Nicole</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Lloyd</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Troth</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1
RECTLY ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED DOCTORAL PROGRAM
### Table 4: Faculty to be Hired

If faculty must be hired, specify the number and title of new positions to be established and minimum qualifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Rank of Position</th>
<th>No. of New Positions</th>
<th>Minimum Qualifications (including degree and discipline area)</th>
<th>F/T or P/T</th>
<th>Percent Time to Program</th>
<th>Expected Course Assignments</th>
<th>Expected Hiring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ph.D in Education or related field</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>Director Course release (6.0 credits) and Introductory Doctoral Seminar in</td>
<td>9/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ph.D in Education or related field</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum in Special Education</td>
<td>9/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ph.D in Education or related field</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum for English Language Learners</td>
<td>9/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix F: New Resources Table

#### Table 5: New Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Year 1 2015-16</th>
<th>Year 2 2016-17</th>
<th>Year 3 2017-18</th>
<th>Year 4 2018-19</th>
<th>Year 5 2019-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Faculty</td>
<td>109,458</td>
<td>109,458</td>
<td>199,930</td>
<td>199,930</td>
<td>290,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Faculty</td>
<td>8,130</td>
<td>85,369</td>
<td>60,978</td>
<td>109,760</td>
<td>97,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Staff</td>
<td>29,925</td>
<td>29,925</td>
<td>59,850</td>
<td>59,850</td>
<td>59,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library (Includes Staffing)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Expenses (Other than Personal Services)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all</td>
<td>155,013</td>
<td>229,752</td>
<td>330,757</td>
<td>377,040</td>
<td>457,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] Specify the inflation rate used for projections. [2] Specify the academic year. [3] Include fringe benefits. [4] New resources means resources engendered specifically by the proposed program. The new resources from the previous year should be carried over to the following year, new resources with adjustments for inflation, if a continuing cost. [5] Specify what is included in "other" category, (e.g., student financial aid).
### Appendix G: Projected Revenue Table

**Projected Revenue Related to the Proposed Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition Revenue[3]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01. From Existing Sources[4]</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$182,880</td>
<td>$397,688</td>
<td>$560,895</td>
<td>$599,068</td>
<td>$633,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Appropriation[6]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04. From Existing Sources§</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05. From New Sources **</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Revenue[7]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07. From Existing Sources§</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08. From New Sources **</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total[8]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. From Existing Sources§</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. From New Sources **</td>
<td>$182,880</td>
<td>$397,688</td>
<td>$560,865</td>
<td>$599,068</td>
<td>$633,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$182,880</td>
<td>$397,688</td>
<td>$560,895</td>
<td>$599,068</td>
<td>$633,732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Supporting Materials for Projected Revenue Table

See Section 5: Cost Assessment
Appendix I : Five Year Financial Projection

The Five-Year Revenue Projections for Program  
SENIOR COLLEGE WORKSHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Fees:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Income (Specify Rate per credit) calculates 2% increase per year</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees (enter ANNUAL program fees other than standard CUNY fees)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Instate Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Fees:</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Income (Specify Rate per credit) calculates 2% increase per year</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees (enter ANNUAL program fees other than standard CUNY fees)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Out of State Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXISTING FULL TIME TUITION REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuition & Fees:
Number of Majors (Enter # of EXISTING PART-TIME In State Students)
Total Enrolled Credits (Enter Avg # credits per student per year-Fall+ Spring+Summer) i.e. 6 Fall, 6 Spring, 3 Summer=15
Tuition Income (Specify Rate per credit) calculates 2% increase per year
Total Tuition
Student Fees (enter ANNUAL program fees other than standard CUNY fees)
Total Fees
Total Part-Time Tuition & Fees

Tuition & Fees:
Number of Majors (Enter # of EXISTING PART-TIME Out of State Students)
Total Enrolled Credits (Enter Avg # credits per student per year-Fall+ Spring+Summer) i.e. 6 Fall, 6 Spring, 3 Summer=15
Tuition Income (Specify Rate per credit) calculates 2% increase per year
Total Tuition
Student Fees (enter ANNUAL program fees other than standard CUNY fees)
Total Fees
Total Part-Time Tuition & Fees
Total Fees
Total Out of State Tuition & Fees
TOTAL EXISTING PART TIME REVENUE

TOTAL EXISTING REVENUE (LINKS TO REVENUE SPREADSHEET ROW 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuition & Fees:
New Students are students who would NOT have enrolled in another program at your college, had the new program not been established. Number of Majors (Enter # of NEW FULL TIME In State Students)
Tuition Income (Specify Rate per credit) calculates 2% increase per year
Total Tuition
Student Fees (enter ANNUAL program fees other than standard CUNY fees)
Total Fees
Total Instate Tuition & Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuition & Fees:
Number of Majors (Enter # of NEW FULL TIME Out of State Students)
Tuition Income (Specify Rate per credit) calculates 2% increase per year
Total Tuition
Student Fees (enter ANNUAL program fees other than standard CUNY fees)
Total Fees
Total Out of State Tuition & Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL NEW FULL TIME TUITION REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuition & Fees:
Number of Majors (Enter # of NEW PART-TIME In State Students)
Total Enrolled Credits (Enter Avg # credits per student per year-Fall+ Spring+Summer) i.e. 6 Fall, 6 Spring, 3 Summer=15
Tuition Income ($635 per credit) calculates 2% increase per year
Total Tuition
Student Fees (enter ANNUAL program fees other than standard CUNY fees)
Total Fees
Total Instate Tuition & Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$635</td>
<td>$648</td>
<td>$661</td>
<td>$674</td>
<td>$687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$182,880</td>
<td>$397,688</td>
<td>$560,895</td>
<td>$599,068</td>
<td>$633,732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuition & Fees:
Number of Majors (Enter # of NEW PART-TIME Out of State Students)
Total Enrolled Credits (Enter Avg # credits per student per year-Fall+ Spring+Summer) i.e. 6 Fall, 6 Spring, 3 Summer=15
Tuition Income (Specify Rate per credit) calculates 2% increase per year
Total Tuition
Student Fees (enter ANNUAL program fees other than standard CUNY fees)
Total Fees
Total Instate Tuition & Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$182,880</td>
<td>$397,688</td>
<td>$560,895</td>
<td>$599,068</td>
<td>$633,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$635</td>
<td>$648</td>
<td>$661</td>
<td>$674</td>
<td>$687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Total Tuition
Student Fees (enter ANNUAL program fees other than standard CUNY fees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Out of State Tuition & Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL NEW PART TIME REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$182,880</td>
<td>$397,688</td>
<td>$560,895</td>
<td>$599,068</td>
<td>$633,732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL NEW REVENUE (LINKS TO REVENUE SPREADSHEET ROW 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$182,880</td>
<td>$397,688</td>
<td>$560,895</td>
<td>$599,068</td>
<td>$633,732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Revenue from EXISTING sources-identify sources

#### STATE BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS FROM EXISTING SOURCES -LINKS TO REVENUE SPREADSHEET ROW 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Revenue from NEW sources-identify sources

#### STATE BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS FROM NEW SOURCES -LINKS TO REVENUE SPREADSHEET ROW 11

FOR YEARS 2-5 INCLUDE CONTINUING RESOURCES FROM PREVIOUS YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Revenue From Existing Sources (specify and explain)- LINKS TO REVENUE SPREADSHEET ROW 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Revenue New (specify and explain) (LINKS TO REVENUE SPREADSHEET ROW 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Students in coursework phase charged $465 per credit, average of 17 credits in first three years. Dissertation years at 3 credits + 1,020 per semester (year 1) and 2,040 for second year.
The Five-Year Financial Projections for Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Operating Expenses</strong> (Include additional expenses incurred by other programs when satisfying needs of new program):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Full Time Faculty Replacement Costs (list separately)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Full Time Faculty Base Salary (list separately)</td>
<td>82,299</td>
<td>82,299</td>
<td>82,299</td>
<td>82,299</td>
<td>82,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>68,024</td>
<td>68,024</td>
<td>68,024</td>
<td>68,024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Full Time Faculty Overload (include Summer)</td>
<td>27,159</td>
<td>27,159</td>
<td>49,607</td>
<td>49,607</td>
<td>72,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Full Time Faculty Overload (include Summer) New Faculty Re-assigned Time (list separately)</td>
<td>109,458</td>
<td>109,458</td>
<td>199,930</td>
<td>199,930</td>
<td>290,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Links to Full-Time Faculty on Program Exp Worksheet)</td>
<td>7,391</td>
<td>77,608</td>
<td>55,434</td>
<td>99,782</td>
<td>88,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Faculty Actual Salaries</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>7,761</td>
<td>5,543</td>
<td>9,978</td>
<td>8,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Faculty Actual Fringe Benefits (10%)</td>
<td>8,130</td>
<td>85,369</td>
<td>60,978</td>
<td>109,760</td>
<td>97,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Links to Part-Time Faculty Program Exp Worksheet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Staff Base Salary (list separately)</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assistant (.5 FTE in years 1 and 2)</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>14,850</td>
<td>14,850</td>
<td>14,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Staff Fringe Benefits (33%)</td>
<td>29,925</td>
<td>29,925</td>
<td>59,850</td>
<td>59,850</td>
<td>59,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Links to Full-Time Staff on Program Exp Worksheet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DO NOT INCLUDE NEW LIBRARY STAFF IN THIS SECTION)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Staff Base Salary (list separately) Graduate Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Hourly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Employee Fringe Benefits (10.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Links to Part-Time Staff on Program Exp Worksheet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Staff Full Time (List Separately) Full Time Staff Fringe Benefits (33%) Library Staff Part Time (List Separately) Part Time Employee Fringe Benefits (10.0%) TOTAL (Links to Library on Program Exp Worksheet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify) Total (Links to Equipment on Program Exp Worksheet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABORATORIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Other (list separately) TOTAL (Links to Laboratories on Program Exp Worksheet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### SUPPLIES AND EXPENSES (OTPS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1,500</th>
<th>1,500</th>
<th>3,000</th>
<th>3,000</th>
<th>4,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and Promotion Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer License Fees</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Total Supplies and OTPS Expenses (Links to Supplies on Program Exp Worksheet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL EXPENDITURES Facility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovations Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (list separately)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (Links to Capital Expenditures on Program Exp Worksheet)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (list separately)

### TOTAL (Links to Other on Program Exp Worksheet)

Also see Section 5: Cost Assessment.
Evaluator:
Dorinda J. Carter Andrews, Ed.D., Associate Professor of Teacher Education, Michigan State University

Program Qualities
The proposal makes clear the need for a clinically-focused EdD in Instructional Leadership in the New York City area and is grounded in distinguishing features of other doctoral programs based on its framing from the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. The need and justification for this type of doctoral program is described through highlighting some powerful changes that have increased the complexity of educational leadership, namely new curriculum standards, new student assessment for college- and career-readiness, new methods for reaching all students, new teacher evaluation systems, and greater transparency for schools and systems. Currently there is no public EdD program in NYC designed to meet the needs of working educators with a part-time cohort model and practice-focused curriculum. With this structure, the program will be very attractive to the average working educator in NYC who is interested in a doctorate. In the area, there are currently only two doctoral programs in education offered by CUNY (a Ph.D. in Urban Education and a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology). For students interested in enrolling in the CUNY system at the doctoral level and obtaining a degree in Instructional Leadership, this program will be one of a kind. This feature, along with the competitive lower cost of the program, will make it attractive to students beyond the NYC area. The rationale for this EdD program supports existing research that indicates a need for more clinically-focused doctoral training for education practitioners across the country. Thus, the program should draw a consistent student base and will respond to occupational demand for graduates who have this type of clinical training at the doctoral level.

Curriculum
The program evidences four key areas in which students will acquire knowledge and skills for meeting the challenges of the changing landscape of education. The emphases on special education and English Language Learners is duly noted given the demographics of students who are disproportionately disadvantaged in urban schools; however, there is lack of evidence of an explicit focus throughout the curriculum on social justice in schools and the examination of race, class, gender, and other social identity markers in relationship to societal inequities and how these impact educational inequities in schools. While some syllabi mention a focus on examination of issues and interventions affecting urban schools and communities and diverse students (e.g., SPED801, ECC801, EDUC809 and EDUC804), this focus is not necessarily apparent across the instructional leadership core area, content-specific courses (e.g., math), research on effective practice and curriculum area, or the research toolkit area. How might future educational leaders study these issues as it relates to how qualitative and quantitative research is conducted and analyzed? What classroom conversations and field assignments and experiences can aid students in more deeply considering policies, strategies and interventions for
combating racial-, socioeconomic-, and gender- inequities in schools? Grappling with these types of questions wasn’t necessarily evident in all syllabi as presented. It should be noted that the reading lists include scholarship that can cultivate an environment where these types of questions are raised; but course descriptions and learner outcomes do not explicitly speak to these issues as goals/objectives/primary aims. Given the environmental context in which the program is located and the criticality of these issues nationwide, it seems that a clinically-based professional doctorate would make these issues central to the curriculum.

The instructional approach will be attractive to potential students as well. Offering a wide range of pedagogical and scheduling approaches (e.g., online and hybrid courses, intensive weekend courses, and summer experiences) will make it possible for working educators to participate fully in a professional educational doctorate. Additionally the curriculum across the program (as evidenced by several syllabi) requires students to link theory and practice consistently so that what is being learned in the classroom is applicable to everyday experiences in school and classrooms.

The program evidences flexibility in elective offerings for students across the four key areas, namely in the areas of research methods and content in instructional leadership. There is also flexibility in how students might design a dissertation inquiry project. However, the program proposal lacks a clear rationale for the makeup of required research methods courses. For example students are required to take 8 credits of quantitative methods courses and 4 credits of qualitative methods courses. What is the rationale for this setup? Additionally, how, if at all, might the qualitative research methods course in educational psychology differ from a qualitative research methods course housed in the curriculum and instruction department? If the course is designed to be an introductory qualitative course (an overview of the various methods), is there a need to require students to take one additional qualitative methods course that is advanced (meaning focused in a particular area such as case study research, discourse analysis, action research, ethnographic methods). Another consideration is whether or not students should be required to take an action research course if the dissertation is designed to be project-based for students who are part-time and working full-time. Program administrators might want to consider having two required introductory research methods courses: 1 qualitative and 1 quantitative and then consider, based on the goals and objectives of the program, what should be required of students beyond that.

The program evidences interdisciplinary efforts within the College across the three departments. This is a strength; however, it is not clear from the materials submitted the relationship of this program to undergraduate programs in the institution or other interdisciplinary programs. Or how the proposed program will interact with other programs or divisions outside the School of Education. Some questions to consider include what other units in the system might be good for cross-listing courses that could be good electives for students in this program as well as exploration of opportunities for research and interdisciplinary dissertation committees. It also is not clear in the proposal how the program will conduct self-assessment, beyond what is required by accrediting bodies to which the multiple programs in the School of Education report. While the proposal states that protocols are in place to collect and analyze data on student performance and that human resources are dedicated to this function within the College, the proposal does not provide much detail on how it will engage in ongoing self-assessment.
Collectively the faculty represents a group that has received doctorate degrees from top-tier universities in the U.S. The full-time faculty has solid teaching experience at the college level but lack experiences with dissertation supervision. Most of the experience with dissertation supervision is held by full professors. Only one assistant professor has served as a member of a dissertation committee, and one associate professor has chaired a dissertation committee. This might be an area of concern given the projection for program cohort sizes and the need to distribute advising responsibilities evenly across the department. Those who are identified as doctoral advisees will most likely need some mentoring/training on how to do this job well. Research indicates that strong advising in doctoral programs impacts students’ time to degree completion and overall experience in programs. Collectively the full-time faculty has a history of sustained service in their respective professional organizations, and several have gained national recognition in their fields. While most have maintained an active record of scholarly research and publication, there are some full-time faculty members (at all ranks) whose curriculum vitae show inconsistency in publication and research.

Collectively the faculty shows a strong record of K-12 teaching experience and outreach and engagement with urban communities. Collectively the faculty demonstrates a solid record of grant funding – both internally and externally. As with research and scholarship, some faculty at all ranks could improve their efforts to seek grants and secure them. Collectively the faculty’s areas of expertise reflect the areas of focus in the curriculum for the proposed doctoral program (e.g., English Language learners, literacy, special education, mathematics, early childhood education, urban education, multicultural education). It is not clear if there are research methodology gaps in the expertise of the full-time faculty. For example as a group does the faculty expertise lie in quantitative methodologies, qualitative methodologies, mixed-methods approaches? Do faculty members have experience with action research since it is an area of focus in this program? A review of curriculum vitae indicates some senior faculty members have expertise in quantitative methodologies, but it is not clear where the qualitative methodological expertise lies. The College acknowledges in the proposal the need for three new faculty members to enhance expertise in practice-based research among the faculty in addition to hiring of adjunct faculty to teach select course in the program. These are both critical strategies for effectively supporting student progression through the program and faculty promotion through the tenure system.

The proposal indicates that all faculty teaching in the proposed program will be full-time faculty. Of the full-time faculty teaching in the program (n=19), 6 have the rank of full professor; 5 have the rank of associate professor; and, 8 have the rank of assistant professor. It is not clear how many of the associate professors are tenured. An additional faculty member (White male) was listed in the proposal but not identified as full- or part-time. When considering race/ethnicity, 3 are Black, 2 are Asian/Pacific Islander, and 13 are White. Approximately 26% of the faculty members are persons of color. While the institution should work to increase this number as it identifies three new faculty members for the program, this percentage reflects well in comparison to some program faculty demographics nationwide. 6 faculty members are male, and 13 are female.
An additional area of concern might be the number of non-tenured full-time faculty members teaching in the program and administration’s ability to balance their teaching and advising responsibilities in the program as they seek to earn tenure. This can affect retention of these faculty members. While the proposal demonstrates shared teaching responsibilities in the program across all three departments in the School of Education, issues of tenure and promotion can be a challenge for junior faculty members and those looking to promote from associate with tenure to full professor. Two of the faculty expected to be hired will be assistant professors, and one will be at the associate level. Program administrators should consider how this might further exacerbate the tenure gap within the program.

Program administrators should also consider strategies for ongoing faculty development and assessment. While the proposal is not descriptive in these areas, faculty evaluation mechanisms should be closely considered as well as the type and frequency of professional development opportunities made available to faculty to best support their new work as doctoral advisors and mentors, and in some cases instructors of certain types of graduate level courses. Are there other units on campus or in the CUNY system that provide professional development for faculty in areas of interest for supporting the success of this program? Administrators should also clearly outline the qualifications of adjunct and part-time faculty who might be engaged in the program.

**Students**

The program has a solid potential student pool upon which to draw. Based on data provided in the proposal on current and former graduate students of the teacher education, counselor education, and school leader programs, there is interest from current and future graduates in pursuing a practice-based, professional doctorate. The program has identified a number of strategies that should prove effective in recruiting, enrolling and retaining students of part-time, minority, or disadvantaged status. Utilizing school partners, affinity educator groups in NYC, union publications, and cooperating teacher and existing part-time faculty pools should prove beneficial in constructing culturally diverse cohort groups. However the program should consider how to be more strategic in ensuring the necessary supports are in place for students from underrepresented groups to be successful at doctoral degree completion. For example, what types of academic and social support services currently exist or need to be in place to ensure degree completion for students from underrepresented groups?

The stated admissions requirements will likely draw a pool of highly qualified applicants and enrollees; however, the program should consider that cohort diversity might suffer as a result of considering prospective students who meet all of the admissions requirements. Some students from underrepresented groups might have lower GRE scores in an area but have the work experience in education and/or have an education-related Master’s degree with the minimum GPA requirement. Or some students from underrepresented groups might have the work experience in education and adequate GRE scores, but do not meet the minimum GPA requirement from their Master’s degree program. Program leaders should consider an applicant’s entire profile as an indication of likelihood of success in this new program.

The student/faculty ratio is adequate. However, there should be a clear process for monitoring students’ progress and performance throughout the program from the onset. For example, if cohort #1 has 18 students, what plans are in place to assist the Program Director in effectively
advising students in year 1? Faculty should be prepared to serve as advisors to students beginning in year 1 of the program. One structure might be to have faculty serve as Guidance Advisors for assisting students through the coursework phase, and then students can identify a different Dissertation Advisor later on if necessary. But a committee should be established for each student early on (by beginning of year 2) to help them understand program benchmarks and process. It doesn’t seem feasible that one person could do this for potentially 18 students in Year 1. Determining when students need to complete and pass a qualifying exam as well as when they can defend their dissertation proposal will be important. Also, if there are any other milestones identified by the program for students, these will need to be made clear, and students will need strong advising for being successful in the process toward degree completion.

The program has identified solid prospects for job placement and advancement, and there are several offices available on campus to aid students in discussing career matters. It should be noted that an Academic Advisor/Program Chair can also assist with some of these things.

**Resources**

While not evident in the proposal, additional information gleaned from the program administration indicates that increasing the number of doctoral programs is part of the Hunter College strategic plan. Because there will be need for additional staff externally, there is belief that the President will aid in spearheading efforts to secure funding to support the development and maintenance of this doctoral program. Three additional faculty lines are proposed for this program over a multiyear period, and it is expected that they will be funded.

The program itself is expected to generate tuition revenue in excess of program costs over the first five years. However the proposal is not clear on what student financial assistance will be planned or from where funds will be allocated for faculty professional development and activities, colloquia, visiting lectures, etc. These types of activities enhance not only faculty skills but also the professional repertoire of the doctoral students. The program administration should identify strategies for these areas of funding. While many faculty members secure external grant funding that can aid in providing some financial support for students through research opportunities, a more structured plan should be developed for financial assistance for students.

With regard to physical resources and facilities, the program will leverage the strengths and resources of the current School of Education programs, minimizing the need for additional capital investment. The proposal outlines (Table 5) projected new resources for the first five years of the program. Primary new resources include full-time and part-time faculty and full-time staff. Additional resources include equipment in years 1 and 3 ($2,500 respectively), and supplies and expenses annually ($5,000). Other expenses, such as library, and laboratories (Appendix I) are not expected.

**Comments**

Overall the proposed EdD in Instructional Leadership has many strengths as it relates to feasibility of implementation and appropriateness of objectives for the degree being offered. First, there is adequate faculty to staff the program, and they provide the appropriate expertise for the curriculum to be taught. As mentioned earlier, administration should further identify
methodological areas of expertise as it relates to applied research and qualitative methodologies. Also, administration should devise plans for faculty mentoring to effectively advise future doctoral students. Because the department is slightly “bottom heavy” with non-tenured faculty members, the pressures to earn tenure coupled with the responsibilities of teaching and advising in a new doctoral program can present some challenges. There are not enough senior faculty members with doctoral advising experience to equitably distribute advising loads for the first cohort of students. Secondly, while full-time faculty members have research expertise in the major content areas/areas of focus in the program syllabi should more clearly explicate how issues of social justice and social inequality are covered across the program and not just on a few days in someone’s syllabus or in certain courses. Learner outcomes and course descriptions should be explicit regarding these issues, given the contexts in which these educators are working and to which they will return and conduct applied research.

This EdD in Instructional Leadership has the potential to produce top-notch educators in the NYC area and for urban centers across this country. It’s practice-based focus and part-time cohort-based structure provides appeal to practitioners who want to further their education and take on leadership roles in the K-12 system and in policy arenas.
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General Comments:  
The proposed Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership at Hunter College is an innovative program designed to respond to a recent and growing need for P-12 educators to have advanced degrees, especially if they want to be instructional leaders, and to be able to interpret, explain, and apply the latest relevant research and make appropriate use of the many types of data now being collected about schools and students. These expectations go beyond what is included in most master’s degree programs. Therefore, this program is designed to address a gap in the preparation of practitioner leaders. It is well designed, offers a substantive curriculum, and will be led and staffed by well-qualified and experienced scholars. I fully support its approval and believe it will make an important contribution in preparing P-12 instructional leaders with knowledge and skills necessary for educational leadership in the 21st century. The suggestions and recommendations included in my responses below to questions in the New York State Education Department Report Form for Evaluation of Doctoral Program Proposals are intended as ideas for further strengthening the program, not as critiques that should impede program approval.  

I. Program  

1. Assess program purpose, structure, and requirements as well as formal mechanisms for program administration and monitoring.  

Program Purpose and Goals  
In articulating the purpose of the proposed Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership at Hunter College, the designers have drawn on the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED), which distinguishes the “Professional Practice Doctorate in Education” (Ed.D.) from the research-focused Ph.D. in Education. The program’s purpose and goals are clearly stated, and the need for a program with the particular purpose and goals is established in the proposal section on Need and Justification. The program is designed to prepare “practitioner leaders…to translate current research into practice” by ensuring that they understand and can apply current knowledge and research. The proposal lists three primary goals: to provide practitioner leaders with a “deep grounding” in research on educational practice; to prepare them to be able to “demonstrate ability to digest,
synthesize, and apply new research quickly to improve educational outcomes for students;” and to prepare them with “the skills to understand and communicate” their understandings and knowledge to various stakeholders. The program’s purpose and goals are largely consistent with the CPED principles.

The expectations for and nature of dissertation research is the one aspect of the program that appears to depart from the CPED principles. The “generation of new knowledge” is one of the CPED goals of Ed.D. programs, but the proposal states that the program will emphasize application of research over “designing research and generating new knowledge” (p.4). This statement also seems inconsistent with the 18 credits of research methods required for the program. The program faculty will need to be clear about what types of “applied research” will be acceptable, to what extent students will be expected to “generate new knowledge,” and what criteria will be used to determine whether a proposed dissertation topic/question is appropriate. I suggest that they develop focused guidelines for dissertations for both students and faculty members.

**Program Structure**

As I understand it from the proposal, the program is designed exclusively for part-time students. This structure has two important implications—one I would consider a strength and the other a potential problem that will warrant attention especially for the first few years of the program. First, having only part-time students will prevent the stratification that is likely to occur in programs that have both part-time and full-time students. It can be a challenge in such programs to ensure that part-time students develop a sense of community with other doctoral students and that they have opportunities to engage in projects with faculty and other students, as full-time students are generally expected to do. Faculty in such programs need to take steps to minimize these outcomes. However, the proposed program’s design for part-time students will avoid this issue.

The potential problem that can stem from a program for part-time students is that it can be perceived and treated as a slightly elevated master’s program. Although the proposed program is rigorous, when all the students work full-time in demanding jobs there is a danger that it will be perceived as simply a series of courses that lead to a credential (similar to a master’s degree) instead of as an advanced engagement with the full body of scholarship in a particular aspect of education. The program faculty will need to be aware of this danger, and be thoughtful and strategic about ways to distinguish this program from a master’s degree program for students. This issue is related to the nature of the dissertation, discussed above. It would be a good idea for the faculty to have a discussion, before the first cohort is admitted, about the distinction between the Ed.D. and a rigorous master’s program, and then revisit that topic periodically in the first several years of the program.

The cohort structure planned for the program is one of its strengths. This structure will help considerably in ensuring that the students develop a sense of community, which can be difficult to build in a program with part-time students. The cohort will also likely provide powerful support for individuals who are less well prepared or inclined to engage
with research and theoretical literature, and those who might otherwise find it difficult to stay focused on their doctoral work, given their other professional and personal obligations. Based on our experience in the Ed.D. programs at Montclair State University, it will probably be a challenge to fully maintain the cohort. Some of the busy working professionals in the program will inevitably experience unanticipated events that will require them to take fewer than the expected courses in one semester or to take a leave for a semester. The faculty and program administration will need to take this likelihood into account, possibly developing other strategies and mechanisms for keeping these students engaged and moving forward without the optimal cohort involvement.

The planned variety of course delivery options (online and hybrid, intensive weekends, summer experiences, opportunities for students to use their own work settings as part of their studies) is another strength of the program. Not only do these options reflect the current means through which increasing numbers of people access ideas and learning opportunities, they also will likely increase the retention of students in the program and reduce the number of people who depart from the planned curriculum for their cohort.

Program Requirements

The admissions requirements are appropriately rigorous to ensure that the applicants have a solid foundation for their doctoral work. The total number of credits required (60) is appropriate for a doctoral program. The emphasis on research is also appropriate for a doctoral program. The program requires 12 credits of Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum, where they build their knowledge of the research related to particular curriculum content and student populations, 12 credits in the Research Toolkit, and 6 credits of special topics in research methods. These requirements should prepare graduates well to understand and interpret research as well as to carry out research themselves.

Formal Mechanisms for Program Administration and Monitoring

Based on a communication with Dr. Sherryl Browne Graves, I understand that the program will have a director and an executive committee consisting of research-active faculty. The director will be responsible for organizing the admissions process (which will be conducted by doctoral faculty) and monitoring students’ progress through the program. The executive committee and the director will regularly review curriculum and make any needed changes. The office of Assessment and Accreditation will administer assessments, which will include student evaluations and peer observations of faculty, and semester reviews of the program by the executive committee. The plan is for the director to provide advisement with support of doctoral faculty. The nature of the advisement, the timing and process for assigning students to faculty advisors, and the roles of the faculty advisors are not described. The plan to have the program director advise all students is likely to be problematic, given the intensive support and mentoring needed by doctoral students. It would be feasible for the director to provide initial advising and then assign each student to a faculty advisor for ongoing mentoring.
2. Comment on the special focus of this program as it relates to the discipline. What are plans and expectations for continuing program development and self-assessment including ongoing external reviews?

Program Focus as it Relates to the Field of Education

This program is designed to address a gap in the preparation of practitioner leaders. As the proposal points out, P-12 educators have increasing opportunities to play both formal and informal leadership roles, many of which have only recently arisen in response to pressures by policymakers and the public to ensure that students meet new, more rigorous learning expectations as measured by high-stakes tests. There is a heightened expectation that instructional leaders will be able to interpret, explain, and apply the latest relevant research as well as the many types of data now being collected about schools and students. These expectations go beyond what is included in most master’s degree programs. The proposed program is designed to prepare graduates to meet these expectations.

Continuing Program Development and Self-Assessment

The Hunter College School of Education appears to be well positioned to engage in ongoing program development and self-assessment. The proposal states that there is a “robust infrastructure” for these activities as a result of the accreditation requirements for teacher education (p. 16). The office of Assessment and Accreditation will administer assessments.

3. Assess the breadth and depth of coverage in terms of faculty availability and expertise, regular course offerings and directed study, and available support from related programs. What evidence is there of program flexibility and innovation?

Faculty availability and expertise

Faculty will initially be drawn from the three departments in the Hunter College School of Education and will devote only a portion of their time to the doctoral program. Thus, faculty in all of these departments will be available to work with doctoral students in various capacities. As the program grows, the School of Education will request additional lines for faculty with expertise needed in the doctoral program.

A review of the 18 faculty CVs included in the proposal shows that the program faculty have expertise in the education of bilingual and multicultural students, special education, educational and developmental psychology, math, literacy, media, and social studies. These areas of expertise closely reflect the curriculum, ensuring that the courses will be taught by scholars with relevant and, in some cases, quite substantial expertise. These 18 faculty members received their doctoral degrees from major graduate universities, including Teachers College Columbia University (4), CUNY Graduate School (2), New York University (2), Harvard University (2), University of Wisconsin Madison (2), University of Arizona, Arizona State University, Michigan State University, and UCLA.
Several of them are very well published and widely recognized in their fields.

**Course offerings and directed study**

There are several strengths related to courses and course offerings:

- The course scheduling appears well planned for part-time students.
- Considerable support will be provided for students as they develop their proposals and carry out their dissertation research.
- EDF 804 Analysis of Major Issues in Contemporary Educational Reform is an especially innovative and substantive course that addresses essential issues for practitioner leaders, providing both current perspectives, policies and practices via websites and scholarly analyses of some of the issues. (I would like to take this course!)
- The program will prepare graduates with knowledge of the research on curriculum and instruction for two groups of P-12 students whose numbers are increasing and who are not well-served in schools: English Language Learners and students with special needs. This is a very forward-looking aspect of the curriculum.
- The inclusion of EDUC 807 Professional Communication for Educational Settings is a major strength of the program; this is an essential skill for practitioner leaders, but one that is not typically addressed in the curriculum.

I also have several comments for strengthening the curriculum. As I indicated previously, these are intended as constructive suggestions.

- Since the program is designed for instructional leaders, it seems likely that much of what graduates will be doing is engaging in professional development, coaching, and other types of support for teachers. It would therefore make sense to devote some explicit attention to how one could go about providing these types of support for teacher learning in each area/issue addressed in the REPAC courses. An example of this can be seen in EDUC 803 Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum in Mathematics, which includes attention to developing the ability to enact professional development for teachers (related to math instruction) and to support teachers as teacher leaders and coaches.
- As I mentioned above, the inclusion of EDUC 807 Professional Communication for Educational Settings is a major strength of the program. However, I have some concerns about the course as it is described in the syllabus:
  - The course is really about professional **writing**, not professional communication, so perhaps the title should be changed to reflect that—or the course should include some attention to professional speaking as well as writing.
  - The syllabus provides minimal information about why and how writing well and knowing the conventions of different genres is essential for success as a practitioner leader, the different types of writing to be examined in the course, or how the instructor will approach developing skills in various genres in the course.
  - I fear this course is trying to do too much. In our Ed.D. program in Teacher Education and Teacher Development, we have two courses that focus on helping students learn to develop and write a review of the literature. And even after all that, they have difficulty with the task. So, asking students to do three different
types of reviews of 10 articles, along with all the other assignments in the course, might be too challenging for the students and for the instructor. I assume the students will need to be taught how to do a search for articles, how to select relevant articles, how to read different types of articles, how to document the relevant information for each article so they can easily access it later—and all of this is actually before considering how to write three different types of literature reviews/summaries/syntheses.

- EDUC 810 does not explicitly mention the research in early childhood education, which makes it appear more like a master’s level course than a doctoral course. It seems there should be some focus on having students become familiar with the “research on effective practice and curriculum” in early childhood education.
- The syllabus for EDF 808 Action Research does not distinguish between action research and practitioner research. As I understand these concepts, practitioner research is often action research (though not always), but the opposite is not necessarily the case. Maybe the course should be titled and framed as Practitioner Action Research and the learning outcomes should include understanding the similarities and differences between action research and practitioner research.
- Depending on the number of students, teaching the Dissertation Seminar will be a major responsibility for the instructor. Our first doctoral program at Montclair State University had a course like this, but we eventually removed it because the instructor found it nearly impossible to give relevant and substantial feedback to several students working on vastly different issues, since the instructor did not have knowledge or expertise in most of the issues students wanted to study.

Support from related programs

As mentioned above, the faculty will initially be drawn from the three departments in the Hunter College School of Education; these faculty members will devote only a portion of their time to the doctoral program. Thus, the program will be directly supported by the programs in the College.

Program flexibility and innovation

As mentioned previously, the plan to offer online, hybrid, weekend, and summer courses is an important strength of the program that will attract the busy working professionals for whom the program is intended. The program developers are to be commended for building the program with these innovative curriculum delivery approaches. In addition, flexibility is built into the curriculum through the options for different research methods courses and for Research on Effective Practice and Curriculum courses focused on the disciplines/school subjects most relevant to students’ areas of expertise.
4. Discuss the relationship of this program to undergraduate, master's and other doctoral programs of the institution. Consider interdisciplinary programs, service function, joint research projects, support programs, etc.

There is likely to be a synergistic relationship between the proposed program and the other programs in the Hunter College School of Education. Because all School of Education programs prepare professionals to work in P-12 schools, there is a close connection between this program and other programs in the College. Faculty from the other programs will teach and mentor doctoral students, and graduates of the other programs will be recruited for the doctoral program. In addition, the content of the doctoral program will be consistent with other programs—i.e., special education, teaching English language learners, and effective curriculum and practice in math, arts, and humanities.

5. What evidence is there of need and demand for the program locally, in the State, and in the field at large? What is the extent of occupational demand for graduates? What evidence is there that it will continue?

The proposal provides convincing (and well documented) evidence of the need for the program:
- The increasing expectation that P-12 administrators, especially those in leadership positions, have a doctoral degree;
- The new leadership roles available to P-12 educators (“instructional coordinators”);
- The rise in the number of education doctorates in the U.S. overall;
- New curriculum standards;
- New student assessments;
- Increased recognition of the need to reach all students and new methods for doing so;
- New teacher evaluation systems;
- Growing calls for collection, interpretation, publication, and use of various types of data.

All of these factors have led to a greater need for administrators and other leaders in P-12 schools to be knowledgeable of research, able to interpret and explain research to various constituencies, and skilled in applying research and data from assessments and evaluations to practice.

II. Faculty

1. What is the caliber of the full-time and part-time faculty, individually and collectively, in regard to education, college teaching experience, experience in doctoral education including dissertation supervision, research and publication, professional service, and national recognition in the field?

The 18 faculty members whose CVs were included in the proposal have had considerable college teaching experience, and are involved in research, publishing, and professional service. They received their doctoral degrees from major graduate universities, and several have received national recognition in their field.
Table 1 in the proposal provides information about academic/scholarly activities of 20 faculty members (two of whom did not have CVs in the appendix). Sixteen of these 20 faculty had articles published in refereed journals within the past five years, with one person having published 30 such articles, another having published 23 articles, and four others having published more than 10 articles in that time. Many of the proposed faculty present at national research conferences, including those of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE), Teachers of English as a Second Language (TESOL), and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). Awards received by the faculty include a Fulbright, the 2006 AERA Emerging Scholar in Disability Studies award, the 2010 AERA Division B Outstanding Dissertation award, and the 2001 National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) Exemplary Research Award.

Three of the 20 faculty members were on dissertation committees in 2013-14. One of those three and two additional faculty members had served on dissertation committees in the previous five years, one as a dissertation chair. Given the large number of faculty without experience mentoring doctoral dissertations, it will be important for those with such experience to mentor their colleagues to ensure that they, in turn, are prepared to mentor dissertations well. We have found at Montclair State that regular meetings and focused discussions on different aspects of doctoral student mentoring (especially proposal and dissertation mentoring) are needed to ensure consistency in the standards and processes across multiple faculty members, especially when so many have little doctoral-level teaching and mentoring experience.

2. **What are the faculty members' primary areas of interest and expertise? How important to the field is the work being done? Discuss any critical gaps.**

A review of the 18 faculty CVs included in the proposal shows that the program faculty have expertise in the education of bilingual and multicultural students, special education, educational and developmental psychology, math, literacy, media, and social studies. These areas of expertise closely reflect the curriculum, ensuring that the courses will be taught by scholars with relevant expertise.

3. **Assess the composition of faculty in terms of diversity (race, gender, seniority).**

Table 1 in the proposal presents information about 20 faculty members for the proposed program. Six are Professors, five are Associate Professors, eight are Assistant Professors, and one is a Distinguished Lecturer. There are seven males and 11 females. Five of the 18 are people of color (three Black and two Asian). Thus, there is diversity in gender and seniority, although less in terms of race and ethnicity. Given the large population of Spanish-speaking students in NYC public schools, it will be especially important to try to recruit a Latino/a doctoral faculty member whenever feasible.
4. **Evaluate faculty activity in generating funds for research, training, facilities, equipment, etc. be offered. Evaluate faculty workload, taking into consideration responsibility for undergraduate, master’s, and other doctoral programs. What are plans for future staffing?**

**Faculty activity in generating external funding**

As shown in proposal Table 1, 12 of the 20 faculty held 21 external research funding grants in 2013-14, and several have had large grants (including an NSF Math and Science Partnership grant, a New York State Initiative for Emergent Bilinguals grant, Spencer post-doctoral research grants, and an NSF Noyce grant).

**Faculty workload and staffing**

The proposal does not specify the faculty load. As I understand from a communication with Dr. Sherryl Browne Graves, there will be no additional workload reduction for doctoral faculty beyond the current system, by which faculty can receive 3 credits of course release per year for scholarly activity—which means the doctoral faculty will likely teach 3 or 4 courses per semester. There is a CUNY-wide formula for workload credit for dissertation chairs, but that formula was not specified in the proposal. Mentoring doctoral students, especially once they get to the qualifying exam phase and beyond, takes much more time than mentoring master’s degree students. If there are no current plans to reduce the teaching load for doctoral faculty members now, this is something the institution may need to consider in the future to ensure that faculty have the time to provide the intensive mentoring required to ensure that students produce high-quality dissertations and that they also have time to be research-active themselves.

Another concern is how faculty will be compensated for helping students prepare for the qualifying exam, for designing the exam, and for assessing student performance on the exam. This does not appear to be a formal course, which suggests that faculty will be expected to do that work (which can be quite time-consuming) on top of their regular teaching load. The program might want to consider giving faculty some credits for mentoring the qualifying exam, especially if there is no reassigned time for the other doctoral responsibilities.

6. **Discuss credentials and involvement of adjunct and support faculty.**

My understanding is no part-time or adjunct faculty will be involved in the proposed program.
III. Students

1. Comment on the student clientele which the program seeks to serve, and assess plans and projections for student recruitment and enrollment.

The proposed program is well positioned to attract the types of students being sought for a variety of reasons. Hunter College School of Education has a strong reputation as a quality teacher preparation program in NYC; it is more affordable than other NYC higher education institutions with similar programs; the course delivery methods (online, hybrid, weekend, summer) will be very appealing to working professionals; and there is no similar program in the CUNY system. The large population of educators in NYC and surrounding areas will serve as a ready pool of potential students.

2. What are the prospects that recruitment efforts and admissions criteria will supply a sufficient pool of highly qualified applicants and enrollees?

Given the factors discussed above, I anticipate that there will be a large number of applicants in the first few years of the program. After that time, there is likely to be a reduction in the number of applicants. The program leaders will probably need to be creative in designing multiple strategies for reaching out to potential applicants, especially after the first few years. Given the ever-changing requirements and mandates of the federal, state, and local education systems, they will need to be flexible and creative with regard to recruitment, anticipating periods of time when there will be less interest in and need for the practitioner doctorate.

3. Comment on provisions for encouraging participation of persons from underrepresented groups. Is there adequate attention to the needs of part-time, minority, or disadvantaged students?

Based on a communication with Dr. Sherryl Browne Graves, I understand that the Hunter College School of Education uses a number of strategies to recruit under-represented groups, including recruiting through affinity educator groups in NYC and from CUNY program graduates. In addition, recruitment activities and materials will highlight the fact that Hunter’s tuition is lower than that of private universities in NYC, which will be an important consideration for students from under-represented groups who are considering pursuing doctoral work in education.

4. Assess the system for monitoring students' progress and performance and for advising students regarding academic and career matters.

Initially, the program director will monitor student progress and performance, focusing on maintenance of the required GPA (which is 3.5 at admission, although the GPA once in the program is not specified in the proposal); passage of the qualifying exam; approval of the dissertation proposal; and a successful dissertation defense. The director will also advise students, but other advisors will be added as the program grows. Regarding career matters, the program director and faculty will collaborate with the Hunter College Office
of Clinical Experiences and the Hunter Office of Career Services. If the former office focuses exclusively on teacher education, it is likely that the office is already very busy, given the increasing emphasis on field and clinical experiences throughout teacher education. Thus, there may be a need to add personnel to focus on the doctoral program if the staff is stretched to or beyond its capacity in serving the Hunter College teacher education candidates.

5. **Discuss prospects for placement or job advancement.**

The prospects for employment and advancement seem quite positive, given the current emphasis on using data to evaluate P-12 students, teachers, and schools, and the accompanying need for instructional leaders who can understand, interpret, explain, and apply data (and research in general) to improve programs and ensure student learning to high levels. I believe graduates of the program will be desirable employees and will have opportunities for greater levels of responsibility and leadership. At the same time, the volatility of the NYC education establishment (as well as the state and federal education systems) makes it difficult to predict what sorts of jobs will be available and/or required in P-12 schools very many years in the future.

**IV. Resources**

1. **What is the institution's commitment to the program as demonstrated by the operating budget, faculty salaries and research support, the number of faculty lines relative to student numbers and workload, support for faculty by non-academic personnel, student financial assistance, and funds provided for faculty professional development and activities, colloquia, visiting lecturers, etc.**

Based on a communication with Dr. Sherryl Browne Graves, I understand that there is active support for the development of the proposed program from CUNY and Hunter College leadership. One goal of the Hunter College strategic plan is to move toward establishing the College as a research-intensive institution and part of that effort involves increasing the number of doctoral programs. Thus, it is hoped that the institution will provide sufficient administrative and operational support to ensure its success. The proposal does not address the details of such support.

2. **Discuss the adequacy of physical resources and facilities, e.g., library, computer, and laboratory facilities, internship sites, and other support services for the program, including use of resources outside the University.**

The physical resources and facilities appear to be adequate for supporting the program.
V. Comments

1. Summarize the major strengths and weaknesses of the program as proposed with particular attention to feasibility of implementation and appropriateness of objectives for the degree offered.

Major Strengths

• This program is designed to address an important gap in the preparation of practitioner leaders. It responds to a growing need for P-12 educators to have advanced degrees, especially if they want to be instructional leaders, and to be able to interpret, explain, and apply the latest relevant research as well as the many types of data now being collected about schools and students. These expectations go beyond what is included in most master’s degree programs.

• Because the program is responsive to major needs and requirements emerging from P-12 schools, the prospects for graduates’ employment and advancement seem promising. I believe graduates will be desirable employees and will have opportunities for greater levels of responsibility and leadership.

• The cohort structure planned for the program will support development of a sense of community among the students and will provide support for individuals who are less well prepared or inclined to engage with research and theoretical literature, and those who might otherwise find it difficult to stay focused on their doctoral work, given their other professional and personal obligations.

• There are several strengths related to courses and course offerings:
  o The course scheduling is well planned for part-time students.
  o Considerable support will be provided for students as they develop their proposals and carry out their dissertation research.
  o EDF 804 Analysis of Major Issues in Contemporary Educational Reform is an especially innovative and substantive course that addresses essential issues for practitioner leaders.
  o The program will ensure that graduates are knowledgeable of issues related to two growing student groups that are generally poorly served in schools: English Language Learners and students with special needs. Few education doctoral programs require all candidates to take such courses; they tend to have such courses as electives for those with special interest in these groups, which means the people who most need to learn about them probably don’t.
  o The planned variety of course delivery options (online and hybrid, intensive weekend, summer experiences, opportunities for students to use their own work settings as part of their studies) is responsive to the need by working adults for flexibility in course delivery, reflects the means through which increasing numbers of people access ideas and learning opportunities, and will likely increase the retention of students in the program and reduce the number of people who depart from the planned curriculum for their cohort.

• The program gives substantial attention to research methods—12 credits in the Research Toolkit and 6 credits of special topics in research methods. These
requirements should prepare graduates well to understand and interpret research as well as to carry out research themselves.

Weaknesses/Major Recommendations

Several of my concerns derive from the fact that this will be the first doctoral program at Hunter College:

• Having been a doctoral faculty member and Associate Dean at Montclair State University as it has evolved from a master’s-only institution to an institution with seven doctoral programs (four in the College of Education and Human Services), I have experienced the challenges associated with such an institutional transition. One of those challenges, especially given shrinking fiscal support from sources other than tuition, is building in sufficient time and resources for faculty so they can support students engaged in rigorous doctoral work. Doctoral student advising and mentoring require considerably more time and attention than working with master’s students. As I understand it, doctoral faculty in the proposed Ed.D. program will maintain their current teaching loads, possibly receiving some additional credits for chairing dissertations. This is likely to become increasingly problematic as the Ed.D. program grows and as students progress to the dissertation stage. It is a challenge the institution and the union will probably need to tackle in the next few years.

• Program leadership and faculty will need to be thoughtful and strategic about ways to distinguish this program from a master’s degree program. Given the lack of a doctoral culture at Hunter, the part-time student population, and the likelihood that many of the students will be the first in their families to pursue doctoral study, there may be a tendency to see the program as an extended master’s program.

• Many of the faculty members have little experience with doctoral education other than their own doctoral studies. Therefore, program leaders will need to provide professional development and support for many of the faculty members as they become acclimated to the expectations and standards for student work, and develop as mentors for part-time doctoral students who can get the students through to program completion in a timely way.

Other recommendations:

• To ensure consistency of the program’s message and the quality of dissertations, program leadership and faculty will need to be clear about whether students are expected to create new knowledge in their dissertations, and exactly what is meant by that concept.

• I did not see much explicit attention in the courses to issues related to preparing the program’s students to lead professional development for educators. As I mentioned previously, students would benefit from attention to research and practice for providing these types of support for teacher learning in each area/issue addressed in the main courses.
2. **In what ways will this program make a unique contribution to the field?**

As mentioned previously, the program is designed to prepare “practitioner leaders…to translate current research into practice” by ensuring that they understand and can apply current knowledge and research. Because this is a relatively recent emphasis on these types of expertise among P-12 educators, there are very few programs like the proposed program at the master’s level and even fewer at the doctoral level. The program therefore has the potential to become a national model for the types of advanced preparation and skills development that will be increasingly emphasized for P-12 instructional leaders.

3. **Include any further observations important to the evaluation of this doctoral program proposal and provide any recommendations for the proposed program.**
Ed.D. Proposal: Response to External Reviews

This report includes the comments and suggestions from two external reviewers approved by NYSED. Where possible we have combined comments and provided responses for each of the comments offered by the reviewers. Key action steps in response to, or clarification of their suggestions are indicated in italics.

It should be noted that both recommended the proposal for approval - In large part their comments focused on issues of implementation.

Area of Review:
Program Focus

Is the dissertation limited to applied research or can it also lead to the generation of new knowledge? It was suggested that this is an area of concern in an Ed.D. program and requires clear guidelines for both students and faculty members.

The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) has a number of different statements about the dissertation or capstone experience of the Education Doctorate that guided our thinking. On the one hand, in the section on reframing the education doctorate there is a statement that “The professional doctorate in education prepares educators for the application of appropriate and specific practices, the generation of new knowledge, and for the stewardship of the profession.” (http://cpedinitiative.org/research-resources). On the other hand, in another section in the same area the dissertation is described as “[a] Dissertation in Practice is a scholarly endeavor that impacts a complex problem of practice.” (http://cpedinitiative.org/design-concept-definitions). It should also be noted that different university members of the CPED have operationalized the dissertation in different ways. The common elements are a scholarly project that combines research or inquiry in the service of addressing or solving a significant problem of practice.
As is stated in the proposal, we focus on the dissertation as a scholarly project that will be applied in nature. Dissertations on problems of practice would exhibit the following characteristics: 1) addresses an educational issue; 2) focuses on some aspect of urban education; 3) focuses on a significant problem of practice and 4) demonstrates proficiency in inquiry skills and methods as appropriate to the problem. We have discussed that dissertations are likely to fall into a number of categories including: a) Program Evaluation, b) Professional Development, c) Curriculum Development, and d) Policy Analysis.

Response on Providing Guidelines: Regarding the suggestion about the need for focused guidelines for dissertations to be used by both students and faculty, we have gathered a collection of guidelines and dissertation handbooks from CPED members as a starting point for the faculty. Starting in the fall the interim director and executive committee will be charged with the development of a dissertation handbook that will provide guidelines for all aspects of the dissertation process.

Since this is a program for part-time students there is a concern that it can be perceived and treated as a slightly elevated master’s program. Several suggestions were offered to prevent this problem. 1. That there be a faculty discussion, before the first cohort is admitted, about the distinction between the Ed.D. and a rigorous master’s program, and then a plan to revisit that topic periodically in the first several years of the program to insure that a common framework is maintained. 2. The use of a cohort model is a powerful support for individuals who may be less well prepared or inclined to engage with research and theoretical literature and those who might find it difficult to stay focused on their doctoral work.

HCSOE Response

Suggestion 1: Agreed: We will continue a series of faculty discussions that have taken place over the past several years and supplement them with selected readings to focus the discussion on the nature of a doctoral program. We will focus on the rationale behind the admissions process, the caliber of the program, and the jobs for which graduates would endeavor.

From the perspective of program structure, we will review the notion of a qualifying paper, what it stands for and why it is a gatekeeper to the dissertation process. We will review the expectations of the dissertation to analyze what knowledge and skills are needed to be a successful doctoral candidate. Additionally, we will emphasize as the purpose of the dissertation seminar to be a concerted effort for the cohort to understand the components of a professional practice dissertation. Finally, in consultation with colleagues in the Hunter College Bellevue School of Nursing who have recently launched a Doctor of Nursing Practice, a professional nursing doctorate, we will discuss best practice in the careful selection of the faculty who staff the dissertation seminar to ensure that the focus on a practice based final project is maintained.
Suggestion 2: The program has been designed in a Cohort Model to emphasize the rigor expected in coursework and dissertation writing. It will be emphasized in advertising, student selection, and throughout the program in order to ensure that students maintain, whenever possible, the standard progression and connection to their entering colleagues. Scheduling of courses will be done in a manner consistent with, and that enforces, a cohort model and the program handbook will institute time to degree rules and progress standards that support student achievement through this timely progression.
Area of Review:  
Program Advisement

The plan for program director to advise all students is likely to be problematic, given the intensive support and mentoring needed by doctoral students. It is suggested that the director could provide initial advising and then assign each student to a faculty advisor for ongoing mentoring.

HCSOE Response

After the first small cohort, the Doctoral Program Director will identify additional doctoral guidance advisers, so that they can particularly focus on the qualifying exam process and the transition to the dissertation. The director and advisors will be part of the process for monitoring student progress. Because of the program design, the need for pre-doctoral advisement will be largely administrative and thus less time consuming.

The Director, along with a staff member who will support the logistical aspects of advising, will be sufficient to manage the majority of the program advising needs, as the Faculty/staff to student ratio will be well below the HCSOE practices in its MA programs.

As students identify their interests in issues of practice and research and introduce themselves to relevant faculty as they progress through the program, there will be a pool of 35-40 faculty (about half the School of Education professors) whose time availability, research expertise and practice-related interests enables them to support a doctoral dissertation at this level.

There should be a clear process for monitoring students’ progress and performance throughout the program from the onset. It was suggested that we have faculty serve as Guidance Advisors for assisting students through the coursework phase, and then students can identify a different Dissertation Advisor later on if necessary.

HCSOE Response

With the first cohort, the director will identify additional doctoral guidance advisers, so that they are ready to monitor student progress during the period of the qualifying exam and the transition to the dissertation. The director and advisor will together form the team of the process for monitoring student progress to completion of the degree.

The HCSOE currently has quite rigorous and complicated progress standards throughout its teacher, administration, and counseling education programs that are administered for a student population of almost 3,000. The current, planned advising structure will be augmented
by the Ed.D executive committee; the committee will be provided reports regularly on all doctoral students to review progress and performance. Additionally, CUNY has instituted a new and more powerful student information system – CUNY FIRST – that will make the monitoring of student process both efficient and in real-time.
Area of Review:
Curriculum

Since graduates of the program will be responsible for engaging in professional development, coaching, and other types of support for teachers, this area of study should receive more attention. It was suggested that the program devote some explicit attention to how one could go about providing these types of support for teacher learning in each area/issue addressed in the REPAC courses.

Issues of professional development in the REPAC content areas will be added to REPAC courses. The Math REPAC course will serve as a model. In addition, with our degrees in Administration and Supervision, Literacy and Math Leadership, the School of Education has a strong track record of experience on how to work on content, professional development, and leadership in an integrated fashion to advance student development. In the doctoral program, we will augment the focus to include research evidence on how and when professional development is effective and leads to changes in student achievement.

Another way to strengthen the focus on professional development in instructional leadership will be the modification of the Professional Development (PD) Course to also focus on effective PD in specific content areas. Upon further review, we will refocus the PD course to expand beyond just a focus on the leader’s role in the PD process, to one that examines the effectiveness of PD for a wider range of participants. This revision will make the course more inclusive of the diverse types of doctoral students that will participate in the program, as well as prepare candidates for effective leading effective PD in a variety of settings to a diverse constituency. This will explicitly acknowledge the diverse roles that the graduates will fill beyond the school building leader role.

Lack of evidence of an explicit focus throughout the curriculum on social justice in schools and the examination of race, class, gender, and other social identity markers in relationship to societal inequities and how these impact educational inequities in schools. It was noted that there was scholarship included in course reading lists that will ensure that these types of questions are raised. But course descriptions and learner outcomes do not explicitly speak to these issues as goals/objectives/primary aims. There is evidence of this perspective in SPED 801, EDF 801, EDUC 809 and EDUC 804. However, this perspective is not necessarily apparent across the instructional leadership core area, content-specific courses (e.g., math) research on effective practice and curriculum or in the research toolkit area.
There is a strong social justice focus in the introductory doctoral seminar. It will be important to connect this foundation to the work of other courses like SPED 801, EDF 801, EDUC 809 and EDUC 804. We will maintain this strand across courses in the instructional leadership core area, REPAC in content specific courses (e.g., math) and in the research toolkit area. We will ensure that the recognition of the multiple diversities of the student populations constantly intersect with the instructional leader’s conceptual models and methods. The goal is to effectively education a diverse student population.

Lack of clear rationale for the makeup of required research methods courses. Why 8 credits of quantitative methods courses and 4 credits of qualitative methods courses? It was suggested that perhaps there could be two required introductory research methods courses: 1 qualitative and 1 quantitative and then consider, what should be required of students beyond that. Also students could be required to take an action research course if the dissertation is designed to be project-based.

HCSOE Response

The program does require one course in each area of quantitative and qualitative methods with one statistics course. The rationale for more exposure to quantitative methods is to insure that instructional leaders can manage the analysis and interpretation of data from both formative and summative student achievement and teacher evaluation programs. The trend in education is for far more use of such data rather than less, and doctoral students need particular ability to understand, digest and evaluate the meaning of quantitative data and how it best supports improved instruction. There are a range of additional research courses including action research and case study research that students can pursue as their doctoral thesis become more known.
Area of Review:
Specific Courses

EDUC 807 Professional Communication for Educational Settings. The course really seems to be about professional writing not communication. There is minimal information about why and how writing well and knowing the conventions of different genres is essential to success. As written there is concern that the goals are too broad. There was the suggestion that there could also be a focus on professional speaking.

HCSOE Response
This course syllabus will be revised to include expanded opportunities for engaging in effective communication beyond writing, including public speaking. There needs to be additional rationale for the importance of the different genres to the life of an instructional leader. While faculty talked about the inclusion of digital and other forms of communication, the syllabus seems to reflect more traditional academic writing genres. The revised course will explicitly address the value of writing – as part of knowing, understanding, and communicating knowledge – and incorporate student work to ensure effective development of writing skills.

EDUC 810 Early Childhood Education does not explicitly mention the research in early childhood education, which makes it appear more like a master’s level course than a doctoral course. It was suggested that there should some focus on having doctoral students become familiar with the “research on effective practice and curriculum” in early childhood education.

HCSOE Response
This course syllabus will be revised to reflect a more research focused, doctoral level course.

EDF 808 Action Research does not distinguish between action research and practitioner research. It was suggested that the course should be titled and framed as Practitioner Action Research and the learning outcomes should include understanding the similarities and differences between action research and practitioner research.

HCSOE Response
While the course title and framing suggestions above point to the educational challenge of this course, the SOE is guided by the CPED standards in this regard. They suggest a reference on action research and practice-based dissertations that are being used in SOE discussions that
underlie the specific course offerings and the broader program framework for the categories of research, the techniques and practices inside each category, and the skills and analysis to understand the product of each specific type of research.

- **Dissertation Seminar will be a major teaching responsibility for the instructor.**
  It was suggested that it be removed because a single instructor will find it nearly impossible to give relevant and substantial feedback to several students working on vastly different issues, without substantive knowledge or expertise in a variety of topics.

HCSOE Response

Our rationale for this course is that it is foundational sharing of the common elements of the dissertation and the dissertation process. *Students during this time will be guided to reach out to specific faculty about the development of their unique projects.* It is not expected that the instructor for this course should be providing individual guidance to the students in this course on their dissertations over the course of two years.

Many students, largely out of school for over a decade and predominantly having focused on professional careers, will need to have a shared foundational grounding of developing a proposal, how to approach a research project to understand the topic better, and the expectations and approaches to writing a dissertation. This course is not intended to serve as the advising of the dissertation, but a foundational grounding in the practice of the dissertation and an exposure to the strengths of the SOE faculty in order to assist students in reaching the critical level of a viable proposal. The dissertation structure was informed by the Hunter College Doctor of Nursing Practice, which has a similar course in its program that has been found to be useful and effective for students to develop a definable, viable dissertation proposal.
Area of Review:
Relationship to other programs

⊙ What is the relationship of the Ed.D. program to undergraduate programs in the institution or other interdisciplinary programs? Or how will the proposed program interact with other programs or divisions outside the School of Education? The following question was raised. What other units in the system might be good for cross-listing courses that could be good electives for students in this program as well as exploration of opportunities for research and interdisciplinary dissertation committees?

HCSOE Response

Currently all of the undergraduate programs in SOE are teacher preparation programs leading to certification. At the master’s level, there are courses in the Educational Psychology program, the masters degree program in Literacy, the Administration and Supervision program, and the Math Leadership programs that have more direct connection with the Ed.D. curriculum. While this is more obvious with the Educational Psychology program because of its research focus, strengths in the other programs add to the ecosystem of leadership fundamental for effective doctoral education in instructional leadership – in understanding content and leading others in its effective teaching. Faculty and program leaders from these areas have developed syllabi for the EdD and Hunter College’s graduate programs in Arts and Sciences provide EdD students with further opportunities – in curricular, extracurricular, and faculty expertise - in Mathematics and Statistics, Applied Social Research, Economics and Psychology. Finally, students will also have access to the expertise and intellectual resources of the CUNY Graduate Center and its PhD programs in a variety of disciplines, including Urban Education.
Area of Review:  
Program Assessment

Not much detail on how it will engage in ongoing self-assessment.

HCSOE Response

The ongoing self-assessment of the Ed.D. will take several forms. First, the program will utilize data that is collected at the course level. Online student evaluation forms are sent by Hunter College to each student for each course. Summary data is reported to departments, the School of Education, and to the instructor; this information is reviewed on an annual basis and informs decisions by programs and Department Chairs on program improvement and faculty assignments.

At the department level faculty members are observed by peers to assess the quality of teaching. This is mandatory for tenure-track faculty members and required for faculty seeking promotion. In addition, from time to time, tenured senior faculty may be observed. This will provide additional data on the quality of the teaching. Additionally, due to the small size of the program, the School of Education will be especially engaged with students in formal and informal ways to ensure informative feedback loops that aid in the program development and improvement over time.

At the level of the School of Education, the Director of Assessment and Accreditation collects data from about programs from students at the start of the program, at the end of the program, from program graduates, and from employers. In addition, there are opportunities for programs to create other types of data that the School’s administrative systems collect and analyze on a regular cycle. In the case of the doctoral program, we will collect data about the qualifying exam process and the dissertation processes in order to understand their value to student development and how improvement can be enacted.

The director, along with the advisors, will be tasked with monitoring student progress at every stage in the program. It will be important to assess student progress at every stage, including: the introductory seminar, the REPAC course sequence, the research toolkit, and the instructional leadership sequence. Particular attention will be given to how prepared the students are for the qualifying exam, and for ready they are to begin and complete the dissertation sequence. The program will have access to GPA and time to degree completion data. In addition, faculty meetings will be held to share information about each student’s progress and about the steps needed to provide additional advisement and support. It will also be important to review the impact of the dissertation handbook from both the student and faculty perspectives, so that work to improve the support systems is guided by end-user need.
Area of Review:  
Faculty

- **There is concern that there are a large number of faculty members without experience mentoring doctoral dissertations.** It was suggested that it is important for those with such experience to mentor their colleagues to ensure that they, in turn, are prepared to mentor dissertations well. Those who are identified as doctoral advisers will most likely need some mentoring/training on how to do this job well. Another suggestion was that there be regular meetings and focused discussions on the different aspects of doctoral student mentoring, especially proposal and dissertation mentoring, to ensure consistency in the standards and processes across multiple faculty members.

**HCSOE Response**

The HCSOE has several faculty who are appointed at the Graduate Center of CUNY – thus, there is a capacity and experience already at the School of Education for the particular work necessary in doctoral level education. In order to further expand this knowledge amongst faculty, the SOE will be instituting a mentoring process between faculty with experience in doctoral supervision and those without. In addition, we will provide professional development opportunities for our faculty by engaging faculty from other Ed.D. and CUNY doctoral programs to share their best practices with dissertation supervision. Finally, we will use data from our assessment system to focus on areas needing additional faculty development.

- **Concern was expressed about the lack of Latino faculty in light of the large Spanish-speaking student population in NYC schools.** It was suggested that we recruit and hire a Latino/a doctoral faculty member whenever feasible.

**HCSOE Response**

This goal has consistently been part of the recruitment plan for past and future hires at the HCSOE. With almost 10 new hires to be made in the next three years, the School of Education is confident in expanding the diversity of its faculty – which by comparison across higher education, is already a positive example of the value and possibility of a diverse university-level faculty.

- **It is not clear where the qualitative methodological expertise lies.** It was suggested three new faculty members are needed to enhance expertise in practice-based research among faculty in addition to hiring adjunct faculty to teach select courses in the program. These are both critical strategies for effectively supporting the student progression through the program and for supporting faculty promotion through the tenure system.
Of the faculty engaged in the development of this Ed.D. proposal, there are a group of faculty whose research is focused on qualitative methodological approaches. Two are full professors (David Connor, Terrie Epstein); two are associate tenured professors (Laura Baecher, Jeanne Weiler) and four tenure-track assistant or associate professors (Amy Johnson Lachuk, Jody Polleck, Melissa Scheible, Debbie Sonu). Three of the four tenure-track faculty will have completed the tenure process by the time it is expected that the first cohort will start the program.

There appear to be a large number of non-tenured full-time faculty members teaching in the program. There is concern about the administration’s ability to balance their teaching and advising responsibilities in the program as they seek to earn tenure. It was suggested that we consider strategies for ongoing faculty development, assessment and support.

Among the faculty intensively involved in the design of the Ed.D. program, there is currently 1 tenure-track professor whose tenure and promotion is effective Fall 2014. There are 2 tenure-track faculty whose promotion and tenure review will occur during 2014-2015. Three tenure-track faculty will be reviewed for tenure and promotion during the 2015-2016 academic year, the first year of the doctoral program. There are four additional tenure-track faculty whose reviews will occur between 2016 and 2018. These faculty, along with an additional 25 to 30 tenured faculty, will be available to teach, advise, and supervise dissertations in the program.
Area of Review: Faculty Workload

There is concern about the nature of the faculty workload since there are no current plans to reduce the teaching load for doctoral faculty members despite the need to provide the intensive mentoring required to ensure that students produce high-quality dissertations and that faculty members also have time to be research-active themselves. It is suggested that we consider strategies for ongoing faculty development and assessment.

The current expectation for faculty workload is similar to the workload for doctoral teaching in the Doctor of Nursing Practice program in the Hunter College School of Nursing, as well as best practice for doctoral programs generally in higher education. The Ed.D. draws on expertise from across the School of Education, which ensures that no faculty member will have a full-time teaching load in the doctoral program. Most faculty members will have expertise to teach one or two courses across the program in addition to dissertation supervision. Faculty workload will reflect the credit hours of the course and workload credit for dissertation supervision. With over 40 faculty members able and interested to contribute to such a robust doctoral ecosystem, from courses to research seminars to advising, the School of Education foresees little impediment to ensure faculty time – that is recognized in workload reports – sufficient to support student success.

There are a number of supports for research activity for faculty. Within the HCSOE, faculty can apply to the School of Education Dean for released time for research activity. There is an Associate Dean in the School of Education to support faculty research, including assistance in the identification and development of external grant opportunities, as well as significant resources in the Office of Research Administration under the Provost of Hunter College.

Within the College, there are a number of research initiatives including an Acting Associate Provost for Research, a Presidential Fund for Faculty Advancement and the Shuster Faculty Fellowship Fund. CUNY itself directs significant numbers of research supports for faculty and students, including the PSC-CUNY Research program and the CUNY Collaborative Initiative. The faculty of the School of Education has consistently been successful recipients of these various research opportunities.
Area of Review:
Qualifying Exam Workload

How will faculty be compensated for helping students prepare for the qualifying exam, for designing the exam, and for assessing student performance on the exam? It was suggested that we consider giving faculty some credits for mentoring the qualifying exam, especially if there is no reassigned time for the other doctoral responsibilities.

HCSOE Response

The Dean of the School of Education monitors faculty workload on administrative and advising activities, and there is a school-wide system in place to ensure that faculty time is acknowledged and reported as part of annual workload. As the qualifying exam will be developed for groups of students who have a particular profile of coursework, the director will identify additional doctoral guidance advisers who can focus on the qualifying exam process and the transition to the dissertation. The director and the executive committee will develop policies and practices for the qualifying exam process including who and how the exam will be developed and scored, and the recognition of the workload involved for faculty will be part of the annual process managed by the Dean of the School of Education.
Area of Review: 
Monitoring Student Progress

There is concern that we did not specify the GPA needed to remain in good standing in the program.

HCSOE Response

As the school moves into implementation, the director and the executive committee will develop specific policies for student progress that are in-line with best practice for effective and meaningful doctoral education, including the required GPA, qualifying exam scores, and transition to the dissertation.
Area of Review:
Administrative/Operational Support

No details of sufficient administrative and operational support to ensure its (the program’s) success.

HCSOE Response

The School of Education is structured organizationally with program leadership, student advisement, and curricular oversight located in the departments, amongst the faculty and chairs. Direct administrative and operational support is embedded in the departments for general academic support. Broader, school-wide support around administration, academic progress, institutional research and accreditation are centralized services in the office of the Dean.

The new program will receive dedicated program support with the hiring of an administrative coordinator to support the director, faculty, and students. More general needs will be included in the responsibilities of the dean’s office staff, marginal increases in systems and processes that manage school-wide academic systems for the current ~ 3,000 student population and 50+ programs. The doctoral program will integrate seamlessly to these support systems.
Area of Review:  
Diverse Students

The program should consider how to be more strategic in ensuring the necessary supports are in place for students from underrepresented groups to be successful at doctoral degree completion. The following question was raised: What types of academic and social support services currently exist or need to be in place to ensure degree completion for students from underrepresented groups? In addition it was suggested that program leaders should consider an applicant’s entire profile as an indication of the likelihood of success in this new program.

HCSOE Response

Hunter College has a long and very distinguished track record of a diverse student and faculty population whose constitution not only mirrors the City of New York from which they come, but also who amplify the learning and success of all members. The director and faculty advisors, as part of the normal systems in place at the School, will identify and provide support for students from underrepresented groups. In particular, as there are faculty from these same groups, there will be professors who can serve as mentors and who can provide expertise on how to support students who need additional support.

Regarding the issue of applicant review, the School of Education as a best practice uses an applicant’s entire profile to predict the likelihood of success in the program. We will be looking for indicators of strength in areas foundational to entrance into and graduation from the Ed.D. program, and the collection of various data in the application process is aimed at the important goal of ensuring a full profile is submitted and reviewed as part of the application process.
Area of Review:
Student Financial Assistance

What student financial assistance will be planned or from where funds will be allocated for faculty professional development and activities, colloquia, visiting lectures? It was suggested that we identify areas of funding for students, including a more structured plan for financial assistance for students.

HCSOE Response

The tuition at Hunter College, a public university part of CUNY, is very competitive. Cost of tuition (including taking graduate loans) is a good investment when measured with salary differentials that graduates would receive in the job market. The cost of the degree, spread over five years, is expected to be on average less than $5,000 per year.

Many potential students are cooperating teachers, and thus have access to tuition vouchers. Other students will be able to get observer/adjunct appointments supporting teacher candidates, as the Ed.D will provide the HCSOE with the traditional (in higher education) student population whose academic careers include taking part in the School’s academic programs. College fund raising for support of doctoral students will focus on tuition support for the most competitive or the most desirable applicants and candidates. Additionally, student financial aid will be supplemented by opportunities to be part of grants and contracts received by the school and faculty that would provide additional financial support for doctoral students.