Eisenhart, M. (2005). Reforming the Doctoral
Program in Education Research at the
University of Colorado.

In C. Hancock & P. Paul (Eds.), *Essays on the role and nature
of research within the PhD Program in Education.* Columbus,
OH: The Ohio State University, College of Education.

Hancock, C., & Paul, P. (Eds.). (2005). Essays on the role
and nature of research within the PhD program in
education. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University,
College of Education. [Publication supported in part by a
grant from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement
of Teaching in relation to the Carnegie Initiative on the
Doctorate].
@The Ohio State University, College of Education.

Chapter 7 Reforming the Doctoral Program in Education Research at the University of Colorado-Boulder

Margaret Eisenhart
University of Colorado-Boulder

In the summer of 2002, faculty in the School of Education at the University of Colorado-Boulder (CU) initiated a reform of the doctoral program in education research. The need for reform was accepted by the whole faculty (n=32) but undertaken by a 10-person committee representing the five doctoral degree programs we offer: Educational Foundations, Educational Psychology, Educational Equity and Cultural Diversity, Instruction and Curriculum, and Research and Evaluation.

The reform was motivated in part by faculty concern that the doctoral curriculum had been virtually unchanged for 10 years and in part by national concerns about the quality of Ph.D. graduates in education research (Burkhardt & Schoenfeld, 2003; Lagemann, 2000; Neumann, Pallas & Peterson, 1999; Schoenfeld, 1999). Our School of Education is known for teacher education and graduate programs that emphasize research-based classroom practice, research methodology, and educational policy. The special character of the School is its shared commitment to equal educational opportunity, diversity, research-based reform, and collaborative research (www.colorado.edu/education). When first implemented in the late 1980s, our existing doctoral program had been ahead of many others in its requirements for coursework in foundational issues in educational research and in both quantitative and qualitative research methods. But over time, concerns had mounted about the datedness of some course content, the balance and extent of training in qualitative and quantitative methods, and the link between research and educational practice. Nationally, many were calling for upgrading the skills and expertise of Ph.D.'s in education. This article tells the story of our efforts to reform our program: What we are trying to do, how we are going about it, and why.

The faculty's first step was to ask the dean to convene an ad hoc faculty committee that would discuss the doctoral program and make recommendations for improvement to the full faculty. In composing the committee, we sought broad representation from all the program areas (the five areas of specialization in which we offer doctoral degrees; see list above). We also sought power and influence. We wanted the work of the committee to result in substantive proposals for change that would be vetted, approved, and heeded by the full faculty. Thus, the committee came to include 9 faculty (nearly a third of the faculty), including the chair of each program area, the dean, the director of graduate studies, the assistant dean, several junior faculty members, and a graduate student representative, who was also assigned to the committee as a research assistant.

The committee began its work by gathering data in two broad areas--internal and external. Internally, our goal was to determine the perspectives of faculty members and students regarding program strengths, limitations, and possible improvements. As part of this effort, we asked students in their final semester of doctoral study to complete an exit survey in which they evaluated their graduate experiences along several dimensions, including scholarly development, coursework, advising, communication/collegiality, and overall climate of the School. (See Appendix A for a copy of the exit survey.) In addition, the committee led several whole-faculty discussions to generate a list of issues to address and ideas to consider. Based on this information, the committee's agenda covered many aspects of the program—coursework, research experiences, teaching experiences, advising and

mentoring, program requirements (e.g., publishable papers, comprehensive examinations, dissertations), program size, student recruitment, and funding.

Externally, the committee examined several sources of information on doctoral education. This information included recent literature on graduate preparation in education, including reports by the Pew Charitable Trusts, the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, the National Research Council, and the Carnegie Foundation, as well as numerous books and articles. From websites and phone calls, we also gathered information about the top 15 graduate programs in education, as rated in the 2002 *U.S. News and World Report*. This information included course requirements, degree requirements, teaching and research experiences, and financial aid packages at each school. The committee reviewed these materials, discussed various alternatives in light of our local circumstances, and prepared to present its ideas to the full faculty for consideration.

At about this time (fall 2002), the Carnegie Foundation announced its new Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID). The CID is a multi-year research and action project to support departments' efforts to more purposefully structure their doctoral programs. The goal is to foster conceptual work and design experiments in a small number of selected departments to stimulate discussion and disseminate results (www.carnegiefoundation.org/CID). We applied and were selected to participate as a CID partner department. Intellectual support from Carnegie and the other partner departments have greatly informed our discussions and decision-making.

As we reviewed other departments' programs and debated alternatives, we returned again and again to the idea of a common core. Although our survey of highly ranked schools of education showed that few currently require common courses for all doctoral students, the committee (and ultimately the full faculty) decided that establishing a common core was desirable for three interconnected reasons: (1) many of our doctoral students are former teachers and lack a discipline-based research background from their undergraduate or master's preparation, i.e., they enter our program with little or no previous research training; (2) prior experience as teachers and lack of research training sometimes results in students who are skeptical of the importance of research for educational improvement; in some cases, this skepticism has led to a rift between students eager to learn more about research and those with other orientations; and (3) students' inconsistent patterns of course taking were hampering our ability to offer truly advanced courses (because almost every course included some novices).

The committee therefore set out to design a core set of courses intended to develop a common language and shared discourse about education research, to present common norms and standards for the conduct of education research; and to build an intellectual and methodological foundation for advanced, specialized coursework. Having made this decision, the committee took the idea to the full faculty for consideration. At this point, we wanted the faculty's approval to move forward with the idea of a core. We knew that we could not expect full approval until we had produced a list of courses and syllabi specifying the content of the core, but we also knew that we did not intend to do all the work of developing new courses and syllabi without a general consensus that establishing a core was a good idea. With some trepidation and repeated calls to "keep us informed," the faculty agreed to let us proceed.

That accomplished, reaching consensus on what the core courses would be was no small a task. Almost every committee member argued that his or her own courses should be included. Debate raged about what was truly "foundational" knowledge in education research. More

debate raged about how many research methods courses students should take and when they should take them. Tempers flared over the idea of more required courses, more credit hours for the degree, and fewer electives for doctoral students. Content-area specialists (literacy educators, science educators, bilingual educators) worried that with all the foundational and methods courses being proposed for the core, there would be little time left for specialty area courses.

After months of discussion, the committee finally settled on a concrete proposal for the core: a set of courses to be required for all entering students in the School and taken as a cohort. It would include two 2-semester courses in the "big (or foundational) ideas" of education and educational research (see also Berliner, 2003); two 2-semester courses in quantitative methods; and two 2-semester courses in qualitative methods. One course of each type (1 big ideas course, 1 quantitative course, 1 qualitative course) would run concurrently each semester of the students' first year. One additional core course in multicultural education was scheduled for the first semester of the second year. In making this proposal, we were doubling the research methods courses required (from one course to two in each methodology), but by incorporating required material from old courses with new material in the core courses, we were able to eliminate a few old courses and hold the total increase in the number of required courses to only one. See Figure 1 for an overview of the new course design.

Given the emphases of our School and the expertise of the faculty, we chose "Perspectives on Classroom Teaching and Learning" and "Education Research and Social Policy" as the two big ideas courses to offer first-year students. The first course focuses on behavioral, cognitive, and socio-cultural theories of teaching and learning, along with associated empirical studies. The second course focuses on the relationship between education research findings and social policy initiatives since the 1950s. In the terminology of our old program, the first course is from psychological foundations; the second is from social foundations.

The two courses in quantitative methods focus on experimental designs and include statistics. The two courses in qualitative methods focus on interpretive designs and include various forms of qualitative inquiry and analysis strategies. Individual student research projects are part of both course sequences. (See Appendix B for copies of the syllabi we are currently using for these courses.)

To promote students' ability to integrate their learning and "to talk" across courses, we included two "cross-cutting" topics in each syllabus. These topics were taken up in each course at approximately the same time during the semester. Each professor was to design his or her approach to the topic and encouraged to discuss the different approaches in class. For example, one cross-cutting topic was organized around the question: If a teacher wants to know whether one reading program is better for her students than another, how could you find out? This topic can be approached substantively (in Perspectives), experimentally (in Quantitative Methods), and qualitatively (in Qualitative Methods). Each approach is different but interrelated and informs the others.

When presented with this proposal for the core, the tentative syllabi for the core courses, and the committee's rationale (a year and a half after we began the process!), the faculty were generally receptive. They especially liked the idea of the cross-cutting topics and the potential to increase students' understanding of the interrelationship between theoretical perspectives and research methods.

At this point in the process, we invited the faculty to make suggestions for improving the core syllabi. Many faculty members made suggestions, and many of their

suggestions were incorporated. However, in a few cases, the committee members who had prepared the syllabi were not receptive to the changes proposed. At one point, this kind of resistance threatened to derail the entire process. Skillful maneuvering by the dean to appease those on both sides who were upset saved the day.

Also at this point, faculty members expressed new and larger concerns about the implications of the core. One major concern was that entering students would not have any opportunity during the first year to explore topics in their areas of specialization. In the core, students would have to take a full year of required courses before they were eligible to enroll in specialty-area courses. For students in Educational 1 Foundations, Educational Psychology, or Research Methodology and Evaluation, the core requirements were close to what they would expect to take in their first year, but this was not the case for students in content area specialties, curriculum and instruction, or bilingual education.

The committee proposed to overcome this obstacle by further requiring that each program area run an informal seminar (1 credit hour) for its doctoral students each semester. These "specialty seminars" were intended to provide a forum for students and faculty in each area to get to know each other, to learn about each other's interests, and to talk about timely issues in their specialty field. The faculty accepted this addition to the core, with the dean's promise that each professor would receive a one-course buy-out for coordinating the specialty seminar for two years.

Another concern was about fairness of opportunities for faculty to teach doctoral-level courses. In our old program, some faculty were considered privileged because they could expect to teach doctoral courses consistently; other faculty, regularly assigned primarily in teacher education or a master's program, might have little or no contact with doctoral students. Since the already-privileged faculty tended to be in research methodology, educational psychology, and social foundations, establishment of the core (which emphasizes these areas) solidified their privileged status. Other faculty wanted to teach in the doctoral program, too.

In principle, we decided to try and address this issue in the second and third years of doctoral coursework. That is, we are now (2004-05) looking for ways to allow more faculty members to teach at least one doctoral course in their area of specialization. To accomplish this with no increase in faculty, we will probably have to increase class sizes and reduce offerings in our other programs. Because we are just beginning to plan seriously for the second and third years of doctoral coursework, our success at dealing with this issue remains to be seen.

Planning for the second and third years of coursework brought up another issue: What would it take to upgrade the specialty-area doctoral courses to take advantage of the foundation provided by the core and new intellectual developments in many of the areas? Although it might seem that faculty would be eager to do this, there has been resistance especially among senior faculty and administrators—to the time it takes and amount of work it takes (without compensation), to the scheduling problems it produces, to the small classes it creates, etc.—to upgrade, update, and re-design these long-standing courses. With the help of some faculty who were eager to be involved and with a more concerted effort to identify courses across campus that can serve our students, we have pieced together a tentative working plan for these changes. The plan is to conceive of our doctoral program in three levels: Level 1—the core; Level 2—intermediate-level coursework that will ground students in their specialty areas and extend their methodological training (may be taken in the School or in courses offered by other departments); and Level 3—

capstone courses in the School that focus on the specialty areas.

Each specialty area has been charged with designing their doctoral program with these guidelines in mind. In some cases, the areas will be able to update or upgrade existing courses; in others, especially in fields that have changed significantly in the past decade, some new courses will be needed.

At this point in our work, it seems that designing or redesigning courses for levels 2 and 3 may prove to be even more contentious than establishing the core. This change will almost certainly include reducing the number of doctoral courses (so that each course will be large enough to meet ever-increasing campus enrollment requirements, and so that faculty who don't regularly teach doctoral courses can do so without increasing their teaching loads). In consequence, hard decisions will have to be made about which courses to cut, which ones to combine, who will teach them, and how to make sure that new or up-to-date material is integrated into the ones that remain. Students will likely have fewer (but hopefully higher quality) offerings from which to choose. These decisions will strike at the heart of faculty and student identities; they may affect our ability to recruit new faculty and new students; and they promise to provoke heated debate and strong resistance.

Figure 1: Overview of the New Doctoral Program at the University of Colorado, Boulder

YEAR ONE: THE CORE

First Semester	Second Semester
Big Ideas: Perspectives on Classroom Teaching and Learning (3 hrs) Qualitative Methods I (3 hrs) Quantitative Methods I (3 hrs) Specialty Seminar (1 hr)	Big Ideas: Education Research and Social Policy (3 hrs) Qualitative Meths II (3 hrs) Quantitative Meth II (3 hrs) Specialty Seminar (1 hr)

YEAR TWO: INTERMEDIATE

First Semester	Second Semester
Multicultural Educ (3 hrs) Specialty Area Courses/ Advanced Methods Courses (3 or 6 hrs)	Specialty Area Courses/ Advanced Methods Courses (3 or 6 hrs)

YEAR THREE: INTERMEDIATE /CAPSTONE

First Semester	Second Semester
Specialty Area Courses/ Advanced Methods Courses/Capstones (3 or 6 hrs)	Specialty Area Courses/ Advanced Methods Courses/Capstones (3 or 6 hrs)

Our new core went into effect in the fall of 2004 with a first-year cohort of sixteen students. Although surprised by the existence of a core when they arrived on campus, the students have been enthusiastic about the plan for the core and the core courses. At the beginning of the semester, several students commented that they were

174

thrilled to have a clear program of study laid out for them and eager to begin. Since then, the new courses have received mostly good reviews from the faculty and students who participated and some cries of jealousy from more senior students who missed out. Some representative positive comments from participating students after the first semester include: "The older graduate students are in awe of our cohort and [our] classes and faculty." "If there's one major thing I've learned, it's that I'm doing the right thing in the right place! Thank you!" "I appreciate what's being done to revamp the PhD program. I'm impressed by my colleagues in the cohort and will miss them when we're not in class together anymore. And I've enjoyed working with in class together anymore. And I've enjoyed working with the professors—they've all been excellent and inspiring." But not all of the comments were positive, for example: "It was tough, I won't lie; but it has taught me so much. I hope the second semester gives us [as much] insight into everything as the first semester," and "I certainly expected to take required courses but the peer group arrangement has been difficult for me. I think this arrangement works really well for those who come from out-of-state and were able to build a support network. However, at times, it really felt very herd-mentality-like."

With regard to the specialty seminars, the faculty and student response has been more mixed. In practice, the seminars have taken several different forms—reading groups, discussion of "hot" topics, review of research proposals, rehearsal of class or conference presentations, review of degree requirements and expectations—depending on the desires and needs of the members. Some have gone smoothly with good participation and high interest from both faculty and students. Others have not gone as well—in one case a seminar split in two and called their action a "divorce." As in other divorces, it will probably take some time for them to get back on track. Despite some problems with the seminars, they do provide

a forum for all new students to learn something about their specialty area during the first year. Concerns remain, however, that specialty-area exposure in the first year is too limited.

Overall, we are proud of the progress we have made so far on this reform. The interim evaluations we have conducted with the first-year students indicate that they are satisfied with most of their experiences so far. We have developed several instruments to begin to track the success of the reforms over time. First, a "student survey" was designed and administered to current doctoral students in Spring, 2004 (before the new cohort arrived and before the new core was implemented). (See Appendix C for a copy of this survey.) The results of the 2004 student survey will serve as a baseline for comparison with new student cohorts, each of which will be surveyed using this instrument at the end of their first year. Second, we developed a corresponding "faculty survey" (Appendix D) that was administered for the first time in Summer, 2004 (also before the changes took effect); it will serve as a baseline for assessing changes in faculty perspectives over time. Third, we developed an "alumni survey" (Appendix E) that was sent to all doctoral graduates from 1992 through Spring, 2004. We intend to use these results as a baseline for assessing changes in alumni perspectives over time.

Although we have accomplished a lot, much remains to be done. There are numerous other features of our doctoral program that need attention. One is the design of authentic assessments (comprehensive exams, annual reviews, published papers, dissertations) that match our new goals for our students. Another is how to provide consistent opportunities for students to practice and receive feedback on research from faculty. In our current program, some students can work with faculty on sponsored research, but many cannot, and even those that do complain

that they do not always learn much about research from the jobs they are assigned. A third is how to reduce the unevenness of faculty mentoring of doctoral students. The new core, our other courses, and these topics will continue to occupy us for some time to come.

For more information about the details of the new program at Colorado, please contact the author.

Works Cited

Berliner, D. (2003). Toward a future as rich as our past. *Carnegie essays on the doctorate.* Retrieved 1/25/05 from www.carnegiefoundation.org/cid.

Burkhardt, H. & Schoenfeld, A. (2003). Improving educational research: Toward a more useful, more influential, and better-funded enterprise. *Educational Researcher, 32* (9), 3-14.

Lagemann, E. C. (2000). *An elusive science: The troubling history of education research.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Neumann, A., Pallas, A., & Peterson, P. (1999). Preparing education practitioners to practice education research. In E.C. Lagemann and L. Shulman, eds., *Issues in education research: Problems and possibilities* (pp. xxx). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schoenfeld, A. (1999). The core, the canon, and the development of research skills. In E.C. Lagemann and L. Shulman, eds., *Issues in education research: Problems and possibilities* (pp. 166-202). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Doctoral Alumni Survey

The purpose of this survey is to learn whether the doctoral program: 1) met your personal expectations; 2) helped you attain your career goals and objectives; and, 3) provided you with the tools to become successful in your current profession. We highly value your input, and greatly appreciate your time and effort spent completing this survey. All responses will be kept confidential and your identity will not be disclosed in any report summarizing findings from this survey. If you have any questions regarding the survey or would like to know how the information will be used for school improvement purposes, please contact Professor xxx via e-mail at:

PERSONAL DATA

1. I am a:

Female
Male

2. I graduated in academic year:

Check one.

1999-2000	___	2002-2003	___
2000-2001	___	2003-2004	___
2001-2002	___		

3. What is your current pre-tax salary? If you work part-time, please give the approximate full-time equivalent annual salary.

Check one.

Less than $20,000 per year___	$40,000 to $54,999___
$20,000 to $29,999 per year___	$55,000 to $74,999___
$30,000 to $39,999 per year___	$80,000 and above ___

EMPLOYMENT DATA

4. Is any of your current employment related to your doctoral education program?

Check one. If not employed, please check the box next to "I am not employed" and skip to the Program Information Section.

Yes, in the same field
Yes, it's in a related field
No, it's in a different field, by my choice
No, it's in a different field, not by my choice
I am not employed

5. What is your current job title?

_____

6. Current Place of Employment

_____

7. Have you co-authored or authored any publications that are directly related to your field or work?

Check one. If no, please move on to the next section.

Yes
No

8. How often has your work appeared in publications related to your field?

Check one. If "other", please indicate how often.

Once within the past 5 years
Once within the past 2 years
Once a year
More than once a year
Other _____

PROGRAM INFORMATION AND FUNDING

9. In which program area were you enrolled?

Circle one (or circle two if enrolled in joint program).

a. Educational Equity and Cultural Diversity (EECD)
b. Educational Foundations, Policy, and Practice (EFPP)
c. Educational Psychology (EPSY)
d. Instruction and Curriculum (ICCA)
e. Research and Evaluation Methodology (REM)

10. During the first four years of your program did you receive funding support in the form of:

Check all that apply.

RA position
TA position
GA position
GPTI position
Fellowship
Scholarship

11. If you checked more than one item above, please indicate how long funding was provided from each area_____
_____

MEETING GOALS OF PROGRAM

12. Overall, did the quality of your research preparation:

Circle one.

a. Exceeded your expectations?
b. Met your expectations?

c. Fallen short of your expectations?
If c, why?

_____
_____

13. If you are currently teaching undergraduate or graduate courses in your profession, did the quality of your teaching preparation:

Circle one.

a. Exceeded your expectations?
b. Met your expectations?
c. Fallen short of your expectations?
If c, why?

_____
_____

14. I found that the School provided me with the skills or tools to interpret and communicate the conceptual and research base of my field to different audiences/constituencies (e.g., policymakers, educational leaders, teachers, etc.):

Check one.

Strongly agree
Moderately agree
Moderately disagree
Strongly disagree
Not applicable

15. I found that classes and activities within the School have allowed me to impact educational practice/policy in my chosen field:

Check one.

Strongly agree
Moderately agree

Moderately disagree
Strongly disagree
Not applicable

16. I found that classes and activities within the School have provided me with the skills or tools to impact the direction of scholarship in my chosen field:

Check one.

Strongly agree
Moderately agree
Moderately disagree
Strongly disagree
Not applicable

17. Overall, I found that classes and activities within the School allowed me to develop expertise in my chosen field:

Check one.

Strongly agree
Moderately agree
Moderately disagree
Strongly disagree
Not applicable

ADVISING

18. Overall, did the quality of advising you've received from faculty:

Circle one.

a. Exceeded your expectations?
b. Met your expectations?
c. Fallen short of your expectations?

If c, why?

_____

_____

ATTITUDES ABOUT PROGRAM

19. Overall, did the quality of all the courses you've taken at the School of Education:
Circle one.

a. Exceeded your expectations?
b. Met your expectations?
c. Fallen short of your expectations?
If c, why?

_____

_____

20. Would you consider recommending the School of Education to a friend considering doctoral work in the field of education?

Circle one.

a. Yes, definitely
b. Yes, somewhat
c. Not at all

Please provide us with your comments for each of the following questions:

21. What are the greatest strengths of the School of Education's graduate program.

22. What are the greatest weaknesses of the School of Education's graduate program.

23. Given the requirements of your current job, what are the most valuable skills you learned in the program?

24. Given the requirements of your current job, what are the least valuable skills you learned in the program?

25. What would you most like to see changed in the School of Education and how?

CU School of Education Faculty Survey about the Doctoral Program
Baseline Administration, August, 2004

The purpose of this survey is to gather data about faculty views of the old doctoral program. These data will serve as a baseline for evaluating the new program. Thank you for your help.

The survey has 43 questions and will take approximately 15-25 minutes to complete. At the end of the survey, you will have the opportunity to provide us with further information on any of the questions asked. The results will be consolidated and made available to the faculty.

Please answer all questions with reference to the old doctoral program and to students enrolled before Fall, 2004.

COURSES

1. In your opinion, for which topics did doctoral students receive a good introduction in the old required School of Education courses? (The old required courses included: Doctoral Research Seminar, Intermediate Statistics, Disciplined Inquiry or Philosophy of Educational Research, and Multicultural Education. Please consider the adequacy of these courses as a set.)

Select all that apply.

a. Key issues in education research
b. Key issues in program areas
c. Quantitative research methods
d. Qualitative research methods

e. Professional skills (developing proposals, academic writing)
f. Key issues in multicultural education
g. Students did not receive a good introduction to any of these topics.
h. I don't know.

_____

_____

2. Of the topics listed in #1 (a-f), what are the 3 most important topics to introduce in a doctoral core?

Select three.

a. Key issues in education research
b. Key issues in program areas
c. Quantitative research methods
d. Qualitative research methods
e. Professional skills (developing proposals, academic writing)
f. Key issues in multicultural education

_____

_____

3. What other topic(s) should be introduced in a doctoral core?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Overall, has the quality of courses taken by doctoral students:

Select one.

a. Exceeded your expectations for doctoral training in research?
b. Met your expectations for doctoral training in research?
c. Fallen short of your expectations for doctoral training in research?

If c, why?

_____

_____

d. I don't know.

RESEARCH PREPARATION

5. In your experience, which of the following research activities were doctoral students prepared to do on their own (assuming the availability of guidance from more senior colleagues on occasion) by the time they completed their doctoral coursework?

Select all that apply.

a. Identify research questions
b. Develop a conceptual framework
c. Conduct a literature review
d. Develop a research design
e. Obtain human subjects approval
f. Collect data
g. Use one or more methods of qualitative research
h. Use one or more methods of quantitative research
i. Analyze data
j. Present findings at a conference
k. Assess the quality of qualitative research
l. Assess the quality of quantitative research
m. Conduct an evaluation
n. Apply education research to practice
o. Apply education research to policy
p. Write a grant proposal for funding
q. Write a research article for a peer-reviewed publication
r. Direct a research project
s. Students are not prepared to do any of these research activities on their own.
t. I don't know.

_____

_____

6. Overall, has the quality of doctoral students' research preparation:

Select one.

a. Exceeded your expectations?
b. Met your expectations?
c. Fallen short of your expectations?
     If c, why?

_____

_____
d. I don't know.

7. To what extent do you agree with the following:

The primary purpose of the doctoral program should be to prepare doctoral students to conduct educational research.

Select one.

a. Strongly agree
b. Agree
c. Neither agree nor disagree
d. Disagree
e. Strongly disagree

_____

_____

8. To what extent do you agree with the following:

In the old doctoral program, too much attention was paid to theories of research and not enough to the practice of research.

Select one.

a. Strongly agree
b. Agree
c. Neither agree nor disagree
d. Disagree

e. Strongly disagree

_____

_____

9. To what extent do you agree with the following:

In the old doctoral program, too much attention was paid to theories of research and not enough to research applications in educational settings.

Select one.

a. Strongly agree
b. Agree
c. Neither agree nor disagree
d. Disagree
e. Strongly disagree

_____

_____

TEACHING PREPARATION

10. In your experience, which of the following teaching activities were doctoral students prepared to do at the university level by the time they finished their doctoral coursework?

Select all that apply.

a. Develop a teaching philosophy
b. Develop a syllabus
c. Select course readings
d. Construct rubrics for student assessment
e. Teach an undergraduate Education course
f. Teach a graduate Education course
g. Prepare a good lecture
h. Lead a good class discussion
i. Create good class assignments
j. Grade papers and assignments
k. Use information technology effectively in class

l. Students are not prepared to do any of these teaching activities at the university level.

m. I don't know.

_____

11. Overall, has the quality of doctoral students' teaching preparation:

Select one.

a. Exceeded your expectations?
b. Met your expectations?
c. Fallen short of your expectations?
    If c, why?

_____

d. I don't know.

SERVICE

12. In your experience, which of the following professional service activities are doctoral students prepared to do at the university or another workplace (state or federal agency, research firm, etc.) by the time they finish their doctoral coursework?

Select all that apply.

a. Serve on a campus or workplace committee
b. Serve as an advisor for a student's dissertation or a junior colleague's research
c. Provide career advice to students or junior colleagues
d. Review grant proposals for possible funding
e. Review articles for possible publication
f. Serve on a search committee for a new hire
g. Participate in public debate on educational issues
h. Be an active participant in professional societies
i. Provide outreach to a community based on professional expertise

j. Students are not prepared to do any of these professional service activities.

l. I don't know.

_____

13. Overall, has the quality of doctoral students' professional service preparation:

Select one.

a. Exceeded your expectations?
b. Met your expectations?
c. Fallen short of your expectations?
    If c, why?

_____

d. I don't know.

PEER ACTIVITIES AND SOCIAL CLIMATE

14. In which of the following activities do you think doctoral students should work together with their peers at the School of Education?

Select all that apply.

a. Studying for classes
b. Studying for comprehensive exams
c. Preparing a conference presentation
d. Co-authoring a paper
e. Conducting research
f. Mentoring more junior graduate students
g. Organizing school-sponsored talks, colloquia, or brown bags
h. Organizing social activities outside the School of Education with School peers
i. Organizing social activities outside the School of Education with School peers and faculty
j. Course planning and teaching

k. Co-teaching
l. Conducting research for the dissertation
m. Writing the dissertation
n. None of these activities.

15. In your experience, are the doctoral students an intellectually stimulating group with whom to engage?

Select one.

a. Yes, for the most part
b. No, for the most part
c. I'm not sure yet

16. In your experience, is the faculty an intellectually stimulating group with whom to engage?

Select one.

a. Yes, for the most part
b. No, for the most part
c. I'm not sure yet

17. Based on your knowledge of the doctoral students, on what career trajectory are the majority of the students in the doctoral program at the School of Education?

Select one.

a. Work as a faculty member at a college or university
b. Work as a teacher, researcher, or administrator in a school district

c. Work as a researcher or policy maker in a federal, state, or private agency
d.
Other_____

e. I don't know what career trajectory the students are on.

18. In your experience, how welcoming is the School of Education to diverse students and diversity issues?

Select one.

a. Very welcoming.
b. Somewhat welcoming
c. Not very welcoming
    If c, why?

d. I don't know.

19. In your experience, are doctoral students at the School of Education shown ways to take on an academic/research identity without having to give up other values (such as being a teacher/practitioner or their cultural identity) that are important to them?

Select one.

a. Yes, for the most part
b. Yes, occasionally
c. No, not at all
    If c, why?

d. I don't know.

ADVISING AND MENTORING

20. How did you learn about expectations for advising and mentoring doctoral students in the School of Education?

Select all that apply.

a. From my faculty mentor in the School of Education
b. From other faculty members in the School of Education
c. From the dean or director of graduate studies
d. From the students
e. From my experiences before I came here
f. From the graduate secretary in the Office of Student Services
g. From faculty meetings, brown bags or special meetings on these topics
h. From reading the graduate student handbook or other written materials
i. I have not learned what the School's expectations for doctoral advising or mentoring are.

_____

_____

21. On average, how often do you have scheduled meetings with your (official) doctoral advisees? (If you have never had any doctoral advisees in the School of Education, please skip to Question 26.)

Select one.

a. Once per week
b. Two or three times per month
c. Once per month
d. Every few months
e. Once or twice per year
f. Less than once per year
g. We make time as needed.

_____

_____

22. Is this the right amount of contact between you and your doctoral advisees?

Select one.

a. Yes, it's just about the right amount of contact for me
b. No, it's too much contact for me
c. No, it's not enough contact for me

_____

_____

23. What assistance do you consistently provide to your doctoral advisees?

Select all that apply.

a. Explanation of doctoral program requirements
b. Suggestions about courses to take
c. Information about funding opportunities
d. Assistance in obtaining study questions and reading lists for comprehensive exams
e. Debriefing his or her performance on comprehensive exams
f. Advocating on his or her behalf with other faculty or administrators
g. Reviewing and critiquing his or her dissertation ideas
h. Reviewing and critiquing his or her prospectus drafts
i. Reviewing and critiquing his or her dissertation drafts
j. Reviewing and critiquing his or her other writing
k. Encouragement to conduct independent research
l. Encouragement to attend and present at conferences
m. Encouragement to prepare and submit articles for publication
n. Suggestions for readings relevant to his or her work
o. Advice about or help in handling the balance between school and personal life
p. Advice about his or her career trajectory
q. Advice or information about employment opportunities
r. Letters of recommendation
s. Advice about job interviews

t. Help in forming professional networks (introducing him or her to other scholars in your field)
u. Conducting annual reviews of his or her progress

_____

_____

24. Overall, has the quality of advising relationships you've had with doctoral students:

Select one.

a. Exceeded your expectations?
b. Met your expectations?
c. Fallen short of your expectations?
   If c, why?

_____

_____

25. How many current doctoral students do you have as (official) advisees?

Select one.

a.   None
b.   1
c.   2-4
d.   5-10
e.   More than 10

_____

_____

EVALUATIONS AND SCHOLARLY PRODUCTS

26. In which of the following evaluations of doctoral students' work have you been involved?

Select all that apply.

a.   Grading doctoral comprehensive exams

b.   Evaluating a student's conference abstract or paper
c.   Evaluating a "publishable paper" to meet the School of Education requirements
d.   Evaluating a student's paper for actual publication
e.   Evaluating a pre-prospectus paper
f.   Evaluating a prospectus
g.   Evaluating a dissertation
h.   I have not been involved in any of these evaluations of doctoral students.
     If h, skip to Question 37.

_____

_____

27. Overall, has the quality of these evaluations and requirements (the instruments, formats, criteria for evaluation, etc.):

Select one.

a. Exceeded your expectations?
b. Met your expectations?
c. Fallen short of your expectations?
   If c, why?

_____

_____

28. Overall, has the quality of the products (results) of these evaluations and requirements:

Select one.

a. Exceeded your expectations?
b. Met your expectations?
c. Fallen short of your expectations?
   If c, why?

_____

_____

29. How critical is the need to revise expectations for doctoral comprehensive exams?

Select one.

a. Very critical
b. Critical
c. Not critical

_____
_____

30. What is the most critical thing to address about the doctoral comprehensive exams?

_____
_____
_____
_____

31. How critical is the need to revise expectations for the publishable paper?

Select one.

a. Very critical
b. Critical
c. Not critical

_____
_____

32. What is the most critical thing to address about the publishable paper?

_____
_____
_____

33. How critical is the need to revise expectations for the prospectus and prospectus defense?

Select one.

a. Very critical
b. Critical
c. Not critical

_____
_____

34. What is the most critical thing to address about the prospectus and prospectus defense?

_____
_____
_____
_____

35. How critical is the need to revise expectations for the dissertation and dissertation defense?

Select one.

a. Very critical
b. Critical
c. Not critical

_____
_____

36. What is the most critical thing to address about the dissertation and dissertation defense?

_____
_____
_____
_____

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

37. Which of the following preparatory experiences do you believe students should have before beginning the doctoral program at the School of Education?

Select all that apply.

a. A master's degree in education
b. A master's or professional degree in another field
c. Teaching at the elementary, secondary, or tertiary level
d. Some qualitative research experience
e. Some quantitative research experience
f. Experience working for an agency or group that focused on educational policy issues
g. Experience working for a school district, department of education, or similar agency that focuses on issues of educational practice
h. Experience in public debates and political activities involving educational issues
i. Publishing a professional article
j. I do not believe any of these preparatory experiences is necessary.

---

38. How many years, on average, should it take students to complete the doctoral program (courses + dissertation) at the School of Education?

Select one.

a. 3-4 years
b. 5-6 years
c. 7 years or more

FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS

39. How many years have you been teaching in the School of Education?

Select one.

a. Less than 1 year
b. 1-5 years
c. 5-10 years
c. 11-20 years
d. More than 20 years

---

40. On average, how many courses do you teach that include some doctoral students each year?

Select one.

a. Less than one per year
b. One per year
c. Two per year
d. More than two per year

---

41. In which program area do you primarily teach?

Select no more than two.

a. Educational Equity and Cultural Diversity (EECD)
b. Educational Foundations, Policy, and Practice (EFPP)
c. Educational Psychology (EPSY)
d. Instruction and Curriculum (ICCA)
e. Research and Evaluation Methodology (REME)

---

42. In general, how do you feel about the amount (ctoral teaching you do?

Select one.

a. It's just about the right amount for me.

b. It's too little for me.
c. It's too much for me.

_____

_____

43. Please provide additional comments on any of the above
questions or anything else you think the Graduate Program
Revision Committee should know about strengths and
weaknesses of the doctoral program.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____