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**SECTION I**

**Introduction to the Education Doctorate (Ed.D.) Program**

Land-grant institutions were founded with the purpose of preparing practically-oriented professionals to serve the needs of local and state communities. As Iowa’s land-grant university, Iowa State University (ISU) is committed to and guided by this applied mission. The School of Education is grounded in the larger mission of the University. The School is “committed to engaging in rigorous and socially meaningful research, preparing leaders and practitioners across the P-20 continuum that support rich and equitable learning opportunities for all students, and supporting public education as a cornerstone of a healthy, vibrant, and just society. We strive to be a national leader in educational theory, policy, and practice, and to honor the land-grant tradition and the broader mission of the university to serve the people of Iowa.”

Iowa State University has been preparing P-12 systems-level leaders, such as superintendents, since the emergence of the modern school system in 1913, and preparing community college leaders since the formation of the community college system in Iowa began with the passage of the Merged Area Schools Act in 1965. In both sectors of public education, Iowa and surrounding states are facing a continued leadership shortage. Leaders at all levels of the P-20 continuum must thus have the awareness, understanding, and necessary skills to navigate educational institutions in a P-20 educational landscape that is increasingly organizationally, financially, and politically interlocking and complex.

ISU’s School of Education was approved by the Iowa Board of Regents in Fall 2019 to grant a Doctor of Education degree (Ed.D.) with a major in Education. The School of Education also offers a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) with a major in Education. As the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. offer preparation for different professional expertise, it is the norm for schools of education to offer both degrees. The Ph.D. prepares educational researchers who conduct methodologically rigorous scholarship that significantly contributes to knowledge in the field of education. By comparison, while preparing students to engage in educational research, an Ed.D. primarily prepares educational leaders n in the field of Education as “scholarly practitioners” who can apply scholarly research to problems of practice in local, state, and national settings. In addition to a serious need to prepare P-12 systems-level leaders and community college leaders, the unique P-20 framing of the program addresses a need to engage educational leaders within the complexity of the P-20 continuum.

The core purpose of ISU Ed.D. is to produce transformational, equity-focused leaders for education systems across the P-20 continuum. All students, regardless of emphasis will take a core curriculum that immerses students across the scope, substance, and inter-relationship of the P-20 schooling continuum. The program’s cohort model aims to stimulate a shared learning experience among students, fostering the development of professional networks and encouraging dialogue among emerging leaders across the educational system.

**Ed.D. Academic Objectives**

The Ed.D. is guided by six principles identified by the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED), a selective national consortium of over 80 colleges and schools of education in the United States~~.~~

The six principles establish that an Ed.D.:

* Is framed around questions of equity, ethics, and social justice to bring about solutions to complex problems of practice.
* Prepares leaders who can construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities.
* Provides opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate collaboration and communication skills to work with diverse communities and to build partnerships.
* Provides field-based opportunities to analyze problems of practice and use multiple frames to develop meaningful solutions.
* Is grounded in and develops a professional knowledge base that integrates both practical and research knowledge, that links theory with systemic and systematic inquiry.
* Emphasizes the generation, transformation, and use of professional knowledge and practice.

The CPED principles underpin ISU’s Ed.D. academic objectives. Students who complete the ISU Ed.D. will demonstrate an ability to:

* Identify and address issues of equity, ethics, and social justice central to bringing about solutions to complex problems of practice.
* Construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities.
* Collaborate, communicate, and build partnerships with diverse communities.
* Analyze problems of practice and use multiple frames to develop meaningful solutions.
* Integrate both practical and research knowledge, that links theory with systemic and systematic inquiry.
* Use professional knowledge and practice in the generation of solutions and transformation of educational institutions.

In addition to these broad academic objectives, because the Ed.D. is designed to prepare scholarly practitioners for professional practice in specific types of educational systems (e.g., community colleges and P-12 school systems) the degree program also aligns with leadership competency standards established by national organizations, including the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), American Council on Education (ACE), and the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) and with state certification standards for P-12 systems-level leaders. Students will thus gain advanced knowledge and skills in core areas, including:

•    Administrative and Organizational Leadership

•    Budget and Financing

•    Cultural Diversity and Inclusion

•    Public Policy Analysis

•    Theories of Learning and Student Development.



**Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate Announces the Admittance of Nine New Member Institutions to the Consortium**

**PITTSBURGH (March 26, 2019)** – The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) has accepted nine new higher education institution members to join the consortium in 2019. The new member institutions are:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Iowa State University**  New Jersey City University  Radford University  Sacred Heart University/Farrington College of Education  The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley | University of California, Davis  University of Southern Indiana  University of West Alabama  University of Wyoming |

These institutions join our 105 current institution members in the important work of redesigning professional practice preparation in education for the improvement of PK-20 education and the organizations that support it. CPED institution members are a network that stimulate each institution's work and provide space for sharing, learning and providing feedback in a national dialogue across faculty, students and administrators in Doctor of Education (EdD) programs.

New members were chosen through a rigorous application process and evaluated by a membership committee composed of leaders of current CPED institution members. Based on the application and support materials of each of these new institution members, CPED anticipates that adding these institutions to the Consortium will add a value that will push CPED’s collective work even farther.

“We’re very excited to welcome these new institution members to CPED’s growing consortium and to see the contributions they will make in transforming the EdD to meet the educational needs of the 21st century,” said CPED executive director Jill A. Perry, PhD.

CPED hosts two bi-annual convenings that take place at one of its member institutions in June and October of each year. New institution members will be invited to attend the upcoming CPED Convening to be held at University of Nebraska – Lincoln in Lincoln, Nebraska from June 10 – 12, 2019. The theme of this convening is *Assuring Quality, Transformation and Brand in CPED-influenced EdD Programs,* offering new institution members an opportunity to explore strategies that ensure quality standards while meeting the needs of scholarly practitioners in CPED-influenced EdD programs. Additionally, new members will meet current CPED members with experience related to both technical and adaptive organizational issues that arise in the process of redesigning EdD programs.

**About the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED)**

The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) is the knowledge forum on the EdD with a membership of over 100 colleges and schools of education, which have committed resources to work together to undertake a critical examination of the doctorate in education (EdD) through dialog, experimentation, critical feedback and evaluation. CPED’s vision is to transform the EdD by inspiring all schools of education to apply the CPED Framework to the preparation of educational leaders by becoming well-equipped scholarly practitioners who provide stewardship of the profession and meet the educational challenges of the 21st century.

**What is the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate?**

<https://www.cpedinitiative.org/page/vision_mission>

<https://www.cpedinitiative.org/page/history>

**ISU Ed.D. Dissertation in Practice**

According to CPED, a problem of practice is “a persistent, contextualized, and specific issue embedded in the work of a professional practitioner, the addressing of which has the potential to result in improved understanding, experience, and outcomes.”

Further, the dissertation in practice is a scholarly endeavor addresses a complex problem of practice that:

* will make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and/or communities;
* is actionable;
* can be improved;
* is directly observable and can be studied empirically;
* is grounded in evidence or dialogue;
* is framed around equity, diversity, ethics, and/or social justice; and
* has implications for the organization(s) of study.

A dissertation in practice culminates in a theory of action or tentative solution that can be applied to the problem that:

* results in an understanding of, and possible solution to, the problem of practice;
* demonstrates an ability to frame the study in existing research on both theory and practice;
* uses rigorous and appropriate methods of inquiry for the problem of practice;
* demonstrates the appropriate development of findings and conclusions that are meaningful, insightful, and well-developed;
* integrates theory and practice to advance practical knowledge; and
* provides evidence of the potential for impact on practice, policy, and/or future research.

Approved by Ed.D. Faculty 11/11/2019**SECTION II**

**Program Structure**

This doctoral program is designed to prepare transformational equity-focused leaders for education systems across the P-20 continuum. The program is cohort-based, three years in length (including two summers; total of eight semesters), and culminates in a dissertation demonstrating the use of critical inquiry to address a complex problem of practice. In addition to emphasis-specific coursework and experiences, all students take a core curriculum that develops understanding of the scope, substance, and inter-relationship of the P-20 schooling continuum. In addition to the core curriculum, students complete courses within their area of emphasis: P-12 Systems-Level Leadership (inclusive of recommendation for Iowa licensure as a superintendent) or Community College Leadership. The cohort model aims to stimulate a shared learning experience among students, fostering the development of professional networks and encouraging dialogue among emerging leaders across the educational system.

# **Delivery Format**

The Ed.D. program utilizes a hybrid (combined online, video-streaming, and face-to-face) model for program delivery. During the two years of coursework, students enroll each semester in a 1-credit doctoral seminar course and two 3-credit program courses, for a total of seven (7) credits per term. In the final year, students will enroll in six (6) credits each term while they complete their capstone experience (fall semester) and dissertation (spring semester).

Because our program views interpersonal interactions as a crucial leadership skill, students will have opportunities to meet regularly with their cohort members and program faculty through monthly, on-campus experiences from August to May in each of the first two years. Students will also be on campus periodically (no more than monthly) through the capstone and dissertation work in the final year.

Students enroll in one (1) hybrid 3-credit course at a time, allowing concentrated focus on specific concepts within an 8-week period. To meet the needs of working adults, the Ed.D. 3-credit courses will take place on weekends, with each course having three Friday evening (5-9pm) and Saturday (8am-5pm) sessions. For each course, two of the weekend sessions will occur on-campus and one will be delivered using video-streaming. Summer course formats will be similar, but will not require more than monthly trips to campus. The 1-credit seminar courses will combine one full day (Saturday) per semester on campus with additional asynchronous online work. For students pursuing P-12 systems-level leadership, field experiences/internships will be built into coursework.

The Curriculum Map can be found in the Appendix of this document.

**SECTION III**

**Systems-Level Leadership Program (SLLP)**

**Division of Teaching, Learning, Leadership, and Policy**

***Educational Leadership, Organizations, and Policy (ELOP)***

***Program Area-Level Conceptual Framework***

*Vision statement*:

The Iowa State University ELOP program will prepare equity-focused leaders who transform their PK-12 organizations through developing socially just and collaborative learning communities. Our program is committed to systemic educational change that enables all stakeholders to individually and collectively confront hegemonic socio-cultural, economic, and organizational practices.

*Mission Statement*:

To prepare transformative leaders who promote high quality schools that result in high levels of learning for every child.

**Tripartite Theory of Action**

We anchor our leadership preparation within the tenets of transformative leadership development and social justice praxis (Bogotch, 2014; Brown, 2004; Brunner, Hammel, & Miller, 2010; Furman, 2012; Shields, 2010, 2011). Our conceptual framework consists of seven anchoring strands of transformative leadership emphases that guide curriculum, field work, and program assessment aligned with state- and national-level leadership preparation and practice standards. These elements are interrelated and represent essential research-based elements to effectively lead diverse and complex educational contexts. The work of our faculty, students, and partnering school mentors reflects each of the tenets that are rooted in equity-focused leadership. We aspire to help leaders understand themselves, understand themselves in relation to others, and understand themselves in relation to systems. We conceptualized these tenets as mechanisms for emerging leaders to develop to self-awareness to influence their schools and ultimately the school system writ large that operates within their communities.

In order to equip leaders with the skills necessary to become transformative leaders, we utilize Brown’s (2004) tripartite theoretical framework of transformative learning, critical social theory, and adult learning theory to engage our candidates in learning experiences that promote transformative change. Brown’s framework guides the learner to understand themselves, understand themselves in relation to others, and understand themselves in relation to systems–we term as the inside-out approach to transformative change (Drago-Severson, Maslin-Ostrowski, & Hoffman, 2012; Lindsey, Robins & Terrell, 2009). We assert that a school leader is the primary leader of learners in a school community, and to affect change, leaders must first reflect on and confront their previous knowledge, skills, beliefs, and positionality (Brown, 2004; Marshall & Hernandez, 2013; Milner, 2003; Nelson & Guerra, 2014; Osterman, 1990; Ridenour, 2004). Our leadership program will challenge individuals to critically question their understandings about learners and reflect on how learning is a socially-constructed, contextually bound process that schools can both constrain and support (Furman, 2012). With this knowledge, we aspire for our leaders to directly confront and act to disrupt institutional education structures that reinforce oppression, such as, along the lines of race and ethnicity, language, gender and sexuality, social class, ability, and religion (Gooden & Dantley, 2012; Jean-Marie, 2008; Jones & Nichols, 2013; Mansfield & Jean-Marie, 2013; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012). We also promote the development of personal and professional strategies for career-long equitable leadership practices (De Jong, Grundmeyer, & Yankey, 2017; Theoharis, 2009).

**ELOP Transformative Leadership Preparation and Practice Conceptual Framework Strands**

**Transformative Leadership**

Guided by Shield’s (2011) tenets of transformative leadership, our goal is to develop transformative leaders ***who integrate research, theory, and their personal and professional experiences to interpret, analyze, and apply leadership practices*** which address seven goals:

1. acknowledge power and privilege
2. articulate both individual and collective purposes (public and private good)
3. deconstruct social-cultural knowledge frameworks that generate inequity and reconstructs them
4. balance critique and promise
5. effect deep and equitable change
6. work toward transformation: liberation, emancipation, democracy, equity, and excellence
7. demonstrate moral courage and activism

In addition, we aim to prepare leaders who “live with tension and challenge” (Shields, 2010, p. 563) and are able to acknowledge and balance contradictions. Although this conceptual framework is directly informed by the work of Shields (2010, 2011) and Brown (2004), the work of other scholars help to further our thinking as it relates to the tenets of transformative leadership and our tripartite theoretical framework. This section provides an overview of our seven strands of transformative leadership preparation and practice and the additional literature that support them.

*Strand One: Acknowledging power and privilege*

Many educators often hold a distorted understanding of the ways in which power, privilege, and oppression operate within our schools (Gooden & Dantley, 2012; King, 1991; Lindsey, Robins, & Terrell 2009). Privilege is embedded within our institutions and have a direct impact on the schooling experiences of marginalized youth, directly contributing to disparate academic outcomes (Darder, 2012; Diem & Carpenter, 2012; Jones & Nichols, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Milner, 2012; Sanders, 2014; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012). In addition, “it is essential to recognize how thinking of power as a finite good or as a zero-sum game perpetuates practices that preserve the privilege of those who have traditionally held positions of influence and who have had the ability to make decisions and create policies for both society and its organization” (Shields, 2011, p. 6). Thus, in order to meet the needs of all students, it is paramount that school leaders become critically conscious of the ways in which power, privilege, and oppression operate to maintain inequity so that they can equip themselves to promote more equitable spaces (Friere, 1970).

*Strand Two: Articulating both individual and collective purposes (public and private good)*

Labaree (1997) argues that three alternative goals of schooling have been at the “root of educational conflict over the years: democratic equality, social efficiency, and social mobility” (p. 39). While we often purport that schools are spaces that prepare students to become democratic citizens in order to “create a better world,” we often fall short of that goal. This is due, in large part, to our inability or unwillingness to develop, articulate, and implement a shared vision (Fullan, 2003) for what it is we want schools to achieve. Transformative leadership requires that schools “articulate and attain purposes related to equity and excellence, public and private good, and individual and collective advancement” (Shields, 2011, p. 6).

*Strand Three: Deconstructing social-cultural knowledge frameworks that generate inequity and reconstructs them*

According to Brown (2006), “transformative learning changes the way people see themselves and their world” (p. 84). Thus, transformative learning brings about a change in one’s frame of reference (Brown, 2004, 2006; Mezirow, 1997). Transformative leaders acknowledge that schools are not objective and neutral spaces but are in fact places that benefit certain groups of students while marginalizing others (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012). Thus, these leaders acknowledge “the significance of sociopolitical, economic and historical experience of different racial, ethnic, gender, [and other identities] as legitimate experiences that have a profound influence on how people learn and achieve inside and outside of formal and informal education settings” (Jones & Nichols, 2013, p. 8). Further, transformative leaders recognize that success in schools is not simply due to merit (Darder, 2012; Milner, 2012) but also a result of cultural matches (Milner, 2012). Relatedly, a lack of success is not simply due to a lack of ability but due to cultural conflicts (Milner, 2012). Equity-focused educators build on this understanding to view knowledge as socially constructed (Furman, 2012) and smartness as cultural practice (Hatt, 2012). They then view all students as funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992) and find ways to embed other socio-cultural knowledge frameworks into their educational practice.

*Strand Four: Balancing critique and promise*

In order to truly transform schools into equitable spaces that promote the transformation of society requires school leaders to develop and initiate an ethic of critique (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2016; Starratt, 1991; Stefkovich & O’Brien, 2004). An ethic of critique forces school leaders to “confront the moral issues involved when schools disproportionately benefit some groups in society and fail others” (Starratt, 1991, p. 190). In addition, it calls on educators to acknowledge that school structures and practices may encourage an inappropriate use of power. However, an ethic of critique also acknowledges that no institutional arrangements are required to remain this way. If these structures were created this way, then they can be re-arranged. Furthermore, when schools are transformed, society can also be transformed as schools are sites for the transformation of society (Friere, 1998; Horvat & Davis, 2010).

*Strand Five: Effecting deep and equitable change*

School reform efforts have historically and traditionally involved “tinkering around the edges of needed change” (Shields, 2011, p. 9). These first-order change efforts have accomplished little in mitigating the academic disparities that have continued to plague our nation’s educational system (Cuban, 1988). To effect deep and meaningful change requires that school leaders engage in second-order change efforts that call for educators to examine their values and belief systems as well as structures and practices that marginalize students (Cuban, 1988). In addition, it requires that educators improve their skillset so that they can re-arrange these inequitable structures and engage in practices that promote equitable change (Khalifa, Gooden, & Davis, 2016).

*Strand Six: Working toward transformation: liberation, emancipation, democracy, equity, and excellence*

Our program’s stance is that schools have become sites of social reproduction where schools serve to perpetuate inequity within society (Anyon, 1980). We also argue, however, that schools can become sites of social transformation (Horvat & Davis, 2010). This moves beyond traditional views and approaches to school reform; it requires leaders to grapple with questions of justice, democracy, and the dialectic between individual accountability and social responsibility” (Weiner, 2013, p. 89). In addition to engaging in the self-work described in the tenets above, leaders must also engage in transformative instructional practices (Howard, 2007) and action as policy praxis (Brown, 2004; Dancy & Horsford, 2010). This involves engaging in activities like school and district equity audits (Skrla, McKenzie, & Scheurich 2009), community-based equity audits (Green, 2017), classroom and curriculum audits (Brown & Brown, 2010; McKenzie & Skrla, 2011), lesson planning; activist action planning (Brown, 2004), and embodying and enacting an equity of community (Furman, 2012).

*Strand Seven: Demonstrating moral courage and activism*

As Shields (2011) suggests, leading in the ways described can be an isolating and often pressure-filled experience. Transformative leadership requires that school leaders challenge their colleagues’ frames of reference, and this process does not come about without some resistance (Gooden, 2012; Singleton & Linton, 2015). In the face of this pressure, leaders must muster the moral courage to move forward because it is their moral and ethical duty to do so (Dantley, 2010; Shields, 2011). As Shields (2011) states, “this mandate requires a clear sense of self and knowledge of what guides and grounds one” (p. 11). Therefore, school leaders should understand their “why” for doing this work and hearken back to it during difficult times (Allen & Kellom, 2001). In addition, these leaders should engage in critical spirituality (Dantley, 2010; Fry, 2003) and self-care for the challenging road ahead (Theoharis, 2010).

**SECTION IV**

**Community College Leadership Program (CCLP)**

Iowa State University has a rich tradition of preparing scholars and leaders in the field of higher education. Students who complete the ISU Ed.D. Community College Leadership Program will demonstrate an ability to:

* Identify and address issues of equity, ethics, and social justice central to bringing about solutions to complex problems of practice.
* Construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities.
* Collaborate, communicate, and build partnerships with diverse communities.
* Analyze problems of practice and use multiple frames to develop meaningful solutions.
* Integrate both practical and research knowledge, that links theory with systemic and systematic inquiry.
* Use professional knowledge and practice in the generation of solutions and transformation of educational institutions.

The objectives for the Ed.D.’s Community College Leadership Program are informed by the competencies developed by the American Association of Community Colleges. Specifically, the [AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders (3rd Edition](https://www.aacc.nche.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/AACC2018Competencies_111618_FINAL.pdf)), approved by the AACC Board of Directors in November 2018, provide competencies to guide the development of leaders across the spectrum, including Faculty, Mid- and Senior-Level Leaders, and three levels of Chief Executive Officers (Presidents) – Aspiring, New, and Established:

* **Organizational Culture** - An effective community college leader embraces the mission, vision, and values of the community college, and acknowledges the significance of the institution’s past while charting a path for its future.
  + Competency Areas: Mission, vision, and values of the community college; Culture of the institution and the external community.
* **Governance, Institutional Policy, and Legislation** - An effective community college leader is knowledgeable about the institution's governance framework and the policies that guide its operation.
  + Competency Areas: Organizational structure of the community college; Governance structure; College policies and procedures; Board relations.
* **Student Success** - An effective community college leader supports student success across the institution, and embraces opportunities to improve access, retention, and success.
  + Competency Areas: Student success; Consistency between the college’s operation and a student-focused agenda; Data usage; Program/performance review; Evaluation for improvement.
* **Institutional Leadership** - An effective community college leader understands the importance of interpersonal relationships, personal philosophy, and management skills to creating a student-centered institution.
  + Competency Areas: Be an influencer; Support team building; Performance management; Lead by example; Problem-solving techniques; Conflict management; Advocate for professional development across the institution; Customer service; Transparency.
* **Institutional Infrastructure** - An effective community college leader is fluent in the management of the foundational aspects of the institution, including the establishment of a strategic plan, financial and facilities management, accreditation, and technology master planning.
  + Competency Areas: Strategic and operational planning; Budgeting; Prioritization and allocation of resources; Accreditation; Facilities master planning and management; Technology master planning.
* **Information and Analysis** - An effective community college leader understands how to use data in ways that give a holistic representation of the institution’s performance, and is open to the fact that data might reveal unexpected or previously unknown trends or issues.
  + Competency Areas: Qualitative and quantitative data; Data analytics.
* **Advocacy and Mobilizing/Motivating Others** - An effective community college leader understands and embraces the importance of championing community college ideals, understands how to mobilize stakeholders to take action on behalf of the college, and understands how to use all of the communications resources available to connect with the college community.
  + Competency Areas: Community college ideals; Stakeholder mobilization; Media relations; Marketing and social media.
* **Fundraising and Relationship Cultivation** - An effective community college leader cultivates relationships across sectors that support the institution and advance the community college agenda.
  + Competency Areas: Fundraising; Alumni relationships; Media relationships; Legislative relations; Public relations; Workforce partnerships.
* **Communications** - An effective community college leader demonstrates strong communication skills, leads and fully embraces the role of community college spokesperson.
  + Competency Areas: Presentation, speaking, and writing skills; Active listening; Global and cultural competence; Strategies for multi-generational engagement; Email etiquette; Fluency with social media and emerging technologies; Consistency in messaging; Crisis communications.
* **Collaboration** - An effective community college leader develops and maintains responsive, cooperative, mutually beneficial, and ethical internal and external relationships that nurture diversity, promote the success of the college community, and sustain the community college mission.
  + Competency Areas: Interconnectivity and interdependence; Work with supervisor/Board; Institutional team building; Collective bargaining (for employees in collective bargaining states).
* **Personal Traits and Abilities** - An effective community college leader possesses certain personal traits and adopts a focus on honing abilities that promote the community college agenda.
  + Competency Areas: Authenticity; Emotional intelligence; Courage; Ethical standards; Self-management and environmental scanning; Time management and planning; Familial impact; Forward-thinking philosophy; Embrace change.

<https://www.aacc.nche.edu/publications-news/aacc-competencies-for-community-college-leaders/>

**SECTION V**

**Laboratories of Practice**

The Education Doctorate program at Iowa State University incorporates Laboratories of Practice as defined by the Carnegie Project for the Education Doctorate. These laboratories occur within the classroom and coursework, as well as individually based on each student’s interests. Individual laboratories are dependent on the student and cohort (SLLP or CCLP), leveraging the current role and creating new experiences in which the Ed.D. student can actively test and apply new knowledge and skills.

“Laboratories of Practice are settings where theory and practice inform and enrich each other. They address complex problems of practice where ideas—formed by the intersection of theory, inquiry, and practice—can be implemented, measured, and analyzed for the impact made. Laboratories of Practice facilitate transformative and generative learning that is measured by the development of scholarly expertise and implementation of practice.” <https://www.cpedinitiative.org/page/framework>

**Systems Level Leadership Program**

**Internship Expectations**

The Systems Level Leadership Program utilizes internship/fieldwork experiences as Laboratories of Practice. These experiences are aligned with the Iowa Standards for School Leaders (ISSL), the National Educational Leadership District Level Leadership Standards (NELP) and the Professional Standards for School Leaders (PSEL). A key outcome of this work is to develop the student’s personal mental model of quality leadership at a systems level. Additionally, the program encompasses the expectation that SLLP students will leverage their current roles and P-12 environments for practical application and analysis of the theories and concepts to enhance their growth as scholarly practitioners.

A minimum of 400 hours of practice will be completed during the three years of a student’s enrollment in the program. These experiences are embedded throughout the course of study and hours are tracked on an ongoing basis throughout the program. These hours of practice will be aligned to the Iowa standards for School Leaders (ISSL) the student and will result in meeting the requirements for evaluator renewal and Superintendent/AEA Chief Licensure in Iowa. A faculty supervisor will work directly with each student to identify a mentor who will support them in this work.

The 400 hours are earned through two broad categories:

1) 370 hours are credited for course related expected field-based work, including the renewal of evaluator training and the problem of practice dissertation process.

2) 30 hours are to be defined by the student and the mentor to meet the student’s leadership growth.

*Note: Upon successful completion of the program, SLLP students will be recommended for Iowa licensure. Students interested in licensure outside of Iowa, will work with their advisor to address any additional requirements necessary.*

**Community College Leadership Program**

**Practical Application Expectations**

The Community College Leadership Program utilizes classroom and coursework experiences as Laboratories of Practice. Additionally, the program encompasses the expectation that CLLP students will leverage their current roles and community college environments for practical application and analysis of the theories and concepts to enhance their growth as scholarly practitioners. Evidence of these applied settings as laboratories of practice will be present in the coursework and through the culminating problem of practice dissertation.

**SECTION VI**

**Iowa State University Graduate Handbooks**

**School of Education Graduate Handbook**

The resources within this handbook are complemented by information from the ISU Graduate College, including the Graduate College handbook. Becoming familiar with the information in both this handbook and the resources offered by the Graduate College will be an important step in attaining the degree you seek.

<https://www.education.iastate.edu/gradhandbook/>

The ***Graduate College Handbook*** is a comprehensive resource for policies and procedures that pertain to graduate students and postdoctoral scholars. Members of the graduate faculty craft policies through their elective representatives on the Graduate Council. Faculty and staff in the Graduate College implement the policies as efficiently and fairly as possible. Students and faculty are invited to collaborate with their representatives on the Graduate Council to enact policy changes that may improve graduate education at Iowa State University.

<https://www.grad-college.iastate.edu/handbook/>
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**APPENDIX A**

**Curriculum Map**

**P-20 EdD Curriculum Map**

**Cohort 1: 2019-2022**

*As of May 28, 2019*

*Note: Field experiences will be built into SLLP track courses*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fall One (7 credits)**  *Aug 26 – Dec 20, 2019* | **Credits** | **Delivery** | **Course Dates**  **(Mon-Sun)** | **On Campus Meeting Dates**  **(Fri-Sat)** | **Zoom Meeting Dates** |
| ELPS 650AX Seminar: Practitioner-Scholar Leadership  Instructor: Anita Micich and Doug Smith | 1 | Hybrid  XA | Aug 1-25 | Aug 23-24 | None |
| ELPS 651X Social Foundations of P-20 Schooling  Instructor: Erin Doran | 3 | Hybrid  XA | Aug 26-Oct 20 | Sept 6-7  Oct 4-5 | Sept 20-21 |
| SLLP Course: EDADM 625X Social Justice Leadership in Organizations  Instructor: Amanda Cordova | 3 | Hybrid  XA | Oct 21 – Dec 20 | Nov 1-2  Dec 13-14 | Nov 15-16 |
| CCLP Course: HGED 663X Community College Students  Instructor: Doug Smith | 3 | Hybrid  XA | Oct 21 – Dec 20 | Nov 1-2  Dec 13-14 | Nov 22-23 |

**NOTE: Dates for Spring 2020 are TENTATIVE until September, 2019**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Spring One (7 credits)**  *Jan 6 – May 3, 2020* | **Credits** | **Delivery** | **Course Dates**  **(Mon-Sun)** | **On Campus Meeting Dates**  **(Fri-Sat)** | **Zoom Meeting Dates** |
| ELPS 650BX Seminar: Aligning P-20 Educational Contexts  Instructor: Doug Wieczorek | 1 | Online  XW/XE | Jan 6 –  Mar 1 | NONE | ALL  Asynchronous throughout the semester |
| ELPS 652X Theory of Inclusive Leadership & Organizations  Instructor: Jan Friedel | 3 | Hybrid  XA | Jan 6 –  Mar 1 | Jan 10 & 11  Feb 21 & 22 | Jan 24 & 25 |
| SLLP Course: EDADM 635X Ethical Governance and Policy  Instructor: Denny Wulf | 3 | Hybrid  XA | Mar 2 - May 3 | Mar 6 & 7  Apr 3 & 4 | Apr 24 & 25 |
| CCLP Course: HGED 664XA College Organization & Administration  Instructor: Chris Duree | 3 | Hybrid  XA | Mar 2 - May 3 | Mar 6 & 7  May 1 & 2 | Apr 17 & 18 |

*All online/Zoom interaction to be determined by course instructors within the course’s allotted 8 weeks.*

***NOTE: SUMMER TERM****:* SLLP Course: EDADM 626X Equitable School Finance (SBO Academy) has these **three** dates on campus during the Spring semester to accommodate the SBO Academy. **Apr29, 30, May1.**(ACADEMY). Craig Hansel Instructor

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Summer One (7 credits)**  *May 11 – Aug 9, 2020*  *(6 week courses)* | **Credits** | **Delivery** | **Course Dates**  **(Mon-Sun)** | **On Campus Meeting Dates**  **(Fri-Sat)** | **Zoom Meeting Dates** |
| SLLP Course: EDADM 626X Equitable School Finance  Instructor: Craig Hansel | **3** | Apr 29 –May 1  (Academy)  May 11 - June 21 | Sp1FApr 29-May 1  & **Sum F2FJune 11 & 12** | **Asynchronous May 1 – Jun13** |  |
| CLLP Course: HGED 666XA Academic Issues & Cultures  Instructor: Erin Doran | **3** | May 11-June 21 | **F2F May 22-23**  **F2F June 19 & 20** | **May 29-30** | TBD |
| ELPS 650CX Seminar: Evidence-Based Decision-Making  Instructors: Anita Micich & Denny Wulf | **1** | May 11–Aug 7 | **NONE** | **All Asynchronous May 11 – Aug 7** | TBD |
| ELPS 653X: Contemporary Issues of Equity and Diversity  Instructor: Amanda Cordova | **3** | June 22–Aug 9 | **F2F June 26 & 27**  **F2F July 24 & 25** | **July 10-11** | TBD |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fall Two (7 credits)**  *Aug 24 – Dec 18.2020* | **Credits** | **Delivery** | **Course Dates**  **(Mon-Sun)** | **On Campus Meeting Dates**  **(Fri-Sat)** | **Zoom Meeting Dates** |
| ELPS 650DX: Seminar: Identifying Research Topic  Instructor: Erin Doran | **1** | Online  XE OR XW |  |  |  |
| ELPS 655X: Scholar- Practitioner Inquiry  Instructor: Doug Wieczorek | **3** | Hybrid  XA |  |  |  |
| SLLP Course: EDADM 636X Culturally Responsive Leadership  Instructor: Amanda Cordova | **3** | Hybrid  XA |  |  |  |
| CCLP Course: HGED 665XA Financing Higher Education  Instructor: Jan Friedel | **3** | Hybrid  XA |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Spring Two (7 credits)**  *Jan 11 – May 6, 2021* | **Credits** | **Delivery** | **Course Dates**  **(Mon-Sun)** | **On Campus Meeting Dates**  **(Fri-Sat)** | **Zoom Meeting Dates** |
| ELPS 650EX Seminar: Developing Research Design  Instructor: Erin Doran | 1 | Online  XE OR XW |  |  |  |
| ELPS 654X Statistics for Education  *Instructor: TBD IN PROCESS* | 3 | Hybrid  XA |  |  |  |
| SLLP Course: EDADM 627X Transformative Instructional Leadership  Instructor: Anita Micich | 3 | Hybrid  XA |  |  |  |
| CCLP Course: HGED 615EXA Federal/State Policy  Instructor: Chris Duree | 3 | Hybrid  XA |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Summer Two (7 credits)**  *May 17 – Aug 6, 2021* | **Credits** | **Delivery** | **Course Dates**  **(Mon-Sun)** | **On Campus Meeting Dates**  **(Fri-Sat)** | **Zoom Meeting Dates** |
| ELPS 650FX Seminar: Writing Research Proposals  Instructor: Joanne Marshall | 1 | Online  XE OR XW |  |  |  |
| ELPS 656X: Program Evaluation and Assessment  Instructor: Zoe Thornton | 3 | Hybrid  XA |  |  |  |
| SLLP Course: EDADM 637X HR and Fiscal Management  Instructor: Craig Hansel and Denny Wulf | 3 | Hybrid  XA | (split with Academy) |  |  |
| CCLP Course: HGED Leadership & Change in Community Colleges  Instructor: Doug Smith | 3 | Hybrid  XA |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fall Three (6 credits)**  *Aug 23 – Dec 17, 2021* | **Credits** | **Delivery** | **Course Dates**  **(Mon-Sun)** | **On Campus Meeting Dates**  **(Fri-Sat)** | **Zoom Meeting Dates** |
| ELPS 616 Capstone Experience (Prelim. Exam/**Proposal Defense by October 15**)  Instructors: Jan Friedel - writing workshops | **3/6** |  | **1st Half** | **ON CAMPUS** |  |
| EDADM or HGED 690 or Advanced Special Topics)  **Independent work with Advisor (CCLP & SLLP)** | **3/6** |  | **Full Semester** |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Spring Three (6 credits)**  *Jan 10 – May 6, 2022* | **Credits** | **Delivery** | **Course Dates**  **(Mon-Sun)** | **On Campus Meeting Dates**  **(Fri-Sat)** | **Zoom Meeting Dates** |
| ELPS 658X: Dissertation Workshop  Instructor: Doug Wieczorek | **3/6** |  | **1st Half** | **ON CAMPUS** |  |
| ELPS 699 Research  Independent work with Advisor (CCLP & SLLP)  **March 1 Major Professor, After Spring Break: Product goes to full committee** | **3/6** |  | **Full semester** |  |  |

***Total Credits*** ***54***

**Graduation Date - May 5, 2022**

**Dissertation Defense Days TBD**

**APPENDIX B**

**SLLP/ELOP Program-level Student Outcomes**

**SLLP/ELOP Program-level Student Outcomes**

1a. Students will analyze, evaluate, and critique how power and privilege contribute to systemic institutional inequities and deconstruct social-cultural knowledge frameworks that generate inequity and reconstructs them.

b. Students will develop a plan to address power and privilege in culturally responsive ways.

c. Students will implement a culturally responsive school improvement project intended disrupt systemic inequities.

2a. Students will articulate and engage in the process of developing and implementing a shared vision focused on equity and excellence, public and private good, and individual and collective advancement.

b. Students will develop, articulate, and implement a vision of leadership that promotes the well-being of each student and leads to transformative change.

3. Students will analyze, evaluate, and critique how power and privilege contribute to systemic institutional inequities and deconstruct social-cultural knowledge frameworks that generate inequity and reconstructs them.

4a. Students will articulate the multiple ethical paradigms of justice, critique, care, the profession, and the community.

b. Students will utilize the multiple ethical frameworks in ethical decision-making and in engaging the school and community in transformative change efforts.

5. Students will be able to identify and develop theory-based practices around second-order change efforts that improve teachers’ efficacy to improve the learning environment by disrupting inequitable structures and engaging in practices that are culturally responsive.

6a. Students will work to transform instructional practices and policy praxis through actions which support liberation, emancipation, democracy, equity, and excellence.

b. Students will address questions of justice, democracy, and the dialectic between individual accountability and social responsibility.

7a. Students will critically self-reflect on their values, ethics, and positionality.

b. Students will develop the competencies to engage in moral, equitable, and socially just leadership in their philosophies and practices.

| **Program Outcome** | **Assessment of Student Performance and Proficiency Scale** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **4**  **“Exceeding”**  *Student demonstrates an advanced professional level of knowledge in this area of leadership and/or task with no gaps in understanding and* ***substantial evidence of integrated, practical application and analysis.*** | **3**  **“Proficient”**  *Student demonstrates an expected professional level of knowledge in this area of leadership and/or task with no gaps in understanding and* ***evidence of integrated, practical application and analysis.*** | **2**  **“Developing”**  *Student demonstrates an emerging level of knowledge in this area of leadership and/or task with gaps in understanding and* ***some evidence of separated, but not integrated, practical application or analysis.*** | **1**  **“Fundamental”**  *Student demonstrates a basic awareness level in this area of leadership and/or task with* ***significant gaps in understanding and minimal or absent evidence of practical application or analysis.*** |
| **1a. Students will analyze, evaluate, and critique how power and privilege contribute to systemic institutional inequities and deconstruct social-cultural knowledge frameworks that generate inequity and reconstructs them.** |  |  |  |  |
| **1b. Students will develop a plan to address power and privilege in culturally responsive ways.** |  |  |  |  |
| **1c. Students will implement a culturally responsive school improvement project intended disrupt systemic inequities.** |  |  |  |  |
| **2a. Students will articulate and engage in the process of developing and implementing a shared vision focused on equity and excellence, public and private good, and individual and collective advancement.** |  |  |  |  |
| **2b. Students will develop, articulate, and implement a vision of leadership that promotes the well-being of each student and leads to transformative change.** |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4**  **“Exceeding”**  *Student demonstrates an advanced professional level of knowledge in this area of leadership and/or task with no gaps in understanding and* ***substantial evidence of integrated, practical application and analysis.*** | **3**  **“Proficient”**  *Student demonstrates an expected professional level of knowledge in this area of leadership and/or task with no gaps in understanding and* ***evidence of integrated, practical application and analysis.*** | **2**  **“Developing”**  *Student demonstrates an emerging level of knowledge in this area of leadership and/or task with gaps in understanding and* ***some evidence of separated, but not integrated, practical application or analysis.*** | **1**  **“Fundamental”**  *Student demonstrates a basic awareness level in this area of leadership and/or task with* ***significant gaps in understanding and minimal or absent evidence of practical application or analysis.*** |
| **3. Students will analyze, evaluate, and critique how power and privilege contribute to systemic institutional inequities and deconstruct social-cultural knowledge frameworks that generate inequity and reconstructs them.** |  |  |  |  |
| **4a. Students will articulate the multiple ethical paradigms of justice, critique, care, the profession, and the community.** |  |  |  |  |
| **4b. Students will utilize the multiple ethical frameworks in ethical decision-making and in engaging the school and community in transformative change efforts.** |  |  |  |  |
| **5. Students will be able to identify and develop theory-based practices around second-order change efforts that improve teachers’ efficacy to improve the learning environment by disrupting inequitable structures and engaging in practices that are culturally responsive.** |  |  |  |  |
|  | **4**  **“Exceeding”**  *Student demonstrates an advanced professional level of knowledge in this area of leadership and/or task with no gaps in understanding and* ***substantial evidence of integrated, practical application and analysis.*** | **3**  **“Proficient”**  *Student demonstrates an expected professional level of knowledge in this area of leadership and/or task with no gaps in understanding and* ***evidence of integrated, practical application and analysis.*** | **2**  **“Developing”**  *Student demonstrates an emerging level of knowledge in this area of leadership and/or task with gaps in understanding and* ***some evidence of separated, but not integrated, practical application or analysis.*** | **1**  **“Fundamental”**  *Student demonstrates a basic awareness level in this area of leadership and/or task with* ***significant gaps in understanding and minimal or absent evidence of practical application or analysis.*** |
| **6a. Students will work to transform instructional practices and policy praxis through actions which support liberation, emancipation, democracy, equity, and excellence.** |  |  |  |  |
| **6b. Students will address questions of justice, democracy, and the dialectic between individual accountability and social responsibility.** |  |  |  |  |
| **7a. Students will critically self-reflect on their values, ethics, and positionality.** |  |  |  |  |
| **7b. Students will develop the competencies to engage in moral, equitable, and socially just leadership in their philosophies and practices.** |  |  |  |  |

**National Educational Leadership Preparation (NELP) Program Standards—District Level Leaders**

**Standard 1: Mission, Vision, and Improvement**

Candidates who successfully complete a district-level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well- being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to collaboratively lead, design, and implement a district mission, vision, and process for continuous improvement that reflects a core set of values and priorities that include data use, technology, values, equity, diversity, digital citizenship, and community.

**Standard 2: Ethics and Professional Norms**

Candidates who successfully complete a district-level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well- being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to understand and demonstrate the capacity to advocate for ethical decisions and cultivate professional norms and culture.

**Standard 3: Equity, Inclusiveness, and Cultural Responsiveness**

Candidates who successfully complete a district-level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well- being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to develop and maintain a supportive, equitable, culturally responsive, and inclusive district culture.

**Standard 4: Learning and Instruction**

Candidates who successfully complete a district-level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well- being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to evaluate, design, cultivate, and implement coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, data systems, supports, assessment, and instructional leadership.

**Standard 5: Community and External Leadership**

Candidates who successfully complete a district-level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well- being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to understand and engage families, communities, and other constituents in the work of schools and the district and to advocate for district, student, and community needs.

**Standard 6: Operations and Management**

Candidates who successfully complete a district-level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the current and future success and well- being of each student and adult by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to develop, monitor, evaluate, and manage data-informed and equitable district systems for operations, resources, technology, and human capital management

**Standard 7: Building Professional Capacity**

Candidates who successfully complete a district-level educational leadership preparation program understand and demonstrate the capacity to promote the present and future success and well- being of students and district personnel by applying the knowledge, skills, and commitments necessary to cultivate relationships, lead collaborative decision making and governance, and represent and advocate for district needs in broader policy conversations.

**Standard 8: Internship**

Candidates successfully complete an internship under the supervision of knowledgeable, expert practitioners that engages candidates in multiple and diverse district settings and provides candidates with coherent, authentic, and sustained opportunities to synthesize and apply the knowledge and skills identified in NELP Standards 1–7 in ways that approximate the full range of responsibilities required of district-level leaders and enable them to promote the current and future success and well-being of each student and adult in their district.

**Professional Standards for School Leaders (PSEL)**

**PSEL 1: Mission, Vision and Core Values**

Effective educational leaders develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision and core values of high-quality education and academic success and well-being of each student.

**PSEL 2: Ethics and Professional Norms**

Effective educational leaders act ethically and according to professional norms to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.

**PSEL 3: Equity and Cultural Responsiveness**

Effective educational leaders strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.

**PSEL 4: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment**

Effective educational leaders develop and support intellectually rigorous and coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.

**PSEL 5: Community of Care and Support for Learners**

Effective educational leaders cultivate an inclusive, caring and supportive school community that promotes the academic success and well-being of each student.

**PSEL 6: Professional Capacity of School Personnel**

Effective educational leaders develop the professional capacity and practice of school personnel to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.

**PSEL 7: Professional Community for Teachers and Staff**

Effective educational leaders foster a professional community for teachers and other professional staff to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.

**PSEL 8: Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community**

Effective educational leaders engage families and the community in meaningful, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial ways to promote each student’s success and well-being.

**PSEL 9: Operations and Management**

Effective educational leaders manage school operations and resources to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.

**PSEL 10: School Improvement**

Effective educational leaders act as agents of continuous improvement to promote each student’s academic success and well-being.

**Iowa’s School Leadership Standards and Criteria**

The School of Education at Iowa State University assures the Iowa Department of Education that each student recommended for initial principal licensure has an understanding of the following six standards: (1) Shared Vision; (2) Culture of Learning; (4) Family and Community; (5) Ethics; and (6) Societal Context.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#1** | **An educational leader promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community. (Shared Vision)**  The administrator:   1. In collaboration with others, uses appropriate data to establish rigorous, concrete goals in the context of student achievement and instructional programs. 2. Uses research and/or best practices in improving the educational program. 3. Articulates and promotes high expectations for teaching and learning. 4. Aligns and implements the educational programs, plans, actions, and resources with the district’s vision and goals. 5. Provides leadership for major initiatives and change efforts. 6. Communicates effectively to various stakeholders regarding progress with school improvement plan goals. |
| **#2** | **An educational leader promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional development.**  **(Culture of Learning)**  The administrator:   1. Provides leadership for assessing, developing and improving climate and culture. 2. Systematically and fairly recognizes and celebrates accomplishments of staff and students. 3. Provides leadership, encouragement, opportunities and structure for staff to continually design more effective teaching and learning experiences for all students. 4. Monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of curriculum, instruction and assessment. 5. Evaluates staff and provides ongoing coaching for improvement. 6. Ensures staff members have professional development that directly enhances their performance and improves student learning. 7. Uses current research and theory about effective schools and leadership to develop and revise his/her professional growth plan. 8. Promotes collaboration with all stakeholders. 9. Is easily accessible and approachable to all stakeholders. 10. Is highly visible and engaged in the school community. 11. Articulates the desired school culture and shows evidence about how it is reinforced. |
| **#3** | **An educational leader promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations and resources for a safe, efficient and effective learning environment.**  **(Management)**  The administrator:   1. Complies with state and federal mandates and local board policies. 2. Recruits, selects, inducts, and retains staff to support quality instruction. 3. Addresses current and potential issues in a timely manner. 4. Manages fiscal and physical resources responsibly, efficiently, and effectively. 5. Protects instructional time by designing and managing operational procedures to maximize learning. 6. Communicates effectively with both internal and external audiences about the operations of the school. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#4** | **An educational leader promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs and mobilizing community resources.**  **(Family and Community)**  The administrator:   1. Engages family and community by promoting shared responsibility for student learning and support of the education system. 2. Promotes and supports a structure for family and community involvement in the education system. 3. Facilitates the connections of students and families to the health and social services that support a focus on learning. 4. Collaboratively establishes a culture that welcomes and honors families and community and seeks ways to engage them in student learning. |
| **#5** | **An educational leader promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner.**  **(Ethics)**  The administrator:   1. Demonstrates ethical and professional behavior. 2. Demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance. 3. Fosters and maintains caring professional relationships with staff. 4. Demonstrates appreciation for and sensitivity to diversity in the school community. 5. Is respectful of divergent opinions. |
| **#6** | **An educational leader promotes the success of all students by understanding the profile of the community and, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural context.**  **(Societal Context)**  The administrator:   1. Collaborates with service providers and other decision-makers to improve teaching and learning. 2. Advocates for the welfare of all members of the learning community. 3. Designs and implements appropriate strategies to reach desired goals. |

SLLP and Program Objectives and Assessment Crosswalk

*This table provides a crosswalk of student learning objectives aligned with the* [*Iowa Standards for School Leaders*](http://www.sai-iowa.org/iowa-standards.cfm) *(ISSL), National Educational Leadership Preparation Standards for District Level Leaders (NELP), Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL), ELOP Conceptual Framework, SLLP Program-level Outcomes, and Artifacts of Learning and Clinical Practice.*

As a result of course based instruction, clinical field work/internship work is embedded within the course structure.

| **SLLP Student Learning Outcome and Course Objective Assessed** | **NELP District Level Standards**  **Assessed** | **ISSL Standards Assessed** | **PSEL Standards Assessed** | **ELOP Conceptual Framework Strand Assessed** | **Program Level Assessment Artifact(s) of Learning and Clinical Practice** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1a. Students will analyze, evaluate, and critique how power and privilege contribute to systemic institutional inequities and deconstruct social-cultural knowledge frameworks that generate inequity and reconstructs them.  b. Students will develop a plan to address power and privilege in culturally responsive ways.  c. Students will implement a culturally responsive school improvement project intended disrupt systemic inequities. | 2. Ethics and Professional Norms  3. Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural Responsiveness  4. Learning and Instruction  5. Community and External Leadership  8. Internship/Clinical | 2 a, c, g, k  4 a, b, c, d;  5 a, b, c, d, e  6 a, b, c | 2: Ethics and Professional Norms  3: Equity & Cultural Responsiveness  4: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment  5: Community of Care and Support for Learners  8: Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community | 1, 2, 3, 4,  5, 6, 7 | ***Artifacts are determined by course and clinical practice requirements.***  ***Each course will identify specific artifacts that demonstrate learning and clinical practice experiences.*** |
| 2a. Students will articulate and engage in the process of developing and implementing a shared vision focused on equity and excellence, public and private good, and individual and collective advancement.    b. Students will develop, articulate, and implement a vision of leadership that promotes the well-being of each student and leads to transformative change. | 1. Mission, Vision, and Improvement  3. Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural Responsiveness  4. Learning and Instruction  5. Community and External Leadership  6. Operations and Management  7. Building Professional Capacity  8. Internship/Clinical | 1a, c, d, f;  2 a, c, g, k;  3 a | 1: Mission, Vision and Core Values  3: Equity & Cultural Responsiveness  5: Community of Care and Support for Learners  6: Professional Capacity of School Personnel  7: Professional Community for Teachers and Staff  8: Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community  9: Operations and Management  10: School Improvement | 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 | ***Artifacts are determined by course and clinical practice requirements.***  ***Each course will identify specific artifacts that demonstrate learning and clinical practice experiences.*** |
| 3. Students will analyze, evaluate, and critique how power and privilege contribute to systemic institutional inequities and deconstruct social-cultural knowledge frameworks that generate inequity and reconstructs them. | 2. Ethics and Professional Norms  3. Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural Responsiveness  5. Community and External Leadership  6. Operations and Management  7. Building Professional Capacity  8. Internship/Clinical | 3 c, f  5 a, b, c, d, e  6 a | 2: Ethics and Professional Norms  5: Community of Care and Support for Learners  6: Professional Capacity of School Personnel  7: Professional Community for Teachers and Staff  8: Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community  9: Operations and Management  10: School Improvement | 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 | ***Artifacts are determined by course and clinical practice requirements.***  ***Each course will identify specific artifacts that demonstrate learning and clinical practice experiences.*** |
| 4a. Students will articulate the multiple ethical paradigms of justice, critique, care, the profession, and the community.  b. Students will utilize multiple ethical frameworks in ethical decision-making and in engaging the school and community in transformative change efforts. | 2. Ethics and Professional Norms  3. Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural Responsiveness  5. Community and External Leadership  7. Building Professional Capacity  8. Internship/Clinical | 2 a-k  4 a-d  5 a-f | 2: Ethics and Professional Norms  5: Community of Care and Support for Learners  6: Professional Capacity of School Personnel  8: Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community | 1, 2, 3, 6 | ***Artifacts are determined by course and clinical practice requirements.***  ***Each course will identify specific artifacts that demonstrate learning and clinical practice experiences.*** |
| 5. Students will be able to identify and develop theory-based practices around second-order change efforts that improve teachers’ efficacy to improve the learning environment by disrupting inequitable structures and engaging in practices that are culturally responsive. | 1. Mission, Vision, and Improvement  2. Ethics and Professional Norms  4. Learning and Instruction  5. Community and External Leadership  7. Building Professional Capacity  8. Internship/Clinical | 1 a, d, e, f;  2 a, c, g, h, i, j, k  4 b, c, d | 1: Mission, Vision and Core Values  2: Ethics and Professional Norms  4: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment  6: Professional Capacity of School Personnel  7: Professional Community for Teachers and Staff  8: Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community | 1, 3 | ***Artifacts are determined by course and clinical practice requirements.***  ***Each course will identify specific artifacts that demonstrate learning and clinical practice experiences.*** |
| 6a. Students will work to transform instructional practices and policy praxis through actions which support liberation, emancipation, democracy, equity, and excellence.  b. Students will address questions of justice, democracy, and the dialectic between individual accountability and social responsibility. | 1. Mission, Vision, and Improvement  2. Ethics and Professional Norm  3. Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural Responsiveness  4. Learning and Instruction  5. Community and External Leadership  7. Building Professional Capacity  8. Internship/Clinical | 5 a, b, c, d, e;  6 a, b, c | 1: Mission, Vision and Core Values  2: Ethics and Professional Norms  4: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment  5: Community of Care and Support for Learners  6: Professional Capacity of School Personnel  7: Professional Community for Teachers and Staff  8: Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community  10: School Improvement | 1, 3, 5, 6 | ***Artifacts are determined by course and clinical practice requirements.***  ***Each course will identify specific artifacts that demonstrate learning and clinical practice experiences.*** |
| 7a. Students will critically self-reflect on their values, ethics, and positionality.  b. Students will develop the competencies to engage in moral, equitable, and socially just leadership in their philosophies and practices. | 1. Mission, Vision, and Improvement  2. Ethics and Professional Norms  3. Equity, Inclusiveness and Cultural Responsiveness  4. Learning and Instruction  5. Community and External Leadership  6. Operations and Management  7. Building Professional Capacity  8. Internship/Clinical | 5 a, b, c, d, e  6 a, b, c | 1: Mission, Vision and Core Values  2: Ethics and Professional Norms  5: Community of Care and Support for Learners  6: Professional Capacity of School Personnel  7: Professional Community for Teachers and Staff  8: Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community  9: Operations and Management  10: School Improvement | 1, 3, 6, 7 | ***Artifacts are determined by course and clinical practice requirements.***  ***Each course will identify specific artifacts that demonstrate learning and clinical practice experiences.*** |

**STUDENT NAME:**

**Ed.D. Clinical Field Experiences Activity Log**

**Organize by ELPS and SLLP Courses**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course** | **Activity (Explanation)** | **Date/Time Started** | **Date/Time Ended** | **Total Time Spent(hrs)** | **School Level/Program**  **District Community Location** | **Running Total General** | **Running Total Community** | **Running Total School Level/Program** | **Running Total District** |
| *EDADM625X* | *Neighborhood Walk* |  | *11.5.19* | *10* | *Elementary* |  | *10* |  |  |
| *EDADM625X* | *Community Observation* |  |  | *1* | *Special Education* |  | *10* |  |  |
| *EDADM625X* | *Plethica 1* |  |  |  |  |  | *20* |  |  |
| *EDADM625X* | *School Board Presentation* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**We suggest putting this in an excel document and color-coding each individual area to better track the work. Your final log should include the total number of hours worked in each area. This is an ongoing process throughout the program. Each P-12 course will include opportunities for you to fulfill the hour requirements. Some courses may offer more opportunities than others. The end goal is to reach the 400 hour requirement for the program. We believe this is reasonable over the three year course of study.**

Program fieldwork hours are embedded within each course during the Ed.D. program. Some fieldwork will also be relevant to your dissertation topic and efforts. ***Each student must 1) complete the assigned fieldwork, and 2) fulfill and track the appropriate, requisite number of field hours, to successfully be recommended for licensure in the State of Iowa.*** We have set a minimum of 45-50 hours per P-12 SLLP course to reach the program requirement of 400 field hours. Students can also provide hours for meetings or professional development experiences that are held within their school or district related to the course of study for P-12.

The SLLP Assistant Professors of Practice will be assisting you with this process throughout the program. Please reach out to Dr. Anita Micich for questions. [amicich@iastate.edu](mailto:amicich@iastate.edu)

**APPENDIX C**

**PROPOSAL TO THE GRADUATE COLLEGE**

**December 9 2019**

**Memo**

**TO:** ISU SCHOOL OF EDUCATION GRADUATE FACULTY

Dr. Don Hackmann, Director

Dr. Anne Foegen, DOGE

ISU GRADUATE COLLEGE

**FROM:** Dr. Doug Smith and Dr. Anita Micich: On behalf of the Education Doctorate Faculty

**RE: Proposed Changes To 6.2.4 Doctoral POS Committee Makeup**

The School of Education Ed.D. faculty request an addition to 6.2.4 Doctoral POS Committee Makeup to reflect the recent establishment of a new professional practice doctoral degree program.

The core purpose of ISU Ed.D. is to produce transformational, equity-focused leaders for education systems across the P-20 continuum (see Appendix A). The Ed.D. Dissertation in Practice is focused on a problem of practice identified by the student and major professor (see Appendix B). Our dissertation approach reflects the philosophy of the program.

The cohort model provides students with active support throughout the duration of the program. All students will culminate their dissertation at the same time (spring, year three), which has an impact on faculty available to advise and support. Currently the Ed.D. faculty is comprised of six tenure-track faculty and five professors of practice, each of whom also have responsibilities for other ISU Master’s and PhD programs.

The proposed committee structure of four members supports the scaffolded approach of the dissertation development that the cohort model provides. All faculty who are serving in the capacity of a major professor will be provided with mentoring, guidance, and opportunities to collaborate with experienced tenure-track faculty.

Therefore the proposed changes to the Graduate College policy (6.2.4 Doctoral POS Committee Makeup)

below intend to maintain rigor in the dissertation process and ensure the committee has the skillset to support the student in producing a high quality dissertation. This reflects the practitioner-scholar focus of the ISU Doctorate of Education degree.

**Graduate College Handbook**

**6.2.4 Doctoral POS Committee Makeup**

The POS committee for a [Ph.D] doctoral program consists of at least five members of the graduate faculty. It must include at least three members, including the major professor, from within the student’s major or program. The committee must include member(s) from different fields of emphasis so as to ensure diversity of perspectives. An associate member of the graduate faculty may participate in the direction of a student’s dissertation research as a co-major professor if a full member of the graduate faculty serves as a co-major professor and jointly accepts responsibility for direction of the dissertation.

**\*PROPOSED ADDITION:**

The POS committee for an Ed.D. doctoral program consists of at least four members of the graduate faculty. It must include at least two faculty members, including the major professor, from within the student’s major or program. The committee must include a minimum of one member from a different field of emphasis so as to ensure diversity of perspectives.  An associate member of the graduate faculty may direct a student’s dissertation research as a major professor if they hold a status of professor of practice within the School of Education faculty.

Approved by Ed.D. Faculty 12/9/2019

**SECTION I (ED.D. HANDBOOK)**

**Introduction to the Education Doctorate (Ed.D.) Program**

Land-grant institutions were founded with the purpose of preparing practically-oriented professionals to serve the needs of local and state communities. As Iowa’s land-grant university, Iowa State University (ISU) is committed to and guided by this applied mission. The School of Education is grounded in the larger mission of the University. The School is “committed to engaging in rigorous and socially meaningful research, preparing leaders and practitioners across the P-20 continuum that support rich and equitable learning opportunities for all students, and supporting public education as a cornerstone of a healthy, vibrant, and just society. We strive to be a national leader in educational theory, policy, and practice, and to honor the land-grant tradition and the broader mission of the university to serve the people of Iowa.”

Iowa State University has been preparing P-12 systems-level leaders, such as superintendents, since the emergence of the modern school system in 1913, and preparing community college leaders since the formation of the community college system in Iowa began with the passage of the Merged Area Schools Act in 1965. In both sectors of public education, Iowa and surrounding states are facing a continued leadership shortage. Leaders at all levels of the P-20 continuum must thus have the awareness, understanding, and necessary skills to navigate educational institutions in a P-20 educational landscape that is increasingly organizationally, financially, and politically interlocking and complex.

ISU’s School of Education was approved by the Iowa Board of Regents in Fall 2019 to grant a Doctor of Education degree (Ed.D.) with a major in Education. The School of Education also offers a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) with a major in Education. As the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. offer preparation for different professional expertise, it is the norm for schools of education to offer both degrees. The Ph.D. prepares educational researchers who conduct methodologically rigorous scholarship that significantly contributes to knowledge in the field of education. By comparison, while preparing students to engage in educational research, an Ed.D. primarily prepares educational leaders n in the field of Education as “scholarly practitioners” who can apply scholarly research to problems of practice in local, state, and national settings. In addition to a serious need to prepare P-12 systems-level leaders and community college leaders, the unique P-20 framing of the program addresses a need to engage educational leaders within the complexity of the P-20 continuum.

The core purpose of ISU Ed.D. is to produce transformational, equity-focused leaders for education systems across the P-20 continuum. All students, regardless of emphasis will take a core curriculum that immerses students across the scope, substance, and inter-relationship of the P-20 schooling continuum. The program’s cohort model aims to stimulate a shared learning experience among students, fostering the development of professional networks and encouraging dialogue among emerging leaders across the educational system.

**Ed.D. Academic Objectives**

The Ed.D. is guided by six principles identified by the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED), a selective national consortium of over 80 colleges and schools of education in the United States~~.~~

The six principles establish that an Ed.D.:

* Is framed around questions of equity, ethics, and social justice to bring about solutions to complex problems of practice.
* Prepares leaders who can construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities.
* Provides opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate collaboration and communication skills to work with diverse communities and to build partnerships.
* Provides field-based opportunities to analyze problems of practice and use multiple frames to develop meaningful solutions.
* Is grounded in and develops a professional knowledge base that integrates both practical and research knowledge, that links theory with systemic and systematic inquiry.
* Emphasizes the generation, transformation, and use of professional knowledge and practice.

The CPED principles underpin ISU’s Ed.D. academic objectives. Students who complete the ISU Ed.D. will demonstrate an ability to:

* Identify and address issues of equity, ethics, and social justice central to bringing about solutions to complex problems of practice.
* Construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities.
* Collaborate, communicate, and build partnerships with diverse communities.
* Analyze problems of practice and use multiple frames to develop meaningful solutions.
* Integrate both practical and research knowledge, that links theory with systemic and systematic inquiry.
* Use professional knowledge and practice in the generation of solutions and transformation of educational institutions.

In addition to these broad academic objectives, because the Ed.D. is designed to prepare scholarly practitioners for professional practice in specific types of educational systems (e.g., community colleges and P-12 school systems) the degree program also aligns with leadership competency standards established by national organizations, including the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), American Council on Education (ACE), and the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) and with state certification standards for P-12 systems-level leaders. Students will thus gain advanced knowledge and skills in core areas, including:

•    Administrative and Organizational Leadership

•    Budget and Financing

•    Cultural Diversity and Inclusion

•    Public Policy Analysis

•    Theories of Learning and Student Development.

Approved by Ed.D. Faculty 12/9/2019