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Directions

Attached please find the Qualifying Exam for Higher Education. The exam is divided into five main parts. In Parts I – IV, you will be given a choice of questions; in each case, you will choose one question to answer. In Part V, Statistics, you will be given four questions and you must answer all four questions. Please indicate on each question answered, the number and title of the question (i.e. Part 2—Public Policy, etc.)

- Before you begin, create a header for each page with your student ID number (found on the label of this envelope), the name of the exam you are taking (HRED Qual) and today’s date.

- When you complete a section, insert a page break before starting the next section.

In developing your responses, be sure to organize them in a logically coherent way and to make optimal use of relevant/current research and literature applicable to each question.

Part I
Historical and Organizational Perspectives
(Choose one of three)

Part II
Public Policy Perspectives
(Based upon your degree, choose a Higher Education or K-12 question)

Part III
Higher Education as a Field of Study
(Choose one of three)

Part IV
Research
(Based upon your degree, choose a Higher Education or K-12 question)

Part V
Statistics
(Answer ALL questions)
HIGHER EDUCATION QUALIFYING EXAM

Part I. HISTORICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

HISTORICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Directions: Answer one of the three questions below and respond to it in a coherent essay of 1500 – 2000 words. In preparing your response, be sure that your organization is clear (your response has a beginning, a middle, and an end), that you draw on the most significant literature and data sources in the field to support your argument, and that you are appropriately analytical in your approach.

Question #1: Forces / philosophies that have shaped American higher education
L. Veysey examines the influence of four forces that have shaped American higher education: discipline & piety, utility, research and liberal culture. Based upon the knowledge of the development of American higher education you have gained through course readings and other relevant scholarship:

- Which of these four forces in your judgment had the most important influence upon contemporary American higher education and why? You must draw upon relevant literature to support your position.

- Which of these four forces in your judgment had the least influence upon contemporary American higher education and why? You must draw upon the relevant literature to support your position.

- OR -

Question #2: Structural and academic evolution of American higher education
Higher education underwent a significant academic and structural evolution from the founding of Harvard College in 1636 to today. During this time, the roles and expectations of faculty and administrators also changed. Identify several of the major changes and expectations in the role of faculty and administrators between 1636 and 2008. What were the factors behind these changes? What were the major changes in expectations and responsibilities of faculty and administrators during this period?

- OR -
Question #3: Tradition and Responsiveness/Innovation in American Higher Education.

In his 2004 volume, *A History of American Higher Education*, John Thelin begins with the following quotation taken from the 1963 Harvard Admissions brochure:

Colleges and universities are historical institutions. They may suffer amnesia or have selective recall, but ultimately heritage is the lifeblood of our campuses... But the University has grown with the country. It has maintained over three centuries an extraordinary vitality and a tough-minded awareness of changing conditions. Its ability to survive and grow strong over these three troubled centuries and its deep roots in the American past have given it an unusual mixture of perspective, confidence, and continuity of purpose.

Using this quotation as a point of departure, write an essay on “Tradition and Responsiveness/Innovation in American Higher Education.” In your essay, describe the balance between tradition and innovation in the historical development of the American system. To what extent, and in what ways, does the American system still reflect historical traditions? To what extent, and in what ways, has the system departed from historical tradition? What, in your view, is the current state of the balance between tradition and responsiveness? What should the balance be? And how can it be maintained?
HIGHER EDUCATION QUALIFYING EXAM

Part II.  PUBLIC POLICY PERSPECTIVES -- HRED

Based upon your degree,
Choose a Higher Education or K-12 Policy Question

HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY QUESTION

PUBLIC POLICY PERSPECTIVES

Directions: Select one (1) of the three Higher Education Policy questions presented below and respond to it in a coherent essay. Be sure to draw on your knowledge of policy analysis and the literature in higher education to frame your basic position, support the position with the best available evidence and to develop your response in clear and coherent prose.

Question #1: Spiraling Cost in Higher Education: What's Going On?

There is perhaps no more urgent issue than the rapidly escalating costs of higher education, especially in the independent sector. As a scholar of American higher education, you are asked to prepare a research-based article for a popular magazine that explains why costs are escalating so rapidly and what steps colleges and universities can take to contain costs. In your response, be sure to include:

a. An analysis of how organizational structure and culture affects expenditure patterns in colleges and universities;

b. An analysis of changes in revenue streams to colleges and universities over the past decade.

c. An analysis of the impact of changing state and federal policy on institutional cost structures; and

d. How in your judgment can higher education address the spiraling cost issue most effectively?

- OR -

4
HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY QUESTION (Con't)

Question #2: Quality and Access

A classic debate regards access and financing of American higher education. Prepare an essay that develops your position with respect to these four questions.

1. Who goes to higher education?
2. Who pays for higher education?
3. Who benefits from higher education?
4. Who should pay?

In preparing your response, please consider such trends as current and historical participation rates in higher education, data & perspectives on individual and societal benefits of higher education participation, current and historical methods for financing higher education. Be certain to address all four (4) of the questions.

- OR -

Question #3: New Jersey State Policy with Respect to Student Migration

Suppose you are a prominent business person with heavy investments in new high-tech industries in New Jersey. Because of your interest in higher education and your political activity in the state, you have been appointed to the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education to represent the public.

As part of your orientation by the state officials, you learn that New Jersey has a very high rate of out-migration of high school graduates. A large percentage of the graduating high school seniors leave the state to start their college education as freshmen in other states.

You ask the state agency for more information. What are the state education or other policies—or circumstances, such as geography—that lead to such a high rate of out-migration? State officials argue that out-migration of college students, who—they assert—eventually return to the state to take jobs, saves the state money, thus both helping to keep college tuition low, and helping slow the rate of tax increase.

Drawing on your reading of higher education literature, and sources outside of education, as well as your own perspectives as a business leader in the state:

1. Explore the probable reasons for the out-migration in NJ.
2. Discuss the rationale offered by the state officials to justify their position.
4. What would you, as a business leader, recommend as being best in the public interest, and why?
Part II. PUBLIC POLICY PERSPECTIVES -- K-12

Based upon your degree, 
Choose a Higher Education or K-12 Policy Question

K-12 POLICY QUESTION

PUBLIC POLICY PERSPECTIVES

Directions: Select one (1) of the two K-12 Policy questions presented below and respond to it in a coherent essay. Be sure to draw on your knowledge of policy analysis and the relevant literature to frame your basic position, to support your position with the best available evidence and to develop your response in clear and coherent prose.

Question #1: Demonstrate your understanding of policy analysis

Directions: answer parts A, B and C

A. What is your “working definition” of policy? In preparing your definition please define and distinguish between “Policy Analysis” and “Policy Advocacy”.

B. Education leaders should have a good understanding of policy that affects education in the pre K-12 area, broadly speaking. Briefly defend this assertion in 2 to 3 paragraphs

C. Theorists often refer to various models for understanding the policy process. These models include: Institutionalism, Rationalism, Group Theory, Elite Theory and Incrementalism. Identify the characteristics of three of these models and your assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of those models in understanding policy development and implementation. In preparing your response you may find it useful to prepare a table to structure your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Analysis Model (prepare response for 3 of these models)</th>
<th>Identify / explain characteristics of model</th>
<th>Identify / explain strengths and weaknesses of model in helping education leaders understand the development and implementation of education policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incrementalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- OR -
K-12 POLICY QUESTION (Con't)

Question #2: Charter Schools and Failing Urban Schools

In the attached essay "Wave of the Future: Why charter schools should replace failing urban schools" A. Smarick presents a case for having charter schools replace failing urban schools. Drawing upon your familiarity with the policy analysis process, develop a cogent analysis that:

- Develops, defines and explains in clear terms what you see to be one (1) of the key policy questions contained in the Smarick article.

- Identifies and explain one or two policy alternatives to the policy question you identified as central to the Smarick article.

- Identifies two or three groups or organizations who would be the principal actors in this policy discussion e.g., parents, principals, politicians, unions, school boards etc. and explain why they would be key actors.

- Identifies the evaluative criteria that the key actors you identified in this policy discussion might be inclined to use to assess the effectiveness of any policy changes with respect to the replacement of failing urban schools with charter schools. For example, what criteria might politicians or school boards use to assess the change proposed by Smarick? Because group interests generally influence the means by which they evaluate a policy the criteria will vary by group or organization.

PLEASE SEE THE FOLLOWING SMARICK ARTICLE..........................

"Wave of the Future: Why charter schools should replace failing urban schools"
Wave
of the future

Why charter schools should replace failing urban schools

By Andy Smarick

In a decade and a half, the charter school movement has gone from a glimmer in the eyes of a few Minnesota reformers to a maturing sector of America's public education system. Now, like all 15-year-olds, chartering must find its own place in the world.

First, advocates must answer a fundamental question: What type of relationship should the nascent charter sector have with the long-dominant district sector? The tension between the two is at the heart of every political, policy, and philosophical tangle faced by the charter movement.

But charter supporters lack a consistent vision. This motley crew includes civil rights activists, free market economists, career public school educators, and voucher proponents. They have varied aspirations for the movement and feelings toward the traditional system. Such differences are part of the movement's DNA:

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools (NAPCS) study found that the nation's charter laws cite at least 18 different goals, including spurring competition, increasing professional opportunities for teachers, and encouraging greater use of technology.

Because of its uniqueness, chartering is unable to look to previous reform efforts for guidance. No K–12 reform has so fundamentally questioned the basic assumptions—school assignments...
based on residence, centralized administrative control, schools lasting in perpetuity—underlying the district model of public education. Even the sweeping standards and assessments movement of the last 20 years, culminating in No Child Left Behind, takes for granted and makes use of the district sector.

Though few charter advocates have openly wrestled with this issue, two camps have organically emerged. The first sees chartering as an education system operating alongside traditional districts. This camp contends that the movement can provide more options and improved opportunities, particularly to disadvantaged students, by simply continuing to grow and serve more families.

The second group sees chartering as a tool to help the traditional sector improve. Chartering, the argument goes, can spur district improvement through a blend of gentle competitive nudging and neighborly information sharing.

Both camps are deeply mistaken. For numerous policy and political reasons, without a radical change in tactics the movement won’t be able to sustain even its current growth rate. And neither decades of sharing best practices nor the introduction of charter competition has caused districts to markedly improve their performance.

Both camps have accepted an exceptionally limited view of what this sector might accomplish. Chartering’s potential extends far beyond the role of stepchild or assistant to districts. The only course that is sustainable, for both chartering and urban education, embraces a third, more expansive view of the movement’s future: replace the district-based system in America’s large cities with fluid, self-improving systems of charter schools.

A Parallel System
Charter advocates are rightfully proud of their achievements. As of spring 2007, 4,046 charter schools were serving more than 1.1 million children across 40 states and the District of Columbia. In a number of cities, charters educate a significant proportion of public school students (see Figure 1). But when compared to the expanse of the traditional district-based system and the educational needs of low-income families, the movement’s accomplishments are modest.

Nationwide, only 2 percent of public school students attend charters. Over the last five years, an average of 335 new charters started annually. At this rate, it would take until 2020 for chartering to corner just 5 percent of the national market. Even these humble figures inflate the movement’s true national standing. In 2007 nearly two-thirds of charter schools were in only seven states. Today, 24 states have less than 1 percent of their students in charter schools. Though strong expansion continues in places like California and Florida, the 2006-07 school year saw 26 states open five or fewer new schools, while 5 states—because of closures—began the school year with fewer charters than they had the year before.

None of this, however, should be taken as an assault on charters’ popularity or effectiveness. In New York, 12,000 students are on charter wait lists; in Massachusetts 19,000; in Pennsylvania 27,000. Students on all of the nation’s charter wait lists would fill an estimated 1,121 new charter schools.

Research on student achievement in charters is encouraging. A recent analysis of the charter school studies since 2001 that measured student or school performance over time—the ideal way to measure a school’s “value added”—reported that 29 of 33 studies found charters performing as well as or better than traditional public schools. The New York Times Magazine spotlighted charter networks KIPP, Uncommon Schools, and
Achievement First in a major feature on how to close the achievement gap. Yet despite these successes, chartering's current status and growth trajectory won't enable it to become a parallel system large enough to serve the millions of needy students across the country within the foreseeable future.

Some might respond, "Then just accelerate growth." But the forces that have held chartering back over the last 15 years aren't going away. Worse, even today's growth levels may be in danger.

Twenty-five states have imposed some type of cap on charter expansion, and in eight states those limits currently constrain growth. The battle against caps must be fought state by state by under-resourced, overextended charter advocates against entrenched opponents. In New York, an expensive and sophisticated multiyear effort by charter advocates that was supported by the governor and New York City's mayor and schools chancellor finally resulted in legislation that raised the cap, but only by 100 schools. The new limit will be reached in just a few years.

Unequal financing is another obstacle. A Fordham institute study found that on average charters receive $1,800 less per student than traditional public schools, despite serving more disadvantaged students. This discourages educators from starting new charters and traditional schools from converting. It also inhibits existing charters from growing enrollment or expanding to new campuses. Facilities are a major piece of this puzzle. While traditional public schools provide a building, charters still must find, secure, and pay for a roof and walls. Only 13 states and Washington, D.C., provide some sort of facilities assistance.

The greatest impediment to growth is the wide array of political, legal, and administrative attacks. Institutional players—teachers unions, school boards, and state and district administrators—frequently petition state leaders for charter caps and reduced charter funding and vigorously oppose alternative authorizers and facilities aid. The nationwide Democratic landslide in the 2006 elections left many state governments less charter-friendly. For example, Ted Strickland, Ohio's new Democratic governor, made a moratorium on new charters one of his top priorities.

In a number of states, most recently Ohio and Michigan, coalitions have attacked chartering through the courts. Though these challenges have been beaten back so far, even one loss could force the closure of hundreds of schools. A 2006 Florida Supreme Court decision was foreboding. Striking down the state's voucher plan for contravening the state constitution's requirement of a "uniform" public education system, the court opened the door to challenges to the state's 350 charters, which, by definition, are not uniform.

Finally, chartering is held back by its administrative arrangements. Ninety percent of authorizers are local school districts, many of which view charters as an administrative inconvenience, competitive nuisance, or worse. In a NAPCS survey of charter school leaders, nearly two-thirds said working with the district was a problem. This summer, a high-performing KIPP charter school in Annapolis, Maryland, was forced to close because it couldn't find a permanent facility, even though the school district, according to its own study, had 900 empty seats in a nearby, underutilized school. Responding to the school's pleas for help, the district's superintendent told the local newspaper, "It's not my responsibility. It's not my school."

The "parallel system" approach to chartering's future rests on two mistaken assumptions: first, that by simply creating new schools and not purposely antagonizing the traditional system, chartering wouldn't attract the ire of defenders of the status quo; and second, that if chartering proved successful and popular, the sky was the limit on growth. As it turned out, district stakeholders have fought charters tooth and nail from the beginning, and they have erected policy obstacles that have severed the link between charter demand and supply.

The District Partner

The second camp envisions a vastly improved traditional school system, achieved through charter cooperation. This group believes that consistent collaboration between the two sectors would enable charters to experiment and then share lessons learned so all students, the vast majority of whom still attend traditional public schools, could benefit.

"I believe that districts and charters will benefit by building more collaborative relationships," says Tom Hutton, a staff attorney for the National School Boards Association and a former board member of the Thurgood Marshall Charter School in Washington, D.C.

Like Hutton, many in this camp are veterans of the traditional system who recognize the value of chartering. But they assume district immortality—districts have been the sole delivery system of public education for generations—and believe a collaborative relationship to be wise, pragmatic, and ultimately necessary. The late Appleton, Wisconsin, superintendent Tom Scullen supported charters within his district but cautioned, "Charter schooling will fail if it tries to become a second track of public education. There isn't enough money to support two systems." Deborah McGriff, executive vice president of Edison Schools and former Detroit superintendent, agrees: "Charters need to start thinking about how we move from suspicion and competition with districts to collaboration and cooperation."

This collaborative relationship is becoming institutionalized. The federal Charter School Program, which provides charter start-up funds, requires that states disseminate charters' best practices to districts. KIPP has an open-door policy for local teachers and principals; they are welcome to
visit and take away whatever lessons they can. Funders in particular are buying into this strategy. NewSchools Venture Fund, whose goal is to improve school districts, invests in charter entrepreneurs in the hope that they can “spark broader transformation in the public school system.” One of the Boston Foundation’s high priorities in its education giving is supporting the sharing of effective practices between chartered and traditional schools.

Though the move toward greater cooperation has emotional appeal, to embrace it you have to believe that districts, including major urban districts, are both willing and able to change and significantly improve student achievement at scale. Sadly, there is *prima facie* evidence that they are not. The achievement gap has been well documented for 40 years: in the Coleman Report, NAEP data, SAT scores, and state assessments. Given the threefold increase in per-pupil spending and countless policy changes, blue-ribbon panel recommendations, and foundation initiatives in the intervening years, it is undeniable that districts have already tried, or have been forced to try, to shape up.

Diane Ravitch recently reported in the *Education Gadfly* (June 7, 2007) on the disappointing achievement scores from New York City, whose much-heralded schools leader, Joel Klein, has implemented some of the nation’s most aggressive reforms. Ravitch found that during Klein’s five-year tenure academic gains have been smaller than during the previous five years and that the reading scores of cohorts of students are actually declining as they progress through the system. New York’s inability to improve despite major interventions is far from unique. NAEP’s Trial Urban District Assessment, which measured the performance of 11 large urban systems in 2005, provides compelling evidence of the futility of district-based reforms: even the highest-performing district studied (Charlotte) had only 29 percent of its 8th graders at or above proficient in reading.

It is unreasonable to believe that charter collaboration will significantly alter these stubbornly disappointing district results. High-performing low-income schools, though too rare, have been documented for decades, and yet their lessons have never been translated into comprehensive district improvement. This is despite major efforts to spread best practices widely, including the work of education schools and $15 billion spent annually on teacher professional development. All in all, the uncomfortable but unavoidable question for collaboration advocates becomes, why should charting invest in a strategy—helping major urban districts solve the achievement gap—that has consistently failed for 40 years when pursued by others?

Many strong believers in school choice, myself included, were convinced that the competitive pressure exerted by charters would lead to a renaissance in the traditional system. The vast district improvements we expected never materialized. The clearest evidence comes from Dayton, Ohio, and Washington, D.C., two cities with significant charter sectors.

In the nation’s capital, 26 percent of students attend one of the city’s 71 charter schools. The city’s charter sector is remarkably innovative and energetic, including such standouts as KIPP KEY Academy, the SEED School, and DC Prep. Nevertheless, the District’s traditional system remains among the very worst in the nation. Of the 11 cities participating in the NAEP Trial Urban District Assessment in 2005, Washington, D.C., had the lowest scores in math and reading in both grades tested. Among its 8th-grade students, only 12 percent reached proficiency in reading and 7 percent in math. A Progressive Policy Institute study of D.C.’s charter experience summarized the situation perfectly: “There is no
clear evidence that charter schools have had a direct impact on student achievement in DCPS schools or otherwise driven systemic reform."

Charters educate 28 percent of Dayton’s students. Last year, the district reached only one of 25 state indicators and failed to make AYP. Seventy and 56 percent of its 8th graders failed to reach proficiency in math and reading, respectively. Residents are understandably frustrated: a 2005 Fordham Foundation survey found that 69 percent of Dayton residents are in favor of either major change from the district or an entirely new education system.

Some studies, like those by Hoxby (see “Rising Tide,” research, Winter 2001) and by Holmes, Desimone, and Rupp (see “Friendly Competition,” research, Winter 2006) have found a small bump in a district’s achievement when it faces charter competition. Bifulco and Ladd (see “Results from the Tar Heel State,” research, Fall 2005) and Buddin and Zimmer, however, found none. There are legitimate disagreements about the influence of additional factors in these studies, such as the amount of competition, the policy environment, and the type of test data used. But when this research is considered alongside our other experience, the only fair conclusion is that competition hasn’t dramatically altered district performance for the better.

Charters have a positive effect. A growing number of districts are advertising for new students. In January 2006, the Boston Teachers Union and the district were in negotiations to spend $100,000 to promote the virtues of traditional public schools to families that are choosing charters. Also, in early 2006, the Cincinnati district sent letters and held information sessions designed to have charter families reenroll in traditional public schools. In May 2007, the St. Louis district awarded a no-bid contract to a marketing firm to “drive the message of the negative impact of charter schools.” Seemingly unable to improve results, districts rely on public relations to stem the migration of students to other schools.

Why is it that major urban school districts are unable to improve student learning at scale? A compelling argument, and a roadmap for charter schooling’s future, can be found in Ted Kolderie’s excellent and underappreciated book, Creating the Capacity for Change. Kolderie applies to K–12 education the lessons Harvard economist Clayton Christensen has drawn from the private sector. Christensen, studying how industries evolve and improve over time, found that critical advancements don’t come from old firms changing their ways. They come from new firms (or independent subsidiaries) entering the market, introducing new products and systems, and responding nimblly to the demands of consumers.

When an industry experiences a major change, existing firms find themselves unable to adjust to navigate the new world. Every aspect of its identity—culture, staffing, practices, priorities—was geared toward succeeding in the old environment. When the environment changes, it’s impossible for the horse and carriage to transform into a steam locomotive.

The implications for public education are profound. For 150 years, public schooling has been a one-factory town: a board- and superintendent-led district manages, staffs, and oversees an area’s entire portfolio of public schools. But in this time, the world has become a radically different place and the expectations of schools have changed even more. As Kolderie points out, if private firms, which are built to respond to competition, are unable to make this kind of leap, we can’t expect gigantic, Byzantine school systems, which are insular from competition, shackled by union contracts, and constrained by a sticky web of regulations, to do so.

The solution isn’t an improved traditional district; it’s an entirely different delivery system for public education: systems of charted schools.
A Transformed System
Charter advocates should strive to have every urban public school be a charter. That is, each school should have significant control over its curriculum, methods, budget, staff, and calendar. Each school should have a contract that spells out its mission and measurable objectives, including guaranteeing that all students achieve proficiency in basic skills. Each school should be held accountable by an approved public body.

"Charter" will no longer be seen as an adjective, a way to describe a type of school, but as a verb, an orderly and sensible process for developing, replicating, operating, overseeing, and closing schools. The system would be fluid, self-improving, and driven by parents and public authority, ensuring the system uses the best of market and government forces. Schools that couldn’t attract families would close, as would those that ran afoul of authorizers for academic, financial, or management failures. School startups, both the number and their characteristics, would reflect the needs of communities and the interests of students, but would also be tightly regulated to generate a high probability of school success.

So, while the government’s role would still be significant, it would no longer operate the city’s entire portfolio of public schools. Instead, it would take on a role similar to the FAA’s role in monitoring the airline industry or a health department’s monitoring of restaurants. Today, we take airline safety for granted and make our choices based on service, connections, and so on. Similarly, we know all restaurants have fire exits and meet food safety standards, so we choose based on our tastes and schedules. A well-regulated charter school system could guarantee that all public schools were providing a safe, high-quality education and properly managing operations, thereby allowing families to choose a school based on other criteria.

The government’s substantial oversight role in guaranteeing safety and quality would differentiate a charter system from a universal voucher program. To many, a voucher system would undesirably blur the lines between church and state, add the profit motive to schooling, remove the “public” from K–12 education, and leave too much to the vicissitudes of the market. By contrast, in a chartered system, public schools would be nonreligious, managed by nonprofits, overseen by a public authority, and held to clear performance standards.

But a chartered system would capitalize on market forces largely absent from district systems, such as constant innovation, competition, and replication. Replication is arguably the most valuable. Chartering has not only created some of America’s finest schools, it has enabled their leaders to identify the characteristics that made those schools so remarkable and then develop systems for creating additional, equally successful schools. In addition to well-known charter management organizations like KIPP, Achievement First, and Uncommon Schools, new ones continue to emerge: Green Dot, High Tech High, Aspire, Noble Street, IDEA, and more. Major funders like the Charter School Growth Fund and New Schools Venture Fund are helping other high-performing charters expand as well.

So how do we transform today’s urban district systems into chartered systems? Absent political realities, the shift could be quite simple. Any district could decide tomorrow to relinquish day-to-day control of its schools and develop performance contracts with each. Every school could develop its own governing board and acquire control of its budget, staffing, and curriculum. The district could then change from a central operator to an authorizer, monitoring schools, closing them when necessary, and allowing new ones to open. The “every school a charter school” idea is not new; others, most prominently Paul Hill of the Center on Reinventing Public Education, have been writing variations on this theme for some time.

Unfortunately, for reasons having more to do with power than student learning, this scenario is highly unlikely. Most districts assiduously avoid the loss of one school, let alone all schools. When one of Washington, D.C.’s highest-performing traditional public schools pursued plans to convert to a charter in 2006, the district agreed to several of its demands in exchange for the school’s agreement to stop farming with charter status. This spring, after faculty at Locke High School in Los Angeles signed petitions to convert into a Green Dot charter, district officials scrambled to put together a counterproposal and convinced some teachers to rescind their signatures.

No government entity likes to lose control of any of its components and the budget and prestige that go with them, especially when the loss suggests a failure by the organization. But shifting from an operator into an authorizer would mean cutting hundreds of central office jobs as well: since charters handle their own transportation, facilities, staffing, and more, district employees filling those responsibilities would become redundant. Such a shift, then, would be vigorously opposed by district staff and those who represent them. Countless powerful organizations, like unions, book publishers, and service providers, would also be adversely affected by a decentralized system of schools.

Clearly we can’t expect the political process to swiftly bring about charter districts in all of America’s big cities. However, if charter advocates carefully target specific systems with an exacting strategy, the current policy environment will allow them to create examples of a new, high-performing system of public education in urban America.

Here, in short, is one roadmap for chartering’s way forward: First, commit to drastically increasing the charter market share in a few select communities until it is the
replicating charter success
time.

A number of organizations are bringing chartering to the public sector by sharing services and practices among network members. Here are some results in the major management organizations and networks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>10 Schools</th>
<th>20 Schools</th>
<th>40 Schools</th>
<th>60 Schools</th>
<th>80 Schools</th>
<th>100 Schools</th>
<th>120 Schools</th>
<th>140 Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edison Schools</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hat Management</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine Schools</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools USA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdVista</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Picture Company</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspire Public Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCES: Organization networks, network schools.

The replication of high-performing schools, and the shuttering of low-performing schools.

As chartering increases its market share in a city, the district will come under growing financial pressure. The district, despite educating fewer and fewer students, will still require a large administrative staff to process payroll and benefits, administer federal programs, and oversee special education. With a lopsided adult-to-student ratio, the district’s per-pupil costs will skyrocket.

At some point along the district’s path from monopoly provider to financially unsustainable marginal player, the city’s investors and stakeholders—taxpayers, foundations, business leaders, elected officials, and editorial boards—are likely to demand fundamental change. That is, eventually the financial crisis will become a political crisis. If the district has progressive leadership, one of two best-case scenarios may result. The district could voluntarily begin the shift to an authorizer, developing a new relationship with its schools and reworking its administrative structure to meet the new conditions. Or, believing the organization is unable to make this change, the district could gradually transfer its schools to an established authorizer.

A more probable district reaction to the mounting pressure would be an aggressive political response. Its leadership team might fight for a charter moratorium or seek protection from the courts. Failing that, they might lobby for additional funding so the district could maintain its administrative structure despite the vast loss of students. Reformers should expect and prepare for this phase of the transition process.

In many ways, replacing the district system seems inconsiderable, almost heretical. Districts have existed for generations, and in many minds, the traditional system is synonymous with public education. However, the history of urban districts’ inability to provide a high-quality education to their low-income students is nearly as long. It’s clear that we need a new type of system for urban public education, one that is able to respond nimbly to great school success, chronic school failure, and everything in between. A chartered system could do precisely that.

Andy Smarick is former congressional aide and charter school founder. Until recently, he served as chief operating officer of the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools.
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THE FIELD OF HIGHER EDUCATION QUESTION

Please choose ONE of the following three options, and craft an analytical essay in response.

OPTION 1
The provost of Seton Hall is organizing an academic conference called “Higher Education in the 21st Century: Key Challenges.” As part of the overall program, he has invited you to write one of the papers to be presented during the conference. The provost has stipulated that your essay should clearly delineate one or two of what you believe are the biggest challenges facing higher education, along with some discussion of why you choose these particular challenges (over other possible choices).

OPTION 2
Recently, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching launched a five year research project, “Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID)” to explore restructuring doctoral programs to better prepare graduates. You have been asked to serve on the advisory board of the CID as a student representative for your institution. Discuss what you believe to be the primary purpose of doctoral education, identify a pressing issue concerning current doctoral education, and explain how doctoral education should be redirected. If you wish, you may choose to discuss doctoral education in a particular field, such as doctoral education in the field of higher education administration, or doctoral education in STEM disciplines (science, technology, engineering, and math).

OPTION 3
In his essay on college students, George Kuh asserts: “One of the few topics about which pundits, policy wonks, higher education scholars, and blue-ribbon panels agree is the subpar quality of undergraduate education.”¹

In a well-crafted essay, discuss the possible causes of this phenomenon. In addressing this question, consider the following:

- Over what period of time has the quality of undergraduate education been a subject of fierce critique?
- What is the exact nature of and evidence for the critiques of undergraduate education?
- What conditions have motivated the critiques?
- What would you propose as the appropriate action to take in response to these critiques?

Part IV. RESEARCH -- HRED

Based upon your degree,
Choose a Higher Education or K-12 Question

HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH QUESTION

Please choose ONE of the following two scenarios as the basis for your answer. Regardless of your choice, your response should:

**Explain (or “frame”) the underlying problem.** Be clear and concise, and keep in mind that without properly framing the research problem (*i.e.*, the subject of your empirical inquiry), it will be difficult to address subsequent tasks.

**Identify one or two critical research questions** that derive from the problem as you have explained it. Each question should be clearly and logically related to the problem.

Using one of those research questions, **develop a coherent research study.** Be sure to identify what specific data are required to answer the questions, the sources of those data, how the data will be obtained, and how they will be analyzed. Justify the effectiveness of this study in addressing the research questions. This methods discussion should be very precise and detailed, and should also compose the bulk of your response.

**SCENARIO 1**
University A is a comprehensive, public university. Over the past four years, the university has experienced a significant increase in faculty losses. In a presentation to the university’s Board of Trustees this July, the Chancellor and Provost resolved to do a better job on faculty retention in light of the recent phenomenon. They commissioned a study to be conducted. Your task is to design a research study that investigates this faculty retention issue at University A. Although you are not responsible for drafting an entire proposal (*e.g.*, you are not responsible for a literature review), you should formulate a coherent and logical study.

**OR**

**SCENARIO 2**
The Peralta community college district consists of 3 community colleges in the same metropolitan region. Concerned with the relatively low numbers of first-semester students who actually complete their first-semester courses, the district has commissioned you to investigate the issue. District administrators believe that many graduates of the surrounding high schools decide to attend colleges in the district, then change their minds early on in the first semester. However, this is an untested theory, and may not prove to be true. Your task is to design a research study that is both coherent and logical in approach.
K-12 RESEARCH QUESTION

The Research question is based upon instruction, discussions and assignments from the Directed Research Course. The material in the exam could relate either to research in general, or to a more specific ‘Type’ of research, such as evaluation research, action research, etc. You should draw upon your own experience and knowledge in establishing the Problem and related Questions (avoid yes/no questions).

1. Develop a problem statement based on the need to understand what factors induce beginning principals to leave the principalship after one year in the job.
   - The problem statement should define the scope (magnitude) and the precise nature of the problem, as well as the usefulness of framing the problem in this form.

2. Develop research questions that derive logically from the problem statement.

3. Explain what type of design you might choose to structure your inquiry. Why would this design be appropriate?

4. Describe who would be studied, how subjects would be selected, what questions would be asked, how the data will be collected and what data analysis procedures will be used.
PART V. STATISTICS

HIGHER EDUCATION QUALIFYING EXAM
Answer ALL Questions

Statistical Analysis Questions
Answer all of the following questions. Fully explain your rationale for interpreting the statistical information. The following background is provided as a context for all questions and analyses that follow. Any similarities to real programs and or data are purely coincidental and are not intended as factual.

Background:
In a recent Wall Street Journal article, author John Hechinger (2008), asserted that "high-school students' performance on SAT college-entrance exams stalled, and the gap widened between low-scoring minority groups and the overall population, raising questions about the quality of teaching in U.S. schools" (WSJ, August 29, 2008, p.D1). Despite the efforts of American schools to respond to the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation the controversy associated with standardized and criterion testing continues.

Average scores for the class of 2008 were reported to be 502 for the critical-reading section, 515 for mathematics and 494 for writing. Each of the three numbers was identical to the averages in 2007. The reading scores of the past two years were the lowest since 1994. Math represented the worst showing since 2001. Each section is judged on a 200- to 800-point scale.

The recent emphasis on the use of data to inform and guide instruction has caused many high school districts to implement new programs and to collect and analyze data in an effort to gain a better understanding of student performance at the local level. The later years of high school and the first year of post-secondary education have received considerable attention as students transition from secondary schools to post-secondary institutions.
Question #1

A local New Jersey principal was asked by her superintendent to complete a correlation analysis between the combined math and reading scores her graduating seniors received on their New Jersey High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA) taken in the spring 2007 and their combined mathematics and critical reading Scholastic Aptitude test results taken six months later in fall 2007. Complete a thorough review of the SPSS Correlation analysis below. Be certain to report and interpret all essential components of a correlation analysis. What does the following output reveal to you with respect to the correlation between HSPA and SAT scores for this local school district?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAT Math &amp; Critical Reading Combined Scores - Fall 2007</th>
<th>HSPA Combined Math and Reading Scores - Spring 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math &amp; Critical Reading Combined Scores - Fall 2007</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSPA Combined Math and Reading Scores - Spring 2007</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question #2
After reviewing the correlation analysis, the superintendent was interested to see how his students did on average when compared to the national SAT average which was reported to be 1017. The principal was asked to interpret the following SPSS output with respect to how her students performed on average as compared to the national mean score for the spring 2008. He knew that his students had historically performed below the national norm but he wasn’t certain if this underperformance was statistically significant. He solicited the assistance of his principal who prepared the following chart. Complete a thorough analysis of this data and comment on what leadership, management and/or policy decisions could be made from this data?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Sample Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math &amp; Critical Reading Combined Scores - Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Value = 1017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>t</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math &amp; Critical Reading Combined Scores - Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question #3

The Board of Education listened attentively to the presentation by both the principal and the superintendent with regard to the test results of their students. However, during the presentation one of the BOE members made the claim that the school was sliding and noted that the 2008 mean score was lower than the 2007 mean score. The superintendent and principal were then questioned about these results and asked to comment on this assertion. A copy of the SPAA analysis comparing the mean score of 2008 graduates (N=180) and the 2007 graduates (N=171) is listed below. Complete a thorough analysis of this data and comment on what leadership, management and/or policy decisions could be made from this data? How should the administration respond to the outspoken BOE member?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping (1)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math &amp; Critical Reading Combined Scores - Fall 2007</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1003.5444</td>
<td>27.32718</td>
<td>2.03685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1007.9474</td>
<td>23.77746</td>
<td>1.81831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math &amp; Critical Reading Combined Scores - Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question #4

One of the action plan activities that grew out of an analysis of the 2007 SAT and HSPA test results involved an intense intervention program of remedial instruction in the area of mathematics. Students who participated in the program, took a practice HSPA test in the fall of 2007 and then took the official HSPA in the spring of their senior year. Only 60 students participated in this “after school program” but for those who volunteered, it was hoped that this would improve their scores. An SPSS data summary is listed below. Please complete an analysis of the SPSS printout including comments on policy, practice and future research as it relates to this math remedial program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>HSPA Post-test Scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HSPA Pre-test Scores</td>
<td>241.77</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.743</td>
<td>2.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>229.68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.075</td>
<td>2.463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>HSPA Post-test Scores - HSPA Pre-test Scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>