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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

"What a person thinks on his own, without being stimulated by the thoughts of others, is, even in the best case, rather paltry and monotonous."

--Albert Einstein

There have been many calls for reform in educational administration over the past years. These calls focused on a variety of perceived program needs during the 1980’s: the need for a concentrated period of study/preparation for students, the need for meaningful student/faculty interaction, the need for continuity and relevance in course and field experiences, and the need for higher program standards (Norton, 1995). Among the various program changes associated with the reform movement was the establishment of student cohorts in administrator preparation programs. By definition a cohort is a “band of persons” who come together generally for a common purpose. Achilles (1994) contends that the “cohort model” used in educational preparation programs was influenced by the “Cooperative Program in Educational Administration,” in the 1940’s and the Culbertson report, “Preparing Educational Leaders in the Seventies.” Achilles (1994) notes that cohorts in educational administration began to prosper in the 1960’s, but many of these early attempts did not flourish. Basom, Yerkes, Norris and Barnett (1995) note that the broader societal climate within the field of school leadership at this time was characterized by a reactive, authoritarian view of management. School administrators were typically recognized as the single leaders of their schools or districts. Therefore, those educational administration preparation programs that incorporated cohorts in order to encourage a cooperative collegial culture were directly challenging the trend toward rationality, order and control. Given the prevailing view of school administration during
that era, it is not surprising that many of the earliest efforts to create cohorts were not sustained.

During the 1980's the cohort concept in educational administration preparation programs was revived. University programs affiliated with the Danforth Foundation's Preparation Program for School Principals elected to prepare students using the cohort format. Although these programs were not specifically required to use the cohort arrangement, Weise (1992) reported that this structure provided university faculty with a convenient mechanism for selecting students and delivering a coherent, integrated curriculum. "Taking Stock," a summary report on the Danforth programs for the preparation of school administrators, authored by Corderio, Parks, Krueger, Restine and Wilson (1991) states that "effective use of cohort groups encourages students to become critical thinkers" (p. 20).

Basom, et. al.(1995) believes that today's preparation programs that use a cohort arrangement will not disintegrate as past programs did. Basom, et. al. (1995) points to the different societal context that exist today in schools -- one characterized by shared leadership. Hallinger (1992) describes these new educational administrators as "transformational leaders." Transformational leaders, Hallinger notes, must define the need for change, create new visions, mobilize commitment to those visions and ultimately transform the organization. Tichy and Devanna (1992) contend that transformational leadership is a process capable of being learned. Therefore successful leadership preparation programs will need to provide school administrators with skills to meet the challenges for creating collaborative, collegial learning environments. This present study is conducted under the assumption that the cohort method of study, which emphasizes
cooperation and group effort, rather than the traditional method of study, which emphasizes individualism and competition, better facilitates the accomplishment of this goal.

Statement of the Problem

Is using a “cohort model” a growing trend in doctoral programs in educational administration? This study will examine the concept of doctoral cohorts in educational administrative preparation programs in a comprehensive manner using descriptive statistics. In 1996, 494 institutions of higher education offered graduate courses in school administration (Peterson's Guide to Graduate Education, 1996). In the Spring of 1995 The University Council for Educational Administration, commissioned M. Scott Norton, from Arizona State University, to initiate a study of cohort usage in UCEA member institutions. Fifty-four UCEA member institutions were surveyed. Of the forty-three that responded 30, or 70%, noted that they utilized cohorts in their preparation programs for school administrators (Norton, 1995).

The purpose of this descriptive study is to expand on the work done by the UCEA and Norton at Arizona State University. This comprehensive study will determine what percentage of universities presently offering doctoral programs offer them in the cohort format. This study will likewise determine if universities with educational administration or educational leadership departments are offering doctoral students a choice of attending classes in the traditional format or the cohort format. This study will then compare and contrast the use of the cohort model in educational administration doctoral programs.

Primary Question

What percentage of universities surveyed offer educational administrative preparation programs in cohort format?
Research Questions

The specific research questions to be addressed in this study are:

1. How many universities offer a doctoral cohort program in their educational administration department?
2. How many universities offer both a traditional and a cohort doctoral program?
3. Do universities perceive the cohort program as draining or enhancing the traditional program?
4. Is the content of the cohort program similar to the content of the traditional program?
5. How often do universities begin a new cohort?
6. During what semester do universities typically begin a new cohort?
7. How many students are typically admitted into each cohort?
8. When are classes held?
9. Are cohort members typically required to complete all coursework in cohort format?
10. What percentage of the coursework are students required to take in cohort format?
11. What is the scheduled length of the coursework in the cohort program?
12. Do students typically begin writing their dissertation after the coursework is completed or while they are completing the required coursework?
13. If students begin writing their dissertation after the required coursework is completed, how long does it typically take to a student to finish their dissertation and graduate?
14. What criteria does the department utilize for student admission into the cohort program? What is the minimum GRE or MAT score acceptable for admission?
15. What methods are used to help bond members of the cohort?
16. What is the cost of the cohort program and how are students charged?
17. What items are included in the cost of the doctoral cohort program?

18. What percentage of the program do full time and adjunct faculty teach?

19. When examining full time faculty, is the doctoral cohort teaching assignment considered part of their full time load or overload?

20. What incentives if any, are provided to faculty for cohort teaching or mentoring?

21. Other than courses, what are the cohort programs graduation requirements?

22. If a formal dissertation is required, how difficult is it to engage mentors?

23. What percentage of assignments given to cohort members are group assignments, compared to individual assignments?

24. How much of a problem is assessing individual effort in group work?

25. Do universities employ e-mail or other forms of electronic communication in their cohort program?

26. How long is the prescribed time from beginning the cohort program to receiving the degree?

27. What percentage of the students completes the program in the prescribed time?

28. How long does it typically take students who do not graduate in the prescribed time, to complete their degree?

29. When students do not graduate in the prescribed time, what factors are perceived as being the primary obstacles?

30. What percentage of students never complete their degree?

31. How is the cohort program marketed?

32. What form does advertising take?

33. How much is budgeted annually for marketing?
34. Is the cohort concept being more widely adopted?

35. Has the cohort concept improved the quality of the overall program in educational administration?

36. What is the perception of the student's assessment of the cohort program?

37. Among students what carry-over experiences have been observed that can be attributed to the cohort concept?

38. What is the perception of the faculty's assessment of the cohort program?

39. Among faculty, what carry-over experiences have been observed that can be attributed to the cohort concept?

40. How are universities that offer cohort doctoral programs funded?

41. What is perceived as the primary strength of the cohort program?

42. What is perceived as the primary weakness of the cohort program?

Significance of the Study

Before the recent revival of cohort programs in educational administration there was only one traditional route for students to receive their doctoral degree in educational leadership. Now many universities offer a choice. Students may receive their degree in educational administration in the traditional format or in the cohort format. A study comparing and contrasting the use of the cohorts in educational administration preparation programs will draw an overall picture of the "perceived success" of this initiative. It will also lead to the sharing of ideas and the betterment of existing and future programs.

Limitations of the Study

There are certain limitations to this study, as recognized by the research, in terms of its applicability of results. Because this study is limited to the doctoral administrative
preparation programs surveyed, the information may not be applicable to the general university population.

Also, with the use of a survey instrument, this researcher would caution that there are a number of inherent limitations. Responses are only available from those institutions that elected to respond. The survey instrument also requested that the respondent answer questions based on their perceptions. Naturally, individuals perceive situations differently.

Definition of Terms

Within this study, terms are utilized that may not be familiar to the reader or are subject to interpretation. In order to minimize confusion over key terms, the following definitions are provided.

Closed or Pure Cohort—Students take all of their coursework together in a prearranged sequence.

Cohort—A group of students who engage in a program of studies together and generally share a set of classes and experiences.

Comprehensive Exam—An examination, written or oral, in the field of study.

Course—A required class for degree completion.


Doctoral Program—A program offered by a university that grants students either an Ed.D. or a Ph.D. degree.

Educational Administration—A program for students that seek to exercise administrative leadership in educational institutions.

Faculty—Instructors in the cohort program.
Fluid or Course by Course Cohort—Students may join the cohort at different times rather than at only an entry point.

Mentor—Faculty member assigned to work with doctoral student on a dissertation.

Open or Mixed Cohort—Students enroll in a core set of classes together and take additional coursework to meet their own needs.

Traditional Program—Students select appropriate courses and proceed through a program at their own pace.

Organization of the Study

This study will be organized into five chapters. Chapter I, “Introduction,” offers an introduction, statement of the problem, research questions, significance of the study and its limitations, and definition of the terms used throughout the paper.

Chapter II, “Review of the Literature,” deals with the related literature about the history of administrative preparation cohort groups in the context of the educational reform movement and the use of the cohort structure in educational administration preparation programs. Literature about group learning and adult learning in relationship to the cohort model is also reviewed.

Chapter III, “Methodology,” gives an overview of the study and describes the subjects, survey instrument, rationale for utilization of a mail survey, pilot study, and research procedures. Types of data analysis to be used in evaluating the significance are described.

Chapter IV, “Results,” describes the results of the investigation. Included in this chapter is an explanation of the findings, response rate and an analysis of the data.
Chapter V, "Conclusions" summarizes the purpose of the study, the research questions, discusses the findings, and describes a typical doctoral cohort program. It will also include recommendations for future research.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

The History of Cohort Groups in the Context of Educational Administration Reform

The field of educational administration has been subject to much criticism recently and thus reformist are looking for ways to improve preparation programs for potential and practicing school administrators. Recommendations have stemmed from the many reports that have studied educational administration. This chapter will chronologically review these reports and give a historical perspective on cohort usage during these reforms.

These reports include:

1. The Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, CPEA (1950-1959)
2. The Ford Sponsored Inter-University Project of IUP-II (1961-1967)
3. The Culberston Report (December 1969)

This chapter will also review that literature that deals with effective groups. Since a "cohort" has been defined as a band of persons who come together for a common purpose, it is essential to review the literature that examines the elements of a well functioning group.
This chapter also addresses adult learning theories and concepts. Since all educational administration preparation cohorts are comprised of adults, adult learning theory is relevant.

Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA) 1950-1959

CPEA was a program that had substantial influence in preparation of education administrators in the 1950’s and 1960’s. Some of the CPEA legacy includes full-time study, use of professors from other fields, a core of courses taught by several professors, and as Davies (1989-1990) contends “some idea of cohorts.” The CPEA program touched most administrator preparation programs during the 1950’s. Columbia, Harvard, Ohio State, Texas, Sanford, George Peabody, Oregon and Chicago were the centers. Achilles (1994) states that “the CPEA spawned the formation of the UCEA (University Council of Educational Administration) an elite institutional-member organization for departments of educational administration” (p. 6).

When Davies was questioned by Achilles about the best element of the CPEA program at Columbia he replied in a personal communication, (November 1988) “perhaps the best element of the Columbia CPEA experience was the large study room where students could sit and talk, occasionally joined by faculty...” (p. 25). CPEA funding ended in 1959 but clearly the first ideas of using student cohort groups had been spawned.

The Ford-Sponsored Inter-University Project of IUP-II (1961-1967)

The Ford Foundation sponsored IUP-II was begun in 1961 at the University of Buffalo. The Educational Professions Development Act, PL 90-35 (amended to PL 89-329) generated interest by providing stipends to full-time students whom participated in the program. Achilles (1994) notes that although the IUP-II primarily emphasized the
year-long internship and change at school sites, other CPEA ideas were adopted. Full-
time residencies, interdisciplinary work, cooperation among universities, group-process
work, and a concept of “cohortness” were key components of the IUP-II of the 1960’s.
Achilles (1994) notes that the difference between the IUP-II Program and the CPEA
program was their focus. The CPEA focused squarely on the superintendent while the
IUP-II Program had a broader scope emphasizing the improvement of all levels of
practitioners: superintendents, urban administrators, change agents and, principals.
Achilles and Hughes (1972) note that one EDPA project LEAP (Leadership for Education
in Appalachia Project, funded by EPDA) included an intensive 4-week live-in seminar and
a “paired team” to help with socialization and induction. The literature reflects that
cohorts were the respected mode of delivery during the 1960’s.

The Culbertson Report (December 1969)

The Culbertson Report, Preparing Educational Leaders for the 1970’s, written by
Culbertson, Farquhar, Gaynor and Shibiles (1969), was developed from a review of the
literature and from questionnaire responses. Like the CPEA Programs, it was aimed at
superintendents. Culbertson et al. (1969) developed a paradigm, a ten component
framework, around which to organize educational administrative study. The framework
describes the major elements of preparation for school administrators. Achilles (1994)
notes that this framework, even today, “seems eminently sensible.” Achilles (1994) also
notes that Culbertson was executive director of the UCEA at the time of the report. Thus
it could be ascertained that the superintendents surveyed in the Culbertson Report of 1969
were superintendents trained in CPEA or UCEA programs that used the “cohort
approach.”
National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration or NCEA (1987-88)

The 1987 NCEA report, *Leaders for America’s Schools*, authored by Griffiths, Forsyth and Stout, gave rise to a National Policy Board which tried to consolidate administrator groups that had drifted apart in the 1970’s and 1980’s. The NCEA and NPB endorsements again, were similar to the CPEA, IUP-II and Culbertson recommendations. But the one recommendation derived from this report that remained constant was the recommendation to establish and use learning teams.

American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education or AACTE 1989 and The National Policy Board (NPB)

Shibles’ 1988 report, *School Leadership Preparation: A Preface for Action*, reflected again, similar recommendations as the past CPEA Program, the IUP-II Program and the Culbertson Report. Achilles (1994) notes that these similarities may be due to the fact that Shibles, author of the AACT report was a co-author on the Culberston report.

The National Policy for Educational Administration report, *Improving the Preparation for School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform*, (1989) lists recommendations similar to the before mentioned reports. One recommendation of interest to this author is for “long term relationship” between students and professors.

Danforth Initiatives (1986-1992)

Since 1986, the Danforth Foundation has provided grants to 22 universities to develop and implement innovative programs through the Danforth Program for the Preparation of School Principals (Corderio et al., 1991). The Danforth Programs seek to link practice, knowledge and theory in the preparation of school leaders. One of the core
elements of these programs is the use of the cohort model for participants. Corderio et al. (1991) reports that the average student cohort size in participating universities is 30. Danforth participants work schedules are also accommodated through offering instruction in the late afternoon, evening, at night and on weekends. Corderio’s summary report of the Danforth Programs, Taking Stock, reports that 75% of the Danforth participants are enrolled in master’s, educational specialist or doctoral degrees. Corderio et al. (1991) summary report also noted that the 22 participating universities unanimously agreed that “the cohort group is an effective element for an educational leadership model” (p. 20). Corderio et al. (1991) note that typically, these groups range between 10 and 25 students who remain together for 12 to 18 months before graduating with a degree. His research has also determined that three-fourths of the students in the Danforth Foundation Programs are female.

Danforth Programs are designed to produce graduates who possess the knowledge, skills and abilities to be effective leaders for the improvement of educational outcomes. Program graduates are viewed as needing skills in directing, involving and developing others. One of the accomplishments listed by Corderio and associates (1991) summary report of the Danforth Programs is “effective use of cohort groups encourages students to become critical thinker” (p. 20). Achilles (1994) notes that the Danforth Foundation Programs have “generated excitement” in participating universities. He also states, “The idea that all this excitement is just over preparation reform is shortsighted. At issue are key elements of education reform and the leadership of America’s schools” (p. 20).
Effective Groups

Yerkes, Basom, Barnett and Norris (1995) state that “in order to recognize, and perhaps develop, a successful cohort, an examination of the factors that combine to characterize a well-functioning group may be useful” (p. 9). Zander (1994) defines a group as “a set of persons who interact with and depend on each other— who collaborate and behave in ways that suit mutual expectations” (p. 5). Johnson & Johnson (1987) define a group as two or more individuals, who interact, are interdependent, share common norms, and pursue individual as well as group goals. It becomes clear in comparing these two definitions that the basis of group effectiveness is “interdependence” (Forsyth, 1990). Johnson and Johnson (1987) speculate that positive interdependence among the members of a group encourages emotional interaction, which results in elevated emotional involvement in learning.

The literature on group development suggests that interdependence results when group members (1) have a common purpose, (2) influence each other through social interaction, and (3) are allowed to pursue individual and group learning opportunities (Johnson & Johnson, 1987; Brilhart & Galanes, 1992).

Larson and LaFasto (1989) note that groups become cohesive when their purpose is clear and acted upon. Larson and LaFasto (1989) contend that when the purpose of the group is clear, a group has a greater probability of success. Basom, Yerkes, Norris and Barnett (1996) suggest the following activities to assist a cohort in defining its purpose:

1. Allow cohort members to set group goals, to determine activities to achieve goals, and to establish criteria for establishing success.
2. Use individual learning plans, action research projects, case studies, simulations and collaborative projects with school districts.

Similarly, Zander (1994) notes four qualities that are necessary for a group to become strong: 1) the members must depend on each other and be able to count on one another's actions, 2) the members must be able to interact freely, 3) the members must want to remain as members, and 4) the group must have the power to exert influence. Members also need to understand what each is saying or doing within the group and why. Such understanding are fostered by creating a cooperative relationship among participants.

Zander notes that all collections of people are not necessarily groups. Thus students that happen to share the same space, assignments and professors are not necessarily cohorts. Yerkes, Basom, Barnett and Norris (1995) note that the development of an effective cohort requires more. Specifically, Yerkes and associates (1995) note that facilitators need to provide a planned set of activities and create a collegial learning atmosphere.

Zander (1994) suggests there are four circumstances that must exist before a group can be formed.

1. Conditions in the environment or in the lives of potential joiners are unsatisfactory or suggest opportunity for desirable change.

2. Organizers conceive of a more satisfactory state of affairs.

3. Members believe they can achieve a more satisfactory state of affairs through activities of the group.

4. Conditions surrounding the unit encourage persons to establish a group and to take part in its activities.
Basom, Yerkes, Norris and Barnett (1996) suggest that during the cohort selection process candidates be asked about their motives and aspirations for participating in a cohort. Barnett and Muse (1993) contend that many students in educational administration programs chose to participate in cohorts because of their preference for working collaboratively. By screening and selecting students who have similar expectations and commitments, faculty ensures the potential for cohesive and interdependent groups.

Zander (1994) notes that members enter a cooperative relationship because their aims for themselves and the group are alike. Deutsch (1990) contends that members who work to benefit themselves in a cooperative group benefit others as well. Yerkes, Basom, Barnett and Norris (1995) contend that it is essential for facilitators of a cohort to ensure that group processes both assist individuals in realizing their potential and assist the group in achieving goals. Forsyth (1990) recommends that throughout the group experience opportunities for individual learning and collective group development are essential if group members are to become interdependent.

Yerkes, Basom, Barnett and Norris (1995) recommend a variety of instructional strategies that are supportive of individual learning and group development. Additionally, they note that activities that nurture individual growth encourage self-evaluation, self-initiation, self-confidence, risk taking and experimentation. Writing in reflective journals, developing individual learning plans, and creating professional portfolios are a part of self-evaluation. Further more they allege that portfolios and individual learning plans also stimulate self-initiation. When students apply their latest skills in fieldwork experiences, as well as their classes, and have the occasion to consider accomplishments and downfalls
their self-confidence is enhanced. Risk taking and experimentation are encouraged when students partake in formulating course goals and evaluation methods, work collaboratively on activities, present their projects, platforms or findings to their colleagues, and establish norms under which the class operates.

Merriam and Caffarella (1991) emphasize that when group members influence the activities and substance of discussion, participate in organization, develop goals, and evaluate results, and when these activities occur in a climate of mutual support and warmth, chances of the group’s accomplishment of its goals are enhanced.

One who accepts membership in a group may have to forgo a part in other bodies or activities. Thus, a joiner decides whether the entity at hand or another unit or program is more attractive or a better place to spend time. Scott (1965) notes that a person will stay in a group if it is more attractive than comparable opportunities and will resign if competing memberships or duties become more appealing. Scott (1965) also notes that an individual is more likely to join a group and prize that membership, if the values of other members are similar to theirs. Thus it can be implied that faculty assembling a cohort be cognizant of these theories.

This explanation of why members join groups, and what characterizes an effective group may be inferred to be prerequisites for developing successful cohorts, and are therefore of particular importance to faculty who are facilitating cohorts of students. An effective cohort, like an effective group will usually not be shaped and mature unaided.
Cohort Groups and Adult Learning

Cohort groups directly address some of the important conceptual principles of adult learning and development. Knowles (1980) contends that while individual learning activities are important, ultimately the organization of these activities can create an environment that either facilitates or inhibits learning.

Barnett and Muse (1993) address four factors of adult learning that are relevant to cohort learning: 1) affiliation among students, 2) learning from others, 3) participation in decision making and 4) the role of the instructor.

Darkenwald (1989) notes that adults enjoy relating to one another and forming meaningful personal relationships. Beer and Darkenwald (1989) note that this affiliation has been found to be a powerful motivator of adult learning, especially for females. Clear evidence of this trend is supported by Corderio et al. (1991) who note that three fourths of the Danforth Foundation Program students are women. Knowles (1980) suggests that learning activities that many cohort programs utilize early in the students' experience should provide ample opportunities for them to get to know one another. Knowles (1980) recommends that these concentrated periods of time together allow students to develop a respect for and an appreciation of the different personalities of the group. Yerkes, Basom, Barnett & Norris (1995) report on the progress that some cohort administrative preparation programs have made in the domain of affiliation. Such affiliation activities include dinner meetings, residential retreats, participation in field trips, cultural events, adventure challenges, and the use of life maps. They endorse the use of these activities when a cohort is being formed thus allowing students to develop strong affiliations, and a foundation of trust that encourages future social interactions.
Because of strong affiliations that develop among adults in a cohort group, Barnett and Muse (1993) suggest that students are more likely to view the other group members as resources and to feel less isolated. Kathrein (1981) has discovered that adults have been found to be powerful resources to one another by engaging in informal discussions, establishing learning cliques, expressing themselves freely and having ready access to information. Barnett and Muse (1993) recommend that initial cohort group learning activities should “develop mutual trust and respect among group members” (p. 405). Barnett and Muse (1993) emphasize that as students become more comfortable with each other, “they are willing to share information and expertise, to engage in joint learning projects, and to interact socially and professionally outside the confines of the program” (p. 407). Yerkes, et. al. note that because of the isolation of the school principalship, “learning to work in a supportive way with colleagues can be a valuable asset to school administrators as they proceed through their careers” (p. 410).

A growing number of adult educators (Darkenwald, 1987; Ennis, 1989; Knowles, 1980) emphasize the need for participants in an instructional setting to have some control over both the content of the learning experience and the group’s decision making processes. The ability to influence activities and topics of discussion, participate in the decision-making process, develop goals, implement activities and evaluate outcomes positively contributes to an adult’s sense of ownership and commitment. Barnett and Muse (1993) recommend that cohort groups be permitted to engage in meaningful decision making. Students should have some control in directing their own learning, rather than being entirely dependent on university faculty to dictate all the learning objectives.
Instructors in the cohort learning model often need to alter their instructional strategies. Educators contend that instructors need to facilitate learning in classrooms. (Merriman and Caffarella, 1991; Murphy, 1990). In attempting to encourage this facilitative role, the organizers of the Danforth Foundation Program selected the term “facilitator” for university faculty involved in the project (Cordiero, 1987). Ennis (1989) discovered that if instructors are open to student-centered discussions, that adults are not only willing to share more information, but also find these discussions to be more relevant to their real world situations. Yerkes, Basom, Barnett and Norris (1995) suggest that effective facilitators should know that it is important to develop an open learning climate where social interaction is encouraged. Forsyth (1990) contends that an authoritarian tone on the part of the instructor can stifle interaction, while a supportive climate of respect, openness and acceptance can facilitate quality interaction.

Clearly, cohort usage has filtered in and out of administrative preparation programs for the past decade. Usage has never completely disappeared, but also has never soared.

This researcher contends that a descriptive study of the present usage of cohorts in educational administrative preparation programs, plus knowledge on group interaction and adult learning will spark interest in the rejuvenation of an educational sound paradigm.
Chapter III
METHODOLOGY

Overview

The intent of this study is to examine the cohort model of study used in doctoral administrator preparation programs. The universities surveyed in this study are the 494 universities listed in Peterson's Guide to Graduate Programs in Educational Administration (Peterson, 1996). In the spring of 1995 a similar but less comprehensive survey, conducted by M. Scott Norton from Arizona State University surveyed UCEA member institutes about the use of student cohorts. That survey concentrated on the program structure and admission criteria, where this survey will examine cohort usage in a comprehensive manner. The survey this researcher uses will be based on the Norton survey (Appendix G) and will be referred to as the Modified Norton Survey. The procedures employed in this study are discussed in this chapter under the following headings: Subjects, Instrument, Rationale for Utilization of a Mail Survey, Pilot Study, Research Procedures, and Data Analysis.

Subjects

The subjects of this study are educational administration chairs or coordinators that replied "yes" to the initial mail solicitation asking the question, "Do you administer a cohort doctoral program and are you willing to complete a brief survey identifying specific characteristics of the program?"
Instrument

The survey instrument used in this study, henceforth known as "The Modified Norton Survey" (Appendix E) was adapted by this researcher and is based upon the survey developed by M. Scott Norton in the Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Arizona State University (Norton, 1995).

Rationale for Utilization of a Mail Survey

A mail survey was used to obtain data for this study. It is economical, assures anonymity, and permits the use of standardized questions. A mail survey also allows for the collection of data from a number of subjects simultaneously. Because of the large population and the geographic distribution of the universities, personal interviews were not feasible.

Pilot Study

In order to determine if the adapted questionnaire developed for this survey would be clear to respondents, the instrument was piloted with a group of expert professors who direct doctoral cohort programs. These experts participating in the pilot test were asked for feedback on reworking items, adding new items and for other suggestions that might improve the validity of the instrument (Appendix D). The instrument was then modified to include their recommendations for improvement.

Research Procedure

Four hundred ninety-six universities were identified as having departments of educational administration. Each of these 496 department chairs were mailed a letter of solicitation (Appendix A), a self-addressed, stamped postcard (Appendix B) and a Seton Hall Doctoral Program Brochure. The letter of solicitation introduced the researcher and
explained the purpose of the study. The postcard inquired if the institution had a doctoral cohort program in educational administration and if the respondents were willing to complete a brief survey identifying specific characteristics of the program. Sixty-eight universities responded by postcard that they had a doctoral cohort program and were willing to fill out a brief survey identifying specific characteristics of their programs. These 68 universities became the subject universities and were sent the survey instrument to fill out. Another letter of introduction and solicitation (Appendix C) and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were included with the survey instrument. The researcher thanked the participants for their participation and offered to share the results of the study upon completion.

After three weeks a follow-up letter was mailed to those subject universities that had not responded to the first mailing. Another survey was enclosed. Completed surveys were entered into a database to facilitate statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

Quantitative and qualitative data were requested from each respondent to identify characteristics of their specific doctoral cohort program. To analyze the quantitative data the software program Microsoft Access was selected for its ease in performing spreadsheet functions and sorting data according to various classifications. To aid in the analysis of the data the software program SPSS/PC+ was selected for performing frequency distributions. Descriptive statistical analyses were applied upon return of the surveys. The analyses were used to summarize the following:

1. How many universities offer a doctoral cohort program in their educational administration department?
2. How many universities offer both a traditional and a cohort doctoral program?

3. Do universities perceive the cohort program as draining or enhancing the traditional program?

4. Is the content of the cohort program similar to the content of the traditional program?

5. How often do universities begin a new cohort?

6. During what semester do universities typically begin a new cohort?

7. How many students are typically admitted into each cohort?

8. When are classes held?

9. Are cohort members typically required to complete all coursework in cohort format?

10. What percentage of the coursework are students required to take in cohort format?

11. What is the scheduled length of the coursework in the cohort program?

12. Do students typically begin writing their dissertation after the coursework is completed or while they are completing the required coursework?

13. If students begin writing their dissertation after the required coursework is completed, how long does it typically take to a student to finish their dissertation and graduate?

14. What criteria does the department utilize for student admission into the cohort program? What is the minimum GRE or MAT score acceptable for admission?

15. What methods are used to help bond members of the cohort?

16. What is the cost of the cohort program and how are students charged?

17. What items are included in the cost of the doctoral cohort program?

18. What percentage of the program does full time and adjunct faculty teach?

19. When examining full time faculty, is the doctoral cohort teaching assignment considered part of their full time load or overload?
20. What incentives if any, are provided to faculty for cohort teaching or mentoring?
21. Other than courses, what are the cohort programs graduation requirements?
22. If a formal dissertation is required, how difficult is it to engage mentors?
23. What percentage of assignments given to cohort members are group assignments, compared to individual assignments?
24. How much of a problem is assessing individual effort in group work?
25. Do universities employ e-mail or other forms of electronic communication in their cohort program?
26. How long is the prescribed time from beginning the cohort program to receiving the degree?
27. What percentage of the students completes the program in the prescribed time?
28. How long does it typically take students who do not graduate in the prescribed time, to complete their degree?
29. When students do not graduate in the prescribed time, what factors are perceived as being the primary obstacles?
30. What percentage of students never complete their degree?
31. How is the cohort program marketed?
32. What form does advertising take?
33. How much is budgeted annually for marketing?
34. Is the cohort concept being more widely adopted?
35. Has the cohort concept improved the quality of the overall program in educational administration?
36. What is the perception of the student’s assessment of the cohort program?
37. Among students what carry-over experiences have been observed that can be attributed to the cohort concept?

38. What is the perception of the faculty's assessment of the cohort program?

39. Among faculty, what carry-over experiences have been observed that can be attributed to the cohort concept?

40. How are universities that offer cohort doctoral programs funded?

41. What is perceived as the primary strength of the cohort program?

42. What is perceived as the primary weakness of the cohort program?
Chapter IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Findings

This chapter is a presentation of the data from this study and an analysis of the results. This chapter will examine each of the forty-two research questions and the individual responses. Each of the research questions will be represented by a narrative of the findings and a table depicting a chart of the frequency of responses. When appropriate a graph will be shown portraying these same frequencies.

Response Rate

The data for this survey was collected during April, May and June of 1998. Four hundred ninety-four letters of solicitation were mailed with return postcards to chairs' of educational administration departments inquiring if they had a cohort doctoral program. The response rate was three hundred eleven, or 62%. Of the 311 responses, 68 universities stated that they had a cohort doctoral program and were willing to fill out a survey about the program. Thus, these 68 universities became the subject universities in this study. These 68 universities were mailed the survey prepared by the researcher along with a return envelope. Forty-eight universities completed and returned the survey in the required time period. The response rate from the subject universities was 70%.

Thus 68 of 311, or 21%, of responding universities have doctoral cohort program. Using this same 21% of the 494 universities, it can be concluded that there are 104 doctoral cohort programs in the entire population.
Analysis of Data

Research question #1 represented in Table 1 and Figure 1. Question 1 asked if the respondent had a cohort doctoral program. Forty-eight of 48 universities responded yes that they did offer a cohort doctoral program in educational administration.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has Cohort Program</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Do you have a cohort doctoral program in educational administration?

Research Question #2 represented in Table 2 and Figure 2. Question #2 asked if the respondent also offered a traditional program in addition to the cohort program.
Seventeen or 35.4% of the universities responded that they also offer a traditional doctoral program in addition to the cohort doctoral program in educational administration. Thirty-one or 64.6% responded that they do not offer a traditional program in addition to the cohort program. One respondent noted that they offered a choice of a cohort program or a traditional program for students pursuing the Ed.D. degree only. Students pursuing the Ph.D. degree were only offered the traditional format.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has Traditional Program</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Universities that offer a traditional program in addition to cohort program
Research question #3 represented in Table 3 and Figure 3. Question #3 asked the respondent if they perceived the cohort program as draining or enhancing membership in the traditional program. Thirty universities responded that the question was not applicable. Four or 8.3% responded that they perceived the cohort program as draining the traditional program. Six or 12.5% responded that they perceived the cohort program as enhancing the traditional program, and 8 or 16.7% responded that they perceived the cohort program as having no effect on the traditional program.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draining</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Does the cohort program effect the traditional program?

Research question #4 represented in Table 4 and Figure 4. When asked if the content of the cohort program was similar to the content in the traditional program 30 or 62.5% of the respondents replied that the question was not applicable. Seventeen or 35.4% responded that the content of both programs were similar. One or 2.1% of the universities responded that the content was not similar. The one responded who answered that the content of both programs was dissimilar qualified the answer with the statement, “The cohort program is more focused on the problems of practitioners while the traditional program is not.”
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarity of Programs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart

Figure 4. Is the content of the cohort and traditional programs similar?

Research question #5 represented by Table #5 and Figure #5. Question #5 focused on how often a new cohort is started. One or 2.1% of the universities responded that a new cohort was started semiannually. Thirty or 62.5% of the universities responded that a new cohort was started annually. Below find the frequency of responses for the 17 or 35.4% of the universities that responded that a new cohort was started during other time periods.
Every two years 11
Every three years 3
Every three years off campus 1
As group is identified 1
Rolling admission 1

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Often Start New Cohort</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiannually</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart

Figure 5. How often do you start a new cohort?
Research question #6 represented by Table 6 and Figure 6. This question inquired as to when during the school year a new cohort begins? Three or 6.3% of the universities responded that they begin a new cohort in the spring. Fifteen or 31.3% of the universities responded that a new cohort begins in the summer. Twenty-nine or 60.4% of universities responded that a new cohort is begun in the fall.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When Does Cohort Begin?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. When during the school year does a cohort begin?
Research question #7 represented by Table 7 and Figure 7. Question 7 asked respondents to describe the number of students in each cohort. One or 2.1% of the respondents replied that there were 0-4 students in a cohort. Four or 8.3% of universities responded that there were 5-9 students in each cohort. Nineteen or 39.9% of universities responded that there were 10-14 students in each cohort. Twelve or 25% of the universities responded that there were 15-19 students in each cohort. Eight or 16.7% of universities responded that there were 20-24 students in each cohort. Four or 8.3% of universities responded that there were 25-29 students in each cohort.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students in Cohort</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7. How many students are in each cohort?

Research question #8 represented by Table 8. Universities were requested to respond to the question “When are cohort doctoral classes held. Check all that apply.” Twenty-nine or 31.5% of universities responded that classes are held weekday evenings. Nine or 9.8% responded that classes are held on weekdays, Twenty-seven or 29.3% responded that classes were held on weekends and 27 or 29.3% responded that classes were held in the summer.

Respondents were asked to explain the answers given. List below are the 15 narrative responses and frequencies:

- All day Wednesday: 2
- Two nights per week 6 to 9 PM: 1
- Weekdays extended time periods: 1
- Every Wednesday 4 PM to 10 PM: 1
One class a semester held on

4 weekends & 4 weeks in summer

Three hours a week when student body is available

One evening per week during fall and spring

Cohort group helps set up schedule

Monday and Wednesday 6 to 8:40 PM

Friday evening and Saturday morning

Friday 7 to 10, Saturday 8 to 5,

Sunday 8 to 12, 4 weekends and

4 weeks in summer

Every Saturday and 3 or 4 intensive Weekends

Two classes each semester, year round,

For 2 ½ years

Two full summers and three weeks a Semester for 2 semesters
Table 8

When are doctoral cohort classes held? Check all that apply.

When Classes are Held
(Value tabulated = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dichotomy label</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Pct of Responses</th>
<th>Pct of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Classes Weekday Evenings</td>
<td>I8A</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Classes Held Weekdays</td>
<td>I8B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Classes Held Weekends</td>
<td>I8C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Classes Held in Summer</td>
<td>I8D</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>191.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 missing cases; 48 valid cases

Research question #9 represented in Table 9 and Figure 9. This question asked if all courses were required to be taken in cohort format. Twenty-six or 54.2% of universities responded yes, that they require all courses to be taken in cohort format. Twenty-two or 45.8% of respondents replied that students were not required to take all courses in cohort format. One respondent wrote that the first part of the program is in cohort format—all students take the classes together while during the second part of the program students can take electives depending on their field of study.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Courses in Cohort Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research question #10 represented by Table 10. Question ten followed up on question 9 and asked what percentage of coursework was required to be taken in cohort format. One or 2.1% replied they required 10% of coursework in cohort format, 1 or 2.1% replied they required 20% in cohort format, 6 or 12.5% required 30% in cohort format, 3 or 6.3% required 40% in cohort format, 2 or 4.2% required 50% in cohort format, 2 or 4.2% required 60% in cohort format, 1 or 2.1% required 70% in cohort format, 7 or 14.6% required 80% in cohort format, 1 or 2.1% required 90% in cohort format and 25 or 50% required 100% of coursework to be taken in cohort format.

When asked to explain the answers given 6 universities responded.

1. Leadership seminars are in cohort format; other professional development coursework and dissertation seminars are planned individually
2. 118 credits are only required in cohort format
3. 18 of 42 credits are taken in cohort format
4. Coursework is in three areas of concentration; in the core concentration 2/3 of classes are in cohort format, in the cognate no classes are taken in cohort
format, and in the area of concentration some classes may be taken in the cohort format.

5. Only 10% of coursework is taken in cohort format. The residency requirement is done in cohort format.

6. This cohort is a group of students who complete their coursework through ITV and Lotus Notes. 70% is distributed through ITV or the Internet.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Courses in Cohort Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. What percent of courses are taken in cohort format?
Research question #11 represented by Table 11 and Figure 11. Question 11 inquired as to the scheduled length of the coursework in the doctoral cohort program. Four or 8.3% of respondents replied that the coursework was scheduled for 1 year, 14 or 29.2% responded the coursework was scheduled for 2 years, 25 or 52.1% responded that the coursework was scheduled for three years, and 5 or 10.4% responded that the coursework was scheduled for 4 years.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduled Length of Cohort Program</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid 1 Year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart

Figure 11. What is the scheduled length of the coursework in the cohort program?
Research question #12 represented by Table 12 and Figure 12. Question 12 inquired if students write the dissertation after they have completed the coursework or while completing the coursework. Twenty-seven or 56.3% of universities responded that students typically begin writing the dissertation after completion of the coursework. Twenty or 41.7% replied that students begin writing the dissertation while completing the coursework. One university responded that no dissertation was required.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Completion</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While Completing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dissertation Required</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12. Do students write the dissertation after completing coursework or while completing coursework?

Research question #13 represented by Table 13 and Figure 13. Question 13 followed up on question 12 inquiring about dissertation writing. Question 13 asked the respondent to estimate the length of time it typically took a student to complete the dissertation and graduate.

Fourteen respondents did not reply to the question. Eight or 16.7% responded that it took one year for students to complete the dissertation and graduate. Sixteen or 33.3% responded it took two years to complete the dissertation and graduate. Seven or 14.6% responded it took 3 years to complete the dissertation and graduate. Two or 4.2% responded it took 4 years to complete the dissertation and graduate, and 1 or 2.1% responded it took 5 years to complete the dissertation and graduate.
Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to Complete Dissertation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart

Figure 13. How long does it typically take a student to complete the dissertation and graduate?

Research question #14 represented by Table 14. The respondents were asked to check the criteria that their department utilizes for student admission into the cohort program. Respondents could check multiple answers. The 48 universities marked off 253 responses. Forty-five of the respondents checked that a minimum grade point average
was required. Forty-six required letters of reference, 34 required an admission interview, 42 required a written essay, 2 required a mentor sponsorship, 20 required administrative experience, 8 required release time from job, 15 required MAT results, 34 required GRE results and 7 had other admission requirements. The average minimum MAT score was 47.9 with the mode being 50 and minimum scores ranging from 37 to 55. The average minimum GRE score was 1114 with a range of 950 to 1500. The mode was 1000.

Seven universities listed other admission requirements. Below are listed these other admission requirements and their frequency distributions.

1. Educational experiences
2. Assessment center activities for one day
3. Evidence of leadership
4. Assessment center presentation and interview
5. In box activity and group exercise
6. Portfolio showing leadership experience

Table 14

Check the criteria that your department utilizes for student admission into the cohort program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dichotomy Label</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Pot of Responses</th>
<th>Pot of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission GPA</td>
<td>E14A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission References</td>
<td>E14B</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Interview</td>
<td>E14C</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Essay</td>
<td>E14D</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Mentor</td>
<td>E14E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Administrative Experience</td>
<td>E14F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Job Time Release</td>
<td>E14G</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission MAT Score</td>
<td>E14H</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E14I</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E14J</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 missing cases; 46 valid cases

Research question #15 represented by Table 15. The respondents were asked to check all the methods that were employed to promote bonding among the cohort. One hundred thirty-four responses were given. Eleven respondents selected retreats, 42 respondents
checked group assignments, 31 checked receptions, 24 checked dinners, 4 checked recreational trips and 22 noted other bonding methods. Listed below are the frequency response rates for the respondents who listed other methods:

1. The first course is team building                        4
2. Educational conferences, seminars and monthly meetings  3
3. Group building activities in class                      3
4. Professional trips                                      3
5. Cohort has students from 2 campuses and use distance learning 1
6. Summer educational experience, students live in dorms    1
7. Common residency over two consecutive summers           1
8. Forum of educational programs                           1
9. Group advising                                           1
10. Doctoral Organization meetings                          1
11. Rope courses                                            1
12. Orientation                                             1
13. Applied field based projects done as teams             1

Table 15

Check the methods that you employ to help bond the members of the cohort. Check all that apply.

Group A Bonding Bonding Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dichotomy label</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Pct of Responses</th>
<th>Pct of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonding Retreats</td>
<td>I1A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding Assignments</td>
<td>I1B</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding Dinners</td>
<td>I1C</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I1D</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding Recreation Trips</td>
<td>I1E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding Other</td>
<td>I1F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>279.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 missing cases; 46 valid cases
Research question #16 represented by Table 16 and Figure 16. Research question #16 addressed the issue of cost to students. Three or 6.3% of universities stated that students were charged a flat fee and 45 or 93.8% noted that students were charged a per credit fee. The mean per credit fee is $229.00 within the range of $71.00 to $700.00. Although 3 universities responded that they charged a flat fee for the cohort program, only one listed the fee at $16,000.

Table 16

How do you charge students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charging Method</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
<th>% of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charge Flat Fee</td>
<td>I16A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Credit Fee</td>
<td>I16C</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 missing cases; 48 valid cases

Research question #17 represented by Table 17: This question followed up on the previous question addressing cost to student. The question inquired that if a flat fee was charged, what was included in this fee. Only 3 universities charged a flat fee so only three universities answered this question. The three respondents noted that the only items included in the flat fee were tuition and fees.
Table 17

17. If a flat fee is charged, check the items that are included in this flat fee.

Charges Include
(Value tabulated = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dichotomy label</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Pct of Responses</th>
<th>Pct of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat Fee Not Applicable</td>
<td>II7A</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Fee Includes Tuition</td>
<td>II7B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Fee Includes Fees</td>
<td>II7C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>106.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 missing cases; 48 valid cases

Research question #18 represented by Table 18 and Figure 18. Question #18 addresses the issue of faculty who teach the cohort doctoral students. One or 2.1% of respondents noted that full time faculty compared to adjunct faculty teach 20% of classes. One or 2.1% of respondents noted that full time faculty teach 40% of their program. One or 2.1% responded that full time faculty teach 60% of the cohort program. Eleven or 22.9% of respondents stated that full time faculty teach 80% of the program. Thirty-four or 70.8% of the respondents stated that full time faculty compared to adjunct faculty teach 100% of their program.

Table 18

Percent Full Time Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research question #19 represented by Table 19 and Figure 19. This question followed up on the previous question addressing the issue of cohort teaching as part of a faculty members' full time load or overload. Forty-seven or 97.9% of respondents replied that it was part of the full time load and 1 or 2.1% responded that cohort teaching was considered as overload.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Load</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Part of Full Time Load</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered Overload</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 19. Is cohort teaching part of faculty member’s full time load or overload?

Research question #20 represented by Table 20 and Figure 20. Question #20 inquired if there were any incentives provided to faculty for teaching in the cohort program. Nine or 18.8% of respondents replied they had a reduced load. Thirty-nine or 81.3% responded to the other category. Of the 39 that responded to the other category, 38 noted that incentives were not offered for teaching in the cohort program because this was considered part of their job. One respondent stated that the other incentive that they received was “doctoral faculty status.” No respondents selected the answer “bonus or other monetary consideration” to the question “What incentives are provided to faculty for teaching in the cohort program?”
Table 20

What incentives, if any, are provided to faculty for cohort teaching or mentoring?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Incentives</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Load</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20. Are any incentives provided for faculty teaching in the cohort program?

Research question #21 represented by Table 21 and Figure 21. Question 21 addressed the issue of graduation requirements. Forty-two or 87.5% of the respondents require a written comprehensive exam. Twenty-eight or 58.3% of the respondents require an oral comprehensive exam. Five or 10.4% require a research paper, 46 or 95.8% require a
dissertation, 40 or 83.3% require a dissertation oral exam, and 5 listed other requirements. The frequency responses of the other requirements were:

Clinical research study 
Field project and defense of project
Portfolio and problem project with oral defense

Table 21

Other than courses, what are your graduation requirements?

Graduation Requirements
(Values tabulated = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dichotomy label</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Pot of Responses</th>
<th>Pot of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require Written Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>I21A</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require Oral Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>I21B</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require Research Paper</td>
<td>I21C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require Dissertation</td>
<td>I21D</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require Dissertation Oral Exam</td>
<td>I21E</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require Other</td>
<td>I21F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total responses 168 100.0 345.8

0 missing cases: 48 valid cases

Research question #22 represented by Table 22 and Figure 22. Question #22 addresses the issue of recruiting faculty members to serve as dissertation mentors. Fourteen or 29.2% stated it was somewhat difficult to recruit faculty members to serve as dissertation mentors and 34 or 70.8% stated that there was no difficulty recruiting mentors. No respondent selected the choice “very difficult.”
Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid difficulty</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Difficult</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Difficulty</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar Chart]

Figure 22. Is there difficulty recruiting faculty to serve as dissertation mentors?

Research question #23 represented by Table 23 and Figure 23. Question #23 addressed the issue of the percentage of assignments given to students that are group assignments compared to individual assignments. Seven or 14.6% of respondents noted that 10% of assignments were group assignments. Thirteen or 27.1% of respondents stated that 20% of assignments were group assignments. Nine or 18.8% of respondents noted that 30% of assignments were group assignments. Four or 8.3% of respondents noted that 40% of
assignments were group assignments. Ten or 20.8% of respondents noted that 50% of assignments were group assignments. Two or 4.2% of respondents noted that 60% of assignments given to students were group assignments. Two or 4.2% of respondents noted that 70% of assignments given to students were group assignments and 1 or 2.1% of respondents noted that 80% of assignments given to students were group assignments. No respondents selected the category 90% or 100% of assignments given to students are group assignments.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid 10%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 23. What percentage of assignments given to students are group assignments compared to individual assignments?

Research question #24 represented by Table 24 and Figure 24. Question #24 inquired if it was a problem assessing individual effort in group work. One or 2.1% of respondents stated it was a real problem, 13 or 27.1% noted it was some problem, 22 or 45.8% noted it was a little problem and 12 or 25% noted it was no problem. Listed below are the 8 respondents' comments on their responses:

"We are seriously considering having students rate each member of their group in terms of contribution and considering the rating in the final grade."

"Parameters are clearly defined."

"Self and group member evaluations help."

"A special written individual report is part of contribution of the group."

"Closely monitored by faculty."
"We try to create learning communities which monitor and challenge one another; nevertheless grading issues still arise."

"No complaints by faculty but some by students when they observe a student not doing their share of the work."

"Goal is to develop a professional learning community which is not a competitive process. Faculty serve as equal members on field based study teams and are aware of individual contributions to the group."

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing Individuals</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Problem</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Problem</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Problem</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24. Is there difficulty assessing individual effort in group work?
Research question #25 represented by Table 25 and Figure 25. Question #25 asked if electronic communication was employed. Forty-eight or 100% of the universities responded yes.

Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25. Do you employ electronic communication in the cohort program?

Research question #26 represented by Table 26 and Figure 26. Question #26 asked how long is the prescribed time from beginning the doctoral cohort program to receiving the doctoral degree. Fourteen or 29.2% of respondents stated there was no prescribed time. No respondents selected the category "2 years." Nine or 18.8% of respondents answered
the prescribed time was 3 years. Ten or 20.8% of respondents replied the prescribed time was 4 years. Six or 12.5% of the respondents replied that the prescribed time was 5 years, and 9 or 18.8% responded the prescribed time was 6 or more years.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prescribed Time for Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Prescribed Time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or More Years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart

Figure 26. How long is the prescribed time from beginning the doctoral program to receiving the degree?
Research question #27 represented by Table 27 and Figure 27. Question #27 asked the respondent to estimate the number of students in the cohort program who complete the degree requirements and graduate in the prescribed time. Fifteen respondents did not answer this question stating that their cohort programs were still too new to estimate graduation rates. One or 2.1% of respondents replied that 10% of students graduate in the prescribed time. Four or 8.3% of respondents replied that 40% of the students graduate in the prescribed time. Three or 6.3% of respondents replied that 50% of the students graduate in the prescribed time. One or 2.1% of respondents replied that 60% of the students graduate in the prescribed time. Seven or 14.6% of respondents replied that 70% of the students graduate in the prescribed time. Five or 10.4% of the respondents replied that 80% of the students graduate in the prescribed time. Ten or 20.8% of the respondents replied that 90% of the student’s graduate in the prescribed time and 2 or 4.2% replied that 100% of students in their program graduate in the prescribed time.
Table 27

Percent Complete in Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 27. Estimate the percent of students who complete the degree requirements and graduate in the prescribed time.

Research question #28 represented in Table 28 and Figure 28. Question #28 addressed those students who do not graduate in the prescribed time. The question asked the
respondent to estimate how long it took those students to graduate if they did not graduate in the prescribed time. Again, 15 respondents did not reply to this question stating that their programs were too new to estimate how long students take to graduate. Six or 12.5% of respondents noted that students typically take 1 year beyond the prescribed time to graduate. Nine or 18.8% of respondents noted that students typically take 2 years beyond the prescribed time to graduate. One or 2.1% of respondents noted that students typically take 3 years beyond the prescribed time to graduate. Six or 12.5% of respondents noted that students typically take 4 years beyond the prescribed time to graduate. Nine or 18.8% of respondents noted that students typically take 5 years beyond the prescribed time to graduate, and 2 or 4.2% of respondents replied that students typically take 5 or more years beyond the prescribed time to graduate.
Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Extensions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid .00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 Years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart

Figure 28. For those that do not graduate in the prescribed time, estimate how long they typically take to receive their degree?
Research question #29 represented by Table 29. Question #29 asked the respondent about perceived obstacles that prevent students from graduating on time. Thirty-seven or 71.2% of respondents noted that a combination of professional and personal responsibilities were the greatest perceived obstacles. Three or 5.8% of respondents replied that professional obstacles prevented students from graduating in the prescribed time. Twelve or 23.1% of respondents listed 12 other obstacles to students graduating in the prescribed time. Below are listed the 12 other responses:

“Low commitment after completing coursework”

“Financial reasons”

“Difficulty completing dissertation”

“Job changes, illness, family problems”

“Lack of consistent contact with peers and professors. Personal initiative is key to completion.”

“Poor preparation for advanced study”

“Some students suffer from ‘Fear of Success’ and struggle at dissertation stage.

“Some students get dream jobs and move away.”

“We have never had a student not complete. Our goal is no ABD’s.”

“In 5 cohorts of 10 to 14 students only 3 students ABD.”

“Too new to judge.”

“No prescribed time but have a 10 year max.”
Table 29

Graduation Obstacles
(Value tabulated = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dichotomy Label</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
<th>% of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obstacle: Professional</td>
<td>128A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstacle: Professional and Personal</td>
<td>129C</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstacles: Other</td>
<td>130D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>113.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 missing cases; 46 valid cases

Research question #30 represented by Table 30 and Figure 30. Question 30 asked the respondent to estimate the percentage of cohort students who never complete the graduation requirements. Five respondents did not answer this question. Seventeen or 35.4% stated 10% of students never complete the graduation requirements. Thirteen or 27.1% replied that 20% of students never complete the graduation requirements. Seven or 14.6% replied that 30% of students never complete the graduation requirements. Three or 6.3% replied that 40% of students never complete the graduation requirements. Two or 4.2% replied that 50% of students never complete the graduation requirements. One or 2.1% of respondents noted that 90% of the students never complete the graduation requirements.
Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Never Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 30. Estimate the percent of students who never complete the graduation requirements.

Research question #31 represented in Table 31 and Figure 31. Question #31 asked the respondent how the cohort doctoral program was marketed. Twenty-nine or 60.4% of the respondents replied that the program was marketed through advertisements. Fifteen or 31.3% of the respondents replied that the program was marketed by word of mouth, and 4
or 8.3% replied the program was not marketed at all. Five respondents elaborated on their answers as listed below:

Mostly referrals

Active Web Site

Recruit through alumni

Orientation sessions in surrounding counties

Flyers

Table 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Market Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Advertise</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 31. How is your cohort program marketed?
Research question #32 represented by Table 32 and Figure 32. Question #32 asked respondents to note what form advertising took. Twelve or 25% of respondents did not answer the question while 19 or 39.6% noted that advertising took the form of print media and 17 or 35.4% noted that other methods of advertising were used. These other methods of advertising response frequencies are listed below.

- Brochure 4
- Presentations in school districts 4
- E-mail and web site 4
- Newsletters to alumni and school administrators 2
- Radio spots 1
- Open house receptions 1
- Cablevision 1

Table 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Media</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total          | 48        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
Figure 32. What form does your advertising take?

Research question #33 represented by Table 33 and Figure 33. Question #33 asked the respondent how much is budgeted annually for marketing? Forty-four or 91.7% of the respondents replied they budget between $0 and $9,999.00 annually. Two or 4.2% of respondents replied they budget between $20,000 and $29,999 annually for marketing. One or 2.1% of respondents replied that they budget between $30,000 and $39,000 annually for marketing, and one or 2.1% of respondents noted they budget over $70,000 annually for marketing.
Table 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing Budget</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid $0-9,999</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-29,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-39,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 or More</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart

Figure 33. Estimate how much you budget annually for marketing.

Research question #34 represented by Table 34 and Figure 34. Question #34 asked the respondent if the cohort concept at their university was being more widely adopted, less widely adopted or remaining at the same level. Twenty-three or 47.9% of the respondents stated the cohort concept was becoming more widely adopted while 2 respondents or 4.2% stated the cohort concept was becoming less widely adopted. Twenty-three or 47.9% viewed the cohort concept as remaining at the same level.
Table 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid Widely</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Widely</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remain the Same</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Widely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar Chart

Figure 34. How do you view the cohort concept at your university?

Research question #35 represented by Table 35 and Figure 35. Question #35 inquired about the effect of the cohort model on the quality of the overall program in educational administration. Thirty-five or 72.9% of respondents noted that the cohort model improved the quality of the overall program in educational administration while 13 or
27.1% noted that the cohort model had no effect on the overall quality of the program in educational administration. No one responded that the cohort model has lowered the quality of the educational administration program. Listed below are 10 respondents' explanations.

"Has given the program more structure and sequence in coursework."

"Our program has been in effect for 20 years and has always been a cohort program. That is all we know."

"More people across the state are involved making standards higher."

"Cohort program is an innovation welcomed by some as a substitute for the residency requirement."

"Builds peer support and encouragement especially at dissertation time."

"Students are assured of a common core of advanced study with only doctoral students."

"Our Ph.D. started in 1990 with a cohort model, thus we have no basis of comparison."

"Collaboration among cohort members has improved the research component."

"I selected #1 but I feel it is not a strong claim because it varies from cohort to cohort."

"Cohort gives us early insight into needs of students allowing us to evaluate carefully each part of the experience."
Table 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid Quality</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved Quality</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 35. Has the student cohort model improved the quality of the overall program in educational administration?

Research question #36 represented by Table 36 and Figure 36. Question 36 asked for the respondents' perception of the student's assessment of the quality of the cohort program. Thirty-two or 66.7% responded that the students' assessment was excellent while 16 or 33.3% responded that the students' assessment of the cohort program was good.
Table 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Quality Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 36. What in general do you perceive as the student's assessment of the quality of the doctoral cohort program?

Research question #37 represented by Table #37. Question #37 asked the respondent if any carry-over experiences were noted among students. Respondents were asked to check all the answers that applied. Forty-one or 85.4% noted student relationships continue, Forty-five or 93.8% noted networking was enhanced, thirty-three or 68.8% noted enhanced student-professor relationships, twelve or 8.6% noted increased alumni participation and eight or 5.8% listed other carry-over experiences. These other carry-over experiences and their frequency of responses are listed below.
Grads often hire other grads 2
Recruitment of new students 1
Enhances part time faculty for Masters Program 1
More collaboration on field based projects 1
Students support and encourage each other 1
Students do professional development with other students 1
Enhanced local support from school districts 1

Table 37

Among cohort doctoral students, what carry-over experiences have you observed? Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carry-over Experiences</th>
<th>Value tabulated = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carryover Student Relationships</td>
<td>IS7B 41 29.5 88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover Networking</td>
<td>IS7C 45 32.4 93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover Student-Faculty Relationship</td>
<td>IS7D 33 23.7 68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover Alumni Participation</td>
<td>IS7E 12 8.6 28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover other</td>
<td>IS7F 8 5.6 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>139 100.0 289.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 missing cases; 48 valid cases

Research question #38 represented on Table 38 and Figure 38. Question 38 asked the respondent for their perception of the faculty’s assessment of the cohort program.

Twenty-seven or 56.3% replied excellent, twenty or 41.7% replied good, and one or 2.1% replied fair.
Table 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Quality Assessment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar Chart]

Figure 38. What in general do you perceive as the faculty's assessment of the quality of the doctoral cohort program?

Research question #39 represented in Table 39 and Figure 39. Question 39 asked if any carry-over experiences were observed among faculty. Six respondents replied that no carry-over experiences were observed. Thirty noted greater collegiality among faculty, Thirty-two noted enhanced student professor relationships and eight observed other carry-over experiences among faculty. Below are listed these eight responses.
“Since we have a state wide program involving several universities, faculty have banded together to share experiences.”

“Much greater interaction with professionals in the field.”

“Joint faculty student research”

“Team teaching enhances faculty to faculty relationships.”

“Interested in improving the quality of curriculum and program standards.”

“Field studies and teaching require faculty to continue own professional development especially when it comes to technology.”

“More faculty coordination about teaching ideas and preparation.”

“Better faculty communication.”

Table 39

Among cohort faculty, what carry-over experiences have you observed? Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Carryover</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Carryover</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Carryover</td>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Carryover</td>
<td>Relation with</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Carryover</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>158.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 missing cases; 48 valid cases

Research question #40 represented in Table 40 and Figure 40. Question #40 asked how each institution was funded. Ten or 20.8% replied that they were privately funded and Thirty-eight or 79.2% replied that they were publicly funded.
Table 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Privately Funded</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publicly Funded</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bar Chart**

Figure 40. How is your institution funded?

Research question 41 represented by Table 41. Question 41 asked the respondent to identify the primary strengths of the cohort program. Below is a list of the frequencies of the answers given. These responses have been divided into four areas; program strengths, student strengths, faculty strengths and curriculum strengths.
Table 41

**Strengths of Cohort Program**

**Program**
- Maximizes utilization of staff and resources 3
- Easy logistics 3
- Reduces scheduling problems 3
- High retention rate and graduation rate 2

**Students**
- Provides for a support group 8
- Networking enhanced 6
- Creates a community of learners 4
- Students can maintain career but complete degree 4
- Students get motivated by each other 2
- Group can focus on professional similar problems 2
- Instructional teaming/less competitive 2
- Convenient scheduling 2

**Faculty**
- Better quality of student than traditional program
  - Because of quality selection process 4
- Enhanced commitment to working with students 3
- Faculty and student bonding 2
- Positive professional relationships among faculty 1

**Curriculum**
- Enhanced curriculum 1
- Provides common core of study 1
- Enhanced theoretical discussions among students 1
- Sensitizes students to research expectations 1

Research Question #42 represented by Table 42. Question 42 asked respondents to identify the primary weakness of the cohort program. Below is a list of frequencies of the answers given. The responses have been divided into 4 areas; program weakness, student weakness, faculty weakness and curriculum weakness. 4 respondents stated they found no weaknesses in the cohort program.
# Table 42

**Weakness of Cohort Program**

## Program
- Drains traditional program
- Program is new and still establishing tradition
- Time needed for reflection and discussion
- Scheduling
- Limits the number of students
- Admission process is more time consuming
- A lot of work putting into place administrative structure

## Students
- Some students prefer to work alone
- Students do fine while together but not during independent research
- Block scheduling does not allow for individual needs
- Lack of support in school district
- Sometime students are too supportive of each other rather than push and challenge
- Lock-step method is to rigid

## Faculty
- “Group think” makes individual evaluation difficult
- Cohort tries to use group power to pressure faculty to lower standards
- High student load for dissertation advising
- Takes its toll on faculty because of weekend teaching
- Some cohorts do not work well together and become competitive
- Faculty changes produce differing expectations in program and instructional models
- Same students in every class—need more diversity
- Faculty planning time is increased
- Coordination between campuses is difficult
- Cohorts at times take on negative characteristics and rather than being supportive they become defensive.
- Less frequent meetings make continuity difficult
- Can’t tailor learning experiences to individual students
- Because of “No ABD” policy intensive workload

## Curriculum 11
- Distance Learning needs improving
- Research component is weak because of time
- Theory/practice mix still unclear and uneven
Chapter V

CONCLUSION

The concluding chapter consists of a summary of the purpose of this study, a statement of the research questions, a discussion of the findings, a description of a typical cohort doctoral program, and recommendations for future study.

Summary of the Purpose of this Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the concept of doctoral cohorts in educational administrative preparation programs in a comprehensive manner using descriptive statistics. More specifically this study attempted to determine what percentage of universities presently offering doctoral programs offer them in the cohort format. Another purpose of this study was to determine if universities with educational administration or educational leadership departments offer doctoral students a choice of attending classes in the traditional format or the cohort format. This study also compared and contrasted the different ways educational administration departments used the cohort model.

Statement of the Research Questions

In attempting to develop a comprehensive profile of cohort doctoral programs in educational administration this investigation responded to the following primary research question: What percentage of universities surveyed offer educational administrative preparation programs in cohort format? The secondary research questions, aimed at comparing the cohort model presently used in educational administration are.
1. How many universities offer a doctoral cohort program in their educational administration department?

2. How many universities offer both a traditional and a cohort doctoral program?

3. Do universities perceive the cohort program as draining or enhancing the traditional program?

4. Is the content of the cohort program similar to the content of the traditional program?

5. How often do universities begin a new cohort?

6. During what semester do universities typically begin a new cohort?

7. How many students are typically admitted into each cohort?

8. When are classes held?

9. Are cohort members typically required to complete all coursework in cohort format?

10. What percentage of the coursework are students required to take in cohort format?

11. What is the scheduled length of the coursework in the cohort program?

12. Do students typically begin writing their dissertation after the coursework is completed or while they are completing the required coursework?

13. If students begin writing their dissertation after the required coursework is completed, how long does it typically take to a student to finish their dissertation and graduate?

14. What criteria does the department utilize for student admission into the cohort program? What is the minimum GRE or MAT score acceptable for admission?

15. What methods are used to help bond members of the cohort?

16. What is the cost of the cohort program and how are students charged?

17. What items are included in the cost of the doctoral cohort program?
18. What percentage of the program does full time and adjunct faculty teach?

19. When examining full time faculty, is the doctoral cohort teaching assignment considered part of their full time load or overload?

20. What incentives if any, are provided to faculty for cohort teaching or mentoring?

21. Other than courses, what is the cohort program's graduation requirements?

22. If a formal dissertation is required, how difficult is it to engage mentors?

23. What percentage of assignments given to cohort members are group assignments, compared to individual assignments?

24. How much of a problem is assessing individual effort in group work?

25. Do universities employ e-mail or other forms of electronic communication in their cohort program?

26. How long is the prescribed time from beginning the cohort program to receiving the degree?

27. What percentage of the students completes the program in the prescribed time?

28. How long does it typically take students who do not graduate in the prescribed time, to complete their degree?

29. When students do not graduate in the prescribed time, what factors are perceived as being the primary obstacles?

30. What percentage of students never completes their degree?

31. How is the cohort program marketed?

32. What form does advertising take?

33. How much is budgeted annually for marketing?

34. Is the cohort concept being more widely adopted?
35. Has the cohort concept improved the quality of the overall program in educational administration?

36. What is the perception of the student’s assessment of the cohort program?

37. Among students what carry-over experiences have been observed that can be attributed to the cohort concept?

38. What is the perception of the faculty’s assessment of the cohort program?

39. Among faculty, what carry-over experiences have been observed that can be attributed to the cohort concept?

40. How are universities that offer cohort doctoral programs funded?

41. What is perceived as the primary strength of the cohort program?

42. What is perceived as the primary weakness of the cohort program?

In response to these questions, findings revealed that 21% of universities that offer doctoral programs through their educational administration department offer them in cohort format. It can also be concluded that there are 104 doctoral programs in the population.

Discussion of the Findings

In response to question number 1, 68 of the 496 universities surveyed answered that they do offer a doctoral cohort program through their educational administration department. This research then focused on the forty-eight universities who did meet these basic criteria and elected to respond to the survey.

Research question 2 asked if the respondent also offered a traditional program in addition to the cohort program. 35% of the respondents offered both programs. Thus, 35% of educational administration programs offer students a choice of pursuing the
doctoral degree in the cohort format or in the traditional format. Conversely, 65% of the respondents replied that they do not offer students a choice. They have eliminated the traditional method of study in favor of the cohort method.

Educational programs presently are reflecting the popular philosophy of shared leadership. Collaborative, collegial learning environments are characteristics of organizations that share leadership. Collaborative, collegial learning environments are also characteristics of the cohort model. The structure of cohort doctoral programs mirrors this popular educational practice. Traditional doctoral programs that do not reflect the principle of shared leadership are being eliminated in favor of cohort doctoral programs that favor this educational goal.

Research question 3 continued to probe respondents that offered both a traditional and a cohort doctoral program. Did the cohort program drain membership from the traditional program? 8.3% of the respondents viewed the cohort program as draining the traditional program. 12.5% viewed the cohort program as enhancing the traditional program, and 16.7% of respondents felt it had no effect.

When developing a cohort program, without eliminating a traditional program, developers should be aware of this problem. A student who accepts membership in one group may have to forgo a part in another group, unless the groups have different criteria. If, for example, the cohort group has the criteria that members must be practicing school administrators in the K-12 field, and the traditional program does not have these criteria, both programs should be able to co-exist without draining membership. Adding specific criteria to the cohort selection process will help towards minimizing the draining effect.
Research question 4 again continued to probe respondents that offered both a traditional and a cohort doctoral program. Was the content in both programs similar? All but one respondent noted that the content was similar. This reflects on the idea that using the cohort model of delivery does not change the content of the subject matter. Using the cohort concept is not altering the subject matter taught in educational administrative doctoral programs.

Research question 5 focused on how often a new cohort is formed. Thirty or 62.5% of respondents replied that a new cohort was formed annually, while 11 or 22.9% of respondents replied that a new cohort was started every two years. Thus, a majority of universities begin a new cohort yearly or every other year. This may well be a reflection of the density of the university population area.

Research question 6 inquired as to when during the school year does the new cohort begin. Only 3 respondents replied that they begin a new cohort in the spring while 29 respondents replied they begin a new cohort in the fall, and 15 respondents replied a new cohort began in the summer. Beginning a new cohort in the fall appears to be the most common starting time. This idea of a “fall start” is a reflection of educational practices seen throughout the world.

Research question 7 addresses the number of students in each cohort. Eighty percent of the respondents noted that the average cohort size ranged between 10 and 24 students. The literature on group development suggests that for a group to become interdependent the members must be allowed to pursue individual as well as group goals. A major element of doctoral programs is writing an individual thesis. A faculty mentor guides this effort. Respondents noted that one weakness of cohort program was that they
had too many students to mentor. Thus, keeping the number of students between 10 and 24 appears to minimize this problem.

Research question 8 asked respondents "When are cohort doctoral classes held?" Thirty-one percent replied classes were held on weekday evenings, 29% replied classes were held on weekends and 29% replied classes were held in the summer. The remaining 9% stated classes were held on weekdays. Clearly, classes meet at dissimilar times. When asked to explain these times respondents answers were diversified. One responded answered noted, "the cohort helps set the schedule," while another stated, "the group meets three hours a week when the student body is available." The cohorts that allowed the members to select meeting times were all cohorts with under 10 members in each group.

Research question 9 inquired if all coursework was taken in cohort format. Fifty-four percent of respondents replied yes and 45.8% replied no. Clearly, closed cohorts, where students take all of their coursework together, are as prevalent as open cohorts, whereby students remain together for a portion of the coursework.

Research question 10 followed up on question 9. Question 10 queried the respondent as to what percentage of the coursework was taken in cohort format. Of the 22 respondents that replied that all coursework is not taken in cohort format, 11 replied that 80% of coursework is taken in cohort format. Thus of the 48 institutions surveyed, 37 or 77%, require students to take at least 80% of the coursework in cohort format.

Research question 11 inquired as to the scheduled length of the coursework in the cohort doctoral program. Fifty percent of respondents noted that the coursework was
scheduled throughout 3 years. Thirty percent of the respondents replied that the coursework was scheduled throughout 2 years.

Research question 12 inquired if students write the dissertation after completing the coursework or while completing the coursework. The responses were evenly divided. Fifty-six percent noted that students begin writing the dissertation after the coursework is completed, and 41.7% replied that the dissertation was begun while completing the coursework.

One of the observed weaknesses of the cohort program that was noted by some respondents was the inability of students to make the transition from group coursework to individual dissertation writing. Dissertation writing, although an individual endeavor, requires peer support that seems to diminish if the process is not begun until after the coursework is over. Beginning the dissertation process, while completing the coursework, when the level of peer support is at its highest would be advised by this researcher.

Research question 13 followed up on question 12 inquiring about students who began writing the dissertation after the coursework was completed. Question 13 asked the respondent to estimate the length of time it typically took a student to complete the dissertation and graduate. 79.2% of the respondent replied that it typically took a student 1 or 2 years of additional dissertation writing after the coursework was completed.

Research question 14 inquired about student admission criteria. Most respondents noted minimum grade point average, letters of reference, admission essay, personal interview, and MAT or GRE test results. The average minimum MAT score required was 47.9 and the average minimum GRE score was 1114. 41.7% of
respondents noted that applicants had to have administrative experience to be admitted into the cohort. When asked to list other requirements for admission two respondents noted that assessment center activities were part of the admissions criteria. Another respondent noted that a portfolio showing leadership experience was part of the admission criteria.

Clearly selection of cohort members is critical to forming a well functioning group. When asked about the strengths of the cohort program four respondents noted that a stringent selection process lead to a superior quality of students.

Research question 15 addressed the issue of bonding among cohort members. Group assignments were the method that was most often used to promote bonding among cohort members. Receptions and dinners were the other methods employed to promote bonding. The literature on group development suggests that interdependence, or bonding, results when group members influence each other through social interaction. Group assignments, receptions and dinners promote this social interaction. Members of a group also need to understand what each is saying or doing within a group and why. Allowing members to get to know one another socially, through group assignments, receptions and dinners accomplished this goal.

Another interesting bonding method noted by four respondents was that the first course the cohort members engaged in was a course on team building. This allows the members of the group, as the literature suggests to view others as resources and to feel less isolated. The literature suggests that adults have been found to be powerful resources to one another by engaging in informal discussions, establishing learning cliques, and expressing themselves freely.
Research questions 16 and 17 addressed the issue of how the university charges students for the doctoral cohort program. Forty-five of 48 universities replied that students were charged at per credit fee at the university rate. The mean per credit fee was $229. Three respondents replied that they charged a flat fee for the cohort program and only 1 listed that fee at $16,000. These 3 respondents replied that the only items included in this flat fee are tuition and university fees.

Research question 18, 19 and 20 addressed the issue of faculty workload and compensation. Seventy percent of the respondents noted that full time faculty members taught 100% of the cohort doctoral program and 97.9% of respondents noted that the cohort teaching assignment was part of the faculty members full time load. When asked if any monetary incentives are provided to faculty for teaching in the cohort program 100% of the respondents replied no to the question. Thirty-nine respondents observed that teaching in the cohort program was considered part of their job assignment.

Research question 21 addressed the issue of graduation requirements. Nine-five percent of the respondents required a written dissertation, and 83% required an oral defense of the dissertation. Eighty-seven percent required a written comprehensive exam as a graduation requirement. Fifty-eight percent required an oral comprehensive exam to graduate. A field project with an oral defense and a clinical research paper were listed as other requirements.

Research question 22 addressed the difficulty of recruiting faculty members to serve as dissertation mentors. Seventy percent of respondents found no difficulty recruiting faculty members to serve as dissertation mentors and 30% of respondents replied they found it somewhat difficult to recruit faculty members to serve as
dissertation mentors. When asked about the weaknesses of the cohort program one
respondent noted that a high student load for dissertation mentoring was a weakness of
the program.

Questions 23 and 24 addressed the issue of group assignments. The most
commonly selected answer to the question what percentage of assignments given are
group assignments was 20%. Forty-three of 48 respondents replied that between 10% and 50% of given assignments were group assignments. When asked if it was a problem
assessing individual effort in group work only 1 respondent noted that it was a real
problem. Twelve of the 48 respondents noted that it was no problem assessing individual
effort in group work. Respondents appear to have solved this problem by having
members of each group submit an individual report along with the group work.

Question 25 inquired if the responded used electronic communication in the
cohort program. One hundred percent of respondents relied that electronic
communication was utilized. One respondent comment that a portion of their cohort
program was offered through the Internet.

Questions 26, 27, 28 and 29 addressed the issue of prescribed time of the cohort
program. When asked how long is the prescribed time of the program 14 respondents
replied that their program had no prescribed time. Ten respondents replied that the
prescribed time was 4 years and nine responded that the prescribed time was 3 years. It
appears that doctoral cohort programs are most often 3 or 4-year programs.

Next the respondent was asked to estimate the number of students who graduate
in the prescribed time. Fifteen respondents replied that their program was too new to
answer the question. Twenty-four respondents replied that 70% to 100% of students graduate in the prescribed time. Two respondents claimed a 100% graduation rate.

Respondents were then asked to examine the students who did not graduate in the prescribed time and estimate how long it typically took them to graduate. Again 15 or 31.3% of respondents did not answer the question because of the newness of their program. Thirty-one percent of the respondents replied that it typically took students an additional year or two to graduate.

When asked about obstacles preventing students from graduating on time, 80% of respondents noted that it was a combination of personal and professional responsibilities that prevented cohort members from graduating in the prescribed time. When asked if there were other reasons why students did not graduate in the prescribed time many respondents’ answers noted the difficulty of the individual effort required in fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

Research question 30 asked the respondent to estimate the percentage of cohort students who never complete the graduation requirements. 62.5% of respondents replied that between 10% and 20% of cohort students never complete the graduation requirements.

Research questions 31, 32 and 33 asked how the cohort doctoral program was marketed. 60.4% of respondents replied that the cohort doctoral program was marketed through advertisements in the print media. Other forms of advertising listed were brochures, cable TV spots, presentations in school districts, websites, newsletters to alumni, direct mailings to local administrators, and open house receptions. Forty-four of 48 universities spend between $0 and $9,999.00 marketing their cohort doctoral program.
Research question 34 determined that 47.9% of respondents felt the cohort concept was being more widely adopted at their university and 47.9% felt the cohort concept was remaining at the same level at their university.

Research question 35 asked the responded if they perceived the cohort model as improving the quality of the overall program in educational administration. 72.9% of respondents felt the cohort concept has improved the quality of the overall program in educational administration.

Research questions 36 and 37 asked for the respondents’ perception of the students’ assessment of the cohort doctoral program. 66.7% of respondents perceived the students’ assessment of the program as excellent and 33.3% perceived the students assessment as good. The next question asked the respondent to note carry-over experiences among students. Networking, continuation of student relationships and enhance faculty-professor relationships were noted.

Research questions 38 and 39 address the issue of faculties’ assessment of the cohort doctoral program. Again, the respondents perceived that the faculty would assess the cohort doctoral program as excellent or good. When asked about carry-over experiences among faculty members enhanced student-professor relationships and greater collegiality among faculty were noted.

Question 40 asked how each institution was funded. Twenty percent of the universities offering cohort doctoral programs are privately funded and 80% are publicly funded.
A Description of a Typical Doctoral Cohort Program

The typical cohort doctoral program in educational administration is offered in a publicly funded university that utilizes electronic communication. Sixty-five percent of educational administration departments that currently offer the doctoral degree in cohort format do not also offer the degree in the traditional format. In the 35% of educational administration departments that do offer the doctoral degree in both the traditional and the cohort format, the content of both programs is similar. Most cohort programs are not viewed as draining the membership of the traditional program.

Departments of educational administration typically begin a new cohort annually, or every other year during the fall semester. The average cohort has between 10 and 24 members. Typically, cohort classes are held on weekday evenings, but much diversity can be found in this area.

Some educational administration departments require students to take all the coursework in cohort format, while others do not. Most of the institutions that do not require students to take all the coursework in cohort format require at least 80% of coursework in cohort format.

Coursework in cohort doctoral programs typically is scheduled for 2 to 3 years. About half of the cohort programs encourage students to begin writing the dissertation during this 2 to 3 year coursework time period and about half encourage students to begin writing the dissertation after the coursework is completed. Typically, students in programs that encourage writing after the coursework is complete can expect to complete the dissertation and graduate in another 1 to 2 years. Thus, cohort doctoral programs that encourage dissertation writing while completing the coursework, typically take a student
2 to 3 years to graduate. On the other hand, cohort doctoral programs that encourage students to wait until after the coursework is completed to begin the dissertation writing typically take 4 or 5 years for students to graduate.

Typically students must have a minimum grade point average, present letters of reference, write an admission essay, attend a personal interview, and have a minimum score or 47 on the MAT or 1114 on the GRE Test, to be admitted into the cohort doctoral program.

Students are typically encouraged in doctoral cohort programs to bond with other students at receptions and dinners. Students can ordinarily expect between 10%-50% of the required assignments to be group assignments. There seems to be little problem assessing individual effort in group work.

Students are typically charged the university graduate school per credit tuition rate for doctoral cohort programs, and can expect all of their classes taught by full time faculty members. Faculty members, typically receive no extra compensation for teaching in the cohort program.

The typical cohort doctoral program requires a written dissertation, an oral defense of the dissertation, a comprehensive examination, and an oral comprehensive examination to graduate. Seventy to one-hundred percent of cohort students can expect to complete the requirements and graduate. Most cohort students who never graduate are unable to balance personal and professional responsibilities with their graduate school requirements. Other students are unable to conqueror the dissertation.

The typical doctoral cohort program is marketed through advertisements in the print media. Typically a cohort doctoral program has $0-$9,999 in the budget for
marketing. The cohort concept is viewed as improving the overall quality of educational administration programs but the concept is typically not expanding to other departments at universities.

Typically, students give an excellent assessment to cohort doctoral programs. Networking, continuation of student relationships, and enhanced student-professor relationships are some of the carry-over experiences that students can expect.

Typically, faculties' assessment of the cohort doctoral program is excellent or good. Faculty involved in doctoral cohort programs, typically experience greater collegiality among their peers and enhanced student-professor relationships.

Recommendations for Further Study

While it was hoped that this research made a contribution to the topic of cohort doctoral programs in educational administration, there remains much to be done. As the evidence presented here suggests, the rapidly changing academic environment, which prompted this study, promises to get more complex in the years ahead. Accordingly, the following are recommendations for further study.

1. Research the program choice of students in educational administration doctoral programs. The respondents to the present study were department chairs. This further investigation might thus be directed at the students who enroll in cohort doctoral programs in educational administration. Why did students chose to enroll in a cohort program rather than a traditional program? Exit interviews with cohort doctoral recipients might be an appropriate technique. This research would attempt to identify perceived benefits of the cohort model and determine what factors influence the decision to matriculate as doctoral cohort students.
2. Research the perceived success of doctoral cohort programs in educational administration through the eyes of faculty members. Again, chairs of educational administration departments who do not necessarily teach cohort students completed this survey. How does the faculty assess the cohort experience compared to the traditional experience?

3. Sixty-five percent of the universities that this researcher surveyed do not offer a student a choice of enrolling in a cohort or a traditional program at the doctoral level. Is this a reflection of the demographics of the university? Discovering if this is a growing trend, and if so may be a fruitful avenue for future researcher.

4. Of much interest to this investigator, and another avenue of future research is a comparison of graduation rates among students who enroll in a cohort program and students who enroll in a traditional program. Do cohort programs graduate a higher percentage of students than traditional programs?

5. A comparison of the curriculum used in cohort and traditional doctoral programs is yet another investigation that might be enlightening. Does using the cohort model impact the curriculum? Does using the cohort model, with its aim of collegial interaction actually produce transformational leaders that researchers note are needed as we enter the twenty-first century?

6. A detailed assessment of Seton Hall University's cohort doctoral program is another avenue that might prove of advantage in refining the present design at this University. Are the attributes found in other doctoral cohort programs similar to those found in the doctoral cohort program at Seton Hall University?
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Appendix A

Letter of Solicitation
May 1998

Dear Department Chair or Coordinator,

I am a doctoral student in the College of Education and Human Services at Seton Hall University in South Orange, New Jersey. I am researching the growing trend of Educational Administration Departments to administer doctoral programs in cohort format. A cohort program is here defined as one in which students engage in a program of study together and generally share a common set of classes and experiences. Seton Hall University presently offers a doctoral degree in cohort format. In the cohort program at Seton Hall, students come together on the campus for eleven weekends and two summers and may complete the program in two years. A brochure describing the program is enclosed.

After surveying 500 universities ( ), respondents that they offer a doctoral degree in cohort format through their Educational Administration Department. At this time I am requesting that you or your designee complete the enclosed brief survey identifying specific characteristics of your doctoral cohort program. Completion of this survey is totally voluntary. Identifying information will be deleted at the end of this research and all data will be reported in group form to preserve the anonymity of the participants.

Any questions about this survey can be answered at the below listed telephone numbers. Please insert the completed survey and the informed consent form into the enclosed envelope and mail it. Again, thank you in advance for your participation is this study.

Sincerely,

Aileen Hresko, Ed.S.
Executive Doctoral Program
Seton Hall University
(973)-275-2728 SHU
(973)-667-8249 home
Appendix B

Postcard
Seton Hall University  
College of Education & Human Services  
Mrs. Alicea Hrasko  
Kazlowsk Hall, Room 407  
South Orange, NJ 07079-2685  
e-mail hraskoa@shu.edu

1. Yes, we administer a cohort doctoral program in educational administration.

2. Yes, I would be willing to complete a brief survey identifying specific characteristics of the program.

3. Yes, I would be interested in the results of this survey.

4. No, we do not administer a doctoral cohort program in educational administration.

Please address the survey to:

Name_____________________________Title__________________

Institution_________________________________________

Address___________________________________________

___________________________________________________

___________________________________________________

___________________________________________________

Phone____________________________FAX__________________

E Mail____________________________
Appendix C

Letter of Solicitation Sent with Survey
June 1998

Dear Department Chair or Coordinator,

I am a doctoral student in the College of Education and Human Services at Seton Hall University in South Orange, New Jersey. As I explained in my previous letter, I am researching the growing trend of Educational Administration Departments to administer doctoral programs in cohort format. A cohort program is here defined as one in which students engage in a program of study together and generally share a common set of classes and experiences. Seton Hall University presently offers a doctoral degree in cohort format. In the cohort program at Seton Hall, students come together on the campus for eleven weekends and two summers and may complete the program in two years. A brochure describing the program is enclosed.

After surveying 500 universities approximately 60 responded that they offer a doctoral degree in cohort format through their Educational Administration Department. At this time I am requesting that you or your designee complete the enclosed brief survey identifying specific characteristics of your doctoral cohort program. Completion of this survey is totally voluntary. Identifying information will be deleted at the end of this research and all data will be reported in group form to preserve the anonymity of the participants.

Any questions about this survey can be answered at the below listed telephone numbers. Please insert the completed survey into the enclosed envelope and mail it. It would be greatly appreciated if you could also enclose a brochure about the doctoral cohort program offered in your university. Again, thank you in advance for your participation is this study.

Sincerely,

Aileen Hresko, Ed.S.
Executive Doctoral Program
Seton Hall University
(973)-275-2728 SHU
(973)-667-8249 home
Appendix D

Sample of Pilot Study Letter
Dear Dr. Margaret Basom,

I am a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall University in South Orange, New Jersey. I am writing my doctoral thesis under the direction of Dr. James Caulfield, the Director of the Executive Doctoral Program at Seton Hall. The focus of my study is to examine doctoral cohorts in educational administration preparation programs. The attached survey attempts to gather data from the growing trend of administrative preparation programs offered in the “cohort format” rather than the “traditional format.”

Dr. Norton, from Arizona State, has granted me permission to expand upon his 1995 UCEA research in the field of doctoral cohorts. Thus, this survey that I have devised, and you have kindly agreed to pilot and critique, is titled “The Modified Norton Survey.” Dr. Caulfield or myself have also reached out to the other experts in the field; Pat Forsythe, Cynthia Norris, Diane Yerkes and Bruce Barnett asking for assistance in piloting this survey.

Please answer the questions on the survey about your doctoral cohort program. Next to the question, or on an attached sheet of paper please comment on any questions that are ambiguous or simply difficult to understand. I would also appreciate it if you could note how long it took you to complete the questionnaire. Please FAX the survey and your comments back to me at 973-667-2351.

Again, thank you so much for your time and effort in this matter. I have read much of your work on the subject of “cohorts” and quote you often in the “Literature Review” section of my thesis. I am honored that you have agreed to pilot this survey. I will be sure to send you a copy of the final results of my research.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Aileen Hresko
Seton Hall University
(h) 973-667-8249
FAX 973-667-2351
Appendix E

Survey
Of Doctoral Cohort Programs in Educational Administration

Thank you for agreeing to complete this survey concerning doctoral cohort programs in educational administration. (A cohort format is defined as a program in which a group of students engage in a program of study together and generally share a common set of classes and experiences). Questions about this survey can be directed to Alleen Hresko via e-mail at hresko@shu.edu or at 973-275-2728 (w) or 973-687-8249 (h).

Institution Name

Address

Name of person completing survey

Title

Phone Number (____) E-mail

1. Do you offer a doctoral cohort program in educational administration whereby students enter the programs as a group and then complete all or part of the program together?
   □ Yes □ No

2. Do you also offer a traditional doctoral program in addition to the cohort doctoral program in educational administration?
   □ Yes □ No

3. Do you perceive the doctoral cohort program as draining or enhancing membership in the traditional program?
   □ Not applicable □ Draining □ Enhancing □ No effect

4. Is the content in the cohort doctoral program similar to the content in the traditional doctoral program?
   □ Not applicable □ Yes □ No
   If no, how do they differ?

5. How often do you start a new cohort?
   □ Semiannually □ Annually □ Other

6. When do you begin a cohort?
   □ Spring □ Summer □ Fall □ Other

7. Which figure best describes the number of students in each cohort?

8. When are doctoral cohort classes held? Check all that apply.
   □ Weekday evenings □ Weekdays □ Weekends □ Summer
   Please Explain:
9. Do you require cohort members to complete all coursework in cohort format?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

10. If no, please estimate the percentage of the coursework that cohort students are required to take in cohort format.
    ☐ 10% ☐ 20% ☐ 30% ☐ 40% ☐ 50% ☐ 60% ☐ 70% ☐ 80% ☐ 90% ☐ 100%
    Please explain ____________________________

11. What is the scheduled length of the coursework in your doctoral cohort program?
    ☐ 1 year ☐ 2 years ☐ 3 years ☐ 4 years ☐ 5 years ☐ More than 5 years

12. Do the students in your doctoral cohort program typically begin writing their dissertation after they have completed their required coursework or while they are completing their required coursework?
    ☐ After completing their coursework ☐ While completing their coursework ☐ No formal dissertation is required

13. If the students in the doctoral cohort program typically begin writing their dissertation after the coursework is completed, estimate the length of time it typically takes a student to complete their dissertation and graduate.
    ☐ 1 year ☐ 2 years ☐ 3 years ☐ 4 years ☐ 5 years ☐ More than 5 years

14. Check below the criteria that your department utilizes for student admission into the cohort program. Please add the minimum MAT or GRE score that is acceptable for admission.
    ☐ Minimum grade point average ☐ References ☐ Personal interview ☐ Written essay
    ☐ Mentor sponsorship ☐ Administrative experience ☐ Release time from job
    ☐ MAT test results - Minimum score ______ ☐ Overall GRE test results - Minimum score ______
    ☐ Other ________________________________

15. Please check the methods that you employ to help bond the members of the cohort. Check all that apply.
    ☐ Retreats ☐ Group assignments ☐ Receptions ☐ Dinners ☐ Recreational trips
    ☐ Other ________________________________

16. How do you charge students?
    ☐ We charge a flat fee of _______________________ ☐ We charge a per credit fee of _______________________ 

17. If a flat fee is charged, check below the items that are included in this flat fee.
    ☐ Not applicable ☐ Tuition ☐ Fees ☐ Parking ☐ Books ☐ Reading requirements and study guides
    ☐ Meals ☐ Lodging ☐ Other, please list ________________________________

18. Estimate the percentage of the doctoral cohort program that is taught by full time faculty compared to adjunct faculty.
    ☐ 20% ☐ 40% ☐ 60% ☐ 80% ☐ 100%

19. When examining full time faculty, is the doctoral cohort teaching assignment considered part of their full time load or overload?
    ☐ Part of full time load ☐ Considered as overload
    Comment ________________________________

20. What incentives, if any, are provided to faculty for cohort teaching or mentoring?
    ☐ Reduced load ☐ Bonus or other monetary considerations
    ☐ Other ________________________________
21. Other than courses, what are your graduation requirements?
☐ Written comprehensive exam or paper ☐ Oral comprehensive exam ☐ Research paper as a culminating activity
☐ Dissertation ☐ Dissertation oral defense ☐ Other

22. If a formal dissertation is required, how difficult is it to recruit faculty members to serve as dissertation mentors?
☐ Very difficult ☐ Somewhat difficult ☐ No difficulty

23. When examining assignments given to cohort students, estimate the percentage of assignments that are group assignments, compared to individual assignments.
☐ 10% ☐ 20% ☐ 30% ☐ 40% ☐ 50% ☐ 60% ☐ 70% ☐ 80% ☐ 90% ☐ 100%

24. If group work is assigned to students, how much of a problem is assessing individual effort in group work?
☐ Real problem ☐ Some problem ☐ Little problem ☐ No problem
Comment

25. Do you employ electronic communication such as e-mail among students and between students and instructors?
☐ Yes ☐ No

26. How long is the prescribed time from beginning the doctoral cohort program to receiving the doctoral degree?
☐ No prescribed time from beginning cohort program to receiving degree
☐ 2 years ☐ 3 years ☐ 4 years ☐ 5 years ☐ 6 or more years

27. If your cohort program has a prescribed time for degree completion, estimate the percent of doctoral cohort students who complete all degree requirements and graduate within the prescribed time.
☐ 10% ☐ 20% ☐ 30% ☐ 40% ☐ 50% ☐ 60% ☐ 70% ☐ 80% ☐ 90% ☐ 100%

28. For those doctoral cohort students who do not graduate in the prescribed time, estimate how long they typically take before receiving their degree.
☐ 1 year ☐ 2 years ☐ 3 years ☐ 4 years ☐ 5 years ☐ More than 5 years

29. When students participating in the cohort program do not graduate in the prescribed amount of time, what factors do you perceive as being the predominant obstacles? Check all that apply.
☐ Professional responsibilities ☐ Personal responsibilities ☐ Combination of professional and personal responsibilities
☐ Other, please explain

30. Estimate the percentage of the doctoral cohort students who never complete the graduation requirements.
☐ 10% ☐ 20% ☐ 30% ☐ 40% ☐ 50% ☐ 60% ☐ 70% ☐ 80% ☐ 90% ☐ 100%

31. How do you market your doctoral cohort program?
☐ Advertise ☐ Word of mouth ☐ We don't
Other

32. If you advertise, what form does it take?
☐ Print media ☐ Non-print media ☐ Other
Please explain


33. Estimate how much you budget annually for marketing your doctoral program.
☐ 0 to $9,999 ☐ $10,000 to $19,999 ☐ $20,000 to $29,999 ☐ $30,000 to $39,999
☐ $40,000 to $49,999 ☐ $50,000 to $59,999 ☐ $60,000 to $69,000 ☐ More than $70,000

34. Is the cohort program at your institution a concept...
☐ being more widely adopted? ☐ remaining at the same level? ☐ being less widely adopted?

35. Select one statement that you perceive as true about your doctoral program.
☐ The student cohort model has definitely improved the quality of the overall program in educational administration.
☐ The student cohort model has not changed the quality of the overall program in educational administration.
☐ The student cohort model has lowered the quality of the overall program in educational administration.
Please explain

36. What in general do you perceive as the student’s assessment of the quality of the doctoral cohort program?
☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

37. Among cohort doctoral students, what carry-over experiences have you observed? Check all that apply.
☐ No carry-over experiences ☐ Student relationships continue ☐ Networking enhanced
☐ Enhanced student-professor relationships ☐ Increased alumni participation
☐ Other

38. What in general do you perceive as the faculty’s assessment of the quality of the doctoral cohort program?
☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

39. Among cohort faculty, what carry-over experiences have you observed? Check all that apply.
☐ No carry-over experiences among faculty ☐ Greater collegiality among faculty ☐ Enhanced student-professor relationships
☐ Other

40. How is your institution funded?
☐ Privately funded ☐ Publically funded ☐ Other

41. What do you perceive as being the primary strength of the doctoral cohort program?

42. What do you perceive as being the primary weakness of the doctoral cohort program?

Thank you for taking time out of your schedule to complete this survey. Please forward it in the self-addressed envelope provided. Also, if you would like to include a brochure about your program, it would be much appreciated.

Would you be interested in belonging to a group of faculty involved in cohorts, receiving occasional newsletters and coming together annually to discuss common issues?
☐ Yes ☐ No Comments
Appendix F

IRB Approval
April 15, 1998

Ms. Alleen Hresko
38 Chestnut Street
Nutley, NJ 07110

Dear Ms. Hresko:

At its March meeting, the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subject Research reviewed and approved as submitted your proposal entitled "A Descriptive Study of Doctoral Cohort Programs in Educational Administrative Preparation Programs." Enclosed please find the signed Request for Approval form for your records.

The Institutional Review Board Approval of the project is valid for a one year period from the date of this letter. Any changes to the research protocol must be reviewed and approved by the committee prior to implementation. Thank you for your cooperation and best wishes for the success of your research.

Sincerely,

Robert C. Hallsay
Robert C. Hallsay, Ph.D.
Acting Chair
Institutional Review Board

/pls
encl.
c: James Caufield
Appendix G

Permission to Modify Survey
February 12, 1998

Dr. M. Scott Norton, Professor
Arizona State University
Main Campus
College of Education
Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
PO Box 872411
Tempe, Arizona 85282-2411

Dear Dr. Norton,

I am a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall University in South Orange, New Jersey. I am writing to inform you that I have completed my doctoral thesis under the direction of Dr. James Caulfield, the Director of the Executive Doctoral Cohort Program at Seton Hall University. The focus of my study is to examine the effectiveness of educational administration programs in the "cohort format" rather than the "traditional format." The survey that you conducted, commissioned by the UCEA, surveyed approximately 50 institutions. With your permission, I would like to modify your survey instrument, and use the modified version as the basis for my research. I would call your original survey the "Norton Survey" and call the modified version the "Modified Norton Survey."

I also thank you for directing me, through Dr. Caulfield, to the studies done by Clark and Aldrich, at Arizona State University on the subject of cohort programs.

Please indicate your willingness to grant me permission to use your survey as a basis for my research by signing on the line below and returning the signed copy to me. I have enclosed a return envelope for your convenience. I will keep you informed about the progress of my research and send you a copy of the final project. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

Aileen P. Hresko
Graduate Assistant, College of Education
Executive Doctoral Program
New Academic Building, Room 407
Seton Hall University
South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2685
973-275-2728 (e-mail) hresko@shu.edu

Permission granted
as noted
2/18/98 M. Scott Norton

(Please sign if permission is granted)
Appendix H

Survey Code Book
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-draining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-enhancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-no effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-semiannually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1- 0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2- 5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3- 10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4- 15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5- 20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6- 25-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7- 30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8- 35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9- more than 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>1-weekday evenings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>1-weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8C</td>
<td>1-weekends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8D</td>
<td>1-summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1-yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10  
1-10%  
2-20%  
3-30%  
4-40%  
5-50%  
6-60%  
7-70%  
8-80%  
9-90%  
10-100%

11  
1-1 year  
2-2 years  
3-3 years  
4-4 years  
5-5 years  
6-more than 5 years

12  
1-after completing their coursework  
2-while completing their coursework  
3-no formal dissertation is required

13  
1- 1 year  
2- 2 years  
3- 3 years  
4- 4 years  
5- 5 years  
6- more than 5 years

14A  
1-Minimum grade point average

14B  
1-References

14C  
1-Personal interview

14D  
1-Written essay

14E  
1-Mentor sponsorship

14F  
1-Administrative experience

14G  
1-Release time from job

14H  
1-MAT test results

14I  
(fill in the MAT test score minimum)

14J  
1-GRE overall test results

14K  
(fill in the GRE test score minimum)

14L  
1-Other

15A  
1-Retreats

15B  
1-Group assignments

15C  
1-receptions

15D  
1-Dinners

15E  
1-Recreational trips

15F  
1-other
16A   1-we charge a flat fee
16B   (fill in dollar amount of flat fee charged)
16C   1-We charge a per credit fee
16D   (fill in the dollar amount of the per credit fee)

17A   1-not applicable
17B   1-tuition
17C   1-fees
17D   1-parking
17E   1-books
17F   1-reading requirements and study guides
17G   1-Meals
17H   1-Lodging
17I   1-Other

18     1-20%
       2-40%
       3-60%
       4-80%
       5-100%

19     1-Part of fulltime load
       2-considered as overload

20     1-reduced load
       2-bonus or other monetary consideration
       3-other

21A   1-written comprehensive exam or paper
21B   1-oral comprehensive exam
21C   1-research paper as a culminating activity
21D   1-dissertation
21E   1-dissertation oral defense
21F   1-other

22     1-very difficult
       2-somewhat difficult
       3-no difficulty

23     1-10% group assignments
       2-20%
       3-30%
       4-40%
       5-50%
       6-60%
       7-70%
       8-80%
       9-90%
10-100%

| 24 | 1-real problem  
|    | 2-some problem  
|    | 3-little problem  
|    | 4-no problem  

| 25 | 1-yes  
|    | 2-no  

| 26 | 1-no prescribed time  
|    | 2-2 years  
|    | 3-3 years  
|    | 4-4 years  
|    | 5-5 years  
|    | 6-6 or more years  

| 27 | 1-10%  
|    | 2-20%  
|    | 3-30%  
|    | 4-40%  
|    | 5-50%  
|    | 5-60%  
|    | 7-70%  
|    | 8-80%  
|    | 9-90%  
|    | 10-100%  

| 28 | 1-1 year  
|    | 2-2 years  
|    | 3-3 years  
|    | 4-4 years  
|    | 5-5 years  
|    | 6-more than 5 years  

| 29A | 1-professional responsibilities  
| 29B | 1-personal responsibilities  
| 29C | 1-combination of professional and personal responsibilities  
| 29D | 1-other  

| 30 | 1-10%  
|    | 2-20%  
|    | 3-30%  
|    | 4-40%  
|    | 5-50%  
|    | 6-60%  
|    | 7-70%  
|    | 8-80%  
|    | 9-90%  
|    |
1-advertise
2-word of mouth
3-we don't

1-print media
2-nonprint media
3-other

1- 0 to $9,999
2- $10,000 to $19,999
3- $20,000 to $29,999
4- $30,000 to $39,999
5- $40,000 to $49,999
6- $50,000 to $59,999
7- $60,000 to $69,999
8- more than $70,000

1- being more widely adopted
2- remaining at the same level
3- being less widely adopted

1-The student cohort model has definitely improved the quality of the overall program in educational administration.
2-The student cohort model has not changed the quality of the overall program in educational administration.
3-The student cohort model has lowered the quality of the overall program in educational administration.

1- Excellent
2- Good
3- Fair
4- Poor

1-no carry-over experiences
1-student relationships continue
1-networking enhanced
1-enhanced student professor relationships
1-increased alumni participation
1-other

1-excellent
2-good
3-fair
4-poor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39A</td>
<td>1-no carry-over experiences among faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39B</td>
<td>1-greater collegiality among faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39C</td>
<td>1-enhance student professor relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39D</td>
<td>1-other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1-privately funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-publically funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>