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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this descriptive case study was to trace the evolution over a five-year period (2001-2006) of the Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) Education graduate program at Iowa State University that was offered using an alternative delivery model and given the name Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy. The qualitative case study approach was the research method employed to explore why and how the Academy model was conceptualized, developed, and implemented and to reveal how involvement in the FCS Education graduate program impacted participants in both their personal and professional lives.

The primary source of data included semi-structured interviews with resident faculty, university administrators, Advisory Board members, visiting scholars, and graduate students involved in the program. Documents were also retrieved as a secondary method of data collection. Analysis of the data collected from the interviews and from the documents provided an historical and descriptive account of the FCS Education graduate program’s transformation from a traditional delivery method. Additionally, the study revealed the conceptual framework upon which the Academy model was designed. Themes emerged which offered insight into the personal and professional experiences affected by one’s participation in the FCS Education graduate program. Participants experienced an increased level of commitment to the profession; expanded their horizons and experiences; established a professional network and connection with colleagues; felt a need for self-reflection of one’s professional practice; and enhanced their leadership philosophy and ability.
As a result of this study, lessons were learned about leadership, collaboration, graduate education in general, and about the FCS Education Leadership Academy model. These lessons prompted implications for leadership development within the FCS profession and suggestions for future research and practice.
OPENING VIGNETTE

Imagine if you will, a place where the most profound scholars, researchers, and leaders assembled to mentor and teach those who believed in a common professional mission. Imagine a place where one could be immersed in the rich history of a profession yet inspired by possibilities for the future. Imagine a place where you would meet those who shared your passions, believed in your ideals, and wanted to accomplish similar goals. Imagine a place where the young and the old, the inexperienced and the experienced could support one another in a shared learning community. Imagine a place where individuals could be empowered with the leadership and confidence to tackle the perennial problems facing individuals and families. Perhaps, this place could only exist in one’s imagination. This place exists no longer as a fantasy; it exists as a new delivery method for the graduate program in Family and Consumer Sciences Education at Iowa State University (ISU).

July 14, 2002 was a red letter date at the Alpha Delta Pi sorority house on the campus of Iowa State University. A momentous event occurred as the resident faculty, the department chair, visiting faculty, graduate students, retired faculty and program supporters came together with a myriad of emotions for the first time to officially launch the first week of the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy. For the resident faculty, it was the culmination of months of hard work and determination. For the 17 graduate students, it was the beginning of a journey! Little did we know the events that led to that day!
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Reoccurring demographic, social, technical, economic, and environmental challenges permeate the lives of individuals and families. Changing family structures based on birth and death rates emphasize the demographic trends happening in the United States. Domestic violence, unemployment, debt, poor quality childcare, and obesity are just a few of the societal ills that plague individual and family well-being. Technical advancements in communication, medicine, information, transportation, food and agriculture are transforming the way we live and work at an accelerating pace leading us to question both the ethical and inappropriate uses of these technologies. These challenges create demands on human, economic, and environmental resources that burden individuals, families, and communities. Addressing these challenges requires effective strategies for acquiring, maintaining, sustaining, and developing these resources. Individuals, families, and communities will need new knowledge and appropriate skills to respond to these challenges and demands. More importantly, they will need to find ways to confront the practical problems proactively presented by life in general. These issues and challenges are not easily understood, addressed, or resolved.

Who will take the lead in tackling life’s most basic questions? In her article on leadership development for strengthening families and communities, Nall (2005) concluded that “The issues facing today’s family cannot be solved alone . . . they require leadership” (p. 18). The ability to respond proactively to these societal challenges depends on the quality of leadership exhibited within society and, in
particular, the profession that integrates knowledge from a variety of disciplines to address perennial problems and improve the quality of life. Providing support for leaders to wrestle with life’s most fundamental matters, Astin and Astin (2000) acknowledged that “Our rapidly changing society desperately needs skilled leaders who are able to address complex issues, build bridges, and heal divisions” (p. 31). It is eminently clear that societal issues that impact individual life demand attention. To ignore the fact that these problems exist by accepting them as normal, overlooks the possibility for an improved human condition (Brown & Paolucci, 1979). Consequently, leadership is needed to explicate the vast dimensions of these social ills and to find viable solutions that will bring about a more positive human experience.

Family and consumer sciences (FCS) professionals have been poised from their origins as home economists to address societal issues with the goal of improving the human condition for individuals and families (Lake Placid Conference, 1902). Family and consumer sciences professionals have more than a century of research, service, and professional attention to the many and varied issues facing society. Their individual and collective contributions to improving the quality of life have been cited throughout history (American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences, 2000; New Directions, 1959; Stage & Vincenti, 1997). Lerner, Miller, and Ostrom (1995) realized and concluded that family and consumer sciences professionals have to “be in the forefront and provide the necessary leadership required to address, from integrative and holistic perspectives, issues related to the human condition” (p. 25). There is no other profession that integrates knowledge
from each of the disciplines with the purpose of addressing the practical perennial problems families face daily (Crabtree, 1994; Deacon, 1987; Green, 1990). The profession’s mission was identified by Brown and Paolucci (1979) in *Home Economics: A Definition*:

> The mission of home economics is to enable families, both as individual units and generally as a social institution, to build and maintain systems of action which lead (1) to maturing in individual self-formation and (2) to enlightened, co-operative participation in the critique and formulation of social goals and means for accomplishing them. (p. 23)

The goal then, of the profession, is to work within the social arena by critiquing societal systems to determine if there might be a better way to live. Family and consumer sciences professionals are equipped to unearth the root causes of societal issues, which are merely symptoms masking our societal ills, and “evaluate what *should be done*” (Gentzler, 1999, p. 24). The profession is charged with preparing and equipping professionals to be leaders who can operationalize the integrative nature of the profession to accomplish the profession’s mission. To do so will contribute to the central goal of improving the quality of life.

The family has been described often as the basic unit of society. As long as that basic unit exists, there will be a need for a profession with a specific focus on individual and family well-being. As long as there is a need for the FCS profession, there will be a need for professionals equipped with leadership skills who are empowered to critically analyze the societal issues and their related consequences facing individuals and families, such as structural changes in families, unemployment, domestic violence, quality child care, and obesity, to name a few.
To accomplish the mission, professionals do not simply address issues; they critique the social systems and determine other social goals that have the potential to create a better world. East (1980) highlighted the profession’s need for “extraordinarily competent intellectuals to guide the field, do the research . . . and cooperate with the leaders in other disciplines and professions” (p. 133). The critical need for leadership in the family and consumer sciences profession has been identified within the last twenty years (Baugher & Kellett, 1983; Belck & Meszaros, 1984; Clark, 2000; Fahm, 1995; Inana, 1983; Jax, 2000). As long as there is a need for leaders within the profession, there will be a need for FCS programs in higher education to prepare students and new professionals to work together in accomplishing the profession’s mission.

For more than a hundred years, the FCS profession has been an instrumental force in serving individuals and families through an integrative, holistic approach to education, research, advocacy, and public policy. During that time, importance was placed on the well-being, safety, and quality of life for the family; thereby providing an impetus for the birth of a professional organization and programs of study in universities across the United States. Historically, the family and consumer sciences profession has prepared leaders for positions in teacher preparation, administration, extension, business and industry, government, communications, and human services. A number of university programs prepared professionals in FCS education to assume leadership and administrative roles in the aforementioned areas. In the past few decades, many of the programs preparing FCS education professionals have recognized lower enrollments, retirements, reconfigurations, and phase-outs
(Haley, Peggram, & Ley, 1993). As a result, those whose educational preparation included an integrated understanding and background in each of the specialties within FCS were now being prepared strictly within the specialization areas, such as textiles and clothing, consumer affairs, nutrition and food science, and/or human development and family studies. Preparation in one of the specialized areas of emphasis under the FCS umbrella does not necessarily result in a broad understanding of how each of the specializations works together in an integrative, synergistic manner to meet the challenge presented by the profession’s mission. Historically, FCS education was the unit within the profession that held a clear understanding of the need for drawing knowledge from each of the disciplines, such as the natural and social sciences, to help individuals and families improve the quality of their lives.

Because so many general FCS and FCS education programs in higher education were eliminated or merged because of economic, political, and social changes, individuals within the FCS education profession began expressing concern about the void that would exist if only specialists were prepared at the graduate level. This action caused much discussion among professionals who began to question, explore, and address the issue of losing FCS education as a key component of the profession (Barnes, 2001; Vincenti, 2004). This raised the question of what should be done about preparing leaders in FCS education programs in higher education units nationwide.

In response, Bailey, Firebaugh, Haley, and Nickols (1993) suggested that “Effective leadership by administrators . . . will be a major factor in the survival and
advancement of programs” (p. 9). If effective leadership was necessary, then one would wonder from where those administrators would come. Much research can be found about the family and consumer sciences profession; however, few studies investigate how the profession is equipping current and future professionals to take on leadership and administrative roles to sustain FCS programs and the profession in the future. Without some means for developing professionals to accept leadership and administrative positions, the programs’ futures remain grim and their ability to survive and thrive diminishes greatly. Without these programs, there will be limited opportunities for preparing students for their future professional roles in serving individuals and families and accomplishing the profession’s mission. Without these future professionals, there may be no one left to advocate for, educate, defend, nurture, and empower “individuals and families to manage the challenges of living and working in a diverse, global society” (Redick, 1998, p. 1). FCS education is needed to sustain the profession so that it could continue to meet the needs of those who benefit from its various and diverse programs.

Thus, graduate FCS programs in higher education have been challenged to prepare leaders for the profession (Fahm, 1995; Mitstifer, 1999; Pestle & Wall, 1988). To respond to the changing environment in higher education and the increased need for administrative leadership, Ley and Webb-Lupo (1988) posed the question, “Is it possible to be innovative in higher education today?” (p. 30). They admitted that programs would be challenged to develop new approaches that “can open doors to exciting programmatic possibilities” (p. 34).
What is the viability of FCS programs in a context of demographic, economic, and political change? Is it really possible for programs to be innovative in their approach? What types of approaches could programs take? Where can they find the key to open the door to exciting opportunities within their programs? These questions deserve an answer – and the profession’s leadership must find a solution to respond to the growing challenges faced by FCS programs in developing leaders who can proactively address the challenges called for in the profession’s mission. One might ask, “What ought to be done?” This study describes one solution – an alternative approach and model for offering graduate education that prepares and develops leaders within the FCS education profession.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this descriptive case study was to trace the evolution of the Family and Consumer Sciences Education graduate program at ISU that was given the name Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy (herein referred to as Academy). Moreover, the case study was a way of understanding the FCS Education graduate program at ISU, the contextual factors which motivated the conceptualization of a new delivery system, as well as the goals and principles of the people who came together to transform and participate in this program. Attention was focused on the conceptualization, development, and implementation of the model beginning in the year 2001 and ending in 2006, its fifth summer session. The study was designed to more fully understand the process of how the Academy became a reality. This study outlined why the Academy model was conceptualized, developed, and implemented and revealed how involvement in the FCS Education
graduate program impacted family and consumer sciences professionals in both their personal and professional lives. The case study method was employed to explore the Academy model of graduate education, to understand the context that led to its conceptualization and implementation, and to begin to discover its contribution to and influence on graduate education and the FCS Education profession.

Specifically, this qualitative case study sought to (1) describe the contextual factors that provided the impetus for the creation of the Academy model; (2) determine the involvement of faculty, administrators, FCS education professionals, and graduate students in the creation, development, and implementation of the model; (3) reveal the model's conceptual and theoretical framework that shaped its guiding principles and curriculum; (4) analyze the issues, influences, and challenges of the Academy model on faculty members, students, Advisory Board members, and university administrators associated with involvement in the Academy model for graduate education; and (5) suggest implications and recommendations regarding graduate education, leadership development, and collaborative endeavors within the FCS education profession.

**Significance of the Study**

This case study traces the history and evolution of the Academy model as a way of learning about and understanding the FCS Education graduate program, the contextual factors which motivated its conceptualization, as well as the goals and principles of the people who came together to transform this program. The study examined the role of key leaders and how their perspectives shaped the
development, curriculum, and work of the Academy. This study attempted to understand how the Academy’s vision and mission have been realized through the voices and perspectives of recognized FCS education leaders, college administrators, resident and visiting faculty members, and FCS Education graduate students.

The actions of key individuals and the events associated with the Academy must be chronicled. This study is a descriptive account of the grim realities facing higher education and the rebirth of a program. This study records the innovation and leadership of a program to develop FCS education leaders to meet a crucial need for the future. No other program like it currently exists. It is hoped that the increasing number of student scholars who have participated and graduated in the FCS Education graduate program will utilize the knowledge gained through their experiences to contribute to the profession and society. The process through which the Academy was conceived and evolved should be documented for the FCS profession, Iowa State University, and most importantly, for the many leaders, faculty members, and students who were involved.

By chronicling the events of the Academy, I hoped to contribute to the knowledge and understanding of others who were engaged in providing educational and leadership opportunities for professionals. Such a study sheds insights into the formulation and implementation of efforts and programs that provide leadership development through graduate education. In addition, this historical perspective can be useful to determine how the lessons learned in its early development can contribute to the principles and practices that will guide its future. This study was
informed by key concepts of leadership and the mission of FCS that emerged from the review of relevant literature, as well as analysis of documents, interviews with knowledgeable others, critical questioning of assumptions and values, and interpretive techniques to further an understanding of the whole.

**Background of the Study**

The Academy model, developed in 2001 and launched formally through the FCS Education graduate program in 2002 by resident faculty with the former College of Family and Consumer Sciences at Iowa State University, provides educational and leadership opportunities to empower FCS professionals by making available graduate degrees in FCS education. The graduate education program, offering both master’s and doctoral degrees, “aspires to strengthen Family and Consumer Sciences by inviting collaborative participation in reflection, renewal, and development of professional scholarship and engagement” (Family and Consumer Sciences Leadership Academy, n.d., [http://www.hs.iastate.edu/academy/](http://www.hs.iastate.edu/academy/)). The Academy provides graduate education for students who participate in summer resident experiences and distance education opportunities that enable them to maintain their professional positions while completing the degree requirements.

Through the Academy, leaders and students have engaged in a collaborative network that has resulted in revitalizing and strengthening the educational and leadership opportunities for FCS professionals. Furthermore, the Academy students are given the opportunity to carry out the mission of the profession through reflection on and engagement in their professional practice. The Academy’s initial establishment and success have been briefly featured in the *Journal of Family and...*
Consumer Sciences (Conlon & Gentzler, 2004; Gentzler, Hausafus, Keino, & Kruempel, 2005), The Educator (“It’s a Hit”, 2003), and at the annual meetings of the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS), Association for Career and Technical Education (ACTE), and Council of Administrators of Family and Consumer Sciences (CAFCS). In 2004, the Academy was recognized as the recipient of the Iowa Distance Learning Association Points of Presence Award.

The Doctor of Philosophy offered through the Academy is one of few doctoral programs in the United States where a student can earn the terminal degree specifically in Family and Consumer Sciences Education. It is most fitting that this program was conceived and realized at Iowa State University because of its rich historical heritage as the first land-grant university. Additionally the former College of Family and Consumer Sciences (CFCS) was recognized as one of the largest programs in the United States (CFCS, n.d., www.fcs.iastate.edu/dean/about/facts/statistics.htm). The graduate programs in the former College of Family and Consumer Sciences at Iowa State University had a strong research foundation with a reputation of stellar research. Of reporting institutions identified in the Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal compilation, Iowa State ranked first in the greatest number of total thesis and dissertation titles listed in 1995 (Lee & Johnson, 1996), 1996 (Ownbey & Taupmann, 1997), 1997 (Ownbey, 1998), and 2003 (Makela, 2004) and ranked second in 2001 (Smith & Hunter, 2002) and 2002 (Makela, 2003).

Changing demographic and enrollment trends have affected graduate education and challenged programs to find innovative solutions to meet the needs of
diverse students. Although other doctoral programs have maintained a graduate program with traditional delivery methods, the Academy responded to changing trends and needs through summer resident experiences and online coursework that allow student scholars, who might be place-bound due to current personal, family, and professional commitments, to earn a graduate degree in FCS education.

Although the Academy model meets a need for graduate education in FCS, it serves a much greater need in the FCS profession and in society itself – empowering current and future leaders and equipping them with graduate credentials to accomplish the mission of the profession.

**Overview of Research Method**

The qualitative research method, specifically the case study approach outlined by Creswell (1998), Merriam (1998), and Stake (1995), was used in this study to gain a greater understanding of the Academy model and program. Purposeful sampling was used to determine participants who would serve as key informants and could provide a rich description of their experiences with the program. The methods of data collection were in-depth interviews and document analysis. The interviews provided insight into the participants’ roles, perspectives, and experiences. Official documents reviewed included meeting agendas, meeting minutes, letters, and reports. The use of several sources of data added to the trustworthiness of the research study.

This inquiry was based upon the ideas and perspectives of individuals who chose to participate in the process of conceptualizing and implementing the Academy and their experiences in the program. These informants have worked
closely with the Academy and possess intimate knowledge of the contextual factors that influenced how and why it was created, as well as being central in moving forward to the implementation and realization of the program’s mission and goals. Through in-depth interviews with these participants, and analysis of relevant documents, I received perspectives about what happened from resident faculty members, administrators, members of the Academy Advisory Board, visiting faculty, and graduate students. I was able to achieve a much truer picture, not only from written documents, but also from a variety of different people’s recollections and analysis over time. This study was not intended to evaluate the Academy; rather, my goal was to understand and describe what happened, as well as to learn and determine the contributions of the individuals involved in the program. In this way, I was able to identify some apparent strengths, as well as limitations, of the Academy and its ability to develop potential FCS leaders. Through interviews, substantive themes emerged with respect to involvement in the Academy and its impact on the individuals involved, graduate education in general, and the FCS profession. Those themes were shared through the voices of those individuals involved in the Academy. It was those themes that documented the true realization of the Academy model’s goals.

Role of the Researcher

My interest in Iowa State’s graduate program in FCS Education was sparked in December, 2001, as someone thrust a flier announcing the program in my hand when I was in an elevator while attending the annual convention for the Association for Career and Technical Education (ACTE). At the time, I was an instructor and
FCS teacher educator at a Southern university with some random, isolated thoughts and dreams regarding the pursuit of a terminal degree in FCS Education. My aspirations had been hindered by my commitments as a full-time employee, a mother of two school-age children, and a wife. With these professional and personal constraints, I had given up on a dream of earning a doctoral degree. I wondered how it would be possible for me to attend school, pay tuition, and earn a degree while juggling personal responsibilities and professional roles. It was not until I learned about the FCS Education graduate program at Iowa State University and its educational, leadership, and scholarship opportunities that I believed that my dream could become a reality.

After several months of not being able to dismiss my interest, I applied for the program and was accepted as a participant in the first class offered through the Academy format. I believe that this event marked an important milestone in my continuing leadership development. My participation in the program was instrumental in helping me to reflect upon my personal and professional leadership experiences; the coursework associated with the program challenged me beyond belief and allowed me to reflect upon and construct meaning from these experiences. I found the content relevant and discovered ways in which it was applicable to my personal and professional life.

Personally, I was challenged to reflect upon my own beliefs, philosophy, experiences, and practices and to think about how those have shaped the individual and leader I am today. My involvement in the program led to national and state scholarship awards that offset tuition expenses and allowed me to continue pursuing
the graduate degree in FCS Education. I was able to keep my position at the university where I was employed and maintain my family responsibilities. I took classes during the academic year via the Internet and traveled to the ISU campus during the summer for the three-week resident courses. Juggling graduate school, professional organization activities, work, and family required sacrifices and much dedication and commitment; but, my employer, my family, and I wholeheartedly agreed that the decision to participate in the FCS Education graduate program was one of the best decisions of my life.

Professionally, my experiences within the program gave me a wealth of knowledge, experiences, and resources that I use in my own classroom and professional practice. As an educator, young FCS professional, and researcher, I became intrigued and captivated by the Academy’s conceptualization, collaborative network, and its educational and leadership opportunities for FCS professionals. In my role as a student in the FCS Education program offered through the Academy model, I had only observed and experienced the work, activities, and curricula from the student “lens”. Because of the impact that those experiences had on me personally and professionally, I wanted to gain a greater understanding of why and how the program created the Academy model from those individuals and leaders who played key roles and were involved in its conceptualization, development, and implementation. I wanted to get a glimpse into the “lenses” from which they viewed and participated in the Academy. I believed that my involvement in the FCS Education program through the Academy and my acquaintance with the resident faculty members and some of the administrators, Advisory Board members, and
visiting faculty would allow me to gather the necessary facts about the program and help me to construct meaning from their experiences and stories.

As a university faculty member, I also was motivated to understand how this type of creative strategy might be captured and perhaps reconfigured to meet the needs of other graduate programs facing similar situations. The Academy model was an innovative solution to the challenges associated with higher education and a model for graduate education programs striving to produce professional leaders equipped to make a positive difference in a global society. There continues to be a convincing need for FCS Education leaders to accomplish the profession’s mission and become a viable force in the resolution of individual and societal issues. It is my intent to discover and understand the justifications and strategies utilized in the conceptualization of the Academy model so that I might be instrumental in preparing FCS Education leaders for the future.

Limitations

This study was restricted to one unique case – the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy at Iowa State University – that was selected for in-depth examination within a five year period (2001 – 2006). The study’s purpose was to explore the creation, implementation, and realization of the Academy model at ISU. The purpose of the study was not to make generalizations to a broad population or to similar single-case efforts. Findings of this research were limited to the interpretations of data collected from interviews with key informants, their perspectives, and their documents.
At the time of this study, all of the key informants who were interviewed were actively participating in the Academy as a faculty member, administrator, Advisory Board member, or graduate student. Thus, there was some difficulty in asking participants to reveal their experiences while they were still involved in the program, especially if they felt that there might be consequences to what was said or shared in the interview. In addition, it should be noted that four of the five members of the Program of Study committee, directing my research, were participants in the program and the study. Because I was a doctoral candidate in the FCS Education program, my work was subject to the evaluation of the committee members and faculty at Iowa State University. Every attempt has been made to conduct data collection and analysis in an appropriate manner and to provide an honest rendering of what I heard, read, and observed in the process of completing this research.

**Definition of Terms**

**FCS Education Leadership Academy**: the name given for the new, alternative delivery model for the traditional, residential FCS Education graduate program at Iowa State University

**Leadership development**: the cultivation and strengthening of qualities, styles, practices, and philosophies of leadership

**Qualitative research**: an interpretive or naturalistic mode of inquiry that seeks to examine and understand experiences by describing, translating, and analyzing the meanings of certain phenomena
**Case study:** a qualitative research method used to explore a bounded system through “detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information rich in context” (Creswell, 1998, p. 61)

**Resident faculty:** individuals who hold graduate faculty rank at Iowa State University, are employed full-time in the program and housed on the campus, and who assume the major role of advising and leading the graduate program in FCS Education

**Visiting scholars:** professors who were nationally distinguished, had varied leadership experiences within the FCS Education profession, and were invited to teach selected summer course offerings and/or online courses for the fall and spring semesters

**Living, learning community:** the development of an intentional environment that "encourage[s] students to create connections between learning that takes place in the classroom setting and the experiences, events, and individuals affecting their lives every day" (Murphy, 2002, p. 24).

**Reflective Human Action:** a theoretical framework defined as “an active, mind-engaging process of meaning-making in a community of practice” (Mitstifer, 1995, p. 3) that emphasizes core leadership principles that guide professional practice

**Organization of Remaining Chapters**

In the next chapter, I review the literature on the history of the profession and FCS higher education programs. This review addresses specifically the increased need for developing and sustaining leadership within the FCS profession to tackle the challenges facing society and higher education programs. This literature
provides the foundation for this study. The third chapter provides an overview of qualitative method as it relates to case study research and offers a detailed description of the research design. Chapter Four introduces the conceptual model upon which the Academy was built. Chapter Five focuses on the historical perspective of the FCS Education program to ascertain why and how the Academy model was conceptualized and developed. Chapter Six provides an analysis and interpretation of the themes, issues, and challenges associated with the Academy model. The seventh, and final chapter, presents conclusions, such as lessons learned from this case study, as well as suggestions for further research.

Summary

This chapter provides a brief statement of the problem and need to which the Academy model has responded. A description of the study’s purpose, research questions, significance, and background has been offered. The chapter concludes with an overview of the research method proposed, my role as the researcher, and the organization of remaining chapters.

Bower (2001) recognized commitment as “a passion, a mission, or even a fever; it is contagious and we are carriers” (p. 20). Imagine the dedication and commitment of the faculty members and key leaders associated with the Academy to the mission of family and consumer sciences and to the development of leaders, not only within the profession but within society. Their dedication to pursuing this graduate education model reaffirms Bower’s (2001) words that maintain, “Our continued viability as a profession depends on our ability ... to instill that unique passion in those who will follow us” (p. 20). Imagine how individuals who read this
A descriptive account of the FCS Education program will be captivated by, and infected with, the same leadership and professional commitment that inspired the conceptualization of the Academy. The FCS Education program has the ability to impact the entire profession, to inform professional practice, and to improve the human condition and individual and family well-being. We no longer have to imagine the FCS Education program’s transformation from a traditional model of graduate education to the Academy model of graduate education – here is its journey from conceptualization to realization!
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to trace the evolution of the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy – a model of graduate education that brings (a) renowned scholars to Iowa State University (ISU) to instruct classes and challenge students from around the world and (b) scholarship into homes through online instruction during the academic year. This chapter provides a history of the FCS profession and of FCS education programs in higher education. A review of relevant literature justified a critical need for leaders within the profession with a FCS Education orientation. University programs in FCS Education must survive and thrive so that professionals can attend to their mission within the context of demographic, political, social, and economic changes. The impact of FCS education program mergers, reorganizations, and closures is outlined because of its relevance to the creation of the Academy model. Leadership perspectives and theories relevant to the mission and practice of FCS professionals are explored and explicated to gain a greater understanding of the concept of leadership.

The Profession of Family and Consumer Sciences

The year was 1899 when eleven people gathered to discuss economic and societal issues and identify possible solutions. The conferences, known as the Lake Placid Conferences, continued for over ten years. From these conferences, a new field and profession evolved – home economics. From its beginning, the profession included a focus on addressing societal issues with the goal of improving the human
condition for individuals and families. In the beginning, the profession was defined as

the study of the laws, conditions, principles, and ideals which are concerned on the one hand with man's immediate physical environment and on the other hand, with his nature as a social being, and is the study especially of the relation between these two factors. (Lake Placid Conference, 1902, p.)

With a high level of importance given to the family's safety, well-being, and improved quality of life, a professional organization, the American Home Economics Association, was born. As individuals, families, and society changed, the profession re-examined its definition and role. The history of the profession has been wrought with the struggles, tensions, and challenges associated with close scrutiny of its identity. Examination of the evolving and changing needs of individuals and families led to a broadened definition of the profession as

the field of knowledge and service primarily concerned with strengthening family life through (1) educating the individual for family living, (2) improving the services and goods used by families, (3) conducting research to discover the changing needs of individuals and families and the means of satisfying these needs, (4) furthering community, national, and world conditions favorable to family living. (*New Directions*, 1959, p. 680)

By 1979, FCS professionals were still searching for identity clarification and two philosophers in home economics education, Brown and Paolucci, tackled the challenge of further defining the purpose of the profession. Within that definition, a mission emerged:

The mission of home economics is to enable families, both as individual units and generally as a social institution, to build and maintain systems of action which lead (1) to maturing in individual self-formation and (2) to enlightened, co-operative participation in the critique and formulation of social goals and means for accomplishing them. (p. 23)
Brown and Paolucci believed that the fundamental goal of home economics was to provide a framework whereby professionals could critique the social arena and work with others to develop new objectives that had the potential to improve the human condition. Moreover, professionals in home economics would have the ability to create social systems of action and assist individuals as they seek to address those goals.

While the mission was explained and justified by Brown and Paolucci (1979), some FCS professionals did not agree with the theoretical framework that referred to the profession as a critical science. According to Stage and Vincenti (1997), the framework stimulated reflection within the profession, prompted discourse among FCS professionals, and inspired curriculum changes at both the secondary and higher education level. Later, Brown (1984) encouraged professionals to continue engaging in “rational argumentation among ourselves: to expect and to provide rational grounds for what we believe and do, to validate the reasons given, to change our beliefs and our practices” (p. 27).

By the 1990s, individuals within home economics were questioning whether the profession was in a position to adequately address issues facing individuals, families, and communities for the 21st century (Simerly, Ralston, Harriman, & Taylor, 2000; Stage & Vincenti, 1997). As a result of a re-examination of the profession, a new name and conceptual framework emerged – family and consumer sciences. The framework identified the focus, beliefs, assumptions, statements of professional practice, and outcomes of the profession as it approached the 21st century. Again, the process required FCS
professionals to engage in a soul-searching endeavor, reflect upon their practice, and participate in a reasoned discussion that would impact the future of the profession.

**Programs to Prepare FCS Professionals**

Since the beginning of the profession, one of its goals was to establish respected higher education programs for women (McGrath, 1968). The Morrill Act of 1862 created land-grant universities throughout the United States where home economics courses were offered. With the passage of the Smith Hughes Act of 1917, federal funding provided support for higher education programs to prepare professionals to teach home economics. As a result, university programs increased rapidly.

Yet, in the 1960s, there was discussion within the profession about the elimination of home economics programs. With a proactive approach, a commissioned study was launched to determine the worth of the home economics profession. As a result, McGrath (1968) indicated the great potential of home economics units to serve society and suggested that the integrity of such programs remain intact. To address changes within the profession in the late 1960s and 1970s, some units approved name changes (Harper, 1981). Although the majority of units (83%) maintained the name “home economics,” the growing number of content specializations within those units led to a reduction of general home economics degrees and an increase of specialty-related content degrees (Harper & Davis, 1986). The analysis of family and consumer sciences programs in higher
education continued throughout the profession’s history (Green, 1989; Greninger, Durrett, Hampton, & Kitt, 1984; Harper & Davis, 1986).

Historically, the family and consumer sciences profession prepared students for positions in teacher education, administration, extension, business and industry, government, communications, and human services. Many higher education programs prepared leaders in FCS to assume leadership and administrative roles to address societal issues from an integrative, synergistic approach. However, the continued preparation of these individuals has been threatened by low enrollments, retirements, mergers, and the elimination of FCS programs in recent years (Haley, Peggram, & Ley, 1993). Those challenges, which arise because of increased pressures in the higher education context, have forced FCS programs to change the way in which they are viewed and administered. Unfortunately, these challenges still plague FCS higher education programs today. Through appropriate preparation of FCS professionals and continued professional development opportunities, leadership development can take place.

**Leadership Development as a Component of Professional Development**

Professional development is central to leadership development. Gentzler (1987) described competent family and consumer sciences professionals as persons who “are expected to have a set of values, skills, attitudes, and behaviors that coincide with the standards established by the professional group to which they belong” (p. 39). One might ask which activities are deemed appropriate for professional development. East (1980) outlined specific activities that she believed were appropriate to professional development when she claimed that “the
professional reads the professional journals, attends the professional meetings . . .
gets added graduate study or attends special workshops or institutes . . . takes
considerable responsibility for sharing knowledge with other colleagues and for
extending professional knowledge through research” (p. 230). Although each of
these behaviors contributes to professional growth, Gentzler (1987) argued that they
may not be sufficient for defining professional competence.

   Gentzler (1987) conceptualized the meaning of competence for FCS
professionals by proposing eight constructs of competence as a basis for
professional development of FCS professionals. Her study revealed that an FCS
professional will

   • be rationally committed to the mission as justifiably established by the
     profession;

   • reflect critically on optimum conditions for fulfilling the mission;

   • be willing to deal with complex concepts relevant to the practice of the
     profession;

   • have a sense of purpose that transcends self-interest;

   • identify with a community of peers;

   • participate in dialogue within the professional community through
     examined critique and reflection using rational standards for
     argumentation;

   • be self-directed in selection of experiences, opportunities, and
     relationships that encourage professional growth; and
• engage in professional practice in ways that are cognitively justifiable and morally defensible (p. 41).

It is not enough to know the appropriate actions to take; one must engage in professional behaviors that are acceptable for themselves and the profession. Professional development, then, is an evolving process. There is no end to one’s ability to grow professionally. Gentzler concluded, “It is the individual who strives for continued professional development and competence who will make the difference” (p. 42) in the accomplishment of the profession’s mission. With that in mind, programs that prepare FCS professionals might ensure that the training and educational opportunities that they provide are appropriate for developing leadership skills and behaviors.

The Need for Leadership in the FCS Profession

The smaller the world has become through globalization, the larger it has become. Friedman (2006) mentioned concepts of “a flat world” and an “unflat world” and noted that the chasm, between those having the advantages of global technology and those who do not, has widened. The need of cultures in the “unflat” world to realize actual answers to their situations of poverty, disease, malnutrition, lack of education, weak governmental infrastructures, and numerous other societal plagues has provided unprecedented opportunities for leaders in all professions to collaborate in their efforts to address practical, perennial problems affecting the human condition.

In light of world events, the mission of FCS as defined by Brown and Paolucci in 1979 still retains the same focus, albeit with greater urgency. Issues requiring the
attention of leaders today are no longer localized. Families, as individual units and as social institutions, are the foundation from which effective delivery systems for individual self-growth and social awareness are constituted. Klausner, former director of global health programs for the Gates Foundation, commented that, “The most important health-care system in the world is a mother” (Friedman, 2006, p. 468). His statement provides justification for the importance and relevance of the FCS profession and mission. Although corporations and organizations fulfill their responsibilities to the increasing world population via resources, scientific research, model communities, and humanitarian aid in general, FCS professionals possess the integrative knowledge and leadership skills to impact cultures by improving human conditions through its central focus on the family.

Although skills-based teaching has been prominent throughout its history, the FCS profession has also impacted individual and family well-being through education, research, service, advocacy, and public policy (American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences, 2000; New Directions, 1959; Stage & Vincenti, 1997). However, the need for healthy families is not over. The profession’s mission requires leaders who are positioned and prepared to tackle societal issues affecting individuals, families, and communities. Without such leadership, the profession may not survive. Without the profession, and its mission to improve the human condition, families will continue to struggle with societal pressures and plagues resulting from conflicting values within an ever-changing world.

The profession’s mission – “…to enable families, both as individual units and generally as a social institution, to build and maintain systems of action which lead
(1) to maturing in individual self-formation and (2) to enlightened, co-operative participation in the critique and formulation of social goals and means for accomplishing them” (Brown & Paolucci, 1979) – can not be ignored. FCS leaders must stand in the forefront to address the new list of social ills threatening society today and to enhance the contributions of individuals and families across the world (Lerner, Miller, & Ostrom, 1995). To lead or not to lead is no longer a question for FCS professionals; it is a necessity. We all have a responsibility to lead – in our families, our neighborhoods, our organizations, our educational institutions, and in our own country (Mitstifer, 1995). In her paper that focused on positioning the FCS profession for the future, Crabtree (1994) questioned:

When has there been a time in our history where there has been greater recognition of the critical role that families have in contributing to the development of human capacity and to the stability and productivity of our society? . . . The time for Family and Consumer Sciences is now more than ever before! (p. 2)

Can FCS professionals continue to be the instrumental force that has been the foundation of the profession for more than 100 years – placing a high degree of importance on the well-being, safety, and quality of life for the family?

The Need for Leadership within FCS Programs

Although much research can be found about the family and consumer sciences profession, few studies investigate strategies for how the profession should equip future professionals to take on leadership roles and sustain the profession in the future. This issue was one of many discussed at the Family and Consumer Sciences in Higher Education Summit (Mitstifer, 1999). Preparing dedicated, committed pre-professionals to be the next generation of leaders within the
profession should be the focus of FCS higher education programs according to Fahm (1995).

Pestle and Wall (1988) pointedly asked “how graduate programs can best prepare future leaders in home economics . . . for it is essential to the continuing development and survival of our profession” (p. 44). This preparation can begin by promoting the importance of and providing opportunities for professionals to develop as a leader.

What has been done to prepare leaders to assume leadership and administrative roles to address issues within FCS programs, universities, the profession, and society? Inana (1983) shared a growing concern regarding the preparation of professionals for leadership and administrative positions. Belck and Meszaros (1984) echoed the “pressing need for additional administrators, more highly skilled administrators, and administrators who pursue positions beyond home economics units to the central administrations of colleges and universities” (p. 25). Without an aim on the preparation of leaders to focus on societal and professional issues, a critical need for leadership in the FCS profession remains (Baugher & Kellett, 1983; Belck & Meszaros, 1984; Clark, 2000; Fahm, 1995; Jax, 2000).

Program viability for university FCS programs has been an issue for more than ten years, as Bailey et al. (1993) pointed out that higher education “is under greater scrutiny” (p. 3). Haley, Peggram, and Ley (1993) reported reductions affecting home economics programs, such as mergers, loss of faculty, streamlining programs, and program deletion. Bailey et al. (1993) believed that “Effective leadership by administrators . . . will be a major factor in the survival and
advancement of programs” (p. 9). Fahm (1995) suggested “that if home economics programs and units are to maintain their viability within the university, they must demonstrate excellence, effectiveness, and efficiency accruing to the measures and values of the particular institutions” (p. 50).

It is clear that there will be a need for continued programming and resources to assist FCS units and administrators in overcoming these challenges. In a study of program administrators, several priorities were identified (Greninger, Hampton, Kitt, & Durrett, 1986). Survey respondents indicated an increased priority for graduate programs to review program quality and increase course offerings. Leadership training and greater integration of subject matter were identified as future needs of administrators. Yet, are these priorities enough to prepare professionals with the leadership and professional development they need to face tough issues associated with the coordination and administration of FCS programs?

Threats to FCS program viability are not new, but discussions of these threats have heightened in recent years. Vincenti (2004) identified external factors that threaten the viability of any FCS program. These include budget cuts, shifts in university administration, and economic, political, and social changes. As a result, some programs have flourished while other programs faded. Unfortunately, too many programs, including FCS Education programs, have become victims, leaving the ability to accomplish the mission of FCS at risk. The profession has also lost influential FCS and FCS Education programs to closures, mergers, and reorganizations. Professionals are left to wonder what ought to be done? In her own response to the issue of program viability, Ralston (2004) shared her personal
belief that, “Leadership is possibly the most important factor in helping our field to develop a viable future” (p. 3). She recognized the important role an administrator plays in sustaining a program. An old proverb warns, “As goes the leader, so goes the organization.” Without leaders who are devoted to accomplishing the mission and to moving forward, FCS programs, and specifically FCS Education programs, will continue to struggle from the constraints and pressures in the higher education climate today. Although administrators can be viewed as change agents, it is no easy task to change institutions like those within higher education (Nidiffer, 2001). The restructuring of higher education must be more responsive to the dynamic, global society as it is now time for “new voices, new perspectives, new strategies, and new ways of working with people” (p. 105).

What external factors or issues are universities and their FCS Education programs facing that will impact their viability and sustainability? In today’s evolving world, economic constraints, pressures for increased research productivity, and the changing demographics of graduate students are only a few of the factors which were examined as relevant issues in this study.

**Budget Cuts to Higher Education**

Changes and cuts in financial support for all university programs are not new challenges (Hebel & Selingo, 2001). Dwindling resources for higher education and its impact on FCS and FCS Education programs have been addressed for many years (Barnes, 2001; Greninger, et al., 1986; Ley & Webb-Lupo, 1988). Collaborative endeavors have been identified as key to responding to challenges in the context of weakening federal and state support. Leaders of FCS units must be
equipped to adapt to challenges and to strategically position their programs because “the way in which each FCS college and department positions itself during this time will have a significant impact on its ability to continue to thrive” (Barnes, 2001, p. 38). When faced with scarce resources, administrators are forced to make difficult decisions that affect programs, curricula, faculty, and/or students. Ley and Webb-Lupo (1988) posed the question, “Is it possible to be innovative in higher education today?” (p. 30). They admitted that programs would be challenged to develop new approaches that “can open doors to exciting programmatic possibilities” (p. 34). The conceptualization of the Academy model could be considered an innovative approach that was developed in response to the growing challenges faced by FCS Education programs.

**Research Productivity**

The future existence and growth of FCS and FCS Education programs within higher education may be dependent on their reputation for research quality and productivity (Breen, 1983; Firebaugh, Davis, & Sailor, 1980; Greninger et al., 1986; McFarland, 1983). In reviewing the research productivity of FCS graduate programs over the last ten years, several conclusions can be drawn. Table 1 illustrates the number of reporting institutions with completed theses and dissertations. The ratio of theses and dissertations in relation to the total titles has maintained some consistency within the last five years. With the exception of 1997 and 1998, there has been a decline in the total numbers of theses and dissertations from 1994 to 2003. In just the last five years (1999-2003), there has been a 56% decline in the
Table 1: Numbers of Theses and Dissertations Reported in the *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal* (1994 – 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reporting Institutions</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theses</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-138</td>
<td>+63</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-145</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertations</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+46</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

number of master’s theses and 79% decline in the number of doctoral dissertations. Although the list of reporting institutions is not exhaustive, this data provided some information regarding the status of research produced in graduate education in FCS Education programs.

If the focus is narrowed even more with regard to the area of FCS education, the numbers indicate an even lower percentage of graduates and research studies. According to the 2003-04 directory of FCS teacher preparation programs distributed by the Association for Career and Technical Education (ACTE), there were 197 programs that offered master’s degrees and only two programs offering doctoral degrees specifically in FCS education (ACTE, 2003). With fewer graduate programs, it is imperative that current programs adapt to current trends and find new strategies or alternative solutions for graduate education in FCS education. If programs don’t respond, there may not be a place for people to earn a doctoral degree specifically in FCS education.

Consequently, those programs lose students to a host of other areas, including but not limited to, curriculum and instruction, educational leadership, the specialty areas, or guidance and counseling. Although all university programs are important in today’s global society, FCS education programs must be recognized for their valuable contributions in empowering individuals and sustaining the family as a foundation of society. What will happen if that recognition does not occur? Programs may continue to be cut. Potential leaders within the profession may be lost. Yet, even more importantly, FCS education professionals may have to stand alone in their calling to accomplish the professional mission.
Trends in Graduate Student Enrollment

In light of the aforementioned challenges, higher education programs and FCS programs, in particular, must respond to changing demographic trends for offering degree programs. Ebersole (2004) predicted that by 2008 more graduate study would be completed on a part-time basis, via the online format, and by female students over age 35. Part-time enrollment will be a result of the increasing costs of tuition and the need for individuals to remain employed. O'Brien and Crabtree (1987) reported characteristics that may be necessary in developing new approaches to graduate education. These included “flexibility in scheduling courses to meet the needs of students who are employed full time [and] courses that foster both theoretical knowledge and pragmatic techniques” (p. 31).

The need to work while attending school adds to the attractiveness of online learning. An estimated 90% of public universities offer courses via the Internet. In fact, “online graduate programs are the fastest growing new category of new offerings” (Ebersole, 2004, p. 15). One of the problems associated with these trends is the lack of a sense of community that develops among students. Perhaps, students will have limited opportunities to interact with fellow students and may not develop an attachment to the university. Thus, a blended program that combines online instruction and face-to-face interaction may be one alternative for adapting to these trends.

With regard to age and gender, trends have indicated that the future graduate student will be older and female. Ebersole (2004) reported that individuals who are 30 years of age or older make up approximately 68% of the enrolled population.
The Council of Graduate Schools (n.d.) profiled graduate enrollment in 2001 as comprising students who were 44% males and 56% females and 52% full-time and 48% part-time. Doctorate-granting universities had a higher majority of women graduate students and 56% of their students were part-time. For master's granting institutions, women comprised 64% of enrollment and 61% were part-time. Projections have indicated that women will earn graduate degrees at a significantly higher rate than their male counterparts. Since 1970, there has been a steady increase in graduate degrees awarded to women both at the master's and doctoral levels (Glazer-Raymo, 1999). When examining the doctoral statistics, there was a total of 1,760 women who earned doctoral degrees in 1965; yet, by 1995, this number had multiplied nearly ten times with a total of 16,333 women earning doctoral degrees.

**Women and Graduate Education**

The trends revealed about females and graduate education are significant because the FCS profession is predominantly female and women earn the majority of doctoral degrees granted in FCS. For many women, earning the doctorate degree is not considered within the normal role for women (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988). However, those women, who break out of the traditional mold of home and family and pursue graduate education, must assess the costs and benefits associated with having the advanced degree. Their decision may be influenced by their preferences for marriage and/or bearing and raising children (Perna, 2004).

In their research study of women's graduate study, Grace and Gouthro (2000) believed that graduate education “frequently ignores the woman’s right to balance
commitments in terms of her responsibilities in the homeplace and the university” (p. 10). Along with the challenges of juggling roles associated with school, work, and family, women may experience a disruption in family and community relationships. Although men are not excluded from the responsibilities associated with home and family, women typically bear the greater burden associated with those roles (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988). Vezina (1998) agreed that the difficulties of keeping up with motherhood while enrolled in graduate school can actually discourage women from pursuing doctoral studies.

Along with those difficulties, female students have to conform to a university learning culture in which men and women experience graduate education differently. In their survey of research into women’s graduate experiences, Isaac, Pruitt-Logan and Upcraft (1995) reported that female students are more likely than male students to perceive disconnection and alienation from the university. In addition, they are more likely to obtain less graduate program support from facilities and curricula, to receive less support from other students, and to have lower degree completion rates.

Grace and Gouthro (2000) demanded that graduate programs and faculty “be in touch and in tune with the current realities of graduate students' lives” (p. 7). For effective change to occur in doctoral programs, LaPidus (1997) suggested they must (1) motivate and support diversely-located women to pursue a doctoral degree and (2) confront and establish academic policies, standards and practices that are aligned with the enrollment trends in graduate education. Johnsrud (1995) identified several barriers that women face while engaging in graduate study: (a) lack of
women faculty who can serve as same-sex role models and offer support throughout their graduate programs; (b) difficulty in obtaining financial support to pursue graduate education, especially for those over 30 and with children; and (c) demands to complete a residency requirement, especially for mothers whose competing responsibilities and limited financial resources make a fixed period of full-time study unrealistic.

**Defining and Understanding Leadership**

This review of relevant literature serves as a framework to set the stage for this research study. Thus far, this review of literature revealed a crucial need for leadership within the FCS profession and outlined the critical issues facing FCS programs. Several definitions of leadership and the application of leadership theories and paradigms to professional practice were reviewed to provide a foundation for this study. Leadership theories relevant to the mission and practice of FCS professionals were shared to operationalize the concept of leadership.

Leadership means different things to different people. Terry (2003) acknowledged the hundreds of definitions of leadership and the numerous skills and strategies that are mentioned throughout current leadership literature. This review does not introduce the numerous definitions, strategies, or skills. Rather, several definitions are presented.

Frank (1993) defined leadership as an observable set of practices that could be learned. Further definition focused on leadership as a group process that involves interaction between at least two persons in pursuit of a goal. Leadership involves action as well as thought. Effective leaders keep the group together,
assure that tasks are completed, and supply a sense of direction. A leader has an ability to see beyond what is to what could be. Frank emphasized that those who lead others will seek and accept challenges.

The key to the success of an organization is good leadership (Ramsay, 1999). That leadership does not come from only one individual. Leadership involves a relationship between the leader, the members, and the organization. According to Bass and Stogdill’s Handbook of Leadership (1990), leadership “occurs when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in a group” (p. 20). Leaders must possess certain beliefs, characteristics, and skills in order to motivate and enhance the development of the individuals within their organizations. Graham and Cockriel (1996) provided an explanation of the important role that leaders play in encouraging followers to become leaders themselves through selflessness, delegation of responsibility, and enthusiasm.

DePree (1989) defined leadership as a “belief, a condition of the heart” (p. 148). The use of the heart metaphor illustrated that leadership was more a set of convictions and values related to one’s work and passion than a list of tasks to be accomplished. Similarly, one FCS professional (Nall, 2005) associated passion with leadership in the following definition: “an action that stems from passion, from the heart and soul of the profession” (p. 20). Anderson and Nickols (2001) described the essence of the profession as heart and soul, focusing on what gives meaning and inspiration to our work. One does not have to look far in the FCS profession to find individuals who meet the descriptions and qualities and have a true passion for their work. FCS leaders and professionals understand the quote from Charles May,
“The great use of life is to spend it for something that will outlast it – life” (as cited in Maxwell, 1996, p. 93). Those professionals demonstrate and exemplify their passion on a daily basis in their practice to improve the human condition.

**Leadership Paradigms and Theoretical Frameworks**

As change occurs within society and within families, and the need for leadership heightens, individuals are often challenged to review their current perspectives and determine whether they are appropriate and applicable to respond to those changes. Thus, the perspectives, or paradigms, for leadership within organizations have shifted throughout history. Three particular paradigms, including the self-organizing, framing, and zone approaches, were identified within the leadership literature and drawn upon to understand how to move organizations and/or institutions forward, given the current context in which we live and in which FCS Education programs operate.

Wheatley’s (2005) self-organizing approach emphasized the strategies necessary for leading an organization or institution in uncertain, turbulent times. Given the climate within higher education today, Bolman and Deal’s (1997) framing approach was helpful in examining how leaders within institutions or programs should address the challenges that they face. Because “education is a process, not a place,” (Friedman, 2006, p. 375), Terry’s (2003) zone approach to leadership outlined the phases that occur within a process of leading an organization or institution.
Wheatley: Self-Organizing Approach

Wheatley (2005) reinforced the concept of self-organization, which challenges systems to “sustain themselves and move toward greater complexity and order as needed. They can respond intelligently to the need for change. They organize (and then reorganize) themselves into adaptive patterns and structures without any externally imposed plan” (p. 33). Institutions and programs that self-organize are able to respond to change, experiment to create new initiatives, and effectively accomplish their work.

Wheatley (2005) suggested three essentials for self-organizing systems: identity, information, and relationships. First, efforts must begin “with an intent, a belief that something more is possible” (p. 37). Likewise, they make sense of who they are and what they do by referencing their vision, mission, and values. “Current interpretations of its history, present decisions and activities, and its sense of the future” (p. 38) contribute to the identity of an organization. Developing a sense of identity requires that individuals explore and clarify their own needs and intentions and commit to creating a shared sense of identity. Secondly, information, which should flow openly, is vital to an organization. Data, from both internal and external sources, are used to organize and to change the organization. Information generates conditions within the system that allows quick and effective responses to challenges. Finally, the system becomes wiser when information is created, more individuals are included, and relationships are built. The more connections established between people, the greater the possibilities within the system.
Bolman and Deal: Framing

Similarly, Bolman and Deal (1997) proposed that organizations would benefit from reframing. They defined frames as perspectives, “windows on the world and lenses that bring the world into focus” (p. 12), filters, or tools that leaders can use to “gather information, make judgments, and determine how best to get things done” (p. 12). Institutions should focus on four major frames: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic.

The structural frame includes the goals, roles, and formal relationships associated within an institution. Within this frame, responsibilities are delegated to individuals and rules, procedures, and policies are established. The human resource frame focuses on the individual needs, skills, and relationships within an institution. The political perspective is viewed according to the power, competition, and conflict often associated with institutional politics and bureaucracy. Negotiation and compromise are integral in the competition for scarce resources and power. Focusing on social and cultural norms, the symbolic frame draws on traditions, rituals, stories, and ceremony as a means of inspiration. Framing one’s institution or program from these perspectives can nurture a greater appreciation for and deeper understanding of the institution.

Terry: Leadership Zones

Terry (2003) challenged that effective leadership must answer the tough question of “What is really going on personally, professionally, and organizationally?” (p. 34). Based on research in the area of leadership and organizations, Terry
outlined seven zones of leadership necessary to building a strong, robust profession, or more specifically, a professional association or higher education unit:

1. Serving the past: The first zone recognizes that “history limits and launches an organization” (p. 35). The zone encourages organizations to learn from their past mistakes and to define their core values. Those tasks are necessary to transmit their core values to others and to accept the challenge of addressing difficult issues from the past.

2. Building core competencies: The second zone ensures that “the right people . . . [have] the right jobs” (p. 35). Providing training to develop skills and competencies in individuals allows one to contribute his own skills and expertise to the organization.

3. (a) Designing sustainable systems and (b) affirming shared identity: The depth of the third zone requires that it be subdivided. The focus of this zone is to create a sustainable system so that resources are not wasted and rules for behavior are established. Once the system is maintaining its function, leaders seek to create a sense of belongingness by connecting individuals in a shared vision for the organization.

4. Creating ownership: Once individuals feel that they belong in an organization, they are given the opportunity to share their voice. In return, leaders listen and become willing to share power, which results in a sense of ownership for the individuals within the organization.

5. (a) Setting direction and (b) anticipating the future: With an identity established, competent individuals in place, and a sustainable system with
individuals who have a shared vision and ownership, the organization is challenged “to create a preferred picture of the future” (p. 36) and direct their efforts toward that picture. The organization acknowledges that “the world does not always go where one wants it to” (p. 36). Leadership anticipates possible issues, problems, and consequences that may occur and develops a plan for resolving them.

6. Creating meaning in chaos: The sixth zone reminds the organization that “nothing is stable” (p. 36). When tragedies and problems occur, leadership within the organization improvises, and everyone works together to make decisions and act upon them.

7. Living the promise: The final zone occurs when there seems to be so much chaos that “the world makes no sense at all and the experience of facing the day erodes hope” (p. 37). This reality requires leadership that is grounded in authenticity, a concept of “knowing what is true and real” (p. 37). Trust, hope, and courage result from the promise of authentic leadership.

With changes in paradigms regarding leadership and graduate education, it would be necessary for new and/or innovative programs to ground their conceptual or theoretical framework with leadership theories that are congruent to their mission. Those theories enable individuals working within the program to design a model that is appropriate both to the university and to the audience for which it was intended.

As definitions and paradigms have been explored and explicated at length throughout the literature, leadership theories have evolved since they were first
introduced in the eighteenth century (Bass, 1990; Yukl, 1994). Theories originated with the assumption that leadership was hereditary as leaders were born with natural abilities. Theoretical studies that associated leadership with particular personality traits that differentiated leaders from followers were prevalent in the early 1900s. Further study promoted behavioral and situational contingency theories in the mid 1900s, which suggested that leaders varied their approaches or behaviors and acted differently according to the context or situation. The most recent leadership theories that have emerged focus on the reciprocal relationship between leaders and followers and have been referred to as transformative leadership.

Transformative leadership is “a process where leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation” (Burns, 1978, p. 20). The interaction between leaders and followers promotes the realization of common goals and purposes, rather than manipulation and exploitation. Principles associated with transforming leadership are justice, equality, order, freedom, and liberty. Sergiovanni (1990) believed that transformative leadership was concerned with “moral questions of goodness, righteousness, duty and obligation” (p. 23). Moral leadership was viewed as the “cornerstone of an effective long-term leadership strategy . . . because it has the power to transcend competence for excellence by inspiring extraordinary commitment and performance” (p. 27).

The concept of servant leadership grew out of the reciprocal and transformative leadership theories. The underlying assumption of servant leadership first described by Greenleaf (1977) was that the servant, who focused on the needs of others and the organization, transformed himself into a leader. According to this
theory, “true leadership emerges from those whose primary motivation is a deep desire to help others” (Spears, 2004, p. 8). Servant leadership placed emphasis on service to others, a holistic approach, building a sense of community, and shared power. Spears asserted that servant leadership “has the potential for creating positive change throughout our society” (p. 8).

Three specific leadership theories were located in a review of research studies and articles focusing on leadership within FCS and FCS Education programs and were included in this review because they were relevant and applicable to professional practice in family and consumer sciences. The theories included Principle Centered Leadership (Coffey, 1995; McGregor, 1997; O’Neal & Burdette, 1995), Key Leadership Practices (Viegas, Brun, & Hausafus, 1998), and Reflective Human Action (Andrews, Mitstifer, Rehm, & Vaughn, 1995; Jax, 2000; McGregor, 2006).

**Covey’s Principle Centered Leadership**

In her perspective on leadership, McGregor (1997) recognized that “Helping families embrace the future is a leadership imperative we can continue to fill” (p. 12). She utilized Covey’s (1992) paradigm for principle centered leadership as a means for that professional practice. The following seven components were profiled: “leadership, empowerment, synergistic problem solving, effective habits, human resource accounting, abundance mentality, and an ecological perspective” (p. 17).

First, there must be a clear distinction made between management and leadership. “Leaders provide direction for transformation . . . while managers provide control” (McGregor, 1997, p. 13). Successful leaders have a vision for what
they want to accomplish. The vision for the FCS profession is evident in its mission statement and conceptual framework. To accomplish this mission, professionals must empower individuals and families, not as victims, but as individuals “who are active in solving their own problems by building on their internal energy, networks, and strengths” (p. 14). McGregor proposed that FCS leaders who are empowered can first change personally and then facilitate change in families and in the profession to solve perennial problems. Covey’s description of synergistic problem solving paralleled the practical reasoning approach utilized in the FCS profession. Both require an evaluation of the contextual factors influencing a situation and the identification of alternate solutions to reach the valued end. Leaders should embrace a philosophy which identifies people as the most valuable resource. Rather than focusing on things, leaders should focus on enhancing relationships and accomplishing results.

As an administrator of a FCS program, Coffey (1995) applied Covey’s principles to her own department in a small, private college. In their application of this theory, O’Neal and Burdette (1995) agreed that the visionary leader “should be able to provide the leadership which manages change, thus, shaping the future rather than responding to it” (p. 74).

Kouzes and Posner Key Leadership Practices

Viegas, Brun, and Hausafus (1998) utilized a transformational leadership theory developed by Kouzes and Posner as a framework for a leadership development course for FCS undergraduate students. Kouzes and Posner’s (1998) Key Leadership Practices were developed from a collection of 2,500 case studies of
managers concerning their best experiences as leaders. Analysis of the case studies suggested a pattern of behaviors exhibited when individuals were most effective as leaders. The behaviors were categorized into five key leadership practices: Challenging the Process, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Enabling Others to Act, Modeling the Way, and Encouraging the Heart. Each practice is applicable to leadership within the FCS profession.

According to Kouzes and Posner (1998), every leadership opportunity involves some kind of challenge. Leaders tend to seek out and accept challenges. This practice specifically focuses on "searching for opportunities and experimenting and taking risks" (p. 12). Leaders then view mistakes made as learning opportunities. FCS professionals, who adhere to the mission of the profession, are continuously looking for ways in which they can solve practical perennial problems; thus, accepting the challenge to improve the quality of life.

Leaders have described their leadership experiences by imagining an exciting, highly attractive future for their organization. The leaders must believe that people who work together can make a difference. This practice specifically focuses on "envisioning an uplifting future and enlisting others in a common vision" (Kouzes & Posner, 1998, p. 12). They have a desire to make something happen, to change the way things are, to create something that no one else has ever created before. Leaders "passionately believe they can make a difference" (p. 318). FCS professionals share a common vision, again demonstrated through the profession’s mission statement and conceptual framework. Nickols (2001) shared numerous
examples of passionate FCS professionals who were making a difference in the lives of individuals, families, and communities.

These leaders acknowledge that they cannot do it alone and need to rely on others. By doing this, leaders create an atmosphere of trust and respect. This practice specifically focuses on “fostering collaboration and strengthening people” (Kouzes & Posner, 1998, p. 13). The integrative, synergistic nature of the profession emphasizes the ability to appreciate unique contributions made by each specialization area in addressing societal issues.

These leaders work to make others feel strong, capable and committed to the organization. Much of this is demonstrated and modeled as leaders set examples and build commitment through simple, daily acts that create progress and momentum. Leaders model the way through personal example and dedicated execution. The FCS profession is filled with individuals who serve as mentors and role models for current and future generations.

When it comes to motivating others to a high standard of performance, recognition of individual effort and achievement is the most powerful method. This practice specifically focuses on “recognizing individual contributions and celebrating team accomplishments” (Kouzes & Posner, 1998, p. 14). Encouragement can come from dramatic gestures or simple actions. In the same manner, FCS professionals build networks for encouragement and support among themselves and the families they serve. This support is integral to the accomplishment of the FCS mission and to the critical analysis of societal issues.
Reflective Human Action

Jax (2000) reaffirmed that the FCS profession “requires leadership to thoughtfully carry out its mission” (p. 85) and proposed critical theory as a basis for this leadership and in response to Brown and Paolucci’s mission of FCS. Democracy and social justice are the major concerns of critical theory; thus, empowerment of individuals in society is important. Empowerment means that one is enabled or given ability or power. A profession should enable its members with knowledge about its mission and purpose. Members should feel as though their needs are met and their values and interests are supported by the profession. Critical theory is an appropriate foundation from which to build FCS leaders who are concerned with the empowerment of individuals and families to improve the human condition, which is inherent in the mission of the profession.

Gentzler (1999) distinguished critical theory “as the end result of a process designed to expose inherent incongruities related to social situations” (p. 23). The process or “course of action taken by individuals and groups to collaboratively examine and critique present social structures” (p. 23) is known as critical science. Understanding critical science and critical theory are crucial to accomplishing the mission proposed by Brown and Paolucci (1979) and to understanding its relationship to the practice of FCS professionals. Through critical science, professionals can focus on what the profession should be doing, rather than its present practice and status.

This approach encourages individuals to think, examine, and reflect upon perennial problems. In practice, the approach enables people to gain personal and
social freedom. With practical reasoning, individuals are able to view various sides of a problem, analyze all issues involved, integrate knowledge and skills, and then make an informed, morally defensible, and rational decision. This teaches valuable critical and creative thinking skills. Through dialectical thinking in daily life, individuals recognize that life’s most important questions do not have single, unchangeable, correct answers. Ultimately, “people free themselves from oppressions, develop to their full potential, and become autonomous participants in the forefront” through a critical science approach (Rehm, 1999, p. 66).

For this aim to become a reality, we must be willing to participate in the transformation process which includes dialogue and conversation (talking, sharing, responding, questioning), consensus-building (reaching a common understanding), and taking collective action to nurture the worth, competence, and capabilities of others. Rehm (1999) reminded FCS professionals that “creativity, imagination, and leadership flourish when groups promote experimentation and welcome new ideas” (p. 69). Reflective thinking and an evaluation of one’s own values and actions are necessary to resolve problems and issues. This reflective nature means that one has the ability to think about what is being done while it is being done.

“Empowered leaders in family and consumer sciences” is the mission of Kappa Omicron Nu, a family and consumer sciences honor society (Andrews et al., 1995, p. iii). That mission guided professionals involved in the society to search for a leadership theory to direct its mission and practice. Because Mitstifer (1995) alleged that “All professionals have a responsibility to lead” (p. 1), the honor society wanted a theory that would demonstrate nonpositional leadership. The results of
their search underscored Bolman and Deal’s (1991) belief that “Leaders need to be deeply reflective, actively thoughtful, and dramatically explicit about their core values and beliefs” (p. 449). Deal later acknowledged that

If you go inside yourself to find and rekindle your heart and soul, that’s when you can relate your center with other people’s hearts and souls and find the common spirit that gives meaning and purpose to life and gives life to organizations. . . . That’s what leadership is all about. (Deal, 1996, p. 18)

Because they concluded that a leader must “be committed to reflective human action and to serving the common good” (p. iii), professionals associated with Kappa Omicron Nu Honor Society developed a leadership model entitled Reflective Human Action (1995). The model is a blend of the work associated with Terry’s (1993) Authentic Leadership: Courage in Action and Wheatley’s (1994) Leadership and the New Science.

“Reflective human action is an active, mind-engaging process of meaning-making in a community of practice” (Mitstifer, 1995, p. 3). According to this theory, there is no one recipe for leadership, but there are core features and principles that guide practice. McGregor (2006) pointed to reflective human action as “leadership that leads to authentic, ethical, and spiritual action by encouraging people to share information, respect chaos, embrace vision, and develop relationships” (p. 109).

The four core features include:

(a) Ethical sensibility: Ethical leaders act in an intellectually and morally defensible manner and integrate the principles of responsibility, love, justice, freedom, and engagement (Andrews et al., 1995).
(b) Spirituality: Spiritual leaders base their practice on the true meaning, purpose, and passion in life.

(c) Authenticity: Authentic leaders are true to themselves and avoid deception and hidden agendas.

(d) Features of human action. Seven features occur in every human action: meaning, mission, power, structure, resources, existence, and fulfillment” (p. 11).

Participating in reflection and integrating the core features of human action offers a conceptual framework for framing and examining issues. Individuals, families, consumers, communities, and organizations engage in reflective human action by adhering to the model’s basic premises: “to accept chaos, share information, develop relationships, and embrace vision” (p. 6).

**Summary**

An historical overview in this chapter described *where the profession has been*. Further review revealed *where we need to go* to fulfill the FCS mission; to contemplate the critical need for leadership within the FCS profession and university programs; and, to address the need for those programs to prepare individuals to accomplish the mission of the profession, despite a context of demographic, political, social, and economic changes. The impact of these changes on the profession, on higher education in general, and on FCS education programs offered insight into the context of the Academy model and this study.

Not only could FCS programs ensure that appropriate opportunities are provided, but those experiences could prepare individuals to take the lead in
addressing perennial problems in an ever-changing world. O’Neal and Burdette (1995) proposed, “In the 21st century, leadership as usual will lead to the demise of the profession” (p. 80). Therefore, we cannot continue to maintain the status quo if we are going to move the profession forward. McGregor (2006) argued that individuals, organizations, and professions transform their practices if, ultimately, they are to effect the optimal well-being of individuals and improve the human condition. Thus, institutions can deliver the necessary leadership development through the preparation and education of FCS professionals in new and innovative ways. In doing so, FCS education programs can “touch the lives of . . . [FCS professionals] who are the emergent leaders of the profession [and can lead the profession] into an era of quality, increased strength, and visibility, facilitating an improved quality of life for individuals and families (Baugher & Kellet, 1983, p. 17).
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

The purpose of this investigation was to document a perspective of the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy at Iowa State University from conceptualization to realization. The study was bound within a five year period (2001 – 2006). This chapter outlines the method used to design the study. The purpose for the study and the research questions that guided the study are defined. The assumptions of qualitative research and perspectives on the case study method are outlined, followed by the rationale for selecting the case study method. Data collection procedures, which included interviews with individuals involved in the FCS Education Leadership Academy as resident faculty, administrators, Advisory Board members, visiting scholars, and graduate students and the acquisition of relevant documents, are described. Finally, data analysis techniques and strategies are summarized.

Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to explore and understand the process of why and how the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy at Iowa State University was conceptualized, developed, and implemented and to reveal its potential impact on the FCS profession. A qualitative case study method was employed to examine the history and evolution of the Academy as a means for (a) understanding the departmental, unit, college, and university context within the FCS profession that led to its conceptualization and implementation; (b) gaining insight
into the goals and philosophy of the program, and (c) discovering the contributions of those involved in the Academy to the FCS profession.

This study traced the evolution of the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy. Specifically, this qualitative case study sought to (1) describe the contextual factors that provided the impetus for the creation of the Academy model; (2) determine the involvement of faculty, administrators, FCS education professionals, and graduate students in the creation, development, and implementation of the model; (3) reveal the model's conceptual and theoretical framework that shaped its guiding principles and curriculum; (4) analyze the issue, influences, and challenges of the Academy model on faculty members, students, Advisory Board members, and university administrators associated with involvement in the Academy model for graduate education; and (5) suggest implications and recommendations regarding graduate education, leadership development, and collaborative endeavors within the FCS education profession.

The study examined the role of administrators and resident faculty who were involved in the conceptualization of the Academy and the visiting faculty and graduate students who chose to participate in the program during its first five years. This study sought to reveal how the Academy's vision, mission, and goals were realized through the voices and perspectives of leaders, administrators, faculty members, and graduate students. This study was informed by key concepts of leadership and the mission of FCS that emerged from a review of relevant literature, as well as analysis of documents, interviews with knowledgeable others, critical questioning, and interpretive techniques.
Research Questions

This qualitative case study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What was the original impetus for the creation of the FCS Education Leadership Academy – background and history? What was the context at the time the Academy was conceptualized within the Department of Apparel, Educational Studies and Hospitality Management, the former College of Family and Consumer Sciences, the Iowa State University, and the FCS profession?

2. Who were the people involved with the Academy’s creation, development, and implementation? What role(s) did these individuals play in each of those phases?

3. What were the mission, guiding principles, and conceptual framework of the program in its beginning in 2001? How did they evolve over the five year period?

4. What was the focus and the curriculum of the program when it was designed? Did they change during the five years? If so, how?

5. What were the significant contributions and influences of the Academy model on those involved? What were some critical challenges facing faculty members, students, board members, and administrators associated with involvement in the Academy model for graduate education?
6. What were the implications of the findings for future leadership within the profession, collaborative ventures with colleagues, and educational programs that prepare FCS professionals and leaders?

**Qualitative Research**

This study presented an account of the facts, ideas, theories and concepts, events, and actions that chronicle the Academy’s evolution and realization. To answer the research questions, an appropriate mode of inquiry that would portray, interpret, and gauge the phenomena associated with the Academy was sought. Thus, a qualitative mode of inquiry was chosen for this study because it allowed the researcher to examine participants’ experiences associated with the Academy model and to interpret the understandings and meanings individuals bring to them.

**A Definition of Qualitative Research**

Denzin and Lincoln (2000) described qualitative research as an interpretive or naturalistic approach that cross-cuts other disciplines and subject matter. Qualitative research includes several forms of inquiry for explaining and understanding phenomena (Merriam, 1998). Further exploration of this mode of inquiry led van Maanen (1979) to define qualitative research as an “interpretive technique which seeks to describe, decode, translate, and otherwise come to terms with the meaning, not the frequency, of certain . . . phenomena” (p. 9). The characteristics or assumptions of qualitative research were integral to my choice of an appropriate method for this study.
Assumptions of Qualitative Research

Several researchers (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Creswell, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Merriam, 1998) characterized qualitative research by its interest in meaning from the participant’s point of view; the naturalistic setting or context in which the research occurs; the role of the researcher as the instrument for data collection and analysis; its inductive, rather than deductive, research strategy; and its richly descriptive nature of reporting. These assumptions are described as a means for understanding the nature of the research and why it is a valuable approach appropriate for this study.

This method provided an ideal forum to explore the questions of this study. Qualitative research attempts to understand the nature of the phenomenon from the participants' perspectives, rather than the researcher's perspective (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The essential concern of qualitative research is “understanding the meaning people have constructed... how they make sense of their world and the experiences they have in the world” (Merriam, 1998, p. 6). This calls for an appreciation for “what it means for participants to be in that setting, what their lives are like, what’s going on for them, what their meanings are, [and] what the world looks like in that particular setting” (Patton, 1985, p. 1). This assumption recognized the existence of multiple realities. In this study, these realities are explored through the perspectives of faculty members, leaders, and students, all of whom played key roles in the development and growth of the Academy, to gather insight about their involvement and experiences.
Qualitative research methods recognize the importance of understanding the naturalistic setting or context in which an event or phenomena occurs. The setting has “to be understood in the historical life of the institutions of which they are a part” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p. 4). Thus, the researcher may need to go to the setting and interact with participants to gain a better understanding of the issues associated with the study (Creswell, 1998). As a student in the Academy, I was familiar with the setting as I attended classes or meetings, visited the Iowa State University campus, and engaged in conversations with resident faculty, visiting faculty, and fellow graduate students. Since 2002, I have interacted with each of these groups of individuals in a variety of ways, both professionally and personally.

To gain familiarity, the researcher may take on the role of participant observer, enter the participants’ world, and get to know and be known by the participants. It is “only by working inside a group . . . [that] we learn who they are” (Wheatley, 2005, p. 77). In many cases, this implies that an outsider enters the setting and observes interaction and activity. In my case, I was involved in the Academy as a graduate student, so I had an insider’s perspective as I participated in the same classes and shared the same experiences as the other students within the Academy. My involvement over the last five years has given me the opportunity to know the faculty members and other graduate students associated with the program and work closely with them, thus gaining their respect and trust, and setting the context for me to conduct my research in a careful, ethical, and reflective manner. Not only did I know them well, they also knew me.
According to van Maanen (1979), firsthand, intimate knowledge of a research study is what should guide most qualitative inquiry. For this research, describing the context in which the Academy model was conceptualized, developed, and implemented was crucial to understanding the what, how, and why questions I sought to answer as I studied the model. As the researcher, I saw things from the student perspective because I was enrolled in courses offered through the program. Given that I was a student, my perspective was limited to what I saw and experienced in that role. To fully understand what the faculty had experienced and what they were encountering, I would have had to be a part of those discussions as well. Although I have read the minutes of meetings with faculty and Advisory Board members, I did not actually attend those meetings, hear discussions that took place, or witness the joys and struggles of their decisions and actions. I did not experience the model as a visiting faculty member, as an administrator, or as an Advisory Board member. My perspectives are also based on those of a doctoral student with a background in FCS education; whereas, many graduate students did not have that same position and foundational knowledge.

Within a qualitative research tradition, the researcher is viewed as “the primary instrument for data collection and analysis” (Merriam, 1998, p. 7). Creswell (1998) reported that “Data are mediated through this human instrument, rather than through inventories, questionnaires, or machines” (p. 145). Meanings, issues, and stories cannot be learned by being outside the group or by using traditional data collection methods. Yet, this assumption introduces the influence of the researcher’s values and biases on the study. My role as the researcher, along with
the assumptions and biases pertaining to this study were summarized in chapter one.

Another assumption of qualitative research is characterized by the inductive strategy for data analysis. Unlike quantitative research, qualitative research is not about proving or disproving hypotheses developed prior to the study. Instead, research findings are typically in the form of categories or themes that emerge during the research process. Many times, the qualitative researcher is the lone investigator whose goal is to seek out the perspectives and viewpoints of various individuals and piece them together into one meaning or understanding. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) used the term *bricoleur* to describe this role and compared it to a “maker of quilts” (p. 4). As I think about a quilt, I recognize that many different, unique squares comprise a full quilt. Individually, those squares are important; yet, it is amazing to see how all of the different squares are “pieced” together into a beautiful whole. As a bricoleur, the qualitative researcher respects the insight and perspectives of each individual participant; yet, the researcher has the awesome task of putting the perspectives together, seeing themes emerge and producing a wonderful work as the story is told.

Finally, qualitative research is richly descriptive. Because the research focuses on understanding, process, and meaning, the data often takes the form of pictures and words over numbers. The voices of the participants are heard through the use of quotes and themes reflecting their words or through direct citations from documents.
Case Study Approach

With the assumptions of a research perspective and the study’s purpose and research questions identified, the researcher must choose a research strategy that is appropriate to the study. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) defined a method as “a bundle of skills, assumptions, and practices that the researcher employs” (p. 22) to collect and analyze data. Qualitative methods include: biography, case study, ethnography, phenomenology, and grounded theory (Creswell, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Merriam, 1998). All of these methods are valuable in designing and conducting research and are unique in their purpose. I was bound to choose a method that allowed me to explore the what, how, and why questions to understand the Academy model and the perspectives of those involved with the program. With careful examination of the research questions guiding my study and the assumptions of qualitative research, I selected the case study as the “distinct methodological tradition of inquiry” (Creswell, 1998, p. 15) for this study.

Rationale for Case Study Approach

According to Merriam (1998), three factors need to be considered when determining whether the case study design is most appropriate method or tradition. Those factors include the nature of the research questions, the amount of control, and the desired end product (Merriam, 1998). Research questions that seek to answer how and why are best suited for the case study design. This research sought to answer how and why questions such as: Why was the Academy model created? What were the mission and goals of the program? How have the mission and goals changed over the five year period under investigation? What were the
roles and contributions of the individuals who were involved in the Academy? What was accomplished as a result of their involvement? Not only did I want to understand what happened and why, I wanted to provide an account for historical purposes of how the Academy model evolved from conceptualization to realization.

The case study approach was selected for several reasons. First, the case tells the story of what the Academy is, why it came to be, and how the students are beginning to affect the FCS profession. The process of program conceptualization and leadership development was complex and cannot be captured fully by surveys or quantitative methods. The case study also seeks to explore what is common and what is particular about the case, and in the end, expects to present something unique. Finally, the case constitutes an event that started in the recent past and continues in the present.

**Case Study Perspectives**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) defined case study as “an intensive or complete examination of a facet, an issue, or perhaps the events of a geographic setting over time. . . a case is a snapshot of reality, a slice of life, or an episode” (p. 214). The use of case studies in qualitative research has been the focus of prominent scholars including Stake (1995), Merriam (1998), and Yin (1994). Whether the case is viewed as an object of study (Stake, 1995) or as a method (Merriam, 1998), case studies are designed to collect detailed data from multiple sources to examine a “bounded system” (Creswell, 1998, p. 61). The case can be bounded by time or by place; and the case can be a program, an activity, an event, or individuals. For this
study, the Academy, in its first five years of existence (2001-2006), serves as the bounded system and the case to be studied.

Stake (1995) defined a case study as “the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances” (p. xi). It is considered the most foundational method of gathering and analyzing data that helps one to make sense of the case. Different methods are used to interpret the case and to raise issues associated with the case.

Stake (1995) described three types of case studies, each serving a different research purpose. The distinction as an intrinsic case study is made when “we are interested in it, not because by studying it we learn about other cases or about some general problem; but because we need to learn about that particular case” (Stake, 1995, p. 3). Understanding comes from the uniqueness, or particularity, of the case, rather than from the case’s capacity for generalization. Stake further explained, “We take a particular case and come to know it well, not primarily as to how it is different from others but what it is, what it does” (p. 8). When the case is of secondary interest, it may be referred to as an instrumental case study. In that situation, the case is used “to understand something else” (p. 3). When several cases are chosen for study, the work is defined as a collective case study. Based on these descriptions, the case study focusing on the Academy could be distinguished as an intrinsic case study because the research was designed to understand what happened and why, and to tell the story of the creation and implementation of the Academy model for graduate education in FCS.
Similar to Stake, Merriam (1998) identified the case or unit of analysis as “an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a bounded phenomenon such as a program, an institution, a person, a process or a social unit” (p. xiii). The case study is designed to “gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved” (p. 19). Merriam acknowledged that case studies can be characterized according to their nature, discipline, and function. Hence, the terms, particularistic, descriptive, and heuristic, can be used to describe the case study. Case studies that focus specifically on particular events, situations, or programs are termed particularistic. When the program or phenomenon itself is richly described in the final product, the case is considered to be descriptive in nature. Heuristic case studies clarify the reader’s understanding by attempting to “bring about the discovery of new meaning, extend the reader’s experience, or confirm what is known” (p. 30).

Often, case studies in education rely on the contributions of specific disciplines to understand the case (Merriam, 1998). For example, a case study takes a historical perspective when it not only provides a chronological history of an event or program, but it allows one to know “the context of the event, the assumptions behind it, and perhaps the event’s impact on the institution or participants” (p. 35). Historical organizational case studies are common in education research as “these studies concentrate on a particular organization over time, tracing the organization’s development” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p. 55). In those studies, researchers rely on data sources such as existing documents and interviews with those associated with the organization.
Finally, case studies can serve descriptive, interpretive, or evaluative functions. Descriptive case studies present “a detailed account of the phenomenon under study” (Merriam, 1998, p. 38). Historical case studies are often descriptive in their function. Interpretive case studies, which also use rich, descriptive data, are typically used to develop, defend, or challenge theoretical frameworks. Evaluative case studies offer descriptions of phenomena in order to produce judgment or determine worth.

Yin (1994) defined a case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context” (p. 13) and suggested that the case study is advantageous for answering the how and why questions. Within the case study, Yin suggested the use of strategies that gather rich, descriptive data to promote the generation of questions and hypotheses and to examine the relationship between cause and effect. Theory development prior to data collection and analysis are critical to the case, from Yin’s perspective.

Each of these research orientations was considered and analyzed for its appropriateness to answer the questions in this study. Although each case study perspective merited consideration, Stake’s (1995) and Merriam’s (1998) views of case study research best reflected the assumptions and strategies associated with this study. Because of its quantitative nature, Yin’s case study research method was not appropriate to this study.

**Design of the Study**

Once the appropriate method is considered and selected, the researcher further designs a study in terms of data collection and data analysis procedures.
However, before these practices can begin, the researcher must gain approval for the study and determine the best data sources from which to glean information. Prior to data collection, Human Subjects approval was sought and granted from the Iowa State University Institutional Review Board (Appendix A). In addition, I sought and received permission from the program faculty to secure appropriate documents for review and analysis.

**Data Collection**

In qualitative research, the researcher serves as the primary data collection and data analysis instrument (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995). More specific qualitative data collection methods include journal records, documents, field notes of shared experiences, and interview transcripts. For this study, I used interviews as the primary method of data collection and acquired documents as the secondary method of data collection.

**Primary Data Collection: Interviews**

Interviewing is one of many data collection methods used within qualitative research. In-depth interviews provide numerous opportunities for conversations and interactions between respondents and the researcher that may be difficult to communicate through surveys or quantitative methods. Bogdan and Biklen (2003) defined an interview as “a purposeful conversation” (p. 94). Fontana and Frey (2000) identified interviewing as “one of the most common and most powerful ways” (p. 645) used by qualitative researchers to gain insight and understanding. Interviewing has been considered a major means for telling the narratives of individuals' experiences throughout recorded history (Seidman, 2006).
The interview allows the researcher to obtain information that is “in and on someone else’s mind” (Merriam, 1998, p. 71). When researchers “cannot observe behavior, feelings, or how people interpret the world around them” (p. 72), they often use interviewing as a data collection method. Interviewing is also a preferred method when information is sought about events that have transpired and cannot be replicated.

Through interviewing, researchers enter the world of the individuals to be studied. Seidman (2006) promoted the use of interviews as a means of “understanding the lived experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience” (p. 9). Researchers interview because they have a sincere “interest in other individuals’ stories because they are of worth” (p. 9). Thus, richer and more meaningful data regarding one’s thoughts, feelings, and intentions can be gathered from interviews.

In this case study about the Academy, interviews were employed to gain descriptions from the participants of what happened, rather than their own speculative explanations of why something happened. Determining the reasons and explanations for what took place became my responsibility.

**Techniques for Interviewing.** Fontana and Frey (2000) described two types of interviews: structured interviews and unstructured interviews. In a structured interview, participants receive the same questions that are asked in a specific sequence by a trained researcher using the same protocol with all participants. This type of interview offers little flexibility or variation. The researcher in an unstructured interview uses open-ended questions to encourage participants to tell stories about
their lives and their experiences, both past and present. Hence, the unstructured interview may provide greater depth and breadth. Kvale (1996) noted that this type of interview is “an inter change of views between the two persons conversing about a common theme” (p. 44). Bogdan and Biklen (2003) extended this idea of interviewing and explained what the researcher should do to elicit conversation and stimulate a good interview.

Good interviews are those in which the subjects are at ease and talk freely about their points of view. Good interviews produce rich data filled with words that reveal the respondents' perspectives. . . . The interviewer may ask for clarification. . . . The interview also probes the respondent to be specific, asking for examples of points that are made. When asking the respondent about the past, for example, the interviewer suggests that he or she think back to that time and try to relive it. (pp. 96-97)

In this study, I used a semi-structured approach to interviewing. Like the unstructured interview, open-ended questions were asked to evoke responses, elicit discussion, and/or encourage their stories. However, the format was structured in that each individual was asked the same set of questions.

Interview Participants. Seidman (2006) proposed that a “primary way a researcher can investigate an educational organization, institution, or process is through the experience of the individual people, the others who make up the organization or carry out the process” (p. 10). Hence, purposeful sampling was the strategy used to select participants. Maximum variation sampling was used to select information-rich participants representing diverse perspectives on the Academy.

The purposeful sample in this study included 40 individuals who have been engaged in the conceptualization, early development, and/or work of the Academy from 2001 to 2006. The sample included: (a) three Family and Consumer Sciences
Education and Studies resident faculty members in the former College of Family and Consumer Sciences at Iowa State University; (b) two administrators, the former Dean of the College of Family and Consumer Sciences and former department head who were in administrative positions when the Academy model was conceptualized; (c) five members of the Academy Advisory Board; (d) 13 visiting faculty who currently teach or have taught classes in the Academy; and (e) 17 graduate students who were enrolled in courses in the 2002 summer session.

The resident faculty, administrators, and Advisory Board members have worked closely with the Academy and possess intimate knowledge of the context in which the Academy was developed, how and why it was created, as well as being central in moving forward to implementation and realization of its mission and goals. The visiting scholars have been involved in the work of the Academy as they have taught classes and interacted with resident faculty and students. The graduate students were enrolled in the FCS Education graduate program through the Academy model in its first year and have been involved in its classes and activities over the last five years. Each of the participants had varying, but significant knowledge about the Academy and was capable of providing an informed perspective. All of these individuals contributed to the story but each brought a different perspective.

Individuals within the sample were contacted by email and by postal mail to invite them to participate in the study. Of the forty individuals contacted, 26 agreed to participate in this study. They included three resident faculty members, two administrators, five Advisory Board members, ten visiting scholars, and six graduate
students. Furthermore, a second interview was conducted with the three resident faculty to clarify findings and to question inconsistencies found in the data. As a result of the interviews with the resident faculty, it was determined that two additional graduate students should be interviewed to ascertain more information on the context of the department and college at the time of the conceptualization and development of the Academy model. Thus, the findings from this research are based on interviews with a total of 28 individuals.

**Interview Protocol.** Before the interview was scheduled, participants were asked to read and sign the informed consent documents (Appendix B) for inclusion in the study. Twenty-five interviews were conducted via the phone and three were face-to-face. The interviews took place over an extended period of time between August, 2005 and February, 2007. The follow-up interviews with resident faculty and the two additional graduate students took place on campus at Iowa State University in January, 2007. Prior to each interview, I provided a context for the interview which included a brief description of the study, the purpose of the interview, and the use of a tape recorder. Participants were asked if they had any questions or concerns, and the researcher gained approval to record the conversation. The interview was concluded by asking whether the participant had anything further to say or to ask. This provided an opportunity for the participant to raise ideas or issues that developed during the interview.

Each participant group (i.e., resident faculty, administrators, advisory board, visiting scholars, and graduate students) was asked to answer specific questions regarding involvement in and experiences with the Academy (Appendix B). The first
question in the list of questions was the core question. The remaining questions were used as extending and probing questions.

**Interview Records.** As each interview was conducted, they were audio-taped, and I took notes. All of my notes recorded as a researcher were maintained in a notebook so that I could refer to the notes later throughout data collection and analysis. After each interview, I reviewed my notes and transcribed the audio-taped interviews. Participants granted permission for the audiotapes to be maintained for archival purposes at Iowa State University.

**Secondary Data Source: Documents**

Documents were a second source of data for this study. Merriam (1998) suggested that documents “refer to a wide range of written, visual, and physical material relevant to the study at hand” (p. 112). Documents are advantageous to use because they are typically produced prior to the study. Hence, the information source is “constant” and was not changed as a result of the study.

A wide variety of documents were reviewed and analyzed for this study (Appendix C). The documents included agendas and minutes of Advisory Board and resident faculty meetings. Internal communications, such as memos and letters, documents, and reports that were developed for student recruitment, course development, and assessment also provided data regarding the activities of the Academy. Program brochures, newsletters, college annual reports, course syllabi, graduate handbooks, and other pertinent materials were reviewed. Most of these documents were obtained, with permission, from Yvonne Gentzler’s files. Data were
also gathered from the Academy’s website during the period of July, 2005 – February, 2007.

**Data Analysis**

Qualitative data analysis is an inductive process of organizing the data into categories and identifying patterns in categories that emerge from the data (McMillan & Schumacher, 1993). It is a process of sorting through and organizing data. In case studies, data analysis involves creating a detailed description of the case and its setting (Creswell, 1998). The data analysis process started with reviewing documents, transcribing tape recordings, writing notes, and checking for accuracy and understanding.

**Document Review**

During the summer of 2005, I spent one week at Iowa State University to collect documents associated with the Academy model. Using the list of documents that was compiled, information regarding the date of origin and purpose of the document was added. Then, each document was reviewed, and a summary of the document’s contents was written for inclusion in the data analysis. The documents were helpful in providing data regarding contextual factors, in identifying specific dates used to determine a timeline of events, and in clarifying and confirming findings.

**Categorizing and Unitizing the Data**

Once the transcripts were completed, I began the process of analyzing the textual data. As Kvale (1996) recommended, I read each interview transcript straight through to get a sense of the whole. I was also able to review the notes that
had been taken during the interview. Oftentimes, I would read the transcript a second or third time. Each time this was done, I would go through the transcript to locate similar comments and sort into comparable groups.

After reading through the transcripts and notes, I began to sort through and organize the interview texts into coding categories. Bogdan and Biklen (2003) described “coding categories” as a method for sorting descriptive data. Initially, situational coding was used where the transcripts were coded according to each participant group: resident faculty, administrators, Advisory Board, visiting faculty, and graduate students. This enabled me to determine how the participants defined or viewed the setting, especially because each group experienced the Academy program from a different perspective and was interviewed using a separate protocol. Then, I focused on the participant’s responses as I began categorizing them according to specific issues, events, and/or interview responses.

When determining appropriate guidelines for categorical names, one must remember that the categories should reflect the research purpose (Merriam, 1998). More specifically, the categories should be the answers to the research questions. In addition, categories should be exhaustive, mutually exclusive, sensitizing, and conceptually congruent. Upon reading the interview transcripts, I began to document possible categories. This list was maintained as I continued to read through the transcripts. This was the process of naming the categories.

This case study utilized an inductive data analysis approach. Unitizing and categorizing data are the two components of this type of data analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The unit must be “the smallest piece of information about something
that can stand by itself. . . it must be interpretable in the absence of any additional information” (p. 345). Thus, a unit of data could be one sentence or paragraph or a sequence of those. Coding segments may overlap and units of data may be assigned to multiple codes. Once each interview transcription was unitized, similar units were grouped into “provisional categories” (p. 347). This categorizing process used the constant comparative method in which units are compared to each other for similarity and inconsistency. The categories were reviewed for consistency once all of the units were coded.

**Trustworthiness**

Trustworthiness in qualitative research is established by carrying out the inquiry in a way that enhances and demonstrates credibility. Four techniques establish trustworthiness in qualitative research: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Lincoln and Guba (1985) equated these techniques with reliability, validity, and objectivity, which are associated with quantitative research. Each of these plays a crucial role in ensuring the quality of the research endeavor.

**Credibility.** In this study, credibility was established through prolonged engagement and triangulation. The study was conducted over a 16-month period from July, 2005 to October, 2006. In the analysis of data, the use of triangulation is recommended to promote the credibility of the study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Janesick, 1994; Mathison, 1988; Stake, 1995). Four types of triangulation are identified:

1. *data triangulation:* the use of a variety of data sources in a study;
2. **investigator triangulation**: the use of several different researchers or evaluators;

3. **theory triangulation**: the use of multiple perspectives to interpret a single set of data; [and]

4. **methodological triangulation**: the use of multiple methods to study a single problem. (Janesick, 1994, pp. 214-215)

For this study, data triangulation was used to reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation. Triangulation was conducted through a conscious effort to use multiple data sources and modes of evidence, such as interview texts, Academy documents, and my own knowledge of and experience with the Academy. In addition, I used other triangulating protocols recommended by Stake (1995). These included: collecting and double-checking findings, hearing or seeing multiple instances from different sources, asking some of the same open-ended questions of several participants in different roles in order to compare versions.

**Transferability, Dependability, and Confirmability.** It is the reader’s responsibility to provide a data base that makes transferability possible (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Transferability refers to the potential for other individuals to apply the study to other cases. Purposeful sampling and the use of rich descriptions assist the reader with that responsibility and application. Maximum variation sampling ensured that information-rich participants were selected from each of the groups represented (resident faculty, administrators, Advisory Board, visiting scholars, and graduate students).
Dependability was established through the process of credibility. Securing multiple data sources, including interviews and documents, being involved over a long period of time, and interviewing 28 participants demonstrated dependability.

The final technique, confirmability, was evident with the use of notes, tapes, and researcher subjectivity. The use of an interview protocol, maintaining audiotapes of interviews, and the process of coding contributed to the confirmability of the study. The data were initially coded using situational codes based on their participant group. A second round of coding was used to place the data into categories that were identified within the research questions.

Member-checking was done with each of the study participants. The transcript of the interview was emailed to the participant for clarification and confirmation to ensure that I had accurately and appropriately interpreted and used the information they provided. Participants also received via email a draft of writing segments in which the participant was mentioned and data from their interview was used for analysis and/or quotation. They were asked to confirm, change, and/or insert comments regarding their data and its interpretation. All but four of the participants responded to the member check.

Summary

The purpose and research questions guiding the study, the research design, as well as the procedures for data collection and analysis are outlined in this chapter. An overview of qualitative research method, with a special emphasis on the case study approach, is included for further clarification on the selected method. For the study, data were generated through semi-structured interviews and
document analysis. The data gathered provided a rich description that assisted in gaining meaning and understanding of the people, events, and activities associated with the Academy. Data analysis provided a historical account of the Academy’s beginning and current work and allowed issues and themes to emerge that led to greater insight and understanding of the Academy and response to the study’s research questions.
CHAPTER 4
A MODEL FOR THE FCS EDUCATION LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

The purpose of this descriptive case study was to trace the evolution of the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy, the name for the newly delivered traditional FCS Education graduate program at Iowa State University. Data were gathered through the review of numerous documents and through interviews with key individuals who were knowledgeable of the Academy. This chapter specifically addresses the response to the following research questions:

1. What was the conceptual framework for the Academy model? What were the mission and guiding principles of the graduate program in 2001? How did the framework, mission, and principles evolve over the five year period?

2. What was the focus of the curriculum and coursework when the model was designed? Did they change during the five years? If so, how?

Conceptual Framework, Mission, and Guiding Principles

To fully understand the scope of the Academy model, it is necessary to become familiar with what the model entails. Thus, I will lay the groundwork for the model’s conceptual framework and design as it was first conceived. The Academy model was intended to provide an opportunity for graduate education in FCS Education at the master’s and doctoral levels. Students were asked to commit to enrolling and participating in courses for three weeks in a residential experience during consecutive three-week summer sessions on the ISU campus. Students
completed their program of study with web-based courses taught during the fall and spring semesters of the academic year. This delivery format was deliberately designed to enable the student to maintain his or her professional position and other personal or familial responsibilities.

**Conceptual Framework**

A conceptual framework was necessary to provide the philosophical, theoretical, and fundamental foundation for how the FCS Education graduate program’s Academy model would be operationalized. A visual diagram pictured in Figure 1 illustrated the components of the Academy model as it was first conceptualized. Although the diagram was not officially approved by the resident faculty members within the FCEdS program at Iowa State, it was found during the document review and determined to be significant to this study. Permission to use the image for this study was granted by Dr. Yvonne Gentzler.

The center star located at the very heart of the framework identifies the mission of FCS, as agreed upon by the resident faculty in the program, and the need for professionals who were prepared to

enable families, both as individual units and generally as a social institution, to build and maintain systems of action which lead (1) to maturing in individual self-formation and (2) to enlightened, cooperative participation in the critique and formulation of social goals and means for accomplishing them. (Brown & Paolucci, 1979, p. 23)

Thus, emphasis was placed on identifying ways to prepare professionals to develop strengths through self-formation, analyze goals that have the potential to impact the family, and determine the best course of action.

Primarily, the model focused on (1) leadership; (2) the formation of a
Figure 1.
Conceptual Framework for the FCS Education Leadership Academy

Used with permission from Y. S. Gentzler
professional network and collaboration; (3) curriculum; and (4) the student’s self-directed participation in the graduate education process.

**Leadership**

Central to the accomplishment of the mission was the preparation and development of future leaders within the profession. Because leadership was integral to the purpose of the Academy, the model needed a leadership theory and philosophy that could be interwoven throughout the curriculum and experiences. The Reflective Human Action model developed by Andrews et al. (1995) for Kappa Omicron Nu was identified by the FCS education resident faculty as appropriate for the Academy. Because the framework for the model views leadership as human action, the model provided a substantive foundation for leadership development within the FCS profession. The model should show the dynamic nature of leadership – the constant interaction and processing in the renewal and rebirth of ideas and actions central to the entire experience. The Reflective Human Action leadership theory and framework best represented the goals and ideals of the Academy model for graduate education.

**Formation of a Professional Network and Collaboration**

The outside star on the model represents the mentors involved and the establishment of a network of collaborators in the education and leadership development process. The Academy model required the contributions and collaborative efforts of many individuals throughout various components of the model. The network of professionals formed through the Academy included the following:
- Resident Faculty: These individuals, who hold graduate faculty rank at Iowa State University and are housed on the campus, are central to the Academy as they assume the major role of advising and leading the graduate program in FCS Education. They are employed full time in the program. This role is in addition to their responsibilities associated with undergraduate teaching and advising, research, and service to the departmental, college, and university.

- Professional Collaborators: These individuals are those persons within the FCS profession who work with the resident faculty to help graduate students achieve their goals. These leaders from across the country would be recruited to serve as mentors for the students who are using the Academy to pursue a graduate degree.

- University Administration: This group includes individuals in administrative positions within the department, college, and university who are responsible for the management and allocation of economic and human resources.

- Advisory Board Members: The board works with the resident faculty on the planning, development, and promotion of the graduate program. This group could assist with teaching courses, fundraising efforts, and securing support.

- Visiting Scholars: Professors who are nationally distinguished and who have varied leadership experiences within the FCS Education profession would be invited to teach selected summer academy course offerings
and/or online courses for the fall and spring semesters. These individuals all have temporary graduate faculty status in the FCEdS program at Iowa State University.

The conceptual framework delineated the roles of the involved individuals to make the program model work. Each of these individuals and groups played a role in the process of guiding the development, implementation, and evolution of the Academy model at Iowa State University and in providing expertise in various areas, such as curriculum, administration, and program development. It was anticipated that each of these individuals could join in collaborative endeavors to provide appropriate experiences that would nurture future leaders within the profession.

The resident faculty desired that the Academy model of graduate education would offer a professional network of key leaders and hoped to create a network of professionals who could collaborate with each other as they worked toward the accomplishment of the FCS mission. To provide this networking opportunity, students were offered the option of staying in a living, learning community during the three week summer residence. Living, learning communities offer a unique experience to promote both learning and socialization. It was designed that spending time together, both in and out of the classroom, would allow graduate students to “live together, learn together, grow together” and “establish relationships and generate collaborative opportunities that would continue long after they earn[ed] their degrees.” The resident faculty wanted to find a place for the students to stay that would accommodate the size of the group, be available during the summer, and yet be affordable. It was also important that this place provide a setting that would
welcome living and sharing meals and time together. The faculty made a deliberate
effort to find a place that would seem like home and explored housing options
available within the university context. Because sorority houses had the atmosphere
and environment that were preferred and because they were usually vacant during
the summer, they were chosen as the most appropriate site for the Academy living,
learning community.

Curriculum

The middle star of the illustration represents the course work and the
experiences of the graduate program that shape the student and future leader in
FCS education. These include: (1) administration focusing on leadership for
organizational change; (2) curriculum planning and program development; (3)
philosophical foundation of the profession; (4) pedagogy consisting of both learner
assessment and program evaluation; and (5) research. The courses in the graduate
program can each be aligned to one of these 5 categories. Identification of the
categories also permitted the resident faculty to see the need for additional courses
which could be later added to the curriculum.

Student Participation in the Process

The inside star of the illustration represents a process the professional goes
through using the value reasoning model beginning with the

(a) professional who is the individual enrolled in the Academy;
(b) valued ends or outcomes that the individual determines in collaboration
with mentors and the program of study committee and that are based on
what the individual desires as an outcome;
(c) individual plan or framework in which he or she establishes his or her own plan within one’s set of circumstances and situation;

(d) selected means of action that the individual plans to take to accomplish his or her goals which ultimately supports the end result of the larger profession; and

(e) reflection upon the action he or she takes in accomplishing the goals and an evaluation of whether the decision and action was of benefit.

The model enabled professionals throughout the world to come together as graduate students to learn and study, interact with one another, and engage in dialogue as they sought an advanced degree in FCS Education. Graduate students enrolled in the Academy would identify their own outcomes; determine an appropriate program of study (POS) and course of action within their professional context; and, finally, participate in and reflect upon the experience. With the foundation from the model, the graduate program could begin to define their mission and determine the principles that would guide its curriculum and practice.

**Mission and Guiding Principles**

While the delivery format for the program was modified in 2001 to address the current challenges of graduate education and better meet the needs of professionals seeking advanced study in the field, the mission of the program remained the same. The mission of the graduate program was “to enhance the educational process for teaching family and consumer sciences content and to advance the understanding of the integrative nature of the profession of family and consumer sciences” (Graduate Handbook, 2005, p. 1). With the basic focus of the model identified, there
was a need to articulate the purpose and mission of the new model to the profession and to the public. Hence, the following aspiration statement was developed: *The Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy aspires to strengthen Family and Consumer Sciences by inviting collaborative participation in reflection, renewal, and development of professional scholarship and engagement.*

Components of professional competence were adapted to develop valued ends for participants and graduates. These valued ends served as the guiding principles in making decisions regarding the components of the model. Thus, the program’s goal was to develop professional leaders who

- provide beneficial service(s) to society, involving intellectual activity, practical judgment, and mastery of theoretical knowledge of the profession;
- are rationally committed to the mission of family and consumer sciences as justifiably established by the profession;
- reflect critically upon personal and collective actions for fulfilling the mission of family and consumer sciences;
- deal with complex concepts and practical problems relevant to the practice of the profession;
- possess a sense of purpose that transcends self-interest;
- identify and interact with a community of peers;
- participate in dialogue through examined critique and reflection using rational standards for argumentation;
• are self-directed in the selection of experiences, opportunities, and relationships that encourage professional growth and renewal; and

• engage in professional practice in ways that are cognitively justifiable and morally defensible (adapted from Gentzler, 1987).

These goals or valued ends were not simply words on paper; they were sincere aspirations to contribute not only to the livelihood of the graduate program, but to the profession in general. It was believed that the program could be designed so that graduate students would eventually possess these attributes. Furthermore, to achieve the program's mission and aspiration, graduate students participating in the Academy were expected to be:

• Self-directed in selecting the experiences necessary for personal and professional development;

• Active participants in class discussion, building on ideas and drawing from the literature rather than simply repeating what another has said;

• Evaluative of their own work and potential and able to establish realistic goals and means for accomplishing them;

• Aware of quality in presenting, revising and refining work before submission;

• Able to critique current concepts and generate personal interpretations of these concepts; and

• Able to understand concepts and issues at all levels of learning, including analysis, evaluation, and synthesis (Graduate Handbook, 2005, p. 2).
These expectations would be met with a graduate experience that emphasized theory and its application to professional practice, exposed students to both historical and current literature, and gave them an opportunity to work with leaders within the FCS Education profession who would provide instruction for the courses.

**Focus of the Curriculum and Coursework**

The coursework and its associated assignments and experiences were designed to shape the professional/leader in five areas including Administration and Leadership for Organizational Change, Curriculum Planning and Program Development, Philosophical Foundations of the Profession, Pedagogy of Learner Assessment and Program Evaluation, and Research. Although the model offered an alternate format in which courses would be delivered, the curriculum and course requirements had to fit within existing requirements, policies, and procedures to earn an advanced degree at the university. The courses within the curriculum focused on building professional and leadership qualities deemed necessary for FCS educators and on keeping up-to-date with current and emerging trends.

Coursework completed in the FCS Education program applied to the completion of the Master of Science (M.S.), Master of Education (M.Ed.) and/or Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree in Family and Consumer Sciences Education. The M.S. degree consisted of a minimum of 30 semester credit hours and included the completion of a research thesis. At least 24 of the minimum credits needed to be taken in the major field, including 18 credits of course work and six credits for the research thesis. The M.Ed. degree consisted of a minimum of 30 semester credit hours and included the development of a creative component. A minimum of 24
credits were taken in the major field, with at least 21 credits of course work and three credits for the creative component. The requirement for the PhD degree included a minimum of 72 semester hour credits which conformed to the requirements of the Graduate College. Those 72 credits were distributed as: 42–50 credit hours in the major area, 12 dissertation/research credit hours, and 10–18 credit hours outside the major area. In the beginning, specific core requirements for the master’s and doctoral degrees included:

- FCEdS 507 Program Planning in Family and Consumer Sciences (3 credits);
- FCEdS 511 Research Methods (3 credits); and
- FCEdS 515 Assessment in Family and Consumer Sciences (3 credits).

The degree programs mandated up to nine credit hours of basic and advanced statistics. Additional credits were earned from a variety of other Family and Consumer Sciences Education and Studies courses.

The POS committee played a guiding and supporting role in the selection of courses for the graduate student. As outlined in the Graduate Handbook (2005), the POS committee:

- encourages academic preparation of the student and development of the Program of Study;
- reviews, makes suggestions, and approves the student’s proposal for the final project (creative component for MEd, thesis for MS, or dissertation for PhD);
• evaluates PhD student's readiness to be advanced to candidacy through written and oral examinations; and

• evaluates the written document of the graduate research project (creative component, thesis, or dissertation) (p. 10).

At the time the Academy model was conceptualized, 13 graduate courses in Family and Consumer Sciences Education and Studies were in place and could be selected for a program of study. These courses, including the course number, title, and catalog description, are listed in Table 2. In the beginning, course offerings were limited to those existing courses. Although courses were offered online during the fall and spring semesters, much of the graduate coursework was accomplished during the three-week residential program in the summer. Many of the courses were resurrected from previous course offerings. Over the five year period studied, changes were made regarding the courses taught and the requirements within the curriculum. The resident faculty and visiting scholars began to recognize that some students, whose background included emphasis in one of the FCS specializations, did not possess an understanding of the larger profession. Resident faculty wanted to offer a course that would provide all students with a better understanding of the field, its development, its philosophy, and its early leaders. A new course, FCEdS 504: Intellectual Foundations of FCS Leadership, was developed and approved. The goal of the course was to "connect the historical and philosophical structure of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCEdS 501</td>
<td>Trends, Issues and Public Policy</td>
<td>Discussion of current topics affecting the family and consumer sciences profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCEdS 507</td>
<td>Program Development in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Application of principles of program development to formal and nonformal educational settings, e.g., secondary school family and consumer sciences programs, training positions in business, Cooperative Extension, human services agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCEdS 508</td>
<td>Models for Teaching Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Selecting teaching strategies and instructional materials based on theories of learning and human development that reflect a professional philosophy of family and consumer sciences. Application to formal and nonformal educational settings with diverse audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCEdS 511</td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>An overview of diverse research approaches focusing on methods for collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data. Critique of research reports and development of research proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCEdS 515</td>
<td>Assessment in Family and Consumer Sciences Programs</td>
<td>Role of assessment in family and consumer sciences education programs. Planning and constructing test items and other assessments of school and nonschool learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCEdS 520</td>
<td>Supervision in Family and Consumer Sciences Programs</td>
<td>Examination of change, communication and leadership theories as related to supervision. Application of conferencing techniques, observation skills, and performance evaluation to professional leadership positions in educational settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCEdS</td>
<td><strong>International Perspectives of Family and Consumer Sciences</strong></td>
<td>Examination of family and consumer sciences from an international perspective; focus on the roles and responsibilities of women in development. Application and adaptation of content to working with families in other countries and cultures. Student participation in cultural activities and critique of international research articles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCEdS</td>
<td><strong>Curriculum Theory and Philosophy in Family and Consumer Sciences</strong></td>
<td>Integration of philosophies of education and family and consumer sciences into an operative philosophy of curriculum development. Study of various curriculum theories and approaches to curriculum development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCEdS</td>
<td><strong>Seminar</strong></td>
<td>Exploration of trends and issues in the profession. May be taken more than once for credit. Offered on a satisfactory-fail grading basis only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCEdS</td>
<td><strong>Program Evaluation in Family and Consumer Sciences</strong></td>
<td>Application of program evaluation approaches and models to family and consumer sciences programs. Standards for program evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCEdS</td>
<td><strong>Coordination of Educational Programs in Family and Consumer Sciences</strong></td>
<td>Approaches to coordination of family and consumer sciences programs in adult education, extension, state department of education, and teacher education. Study of undergraduate programs in family and consumer sciences education, observation and participation in undergraduate courses, and practicum experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCEdS</td>
<td><strong>Theories of Administration in Family and Consumer Sciences</strong></td>
<td>Review of administrative theory; application to family and consumer sciences programs with emphasis on higher education. Administrative leadership roles, and their interrelationships. Consideration of current issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the profession with perspectives leading to innovative professional action.” In the course, students were required to read classic documents from the profession’s heritage and asked to examine leaders in the field as examples of leadership. The course was officially added to the core curriculum for all master’s and doctoral students.

As needs and trends emerged within the profession, additional courses were created and developed as experimental courses. The titles and course descriptions for those included the following:

- FCEdS 506X – Curriculum Development in Family and Consumer Sciences: Based on the course description, objectives, and syllabus, the course focused on a critique of curriculum designs and materials and required the development of materials from a critical science perspective.

- FCEdS 519X – Reflective Leadership: The purpose of this course was to examine the meaning and role of reflective human action within both the greater FCS profession and individual professional experience. The course provided opportunities for students to explore qualities that underlie reflective thought and meaningful practice. The course was also developed to offer an understanding of how the Reflective Human Action model fits into professional practice.

- FCEdS 579X – Educational and Critical Science Perspectives of Family and Consumer Issues: The course was an examination of social issues within a family and community context from a critical sciences perspective and an application of critical thinking, diverse perspectives, and reflection
to family and social issues. Family and consumer sciences philosophy, theory, and research were analyzed in relation to current social issues.

- **FCEdS 601X – Advanced Philosophical Critique of Trends, Issues, and Public Policy**: The course was a critical examination of current topics in the family and consumer sciences profession and involved concentrated group study with implications for action. The course, funded in part by Kappa Omicron Nu, served as a Critical Science Summit and was the first course that visiting faculty were invited to participate.

- **FCEdS 626X – Advanced Research Methods**: This course provided an examination of modes of inquiry used to conduct research in various educational arenas in the interest of the human context in these settings. The modes of inquiry were organized around the three perspectives of Empirical/Analytic Science, Interpretive Science and Critical Science. The course also provided an understanding of appropriate research methods used within the FCS profession.

The faculty members who taught aforementioned courses created them to reflect the goals outlined by the resident faculty and approved by the College Curriculum Committee. The courses included both required and recommended course readings and assignments that complemented the content of the course, led to accomplishment of the course goals, and applied to the students’ professional practice.
Assessment and Evaluation within the Model

There are many opportunities for assessment within the Academy model. This assessment takes many forms. Within each course, valued ends are established which delineate the expectations and outcomes of projects and assignments designed to help the students reach their professional goals. Visiting faculty who teach those courses then evaluate students’ assignments and participation. In line with university procedures, graduate students complete course and faculty evaluations. Ongoing assessment occurs as resident faculty, visiting faculty, and the students provide regular feedback as their experiences and growth.

Within the doctoral program only, students are required to complete preliminary written and oral examinations in order for faculty to assess the students’ presentation and application of theory (Graduate Handbook, 2005). The preliminary examination is taken after the student has completed the majority of his or her coursework.

Written Preliminary Examination

The written preliminary examination, which is comprehensive in nature, was based on program competencies established by the resident faculty. Five to six questions were included in the exam. Three of those were derived from the program’s core curriculum (FCEDS 504, 507, 511, and 515). The additional questions were selected by the major professor and other members of the resident faculty. The resident faculty reviewed, evaluated, and assigned each core question a score of Strong Pass, Pass, Weak Pass, or Fail. Until May, 2005, two methods of examination were available that the student could choose from: traditional or
Academy. After that time, all doctoral students completed the preliminary exam using the Academy format. The next section describes both the traditional and Academy models for preliminary exams.

**Traditional Model**

In the traditional format, students sat in a proctored room for three class days and wrote their responses to the assigned questions. The student had three to four hours to compose his or her response to each of the questions, which were given one at a time. Textbooks and notes were not allowed. Upon completion, copies of the original response were submitted and then the student had one week to provide unedited, typed copies to the Director of Graduate Education (DOGE).

**Academy Model**

With the Academy model format, students received the core questions and were permitted a period of four consecutive weeks to prepare their response. One of those questions, which was required for all students, asked them to “Describe your personal philosophy of leadership as it has emerged through reflection on coursework, reading, and experience, and envision your role in accomplishing the mission of the profession.” Once the responses to the core questions were submitted, the remaining two or three questions were sent to the student by the DOGE. Although each question was to be answered independently, textbooks and notes could be used. In formulating and typing the response, each must be typed, double-spaced, with a minimum of eight pages and a maximum of 15 pages, not including references.
Oral Preliminary Examination

With satisfactory performance on the written part of the exam, doctoral students proceed to the oral examination. The primary purpose of the oral exam is to evaluate the student’s knowledge and ability to integrate, synthesize, organize, and orally articulate relevant information. The major professor and the POS committee have authority over the oral exam. Upon conclusion of the exam, the committee recommends one of the following grades: (1) Pass, which denotes admission to candidacy to the doctoral program; (2) Conditional Pass indicating that specific conditions must be met before the admission to candidacy; (3) Fail with an opportunity to retake the exam in six months; and (4) Fail with no opportunity to continue toward the doctoral degree.

Summary

As an innovative approach to addressing the critical need for FCS leaders, the model was designed to prepare individuals to step forward confidently to accept and carry out the mission of our profession. The model, including its goals, structure, and coursework as it was first intended, has been described. Through the years, changes were necessitated. These changes were described in this chapter. Gentzler summarized the importance and the role of change to the Academy model:

If it weren’t constantly evolving, it would not be good because the program is driven by the research – it’s driven by the individual – it’s driven by the need for leadership – It’s driven by all of these components that are constantly moving. And so, it can never stop. It has to keep going. Research doesn’t end – people’s lives don’t end – your goals never end – accomplishing our mission never ends – the networking never ends – none of these components end. It constantly creates more opportunities, and that’s the dynamics of and the excitement about this model. It’s just the beginning of what can be, and
what will be, and what I believe will prepare the future leadership for Family and Consumer Sciences Education.

Understanding the model is key to fully appreciating the events and activities surrounding its conceptualization, development, and implementation.
CHAPTER 5
THE MODEL: CONCEPTUALIZATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND IMPLEMENTATION

Because I participated as a student in the Academy and learned about the framework from which this graduate program was redesigned, I could not help wondering where this model originated and what had occurred that motivated the need for the graduate program’s new, alternative format. It was those initial questions that sparked my desire to understand and chronicle the Academy model for graduate education. Although I will acknowledge that it may not be “the” complete story; it is “a” story of the Academy from what I gleaned through conversations, documents, and my insider observations and experiences to answer the following questions:

- What was the original impetus for the creation of the FCS Education Leadership Academy model? What was the context at the time the Academy was conceptualized within the Department of Apparel, Educational Studies and Hospitality Management, the former College of Family and Consumer Sciences, the Iowa State University, and the FCS profession?

- Who were the people involved with the Academy’s creation, development, and implementation? What role(s) did these individuals play? Why did they become involved?

Two factors influenced how the information used to compile this historical account unfolded and was conveyed to me. First, all of my conversations occurred in 2005 and 2006, several years after the model was initially conceptualized. Many
of my questions required that individuals remember or recall past events, actions, and conversations. On several occasions, some individuals openly acknowledged the inability to recall some of the details. I believed that these memory lapses were sincere, thereby seeking other methods to gather and confirm information.

Secondly, despite repeated attempts and additional probing, some respondents did not feel comfortable or were somewhat cautious in responding to the questions raised. The political climate that sometimes exists within a university context may have contributed to this apprehension.

**Contextual Factors and Impetus for Model**

This chapter assembles the factual and historical description of the Academy model’s conceptualization, development, implementation, and evolution over a five year period from 2001 to 2006. To further explicate this perspective, a historical account of the FCS program at Iowa State and the context and climate within the university and the profession are outlined below. Issues, concerns, and events that might have served as the catalyst for offering the graduate program in an alternative format will be revealed.

**Historical Context of FCS Program at Iowa State University**

When the Morrill Act of 1862 was passed, Iowa was the first state to accept the law’s provisions, and in 1869, students were first admitted to Iowa State College. At the time, agriculture was the only curriculum available. Mary B. Welch, wife of the first president Dr. Adonijah Welch, had a vision for a program that would be relevant for women. The domestic science program at ISU was first developed as a *ladies course* when it was approved by the Board of Trustees in 1871 (Eppright &
As a result, Iowa State University was the first land-grant institution to offer a home economics program. Even in its early days, the ISU home economics program was feeling pressure by state policies and legislation. The program was threatened when the Iowa Board of Education voted in 1912 for all home economics courses to be moved to the State University of Iowa. After much protest, the decision was overturned. The university reorganized its programs in 1913 and established a separate unit with a new name, the Division of Home Economics. That reorganization “gave home economics prestige, autonomy, and an opportunity to control its own destiny” (p. 2). As a result of the Smith-Hughes Act, which required the education of home economics teachers, teacher education was the first formal career preparation offered by the college. This meant a tremendous boost to the home economics education program.

In 1914, graduate work began in the College of Home Economics at ISU and the first Master of Science degree was awarded in 1915. The strong research focus continued throughout the years, and program enrollment remained a steady 19% of the total university enrollment from 1927 – 1952 (CFCS, 1999). The program was recognized as having established a strong state and national reputation for quality programs and became the College of Home Economics in 1959.

Valiant leadership from administrators and faculty within the College of Home Economics led the program to many firsts, including:
creating the first curriculum in home economics for women in a land grant institution; offering the first program for non-traditional older students; becoming the pilot college for computerized alumni records . . . [and] for developing computer scheduling; developing the formalized articulation model for transfers with community colleges, a model now used by other ISU colleges; [and] offering the first campus honors programs. (CFCS, 1999, p. 33)

The visionary leadership of the College of Home Economics not only addressed the needs within that college but also impacted other ISU colleges. Such sustained leadership directly contributed to the history of creativity enjoyed by the College of Home Economics, in light of its many firsts previously noted. This was another example of the commitment demonstrated by administrators and faculty who rose to the challenges of the times and offered viable solutions. The FCS Education program at Iowa State University became the only FCS graduate program in the state, following the closures of similar programs at the University of Iowa and the University of Northern Iowa. By the year 2000, the doctoral program in Family and Consumer Sciences Education became one of only few such graduate programs in the nation. Graduate programs in FCS related areas, including the FCS Education program, at Iowa State University have maintained a reputation of stellar research throughout its history. As a result, in the last ten years, Iowa State University has ranked first or second in the greatest number of total thesis and dissertation titles reported in the *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal* (Lee & Johnson, 1996; Makela, 2003; Makela, 2004; Ownbey, 1998; Ownbey & Taupmann, 1997; Smith & Hunter, 2002). These rankings illustrated the status of the graduate program over time; yet, of greater importance was the research contribution to the profession’s body of knowledge. Throughout the FCS Education graduate
program’s history, research focused on issues associated with consumer education, nutrition education, parenting, time management, balancing work and family, and domestic violence. Whether it was an examination of women’s roles in Sudan, the food practices of Brazilians, the household tasks in Malaysia, or adolescent girls in India, the research had international implications. In the teacher education arena, many research studies concentrated on the experiences of students in the FCS classroom, the effectiveness or impact of teaching methods, and in working with special needs students. Research designed to evaluate education needs and their potential impact on the field was conducted in schools across the United States.

**Current Context of FCS Program and Impetus for Model**

Even before celebrating the 125th anniversary of the College of Family and Consumer Sciences in 1997, university administrators and faculty dealt with issues related to dwindling budget allocations, declining enrollment, program duplication, and ideas of reorganization. In light of those issues, the dean at that time, Dr. Carol Meeks, acknowledged the role of technology and teamwork and the need for diversity and recruitment in responding to change, establishing a direction for the future of learning, and strengthening families and the profession (CFCS, 1999). Yet in 2000, after the third straight year of budget cuts, college administrators struggled to find solutions for dealing with limited financial resources. Dean Meeks noted in the interview, “Everybody was stressed . . . not just in our College but in the whole university.” Finally, an administrative decision to reorganize departments within the College was announced unexpectedly at a college-wide faculty meeting in the summer of 2000.
Reorganization of the College

The reorganization and merger involved three departments including Family and Consumer Sciences Education and Studies; Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management; and Textiles and Clothing. Although the merger did not become official until July, 2001, with the Board of Regents approval, the departments operated in the merged structure starting July 1, 2000. At that time, a new department chair was named who would lead the merged unit. Faculty in the impacted departments did not have input into the decision to merge the departments; however, they were given opportunities for input on the department’s name. Selecting a name for the new department involved much discussion as faculty in each program wanted to maintain a clear program identity. The Department of Apparel, Educational Studies, and Hospitality Management (AESHM) became the name of the merged unit. Retreats were held during that time with the faculty and the department chair to address issues and challenges of each program.

Even with input, however, the merger seemed to be a particularly difficult time within the new department. Not only were faculty unhappy about the unexpected and unwanted merger, graduate students became concerned about the direction of their programs, given the recent retirements and resignations of several faculty members within the FCEdS program.

Program Challenges

With the reorganization, the Family and Consumer Sciences Education and Studies program faced many challenges including fewer faculty members, declining student enrollment, reduced facility space, and a limited operating budget. Of
specific concern was the viability of the graduate program in family and consumer sciences education. How could faculty continue to grow and build a program with limited resources, personnel, space, and program identity?

Furthermore, student enrollment in the resident graduate program was dwindling. The decline was attributed to “fewer students who were willing to quit their jobs, come to campus, and work on a graduate degree; [thus] we were seeing much less diversity in our graduate program.” The faculty recognized that many potential students were unable to pick up their lives and come to campus for a residential degree program. Even with that recognition, what could be done to address the low enrollments? That led the remaining faculty to consider how they had met challenges previously.

The FCS education program had experienced success with the Millenium Project funded by the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences that was targeted to professionals seeking licensure to teach FCS in middle and secondary schools. Dr. Cheryl Hausafus and Dr. Margaret Torrie directed the Millenium Project, which administered coursework via the Iowa Communications Network (ICN). Through the funded project, individuals were recruited and given scholarships to enroll in classes and to ultimately become a licensed FCS secondary teacher. One faculty member acknowledged, “We were having difficulty with people who already had a bachelor’s degree and wanted licensure and could not come to campus to take courses.” However, the Millennium Project was limited to FCS professionals in Iowa. Although the project gave the program some experience in delivering coursework through distance education, it didn’t appear to be an adequate
solution for the graduate program. The enrollment problem faced by the graduate program seemed to be on a much larger scale; it was a growing problem that was plaguing the profession and programs throughout the nation.

The individuals who would potentially seek the doctoral degree were likely to be young faculty members in FCS teacher education and other university programs. How could they possibly leave their positions if they had personal and family responsibilities? One resident faculty member suggested that “the people that we would most likely have as graduate students, especially at the PhD level, who were working in other [universities] found it not a very secure thing to do.” This resulted in fewer students in residence; yet, these individuals were still in need of professional development and education.

Of broader concern was the question of “How could we develop future leaders for the profession?” A number of leaders in the profession were nearing retirement. Many FCS leaders taught at universities where no graduate program existed. Not only were these leaders unable to share their expertise with graduate students, they had no means for interaction with them either. With fewer graduate programs and active leaders, much discussion emerged regarding what was actually being done to develop future leaders for the profession.

The three remaining faculty members within the FCS Education program at ISU struggled with the threat of the graduate program with a long-standing history, prestigious research base, and strong alumni support, on the brink of being closed. The program had a reputation, both nationally and internationally, of having strong educational programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The graduate
program’s reputation had been praised by a resident faculty member as being “a very strong powerhouse of Family and Consumer Sciences Education research” that had graduates “who have taken key positions all over the world who have made an impact in Family and Consumer Sciences as well as accomplishing our mission.”

Yet, the future of the graduate program was grim. The climate of the university, college, department, and program was ripe for change. Faculty members were strongly encouraged to dismantle the FCS Education graduate program, and, by the end of the summer semester of 2001, they were asked to officially vote on the status of the program. The three remaining faculty members, two who were tenured, recognized they were in a “key position to either make something happen or to accept our fate.” The words of one administrator holds true: “Goals are accomplished not by whining or complaining or by hiding, but by action. We must assume responsibility for what and where we want to be” (CFCS, 1999, p. 16). That is what the FCEdS faculty chose to do. They chose to take action!

**Individuals Involved in Conceptualization**

The conceptualization stage focused on the creation of the idea for an Academy, including initial reactions and approval of the idea. I spoke with each of the three resident faculty members in the FCEdS program to gather data regarding the model’s initial conceptualization. In addition, information was elicited through the interviews with the Dean and Department Chair who were in administrative positions at the time of the conceptualization. Each of them played a role in the founding and establishment of the Academy model for graduate education. In the following section, a brief description of these individuals based on their interview responses
and my experiences in working with them over the last five years will be provided. The summaries are not intended as biographical sketches, but as insights into their professional background.

**Resident Faculty**

In the newly created Department of Apparel, Educational Studies, and Hospitality Management, three faculty members became responsible for the graduate program in FCS education. Resident faculty members at that time were:

- **Yvonne S. Gentzler, PhD**: Gentzler was new to Iowa State University. After serving in faculty positions at the University of Idaho and University of Maryland, she came to Iowa State as the Department Chair of FCEdS. With the department merger, she assumed the FCEdS Program Chair position. Her scholarship focused on professional competence and professional development. She held the rank of Associate Professor.

- **Cheryl O. Hausafus, PhD**: With the rank of Associate Professor and as the program’s Director of Graduate Education (DOGE), Hausafus’ twenty year tenure with the College gave her extensive knowledge of the history, traditions, and procedures of the former department and of graduate education. Additionally, she had been examining trends in FCS graduate programs in the United States.

- **Beverly J. Kruempel, PhD**: Following the College reorganization and the elimination of her position as the Director of Student Services and Director of Career Services, Kruempel transitioned to the FCEdS program as a full-time faculty member. She held the rank of Adjunct Assistant Professor in
the College. Primarily, she worked with undergraduate students as their academic advisor and taught undergraduate courses.

**Administrators**

Within the reorganized college, two individuals served in administrative roles at the time the Academy model was conceptualized.

- **Mary Gregoire, PhD:** Gregoire came to Iowa State University in 1998 as chair of the Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management department. Following the College’s reorganization, she was named Chair of the newly merged department.

- **Carol Meeks Roskey, PhD:** Roskey served as Dean of the former College of Family and Consumer Sciences when the Academy model was conceptualized. She had been in that position since August, 1997. Prior to her arrival at Iowa State University, she held the rank of Professor and position of Department Head at the University of Georgia at Athens.

**A Faculty Member Seeks Refuge**

Due to budget cuts, low enrollments, and fewer faculty to maintain both the undergraduate and graduate programs, the FCEdS resident faculty were instructed to close the graduate program. Yet, they knew that it was one of few programs left in the country to prepare doctoral students specifically in FCS education. The decision to eliminate the graduate program had been especially difficult for Gentzler as she had experienced FCS Education program closures at The Pennsylvania State University and the University of Maryland. After all, the reputable graduate program had been the draw for her to accept the department chair position at Iowa
State. She remembered the professional dilemma of wondering what impact the closure could have on the profession. What would happen with fewer FCS teacher educators? Eventually, there would be fewer FCS teachers, which would have a huge impact within the schools and on the effectiveness of what FCS professionals do and how they accomplish their mission.

Gentzler had a passion for the FCS profession that was instilled in her development from her experiences with mentors, Twyla Shear and Elizabeth Ray. These experiences had shaped her life and cultivated a commitment for the profession with a mission to improve the human condition. As the academic year ended in Spring, 2001, it seemed that the FCEdS graduate program would be disbanded. Just like every other summer, she headed to her shore property in Avalon, New Jersey. It was there that she sought refuge because the beach had always been a place where she found the solitude that stimulated her creativity.

She contemplated resigning. At the beach, questions began to emerge requiring her to reflect upon her professional values: “What is my role in the profession? What should I do? What ought I to do? What’s the right thing to do? What would I have wanted someone else to do?” Personally, she felt the closure was ultimately “the death of a commitment” she had made earlier in life to the FCS profession. She thought, “I would have been walking away from all of the energy that had been put into my development . . . [and those who] had given me everything I needed in order to assume a leadership role in this profession.” Remembering the courage of Ellen Swallow Richards in establishing the profession and the visionary thinking of Marjorie Brown and Beatrice Paolucci in defining the profession, she
knew she must draw upon that strength and commitment “to make something happen.”

**A Concept Born**

Taking long walks along the beach each day, Gentzler contemplated the future, looked into the horizon, and searched for an answer. She wrestled with the fact that only three faculty members remained: “What would we do? How would we do this?” Then, she thought about the FCS teacher educators and leaders across the United States who were alone in their programs and did not have colleagues in FCS education to talk with and share ideas. Finally, sitting on the beach one afternoon with her legal pad in hand, she pondered, “What if we were to create a model for the FCS Education graduate program at Iowa State that would impact the profession at large? How could we pull people together and rally the profession? What would that look like?”

Suddenly, Gentzler’s mind flooded with ideas. She found herself drawing circles, interconnecting those with other circles, writing down people’s names and their expertise, and drawing a map of the United States. The legal pad quickly filled with sketches and thoughts comprising a vision that would materialize into a model to bring FCS researchers, scholars, and leaders together to offer an advanced degree in FCS education. She was confident that “Iowa State would be the perfect place” with its supportive alumni base. She knew that many of the retired faculty in the area still believed in, and recognized, the program’s important role in shaping people and the profession. She considered how this would actually work and whether others would buy into this idea that “might save the program.”
Reactions to the Concept

Immediately upon her return to campus in early July, Gentzler sought the opportunity to share the idea with her colleague, Cheryl Hausafus, who was respected because of her long tenure in the FCS Education program at Iowa State University. They met on the eve of the faculty meeting where the fate of the graduate program would be decided. Prior to that meeting, however, they spent time on the telephone – Hausafus in Florida and Gentzler in New Jersey. Neither of them wanted to vote to end the program. Neither of them believed that the program should be closed. Yet, they knew that they had a responsibility to sustain the program. Upon hearing the idea, Hausafus enthusiastically agreed to offer her support at the faculty meeting for sharing a concept that promised “interest and intrigue.”

The following morning, the three resident faculty members met with the department chair, Dr. Mary Gregoire, who totally expected that the meeting would result in closing the graduate program. Gentzler asked to share an idea before they discussed the business at hand. Once the idea was briefly shared, a sense of optimism and excitement transformed the meeting into an opportunity to brainstorm possibilities. Dr. Gregoire remembered her initial reaction to a “very creative solution to potentially [resolve] the challenges” that were facing the program. She was impressed with the faculty’s creativity and willingness to invest time and effort into the idea’s further development. She noted, “The easiest thing . . . would have been to say ‘we’re just going to do away with the graduate program.’ But [the faculty] didn’t do that. I think that it was a great decision by a great group of faculty.” In
reflecting upon that time, Hausafus emphasized the program’s need for self-preservation and added, “It is during those times of change that I think we’ve come to develop very strong programs – much stronger than we would have had.”

At that point, the idea was still a conceptual idea in Gentzler’s mind. She had to walk through the stages and share the possibilities with the other two faculty members. There were months of discussions and brainstorming. It was what every leader goes through when she has a vision and believes in it. It was not easy.

The faculty had to put the idea on paper before it could be shared with administrators. Dr. Gregoire, who had been introduced to the idea and involved in some of the brainstorming, communicated the concept with Dean Meeks who initially questioned whether or not it would work. However, Meeks considered the trust that she had in the faculty who were the closest to, and most knowledgeable of, the field. When she observed the enthusiasm of the people involved and the overwhelming support within the program and from the department chair, she felt confident in offering her support for the “opportunity to make some major contributions” to the profession through FCS education.

With the approval and assistance of the department chair, the program faculty moved forward to seek external support for the concept. Faculty members were advised that the time and effort spent developing the idea would be above and beyond their responsibilities to the undergraduate program. Hausafus pulled together a group of six graduate students in a Graduate Seminar in the Fall Semester of 2001 where she and Gentzler shared the idea. Initially, the students questioned: Did the need exist? What should be done about the program in
general? What were other FCS Education programs doing to guard against elimination? Would an alternative format really work? The seminar students were asked to research and examine ways to get more diverse groups of students into graduate education. The students assembled literature from within the profession and graduate education that would support alternative delivery formats. As they tried to discuss and debate ways to address the situation, the process seemed slow. The idea was still coming into fruition, and the graduate students seemed skeptical that the program would actually work. There were so many unknowns – there were policies, procedures, and requirements already in place that would have to be considered. Those obstacles didn’t seem to stop the resident faculty from pursuing this dream. Cheryl Hausafus continued to explore alternatives and possibilities with the students.

Meanwhile, Gentzler began making phone calls. She got on the telephone and called her colleagues, Penny Ralston and Beverly Crabtree, followed by Dorothy Mitstifer, Virginia Johnson, Francine Hultgren, Laurie Nichols and others who ultimately played a role in the Academy model. Letters were drafted and sent to FCS administrators, leaders, alumni, supporters, friends, and colleagues across the United States inviting them to contribute their expertise and endorse a new program model that could “ultimately sustain our profession.” The program received favorable comments and responses from FCS professionals that provided the affirmation and support necessary to further develop the concept into a model utilizing an alternative delivery for a graduate program offering both the masters and doctoral degrees. FCS education professionals seemed convinced that this type of
model would work! The obstacles that were facing the graduate program were
great, yet the resident faculty forged ahead with the idea. This took great vision and
leadership on the part of the resident faculty.

**Individuals Involved in the Development of the Model**

The resident faculty played key roles in the further development of the
Academy model; administrators approved their efforts. Armed with data, the faculty
outlined what the model would look like and the “nitty gritty” details of how the
program would develop and operate. Gentzler, Hausafus, and Kruempel met weekly
to brainstorm ideas and address issues involved in the process of designing an
innovative model for graduate education within an existing program that included
courses and existing policies and procedures. The resident faculty could enhance
the educational experience through their backgrounds and classroom
responsiveness. Furthermore, the faculty members could “engage in research
endeavors that focus on current trends and information in critical areas of family and
consumer sciences education."

Given Kruempel’s primary responsibility to the undergraduate program and
Hausafus’ duties as Director of Graduate Education, Gentzler assumed much of the
responsibility for, literally, jumpstarting the alternate format for the graduate program.
She had begun the process by calling friends and professional colleagues to seek
their support and guidance. In one of those phone calls, a current FCS administrator
from another university suggested that she seek professional contributions from a
group of FCS leaders to provide a “backbone” of support for the model’s
development. These leaders were invited to become the Academy's first Advisory Board.

**Advisory Board Members**

The advisory board was created to give a voice to the program. “We needed the weight of the leaders in the profession to get the attention of our own administrators.” Eight leaders, were selected who brought an array of experiences, educational backgrounds, and expertise and who lived in diverse locations within the United States and Canada, were invited to serve on the advisory board. Gentzler called each one. No one invited refused the opportunity. These leaders included:

- **Jan Bowers, PhD**: She was Professor and Chair of the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences at Central Washington University. Bowers served as the volunteer executive director for the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Association (FCSEA) and had professional experience as a former state supervisor of FCS programs. She served, at that time, on the Family, Career, and Community Leaders of America (FCCLA) Advisory Board.

- **Beverly Crabtree, PhD**: As Dean Emeritus of the former College of Family and Consumer Sciences at Iowa State University, she was selected to serve as Chair of the Advisory Board. Prior to her tenure at Iowa State, Crabtree served as Dean at Oklahoma State University. In both of her Dean positions, she had been instrumental in successful fundraising, building, and program development efforts.
• Beulah M. Hirshlein, PhD: She held the rank of Professor within the Department of Family Relations and Child Development at Oklahoma State University. Hirshlein had provided strong support at her university and was recommended for her expertise in grant writing and funding.

• Sue McGregor, PhD: McGregor was a Professor and Coordinator of the Peace and Conflict Studies Program at Mount Saint Vincent University in Canada. She had served as a Fellow for Kappa Omicron Nu, the family and consumer sciences honor society and had a background in critical science, transformative leadership, and international studies.

• Dorothy Mitstifer, PhD: Mitstifer was selected to serve, in part, because of her role as the executive director of Kappa Omicron Nu, the family and consumer sciences honor society. Her work with the society focused on the Reflective Human Action leadership theory.

• Penny Ralston, PhD: As a former President of the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences and then Dean of the College of Human Sciences at Florida State University, Ralston brought expertise in leadership and administration theories and issues. Earlier in her career, Ralston had served as a former faculty member in the FCS Education program at Iowa State University.

• Cecilia Thompson, PhD: Being a Professor of Vocational and Adult Education in the College of Education and Health Professions at the University of Arkansas, Thompson brought expertise in the area of FCS
teacher education and represented FCS programs in the south who were mentoring and supporting FCS education.

- Sally K. Williams, PhD: She held the title of Professor Emerita for Family and Consumer Sciences Education at Iowa State University. Williams brought an international perspective to the Board because she had worked with families in several countries during her tenure as a former faculty member in the program at Iowa State University and even after her retirement.

The reactions of these individuals propelled the model forward as they enthusiastically agreed to support the resident faculty in the development of the Academy model. Insights into their reaction and motivation for involvement are presented later in this chapter.

**Advisory Board Organizes**

On a cold and snowy day in January, 2002, the Advisory Board members assembled for their first meeting. Although they came from all parts of the United States and Canada and from varying professional practice settings, they shared a common bond . . . a professional or philosophical connection to FCS education. Many had moved into leadership positions in professional associations and administrative roles in higher education. Time was spent brainstorming ideas, suggesting avenues to pursue, and discussing potential problems and solutions that might emerge with the new delivery system for earning a graduate degree in FCS education. Work groups based on areas of professional expertise were formed to further cement the model and its components. Members recognized the potential of
this conceptual model to develop a learning community of professionals within and beyond the FCS profession.

Board members truly operated in an advisory capacity as they were “quite vocal” and “aggressive” in seeking a firm commitment from Dr. Gregoire to support the program, making suggestions regarding potential faculty to teach courses; prioritizing issues; and, yet, trying not to dictate curriculum or procedures. The resident faculty members credit the Advisory Board as being very supportive and providing “creative ideas . . . contacts . . . [and a] recruiting network.” The Advisory Board was praised for moving forward to lay the foundation for “opening [the Academy] up nationally and internationally, as well as pulling it together by [the] summer of 2002.” The Advisory Board members worked tirelessly in a short period of time to offer their guidance regarding how the program could be implemented.

**Individuals Involved in the Initial Implementation of the Model**

This stage emphasizes the actual implementation of the Academy model, with particular attention paid to the instruction of the coursework, activities of the program, as well as the students who chose to participate. Much time and energy were spent in the conceptualization and development of the Academy model by the resident faculty. With a new framework, supported by the existing program mission and goals, resident faculty began to mold the curriculum together, identify courses to be taught within the program, gain approval for the alternative format, and make decisions about logistics. It was time to put plans and ideas into action. Recruitment of faculty and students would be vital to the model’s success. Thus, other individuals involved in this stage of implementation were the visiting scholars
who were invited to teach and the graduate students who chose to enroll in the first year of the graduate program using the Academy format.

**Resident Faculty**

The creation of the model was only the first step in redefining the FCS Education graduate program. The resident faculty were faced with the challenging task of addressing university regulations, policies, and procedures in its proposal to offer the graduate program in an alternative format that included three weeks of summer residential study on campus and online course delivery in the fall and spring semesters. It seemed that there were additional hoops to jump through every time they turned around; yet, resident faculty moved forward following the protocols or the procedures necessary to ensure that the delivery format would be acceptable to the university and to the Graduate College.

One example of how the program attempted to work within existing policies related to the university’s residency requirement for doctoral students. The policy indicated that students must earn 24 semester credits within three consecutive semesters. Because of the unique characteristics of the Academy model, resident faculty proposed and gained approval from the Graduate College for an alternative interpretation of the residency requirement. Students in the FCS Education graduate program can fulfill the residency requirement by earning 24 consecutive credits within four consecutive semesters: summer, fall, spring, and summer semesters. Kruempel commended the committee’s approval by adding, “In changing and looking at alternative formats, the university had to also be as flexible
as the program.” Hausafus noted, “We did have a long standing history of distance education in other areas.”

Serving on the curriculum committee at the department and college levels and on the university Graduate Membership Committee during this time was important for resident faculty so they could explain and justify the program. The resident faculty were called upon to advocate for the approval of experimental courses and dossiers of visiting scholars for receiving graduate faculty status. It proved vital when the first visiting scholars’ vitas were presented and the committee discussed their graduate faculty status. As a member of the Graduate Membership Committee, Hausafus explained how the program worked and recalled, “There was not a question about the qualifications of our visiting scholars but there was always a question about whether or not they could really provide the assistance and the help to students because they weren’t on campus.”

Although the program is administered by the Department of Apparel, Educational Studies, and Hospitality Management, course registration is handled and managed through the Office of Distance and Continuing Education (formerly called Extension and Continuing Education). Offering the courses through the university Continuing Education program allowed out-of-state students to pay in-state lower tuition rates. Students register for courses through Continuing Education which holds 27% of the tuition for operating the program. The Dean’s office in the college holds another 15% of the tuition dollars leaving the remaining 53% for program administration.
Hausafus took responsibility for student admissions; Gentzler worked with the visiting scholars in preparation for their courses; and, Kruempel arranged facilities and performed some of the daily tasks during the summer program. A program coordinator was hired to coordinate the logistics associated with the operations and management of the Academy’s summer sessions. The coordinator maintained correspondence and communication with graduate students, assisted with housing in the living-learning community, and planned off-campus tours and activities for students during their three-week on-campus residence.

Because one of the resident faculty members had previously served as a sorority house director, she knew that sorority houses were typically empty during the summer; therefore, it seemed like an appropriate location for a living-learning community. A former alumni of the FCS Education program, Dr. Beverly Madden, served on the Alpha Delta Pi (ADPi) Alumni board and was ecstatic to discuss the possibility of hosting students in the sorority ADPi house. The living-learning community facility was located adjacent to the campus and served as the students’ headquarters and the site for class orientations, Sunday evening receptions, class meetings, and other special events. Different sorority houses were selected in subsequent years to better meet the needs of those who selected to take advantage of the opportunity.

**Visiting Scholars (Summer, 2002 and Academic Year 2002-03)**

One of the components of the model involved inviting FCS education professionals who were recognized as national leaders to serve as visiting scholars for the program. In the information letter that was sent in January, 2002 to teacher
educators, state FCS administrators, and FCS leaders in professional roles and associations, Gentzler shared the idea/concept of the Academy and invited them to make “an investment in our profession’s future” by nominating faculty members to teach. These Individuals from throughout the country with expertise in the required curriculum would be invited to teach based on their outstanding credentials.

Following nominations and suggestions from the Advisory Board, the resident faculty voted to determine who they believed would be the most appropriate scholar to teach the courses. Gentzler contacted those people by telephone to invite them to teach. One of the criteria for selecting visiting scholars was making sure that they came from diverse geographic areas of the United States and Canada. The formal invitation emphasized that “becoming a faculty member in this program shows that you have earned the respect of your peers, as each of your assignments has come as a result of being nominated and selected from a pool of distinguished FCS leaders.”

Three FCS leaders were invited and each accepted the invitation to serve as visiting scholars for the Academy’s first summer of courses in 2002:

- **Virginia Clark Johnson, PhD:** Johnson served as Dean of the College of Education and Human Development at North Dakota State University. Johnson taught FCEdS 618: Coordination of Educational Programs in FCS in the first week of the three-week program.

- **Laurie Stenberg-Nichols, PhD:** As the Dean of the College of Family and Consumer Sciences at South Dakota State University at that time,
Stenberg-Nichols shared her expertise during week two to teach FCEdS 507: Program Development in FCS.

- Penny Ralston, PhD: At the time, Ralston was serving as Dean of the College of Human Sciences at Florida State University and as a member of the Academy’s Advisory Board. During week three, she taught FCEdS 620: Theories of Administration.

The expertise and experiences that these individuals brought as leaders within the profession and as Deans of FCS programs were invaluable to teaching program development, coordination, and administration. Each of these individuals had a long history and friendship with Yvonne Gentzler that had resulted from both personal and professional contacts throughout their careers. Penny Ralston was also a member of the Advisory Board and the first member to teach a course in the Academy program.

An opening reception on Sunday evening began each week of classes. Alumni, retired faculty, and administrators joined resident faculty in welcoming the graduate students and the visiting scholars. To meet university requirements regarding course structure and contact hours, each one semester credit hour must entail 15 50-minute periods or lesson segments. Thus, depending on whether the course consisted of one, two, or three semester credit hours, the week-long class included 15, 30, or 45 lesson segments. These lesson segments were incorporated through intense hours of class instruction and arranged hours that included attendance at a lecture series held each week during the summer program. The lecture series was open to the public and gave each visiting scholar an opportunity
to present a lecture based on research or a special topic of interest in an open forum for the general public. It also provided an opportunity for the students to see the professor in a more formal situation – part of the model’s mentoring component. Ideally, the lecture represented a project or endeavor where the visiting scholar provided a leadership role within the profession. In the summer of 2002, the lecture series included:

- "Leadership: Up Close and Personal" by Virginia Clark Johnson, PhD
- "Innovative Collaborative Program Development" by Laurie Stenberg Nichols, PhD
- "Sustaining the Profession in the 21st Century: The Importance of Capacity Building" by Penny Ralston, PhD

The public lectures allowed other university faculty and students, alumni, and interested community citizens to learn about specific issues or trends that were relevant to the profession. Each lecture was followed by a question and answer period that gave the audience an opportunity to interact with the visiting scholars. Finally, a reception followed that promoted networking. Each visiting scholar provided an abstract that was included on the Academy website.

In addition, two faculty members developed, offered, and taught online courses during the 2002-2003 academic year for the graduate students:

- Cheryl O. Hausafus, PhD: As a resident faculty member and the Director of Graduate Education, Hausafus first developed and taught the FCEdS 511: Research Methods online in the Fall semester, 2002.
• Lorna B. Browne, PhD: Iowa State University had contracted with Browne in 1999 to teach the FCEdS 508: Models of Teaching course using an online format. The course was taught in the Spring semester of 2003 for graduate students. Browne, who had been a graduate student of Gentzler’s at the University of Maryland, developed and taught the online course for Iowa State University prior to the Academy’s conceptualization.

Graduate Students

The names of potential students were requested from department heads of institutions with FCS programs, FCS teacher educators, and state FCS administrators. The resident faculty also made presentations and distributed information at regional, state, and national conferences and through professional association newsletters and websites.

The resident faculty members remembered their delight when applications for the program began arriving. For the resident members, their months of planning and waiting had come to an end. According to Kruempel, “It was exciting . . . we actually had enough students to pull it off . . . by June, we knew that it was coming together and we needed to be ready and follow through.” Hausafus was “particularly impressed by the caliber of students enrolling.” The potential impact of the program could be significant as several of the academy students were currently working in colleges and universities throughout the world and preparing graduates who would become FCS classroom teachers and professionals.

The date was Sunday, July 14, 2002, and the first group of students arrived on the Iowa State University campus for this educational journey. Seventeen
students from eight different states (Arkansas, Idaho, Iowa, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, and Wisconsin) and the country of Malaysia participated during the first summer. Eleven students were pursuing the doctoral degree and six were pursuing the master’s degree, one of whom enrolled in the concurrent program. These individuals were FCS teacher educators, junior and senior high school teachers, university faculty, and professionals working in business, industry, or regional education offices with experience ranging from 2 to 20 years. Additionally, these graduate students actively participated in and held leadership roles within student groups (FCCLA, AAFCS, 4-H), professional associations (AAFCS, ACTE, and state affiliates), as well as volunteer groups within the community (Special Olympics, Peace Corps). They came with varied backgrounds in family and consumer sciences education, communications, clothing and textiles, economics, food science, and family studies. Not only were they graduate students and FCS professionals, they were wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters.

Following the summer session in 2002, Gentzler summarized, “Our original outlook was high, but all expectations were exceeded.” Reminiscing about that time, Gregoire concluded that the three FCEdS faculty members, who each brought unique strengths and talents to the table, found a way to really work together as a team towards a goal. This was integral to implementation that first year.

**Individuals Involved in the Continued Implementation of the Model**

The following section examines the continued implementation of the Academy model after its initial summer session in July, 2002 and the 2002-03 academic year.
For the next four summers, graduate students traveled to the Iowa State University campus for three weeks in July with the anticipation and desire to earn an advanced degree. In those later years, resident faculty, administrators, Advisory Board members, visiting scholars, and graduate students played roles in the continuation of the Academy and in changes regarding the curriculum, policies and procedures, and operations. Their roles, in relation to the program’s continuation and evolution, are outlined.

**Resident Faculty**

Throughout the years under examination, the resident faculty administered the program. They maintained an active role in directing program of study (POS) committee meetings and research projects; developing and assessing preliminary exams; seeking funding sources; and, recruiting visiting scholars and graduate students. In 2004, Dr. Leah Keino joined the resident faculty as Assistant Professor in FCS education. Resident faculty also taught courses for the graduate program. Hausafus taught two online courses: one in the fall, FCEdS 511: Research Methods, and one in the spring, FCEdS 515: Assessment in FCS. In the summer of 2006, Gentzler taught FCEdS 601X: Advanced Philosophical Critique of Trends, Issues, and Public Policy which focused on critical science and was funded in part by Kappa Omicron Nu. Paula Gmelch handled the daily management and logistics of the summer Academy program until the end of the 2004 summer program. At which time, Gretchen Mosher was hired to assist with coordination and logistics. She remained in that position until the beginning of the Fall semester of 2006. The position was not filled upon her resignation.
During the first years, resident faculty members met weekly regarding the administration and operation of the graduate program. Those weekly meetings moved to monthly meetings after several years where discussions focused on building the program and moving forward. Each resident faculty member fell into a particular role that they played in the program. According to the minutes of their meetings, much time was spent on issues related to student recruitment, public relations materials, scheduling, and course and facility planning. However, resident faculty reflected upon current practices and how they may be revised to accomplish the Academy’s purposes in the areas of preliminary exams and mentoring.

Other discussions focused on student work and writing, graduate committee memberships for visiting scholars, admissions procedures, and other staff responsibilities associated with the graduate program. Kruempel emphasized that “being flexible and growing and changing is very, very important” to the continuation of the program. “It’s not something that is static by any means.”

**Administration**

In June, 2003, Dr. Carol Meeks Roskey moved from the Dean’s position to serve as the Director of the Center for Family Policy at Iowa State. At that time, Dr. Pamela White was selected to serve as Interim Dean of the College of Family and Consumer Sciences. Following discussions of central administration regarding budget concerns and restructuring, decisions were made to officially merge the College of Family and Consumer Sciences and the College of Education to form a new college later named the College of Human Sciences. During that transition, Dr. White continued to serve as Interim Dean. In September, 2005, Dr. Cheryl
Achtenberg was named as Dean of the newly formed college. Dr. Mary Gregoire remained as Department Chair of AESHM until May, 2006, when she accepted another position out of state. Dr. Grace Kunz was selected by Dean Achtenberg as Interim Department Chair for AESHM to fill Mary Gregoire’s vacated position.

**Advisory Board**

The original eight members of the Advisory Board were joined by the addition of Dr. Virginia Caples, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Alabama A & M University, and Dr. Sidiga Rahim Washi, Dean of the School of Family Sciences at Ahfad University for Women in Sudan, Africa. As a former president of the American Home Economics Association and as a university administrator, Dr. Caples brought leadership ability and expertise in program coordination. Dr. Washi offered an international perspective for the program. Both individuals are alumni of Iowa State University.

Communication was maintained mostly through telephone calls and email messages. Initial plans were discussed regarding an Advisory Board meeting during the 2004 summer program where members could interact with visiting scholars and graduate students; yet, funding to support the endeavor could not be secured. However, some members of the Advisory Board met with resident faculty and some of the visiting scholars in a pre-conference meeting prior to the 2005 American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS) Annual Conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota. At that time, resident faculty reported that over 60 students were enrolled in the program with more pursuing the PhD than the master’s degree. This was the first time that the resident faculty and Dr. Gregoire met together with a
group of Advisory Board members and visiting scholars. Discussions focused upon the progress of the graduate students and on key issues, concerns, and challenges that should be addressed. These issues and challenges will be revealed in the next chapter.

**Visiting Scholars**

In the five years of the Academy summer program, all three of the original visiting scholars have returned to teach courses and work with graduate students. Dr. Johnson returned in the summer of 2004 to teach FCEdS 618: Coordination of Educational Programs. Dr. Stenberg-Nichols returned each summer to teach the FCEdS 507: Program Development course. Because the course was listed as a core requirement for all graduate students, Nichols is the only visiting scholar to have taught almost every graduate student enrolled through the Academy. If a PhD student had taken a program development course in their master’s degree program, they were not required to take FCEdS 507. There have been few (less than five) who did not take the course taught by Nichols. Ralston also returned during the summers of 2004 and 2006 to teach FCEdS 620: Theories of Administration.

The resident faculty continued to receive nominations for visiting scholars to teach a variety of courses. From those nominations and recommendations, ten additional visiting scholars were invited and accepted the invitation to teach courses during the academic year or the three-week summer program. Some others were invited; however, because of scheduling and their own professional work responsibilities, they were not able to accept the invitation. The visiting scholars during those five years included:
• Merrilyn N. Cummings, PhD, Professor, New Mexico State University.
• Francine H. Hultgren, PhD, Professor, University of Maryland
• Janet Laster, PhD, Associate Professor Emeritus, Ohio State University.
• Linda Peterat, PhD, Professor, University of British Columbia.
• Sharon Redick, PhD: Professor Emerita, Ohio State University.
• Marsha Rehm, PhD, Associate Professor, Florida State University.
• Daisy Stewart, PhD, Associate Professor and Graduate Coordinator, Virginia Tech University.
• Virginia Vincenti, PhD, Professor, University of Wyoming.
• Sally K. Williams, PhD: Professor Emerita, Iowa State University
• Jan Wissman, PhD, Professor and Associate Dean, Kansas State University.

Each visiting scholar had a record of professional service to FCS Education in a variety of areas and had demonstrated proven leadership roles. These individuals agreed to teach in the FCS education graduate program, in addition to their current professional positions and responsibilities. Each of the visiting scholars earned graduate faculty status at Iowa State University. In addition to teaching courses in the graduate FCS Education program, some visiting scholars maintained their involvement through service on Program of Study (POS) committees and through time and effort devoted to independent studies with graduate students. Visiting scholars brought experience and expertise to their role as a member of the POS committee. Table 3 identifies the course offerings for the years 2003 – 2006 and the faculty member who taught the course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2003</td>
<td>FCEdS 507: Program Development in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Stenberg-Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 520: Supervision of Family and Consumer Sciences Programs</td>
<td>Cummings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 521: International Perspectives of FCS</td>
<td>Redick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 607: Curriculum Theory and Philosophy in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Hultgren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 610: Seminar</td>
<td>Hausafus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2003</td>
<td>FCEdS 511: Research Methods (web)</td>
<td>Hausafus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 504X: Intellectual Foundations in Family and Consumer Sciences (web)</td>
<td>Vincenti &amp; Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2004</td>
<td>FCEdS 508: Models of Teaching Family and Consumer Sciences (web)</td>
<td>Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 515: Assessment in Family and Consumer Sciences (web)</td>
<td>Hausafus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2004</td>
<td>FCEdS 610: Seminar</td>
<td>Hausafus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 507: Program Development in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Stenberg-Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 618: Coordination of Educational Programs in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Clark Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 620: Theories of Administration in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Ralston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 501: Trends, Issues, and Public Policy</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2004</td>
<td>FCEdS 579X: Educational and Critical Science Perspectives of Family and Consumer Issues</td>
<td>Peterat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 611: Program Evaluation in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Wissman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2004</td>
<td>FCEdS 504X: Intellectual Foundations in Family and Consumer Sciences (Web)</td>
<td>Vincenti &amp; Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 511: Research Methods (Web)</td>
<td>Hausafus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2005</td>
<td>FCEdS 508: Models of Teaching (Web)</td>
<td>Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 515: Assessment (Web)</td>
<td>Hausafus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 521: International Perspectives</td>
<td>Kruempel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 610: Seminar</td>
<td>Gentzler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2005</td>
<td>FCEdS 610: Seminar</td>
<td>Hausafus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 507: Program Development in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Stenberg-Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 626X: Advanced Research Methods in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Hultgren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 607: Curriculum Theory and Philosophy in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Peterat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 520: Supervision in Family and Consumer Sciences Programs</td>
<td>Cummings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 506X: Curriculum Development in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Laster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 519X: Reflective Leadership</td>
<td>Rehm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2005</td>
<td>FCEdS 511: Research Methods (Web)</td>
<td>Hausafus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 504X: Intellectual Foundations in Family and Consumer Sciences (Web)</td>
<td>Vincenti &amp; Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, 2006</td>
<td>FCEdS 508: Models of Teaching Family and Consumer Sciences (Web)</td>
<td>Browne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 515: Assessment in Family and Consumer Sciences (Web)</td>
<td>Hausafus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 2006</td>
<td>FCEdS 507: Program Development in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Stenberg Nichols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 620: Theories of Administration in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Ralston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 601X: Advanced Philosophical Critique of Trends, Issues, and Public Policy</td>
<td>Gentzler &amp; Critical Science Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 521: International Perspectives of Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCEdS 611: Program Evaluation in Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Wissman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate Students

From the graduate students who began in the inaugural year of the Academy, the first master’s students graduated in the summer of 2004 and the first doctoral candidates graduated in Fall, 2005. Since that time, five master’s students have graduated and five of the 11 doctoral candidates have graduated. Of the remaining students, five are continuing in the program and one is no longer in the program. Graduate student enrollment jumped to 30 students in the second year (2003) and
included students from 25 to 85 years of age. Following the 2004 summer, graduate students enrolled in the Academy represented sixteen states and five countries. In 2004, the College of Family and Consumer Sciences was praised as being the only college to have an increase in student enrollment over the past two years. In fact, the College’s graduate enrollment grew from 199 in the Fall of 2001 to 230 graduate students in the Fall of 2004. The increasing number of students enrolled in the FCS Education graduate program had a positive impact on college enrollment overall. In 2005, eight master’s students and eight doctoral students were admitted into the graduate program. According to Hausafus, the enrollment numbers for the program stabilized but the number of contacts and interests received increased each year. At the completion of this study in 2006, there were a total of 64 graduate students in the program.

Involvement in the Academy

Everyone engaged with the graduate FCS Education program had the choice to be involved. This section of the study focuses specifically on the choices of three groups: the Advisory Board, the visiting scholars, and the graduate students. To understand the individual experiences within the Academy, it was necessary to gain a perspective on how each became involved with the program, why she became involved, and what that involvement meant to the individual both personally and professionally. Themes that emerged in each of those areas are revealed.

Advisory Board

Although none of the persons interviewed remembered the exact date or time, each of the persons that I spoke with remembered the conversation of the
initial phone call from Dr. Yvonne Gentzler regarding this new idea. Getting a call from Yvonne Gentzler was not out of the ordinary as many of these individuals were familiar with her work or had a professional relationship with her. She began describing her “new” idea for the FCS graduate program at Iowa State, and then presented the real purpose of the personal contact – asking for assistance to guide the program in an advisory capacity.

Each initial reaction to the idea was positive. Each expressed her pleasure and enthusiasm for being a part of an innovative program and was honored to be asked to serve in this capacity. Each seemed very willing to commit her time and energy to participate in and support the program. None of them turned Gentzler down. Had they done so, perhaps she would have questioned whether the goal could be achieved. Their reactions were so positive that they fueled her enthusiasm.

Describing the Iowa State program as “one of the best in the country,” one board member acknowledged that seeing “this visionary idea pop out of a situation that was dire was just phenomenal.” Another member was impressed with the “creativity and the initiative that the faculty had taken” to address the need to prepare FCS educators for leadership roles in the profession. Although stated differently, the same passion for FCS flowed through each person’s comments. Several members, who were formerly affiliated with the program at Iowa State felt like it was “a great way to stay connected with the University and was an exciting new venture in terms of the program” and that it was a “way to give back to a university that was very special to me in my development.”

Several supported the notion of leadership by commenting that,
We’ve got to be focusing on leadership development. We need to make it more of a concerted effort. I’m concerned about people who are place bound or family bound or job bound. We really need to be offering people, particularly women, more opportunities to pursue graduate studies and to move into leadership positions.

There is a really big problem because you’ve got to develop the next generation of leaders. My concern for the future made me very interested. I was very supportive of Iowa State taking leadership and moving forward to fill the gap.

And, finally seeing an opportunity to collaborate, one member claimed,

My concern about the profession and how we need to change things motivated me. I’m always willing to partner with people that want to address the issues that we have in Family and Consumer Sciences.

The board members acknowledged that there would be a lack of FCS education professionals who would be prepared to commit to leadership positions and roles with the profession. They knew that there were fewer graduate programs in FCS Education. They knew the power of collaboration and partnerships. They believed the model was a way to address the leadership “gap” that exists within the profession. Two comments from board members best summarized the meaning of their involvement:

[It] helps me continue to be involved in the profession and its future [and] to see the direction that the profession is moving.

[It is] a commitment to move the profession forward . . . a commitment to what we are doing in Family and Consumer Sciences and how can we do it better and take those individual strengths and interests and benefit the entire profession.

Without exception, what resonated most to me was the heartfelt commitment to and concern for both the Iowa State FCS graduate program and the profession that motivated each Advisory Board member’s involvement. Having the support of these
individuals affirmed the need for this type of model and its superb potential for strengthening leadership within the profession.

**Visiting Scholars**

A similar phone call from Yvonne Gentzler was how the visiting scholars remembered the beginning of their involvement with the Academy. Prior to the call, some of them had responded to a letter where resident faculty invited them to invest in the profession’s future with their expertise and endorsement for the program. After the first summer residential session, many of the visiting scholars acknowledged that they became aware of the new initiative through presentations at professional meetings, publications, or conversations with colleagues. Each of the invited scholars expressed familiarity with the history and reputation of the program at Iowa State and the work of Cheryl Hausafus and/or Yvonne Gentzler. The visiting scholars were nominated and recommended to teach in the program based on their outstanding credentials, leadership within FCS Education and the profession, and subject matter expertise and experiences.

**Motivation for Involvement**

The visiting scholars seemed impressed with the Academy model and described it as a “great idea” that was “intriguing”, “provocative”, “creative”, “interesting”, “unique”, and “remarkable.” Visiting scholars were honored to be considered leaders within the profession and to be asked to teach in the graduate program at Iowa State. One visiting scholar appreciated the “recognition that you’ve had the experiences that you can contribute personally to the student.” Overall, they
saw their involvement as an opportunity to impact the profession while stimulating their own professional growth and interacting with graduate students.

The visiting scholars, as key leaders in FCS higher education programs, recognized the graduate trends associated with declining numbers of student enrollment and programs offering FCS education. They chose to participate in the Iowa State program as an opportunity to contribute to a need within the profession. One visiting scholar explained, “Today’s learners are very, very different. The days of relocating for three or four years, going to another campus, and stopping your life are over. I don’t think people are willing to do that because there are other viable options for them, and they’re interested in pursuing them.” The challenges associated with leaving a job or professional position and family make it more difficult to pursue a graduate degree today. Yet, as one faculty member noted, the Academy model would “appeal to and attract students who might not be able to come and participate throughout the academic year sessions because of their job responsibilities.” Furthermore, “it would meet such a need for students around the country who were looking for a graduate degree that they could get that would logistically be possible for them.” It was their own personal commitment to the profession that ultimately motivated their involvement:

I just really jumped at the opportunity to provide some leadership at the national level for the next generation of professionals.

It was exciting to see that people can come together in a new way and make contributions to the future of the field; this was my chance to contribute to the future of the FCS profession.

I just felt it was important to support it. I said “Yes, I want to help any way that I can.”
I need to do this because it’s really what needs to happen right now in our profession if we’re going to survive and even thrive. If we really want to keep moving forward, I think it needs to happen. The faculty in that program can not do this themselves. If they need me right now to make this succeed, I am going to be there for them because I think it’s really, really important for the profession.

It was an interesting way to keep a connection to and footing in FCS since I don’t teach in that area now. It allowed me to keep abreast of the field and ‘come back home’ per se. It didn’t take too long to say ‘Yes.’

Comments revealing such passion for FCS symbolized an embodiment of the mission of those who had been called to serve as leaders.

Visiting scholars also recognized the opportunity for professional growth as a means to enrich their own teaching abilities and collegial relationships with other FCS professionals.

Anytime a faculty member goes to another university and sees a different prospective on teacher education, that’s a positive experience.

[The Academy was] a good professional development experience for me to enhance my own knowledge and [to] work more closely with some other faculty that I had known over the years but had not worked with directly. We can always learn from each other.

It was challenging professionally to teach and design a course. I came home invigorated and ready to put together new projects based on my work.

I needed something new so it was sort of invigorating. I had just gotten tired of doing the same old thing so it was energizing. I read articles that I never would have otherwise and met some new people from different types of [personal] lives and work lives.

An unexpected benefit was realized as the current leaders of the profession rekindled their passion and professional growth as they set forth challenging studies for the Academy students who they considered the leaders of the future.
Many of the visiting scholars are professionals who hold administrative positions, such as Dean, Department Chair, or Coordinator. Thus, the opportunities for them to interact and collaborate with graduate students in FCS Education in their current positions are limited.

It’s a broadening experience for me to get a chance to work with students in a different environment.

It is a really nice change for me. It’s a chance to get into some of the literature and the theory and really think about it from a different perspective. The interaction with students is really fun for me so it’s almost like a sabbatical.

It’s been very rewarding in getting to work with graduate students and getting to teach in my area of expertise.

This was an opportunity for me to teach a graduate class and to interact with students from around the country and around the world. That added meaning to the whole experience for me.

It’s personally gratifying for me to be able to go and teach a graduate course to an incredibly strong group of graduate students who are really interested. They obviously really want to be there and have very clear goals in mind in terms of what they want to get out of this. As a teacher you can’t ask for anything better than that.

In my conversations with the visiting scholars, descriptions kept emerging about the graduate students who were in their classes. Their thoughts and perspectives on those interactions are noted. A visiting scholar explained: “it is that basic level of interaction as a faculty member with your student; then you reach a different level as they’ve advanced in their degree program and you are assisting them in some other way, such as serving on their committee or turning class assignments into presentations.” Whether it is through an intense week of interaction or lots of emails and phone calls, contact between visiting scholars and
students occurs prior to class, during the class, and, for many, even after the course has ended. Another scholar described the working relationship with students as “becoming partners in the process.” This illustrates the important mentoring component of the Academy model. Within their classes and the program in general, students were mentored in both formal and informal ways.

As time transcended with the former, the current, and the future leadership of the profession being brought together, the strong bonds of a lasting, “real” network were established. Opportunities to meet the “learned authorities” in FCS education gave the otherwise overwhelmed and pressured students a sense of excitement that produced its own fuel for performance. Knowing that they would continue to impact FCS education through transforming the profession’s future leaders, the visiting scholars felt a renewed commitment to establish a bond with their students.

The perspectives of the visiting scholars help one to understand the type of student in the FCS Education graduate program at Iowa State University. As one visiting scholar noted, “Each one [class] has been a little different but they’ve all been very good.” The diversity of students enrolled in the Academy seemed to be significant to the visiting scholars. Students brought a “richness” to the class because of the diversity in years of professional experience, their professional work settings and audiences, their professional and educational backgrounds, their leadership experiences, not to mention the diverse geographic locations from which they traveled. The Academy provided “an innovative way to attract a wide group of students from very diverse backgrounds and regions of the country; that diversity is energizing.”
It was a good range of backgrounds and experiences that the students had had which helped to add value to the discussion that we had in class and the sharing sessions among students. We were certainly enriched by the range of backgrounds that the students had.

I think there’s a real synergy that takes place when people come from all different parts of the country to work together and bring their expertise to one central location and share it for the time that people are together.

Not only did their diversity bring strength to the classroom and coursework, but there was something else that the visiting scholars observed - a deep yearning to learn. They described it as a "hunger" – evident through “this real desire to learn and to learn as much as they possibly can. You certainly don’t see that in undergraduate cultures and not even with some graduate students.” Students were described as “well prepared” individuals who bring excitement and enthusiasm about learning to the classroom and as “extremely diligent people who are very motivated.”

They are very goal oriented; they know exactly what they would like to be doing professionally. Not having a degree is holding them back so they’re coming back to do their PhD so that they can keep moving forward.

Students seem to be self-starters and eager learners. Learning in a new context is very rewarding; having a community of eager learners is very contagious and fulfilling.

From the visiting scholars’ perspective, the students were not just learning in the context of completing an assignment but they were moving ahead to make some significant change in their practice. Most of the visiting scholars felt that the content was being studied, learned, and used in “becoming transformative” for students in their practice and within their professional associations. One visiting scholar described the graduate students best:

It takes a particularly committed student to engage in this distance journey of the Academy outside of their home place. All students are engaged
professionally and have families, and making the commitment to be away for three weeks truly marks a person’s ability to venture forth in creative ways. They are willing to take risks and are open to new challenges.

Perhaps the visiting scholars caught glimpses of their earlier years as they recalled that one becomes a graduate student because they are not satisfied with the status quo. Although the total sacrifices of the journey were only known with each turn of new experiences, the graduate sojourner knew instinctively that her life was meant for this opportunity. Personal sacrifices, though difficult, gave way to greater purpose as challenging new heights were faced and scaled.

**Meaning of Involvement**

Overwhelmingly, visiting scholars highlighted personal rewards and satisfaction that their involvement with the program had meant to them. One person felt that her involvement went “beyond teaching” as visiting scholars “benefit students by offering them a broader range of faculty to select from and to involve in their future.” Isn’t that what mentoring is all about? Another said, “This program educates the next generation of leaders in our profession. The opportunity to interact with these scholars and to help foster their development is a major service to the profession and personally rewarding.”

Visiting scholars recognized the collaborative nature of the Academy. One claimed that, “It was a good way to do something you can’t do by yourself at your own institution.” Perhaps their involvement was best described by these statements: it was “the ultimate teaching experience,” “an extremely motivational experience,” and a “wonderful opportunity to influence someone’s life in a profound way.”
Graduate Students

The search for graduate students to enroll in the graduate program through the Academy model began by seeking nominations from leaders of FCS professional associations, teacher preparation programs, and state administrators. Letters, phone calls, professional presentations, and newsletter postings were the focus of recruitment efforts of the resident faculty members who sought students to accept the Academy’s opportunity for professional and leadership development. In the first year, resident faculty members wrote letters to prospective students.

Yvonne Gentzler and Cheryl Hausafus promoted the Academy at the ACTE Convention held in December, 2001, in New Orleans, Louisiana. Their efforts paid off as graduate students vividly remembered and described how they first learned of and became involved in the program.

Two graduate students attended statewide FCS conferences in Iowa where they were able to discuss the opportunity with Gentzler, Hausafus, or Kruempel. A student acknowledged, “I came away excited because I knew it would fit my needs related to my job but also logistics. I live an hour away from Ames so I got information on it, immediately went back and sought approval [from my unit], applied, and was accepted in the first cohort.” Another student became involved after the encouragement of her department chair who thought “it would be a fantastic opportunity.” Other students recollected:

I had taken some graduate credits and was enrolled in something, but I was looking for my focus. I had originally looked at curriculum and instruction at one of the local universities but I didn’t like the program’s structure. A coworker knew that I was looking for something and happened to print off a copy of an online or internet blog from a posting room for FCS professionals.
There was just a brief blurb about the Academy forming at Iowa State and the potential to earn a master of science in FCS education. I knew that I wanted a master of science and not a master of education. I had heard a lot of great things about Iowa State so I called Cheryl Hausafus.

[I had] just come into the office to do some work and there was [a state affiliate of] AAFCS summer newsletter and there was a posting for individuals interested in getting advanced degrees announcing an academy that ISU was conducting. It was laying on top of my mail with that posting up and it was almost like a fluke because I had just had a conversation with my department chair about the need for me to pursue a degree. This was first year, and I was very overwhelmed at how I would teach full time and work on my Ph.D. because the place where I would logically go was over an hour drive and they did not have a FCS specific program. This occurred on Tuesday; I made a phone call to Dr. Hausafus on Wednesday. By Friday, I was registered, and on Sunday, I arrived on campus in Ames.

During the spring semester of 2002, I was finishing up my master’s [degree at an institution in another state] and had contacted Dr. Gentzler about teaching positions [available]. She mentioned the Academy and the opportunity available and recommended that I consider it further.

First learning about the Academy raised more questions than answers in the students’ minds: How does it work? How is it structured? How long will it take? How difficult will it be? Where will I live? How much does it cost? What courses do I take? What are the benefits of doing it this way? How would I find the time to do the work on top of a full-time job and a family? Can I really do this?

Some of these questions could be answered quite simply; yet, other questions would require self-reflection to determine whether they should or should not enroll. The decision could not be made without the influence of significant individuals in the lives of the graduate students. Supervisors, mentors, family members, and professional colleagues were identified as playing influential roles in encouraging students to enroll in the Academy. The students acknowledged the advice, encouragement, and support that these individuals provided which helped
them realize that they “would be crazy not to take this opportunity.” And so it was, students began to apply for admission to the FCS Education graduate program at Iowa State.

Motivation for Involvement

What were the underlying motivations which prompted the students to accept the challenge and enroll in the Academy? Factors, such as job requirements and the delivery format, would provide them an opportunity to develop professional and leadership skills.

The program had a lot of energy and that was exciting. [I thought it was] an opportunity for leadership and to explore leadership in FCS education further.

A FCS professional made such a difference in my life; this was an opportunity for me to do the same for others as a FCS teacher.

Those students who held positions at the university level indicated that the degree requirement to maintain their current status was one motivating factor for their involvement; others recognized the additional professional, economic, and personal benefits of earning an advanced degree in FCS education.

The original motivation was for my job, but I had looked at 3 other programs and didn’t really feel like them. When I saw this, there was no question in my mind because of its tie to higher education, supervision, and FCS. The professional connection is important to me.

Students were quick to acknowledge that their involvement would be possible because of the Academy’s unique delivery format:

I like the flexibility of being able to attend classes there as well as online. I thought the best part of it was the fact that they were bringing top people in FCS from all across the nation. I would have been ecstatic to have the faculty at Iowa State teaching the classes; however, I was very intrigued when I saw the classes being offered that first summer. I was just ecstatic! I couldn’t wait
to have someone like that teaching the classes and interacting with them one-on-one.

All of the masters’ programs required you to be on campus. Years ago, I had small children and never could explore other options. With the summer and online courses, I knew this [the Academy] was for me.

It was an outstanding way of delivering the information. I really liked that they were bringing in leaders from all over US. I had read some of their materials so it was great and really exciting to actually meet and work with them one-on-one.

To be a part of such a creative graduate program was surely the fulfillment of each graduate student’s dreams. It was as though the creators of this new graduate education model had not only thought “outside the box” but had literally tried to “blow up the box.” The result was a new group of pioneers working together in the 21st century to pave the way for more effective graduate delivery systems and for new leaders poised for the rapid changes of the future.

**Meaning of Involvement**

Students described the “awesome” personal rewards and satisfaction that they gained through their involvement and felt like it was a real “growing experience.” I was moved by the students’ responses to the questions related to what their involvement meant to them. It was not just the words that the students used, but the sincerity in their voices.

Their personal lives have been transformed from simply the opportunity “to earn a degree in this format” to that of interacting and building relationships with FCS education leaders and professionals around the world.

It has personally challenged me to think outside the box and to remember that, even though something is very difficult, going through the process, working hard, turning in a final product, getting feedback, and reflecting on it
is ultimately challenging me as an individual to learn how to stand up and speak on something that I believe strongly about.

Personally, I have been challenged to reflect upon my own beliefs, philosophy, experiences, and practices and to think about how these have shaped the individual that I have become.

Students gained far more than the “surface knowledge” provided in the various classes. As they networked with the visiting and resident faculty and each other, they gained skills, understanding, and insight into the opportunities within the profession that extends far beyond the pages of textbooks.

Summary

This chapter chronicled the history and evolution of the Academy model for the FCS Education graduate program at Iowa State University from its conceptualization on a New Jersey beach in 2001. What began five years ago to what is seen and experienced today may have some similarities and some differences as the model and conceptual framework have evolved to meet the needs of those individuals involved.

The conceptualization, development and implementation of this model would not be complete without the many individuals who came together to envision a future for, collaborate with, support or advocate for, and guide the FCS Education graduate program. The commitment demonstrated from these individuals who had full time responsibilities, yet they committed themselves to this program and to serving the profession in this way, is inspirational. Their passion for the profession provides a model for new professionals who are presently providing leadership to or in the profession. What better example of professionalism and leadership than the
commitment evident in the lives of individuals involved with the FCS Education graduate program at Iowa State University?
CHAPTER 6

THE REALIZATION OF THE FCS EDUCATION LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

The purpose of this study was to chronicle the events associated with the conceptualization and development of the FCS Education Leadership Academy model. In this chapter, I attempted to reveal the themes that emerged from my conversations with the participants. These themes demonstrated the reality and experiences of participation in the Academy. Specifically, I wanted to know how the individuals were changed by their participation in the FCS Education graduate program at Iowa State University. In discovering these changes, I hoped to ascertain whether the aspiration of the Academy model was actually realized. In exploring the model and the participants’ experiences, several issues emerged which could hinder the success of program. This chapter addressed the following research question: What were the significant influences of the Academy model on those involved? What were some critical issues facing faculty members, students, board members, and administrators associated with involvement in the Academy model for graduate education?

Significant Influences and Impact

For the students who participated, the Academy was an opportunity for them to be associated with leaders in the profession and feel as though they were part of the profession’s future. The students felt like they were pioneers – pioneers in a new type of learning and in a new program – pioneers to lead the profession’s future. You could hear the thrill of living beyond the present in the words of the graduate students:
It has meant a chance to be a part of the future of FCS education.

Being involved has meant a sense of belonging for me. I have always felt that FCS is my passion and what I am meant to do. I am very involved and work really hard getting people excited about it. The Academy gave me a sense of belonging with a group of other professionals that had those same experiences. They were respected in their fields. They have the same passion and leadership qualities. They were trying to accomplish the same things. Like me, many of them were juggling families and professions. It was meaningful to me that there were others who were trying to accomplish this.

Just as the pioneers of the Westward Movement needed guides on their journey, so to did the students of the Academy. The resident faculty members and visiting scholars provided cutting-edge knowledge about the profession, and perhaps more importantly, they served as mentors to these fledgling leaders as they prepared to leave their comfortable nests. Subconsciously and consciously, visiting scholars demonstrated techniques needed for leaders to balance the demands of a calling to a profession, family responsibilities, civic obligations, and personal needs. They served as encouragers and safety nets as the students began to spread their wings.

In the short time in which the Academy had been functioning, these pioneering students stepped up to the plate. Their accomplishments are, perhaps, the more tangible evidence upon which one might measure the extent to which the Academy’s mission and aspiration have been realized and the significant influence made on one’s own intellectual, personal, and leadership development. Yet, the best measure may be the intangible. Perhaps, one of the greatest contributions and most intangible was the opportunity for emerging and seasoned leaders to be re-energized through the bonding experiences provided by the sharing of joys, tears,
and overall struggles of this new journey. This would raise the question of whether it was the Academy itself or the way that the program was conceptualized that provided the opportunity for students to form relationships with the mentors and to bond with one another through the living-learning experience and shared class experiences.

Through the interviews conducted and documents read for this study, themes emerged as influences that the involvement in the FCS Education graduate program had on the participants. The significant influences can be categorized as (a) experiencing an increased level of commitment to the profession; (b) expanding their own horizons and experiences; (c) establishing a professional network and connected with colleagues; (d) inspiring a need for self-reflection on their own professional practice; and (e) enhancing their leadership philosophy and ability.

**Increased Commitment to the Profession**

Gentzler (1995) defined commitment as “sustaining a personal dedication and belief and a common philosophy which supports the actions implied by the integrative nature” (p. 97) of the profession. That commitment or personal dedication emerged as a common thread throughout the experiences of resident faculty, the department chair, board members, and visiting faculty. Whether it was a commitment to the profession, to the university, or to the Academy model itself, I found it quite evident that the individuals involved in those roles truly demonstrated commitment through their time and expertise. It was not surprising that this sense of commitment was felt by the students expressed in the interviews.
The Academy really planted a seed and deepened my roots in this profession.

I needed more connection to the whole profession itself. I think the Academy did a good job of doing that.

Through the Academy, we have become much more enlightened and it has renewed involvement in the FCS profession. We saw those *leaders in action* and you knew they were involved. Seeing their passion and commitment to the profession helped me realize that in order for this profession to continue to grow, we all need to be involved and do our part.

There was an individual in a secondary classroom who impacted my life, and I knew that I wanted to touch people in that way too. This [the Academy] has been a “vehicle” that’s given me the opportunity to do that.

The commitment that the students felt within the network was contagious. One of the significant prerequisites of a leader is commitment. In this case, it is evident that a commitment for the profession was not “taught” but “caught” through their Academy experiences.

**Expanded Horizons and Experiences**

The opportunities for growth have resulted in new and exciting experiences for students; some of which would not have been possible without the Academy. As one visiting scholar observed:

As a participant in the academy, students begin to recognize opportunities that are available out there for professional development just by dialoguing with those that teach a class and dialoguing with each other. They recognize, first of all, the importance of professional development. That is a big thrust at the Academy – pushing students to take advantage of the professional development opportunities that are out there and available to them.

Through the students’ involvement, new concepts and approaches were explored, and perspectives were broadened. Students experienced a “broadening view of the
potential that FCS professionals have in making an impact in the world" and a renewed, refreshed desire for learning.

More than anything, the Academy stimulated my mind and challenged me to think about issues from different perspectives.

The Academy was way beyond anything I had anticipated! It was a fantastic learning and networking environment, plus we had the opportunity to be instructed by outstanding leaders in the profession!

Since becoming a member of the Academy and pursuing advanced degrees, I have become more knowledgeable not only in the profession and in the history of FCS but also in educational methods and assessment.

We've been presented with lots of resources and recommended readings and have been challenged to take an article, dive deeper, and read more. It has been amazing to see how the readings have peaked my curiosity, and I take that curiosity and direct it into discovering more.

Not only did their Academy experiences offer intellectual stimulation and challenge, many doors for professional possibilities were opened. One student who was contacted and asked to write curriculum materials for a major textbook publisher, acknowledged, "it would have never happened without the Academy connection." Opportunities were sought and accepted by students to integrate coursework into their professional practice.

Visiting scholars shared anecdotal evidence of the increased opportunities which enriched students’ knowledge and experiences. They shared many informal comments that they had heard from students about “being inspired” and “learning a lot.” There are also other pieces of evidence that the scholars could document, such as manuscripts for professional journals, papers presented at professional meetings, active involvement on university and school committees, and engagement in professional associations.
A manuscript from one master’s student’s thesis was published in the *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*. In addition, numerous students have submitted presentations for professional conferences and publications for professional journals. Students have received Iowa State University scholarships as well as national fellowships from the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences and the Family and Consumer Sciences Division of the Association for Career and Technical Education. A review from the Accomplishments section of the Academy’s webpage (available at [http://www.aeshm.hs.iastate.edu/academy/](http://www.aeshm.hs.iastate.edu/academy/)) indicated other examples of awards, scholarships, publications, and presentations that have resulted from students’ involvement in the Academy.

From the beginning, the dream that led to the conceptual design of the new graduate delivery format at Iowa State, known as the FCS Education Leadership Academy, had as its driving force the goal of providing a means for FCS education leaders to be nurtured and to capitalize on the synergy of a group of individuals committed to the aspirations of the program. Graduate students have provided beneficial services to their own students, schools, communities, and states, evidenced by the outstanding teaching and advising awards they have received. These include, but are not limited to, the Milliken Family Foundation National Educator Award, American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS) New Achiever, Master Adviser for the Family, Career, and Community Leaders of America (FCCLA), and Certified in Family and Consumer Sciences (CFCS) professional credential.
Along with the scholarships, honors, and awards bestowed, several students were promoted in their professional positions. For example, one student who was teaching middle school when she first enrolled in the Academy was hired at the local university because they needed someone to lead their FCS education program that was threatened to be cut. This student was offered a tenure track position that she credits as a “true testament to the success of the Academy and the evidence that it produces leaders.” Two additional students advanced to tenure-track positions within their employing university. The stories speak for themselves. Academy students are making a difference through their service to others. They are being recognized and identified as leaders. They are moving forward. They are taking the reigns to deal with complex issues. This provides another example of the realization of the Academy’s original goals.

Another example mentioned in my conversations with students was the one who became a FCS administrator with a state’s educational agency. Through one of the courses taken, she became aware of the need for statewide leadership for FCS education and sought solutions to address that need. As a result of her work, she was able to advance into the state administrative position for FCS programs in one state—consequently becoming a key decision-maker in the development and implementation of secondary FCS curricula.

The students with whom I spoke celebrated the awards, honors, and professional advances that their peers had received. Students credited their involvement in the Academy as integral to the advancements in professional positions and teaching awards. One student summarized it best:
I truly believe that having recently been recognized as a National Milliken Educator; not only is it a reflection of my leadership but also my professional development. I believe those two things happened as a result of my experiences at Iowa State and bringing what I learned or was able to do as a result of Iowa State to my classroom in professional growth and in leadership opportunities in my classroom and my school.

The National Milliken Educator Award, the most prestigious teacher recognition program in the United States, is presented to outstanding educators who are furthering excellence in education through the use of innovative practices in the classroom. Known for its groundbreaking educational programs, the Milliken Family Foundation’s awards for educators are highly coveted and respected. The achievement of this award by an Academy student truly evidenced the significance of the program in preparing future leaders for the profession.

**Established Network and Connection with Colleagues**

The relationships developed through involvement in the Academy were not limited only to those related to students. Connections were established among students and between faculty and students. Visiting scholars themselves acknowledged the collegiality they felt and the potential to collaborate with others. Once again, a goal of the Academy was realized as all participants were given the opportunity to develop a professional network that promoted dialogue and interaction with their peers. The relationships that emerged fostered professional growth and renewal. According to both the students and visiting scholars, the connections revealed such purposes as support, collaboration, and idea sharing.

The sheer nature of this program has provided me with a support system that cannot fail. I feel that at any time, I can contact my professors, my advisors, and my peers – and these people are all over the United States.
I feel that the Academy has provided me with a new network of professionals to interact with . . . specifically other members in the Academy and faculty and community at ISU.

Identifying current leaders in the field and involving those individuals with our education has been amazing and so appropriate. It's given us individuals to talk to who have been through a lot of the situations that someday we want to go through as far as positions held and service given. That doesn't happen all over and so this really makes a connection of FCS professionals.

Many of the visiting scholars relished the opportunity to establish new connections and strengthen present connections. Even the visiting scholars were meeting the goals of the graduate program as they provided strategies in instruction, classroom opportunities, assignments, interactions, and problem solving for students.

The interactions that occurred among students and faculty leaders definitely developed a sound basis for future networking.

Once we have connections in class through the Academy, then you can expand on them in future professional involvement and endeavors.

The chance to interact over meal functions, conversations and those sorts of interactions always help again to build collegial relationships and to build connections among faculty in different institutions. That was a very rewarding aspect.

The living-learning community played an integral role in helping the students build connections and relationships with their fellow students. The living-learning community remained a vital part of the Academy structure as it continued to provide opportunities for socialization and networking. The Alpha Delta Pi sorority house served as the students' "home" in the summer of 2003. The program was moved to the Pi Beta Phi sorority house in 2004 and 2005. Due to major construction at the Pi Beta Phi house in 2006, the program moved to the Delta Delta Delta sorority house.
The students have shared many experiences within each of their living environments.

The sorority house not only served as a headquarters for Academy events and activities but provided the students a residence for three weeks, the community met socialization needs, extended learning beyond the classroom, and established personal relationships among the students. Initially, some concern was expressed regarding how students would respond to this type of living arrangement. However, the living-learning community proved to be an integral part of the Academy model. It provided a means to socialize and dialogue with a community of peers. Graduate students who resided in the learning community echoed those sentiments:

I am a "social" being [and] I like being around people, visiting, [and] learning about others [so] I thought the living-learning community was an outstanding idea . . . I looked forward to the opportunity to interact with these people outside [the] classroom . . . I've made some friends in that situation that I keep in touch with very regularly. [We] have become very good friends and have opened up some personal and professional opportunities for me that I wouldn't have had if we were just in the classroom together. [It] helped you grow so much more. We didn't talk about coursework all the time but it was an overriding factor [and] you were able to bounce off ideas [and] chat about it in an informal situation which broadened that learning base. I look at it as a support system [because it] made the experience of being away from home not so overwhelming.

You need to get to know everybody and you need those relationships, and I think that it is a very important piece. I think that [the] key to making this work is that we lived together.

[It was a] good way to help us connect and continue [the] connection afterward.

You get to know others on a personal level, in part from being in class with people all week long every day. [We were] an intimate group of people and when you share space, you get to know a lot about those people. I think the living learning community stands out to me personally as one of the best experiences of the Academy.
It was neat to see how it continued everything that we were doing in the classroom. It added a lot of “life” to the academy because people were sharing their stories and pictures of families. It provided an opportunity for support from each other and to build camaraderie.

Students have maintained the connections they established and anxiously anticipate attending professional conferences where they might have the opportunity to reconnect. One student indicated,

The interaction with other people is the one thing I take away from this experience. The best part was being on campus together with other women from all over the world; I would have never had an opportunity to be exposed to other cultures and countries and to learn about their own personal goals and lives.

The living-learning community concept raised the preparation of the profession’s future leadership to one of the highest levels. It allowed the participants to connect to each other, to respect individual differences, to better understand others, to strengthen communication skills, and to value the contributions of others. As such, relationships were formed and leadership that multiplies itself was born.

**Inspired a Desire to Reflect on Professional Practice**

As students reflected introspectively on their opportunities, they realized that the true measure of their experiences at the Academy would only be seen as those concepts were reflected in their practice within the world around them. The FCS mission would only be fulfilled to the extent to which they had internalized the leadership preparation that they had experienced. “An opportunity to think about how I can make a difference at the local, state, and national level in relation to FCS” is how one student summarized her Academy experience. The coursework prompted students to reflect upon what they had learned in class and then apply the
knowledge and skills within their professional practice. Another student noted, “The Academy leaders, at times, really tried to tie what we were learning in class to our current practice and needs.” For many students, it was not simply enough to complete a project or assignment. Those students recognized the importance of these projects and wanted to actively engage in the process and to reflect upon it. The results of their actions were great and best described by one student’s reflection:

In every class, there is some sort of project that you must do in order to show your application of the concepts of the course and some sort of reflection. The work that is required to earn the credit has us so involved that it activates you and engages you. You feel you must actually go out and apply it! The best evidence of what the Academy has done is through the actual application of what we do for each class.

Examples from several of the classes promote the realization of the program’s goal to reflect upon one’s practice. Students enrolled in the Coordination of FCS Programs (FCEdS 618) course had the opportunity to identify a problem and look at a collaborative effort that addressed the problem or examined it in real life. One student chose an issue associated with the state's mandate for financial education in secondary schools. In the state, FCS teachers were not being included in the discussions and the curriculum development process. As a result of the class and its final project, the student was instrumental in securing board seats for FCS teachers and gaining approval for a FCS course to meet the state requirement.

Student proposals developed in the FCEdS 507: Program Development course were submitted to grant agencies and received funding. The professor described it as a “mark of success when you can develop a program proposal that's
good enough to submit, compete against others, and get funded.” Students were challenged in FCEdS 607: Curriculum Theory to integrate a critical science approach to a specific course or set of curricular activities or materials. Once the transformation had taken place, students reflected on the experience of trying something different in their own teaching. One particular project resulted in a collaborative presentation at a regional conference that shared highlights of the experience and examples of student work.

Other examples include manuscripts that were written for the FCEdS 504: Intellectual Foundations of FCS course’s final project. These manuscripts told the stories of, and traced the contributions and legacies of prominent FCS leaders who had been honored as AAFCS Distinguished Service Award recipients. Many of the manuscripts have been submitted for the Legacy issue of Kappa Omicron Nu Forum. In addition, students have contributed to documenting the history of the profession and to developing articulation statements justifying the impact and usefulness of FCS programs.

In the FCEdS 501: Trends, Issues, and Public Policy course, each student selected an issue and developed a paper to propose a policy change that would be beneficial at the local, state, or federal level. According to the visiting scholar, “I definitely saw that there was growth in terms of their [the students’] understanding as well as in recognizing the importance of this [public policy] area to their role as a professional.” Similarly, FCEdS 519X: Reflective Human Action course required students to describe a current leadership position within an organization and to reflect on the role they played, the relationships associated with the position, and the
“soul and spirit of the organization.” Then, students were asked to apply the readings and class materials to their own leadership situation, introduce a new concept, and evaluate its results.

One student chose to get involved in a formal mentoring program at her school. Another student reflected on the highlight of her re-energized professional practice and the impact it had on others:

Professionally, I want to help challenge others that I come in contact with. I want my students to receive the benefits that I have received and growth as well.

As a result of their involvement in the Academy, students demonstrated the integration of theory and application of leadership principles to their professional practice setting. For the many examples that are provided herein regarding course experiences as a result of the Academy experience, there are many, many more that are waiting to be heard and told.

Enhanced Leadership Philosophy and Ability

As a result of their commitment to the profession, the broad array of experiences, and the connections established, the students’ leadership views and abilities were changed. Although one claimed that, “We can’t be naïve enough to say that if someone goes through the Academy, they are going to become a leader,” there is evidence to support the growth in leadership that occurred during the five years studied for those students involved in the first summer experience of the Academy model. Respondents claimed

I have sometimes doubted my abilities to be a leader, though I “lead” in many aspects of my life. I have always felt self-confident about many of my abilities, but honestly didn’t consider myself to be ‘leadership’ material. The
qualities and characteristics I admire in a leader, I did not see in myself. I was incorrect. Through the Academy, I have been able to be more objective about myself and my capabilities and realize that I do, can, and have been a leader. This just reaffirms that and allows me to better utilize all that I am capable of and to rise to new challenges.

[The Academy has] confirmed leadership for me. I have always thought of myself as a leader in terms of when I want something accomplished or know that something needed to be done, I have always taken the position of trying to take the lead. There were times when I was effective and times when I was not; but, the Academy has confirmed to me that it is a role that works for me and has helped me see different ways that leadership that can be done. It has solidified how I view leadership and helped me to define myself in terms of what others look for in a leader and what makes a leader.

Students have new positions; people are being promoted; people are taking leadership roles in professional organizations. People are seeing themselves as leaders; whereas, they may not have before. Even the people we work for see us as future leaders and administrators.

Students became increasingly aware of a higher calling and sense of purpose for their lives. Career focus became mission focused as they began to think more about society than themselves. When asked about their views and perspectives regarding leadership, students believed they had been empowered to become leaders and recognized the importance of leadership to the profession.

My "lens" on leadership has changed. I now look at more possibilities for me as a leader and I am very aware of trying to answer "what is leadership and what makes an effective leader?"

I have realized that I am a leader and can be a leader. This ultimately means to me that I do currently have and can have a leadership role in my profession.

When the decisions were made to participate in the Academy, individuals did not expect that a large part of their leadership preparation would be a sense of empowerment. But, as visiting scholars and resident faculty gave permission for these newly recruited leaders to succeed and to develop their potential as leaders, a
sense of empowerment as leaders began to blossom in each spirit. It was only
natural that a commitment to the profession would follow and be expressed so
passionately as

Leadership in the profession is up to us. If we do not take the lead who will? We also need to encourage and teach our students to take leadership roles in FCS.

I feel that leadership is as important for me as it is for those I impact. I am ready to begin my journey in becoming a leader in the FCS field.

I did not view myself as a leader going into this program. I don’t know that I would say now that I really am a leader; but, by virtue of what I did and how we all came together, took the steps to do this, and follow through, I guess that gives me more self-confidence and self-realization that I can do this and I can be a leader.

Students described their experiences as “so involved” that it “activates you”; it “engages you.” Therefore, some students felt compelled to accept leadership in response to the great need within the FCS profession.

One thing that I think that is really exciting is you get to see the leadership styles of future and present leaders and try to nurture people and encourage them to take the next step . . . to step more into leadership at whatever level, wherever they are. At the point when they [students] come into the Academy, I can’t imagine that they wouldn’t just grow every year.

One of the most prominent findings was the common thread from the student interviews related to each of the five contributions outlined in this chapter – an overwhelming sense of confidence that has empowered these individuals.

Being involved has given me more confidence to step up and do things in my school and community.

Prior to the academy, I was confident but now my confidence level is somewhat on steroids. I can just go into any situation and be confident that I will be successful. Or if it is not something that is as successful, I know that I have the strategies to be able to rebound from it and grow from that situation.
It is a really rigorous program. Although I was stretched by doing it, I have gained so much. It left me with the feeling that I can do more than I thought I could.

I also feel that I have gained confidence in collaborating with others at my institution and in the FCS profession.

The far-reaching impact of the Academy has been recognized by the students using their new sense of empowerment to influence others. By tapping strands of self-confidence in each participant, the creators of the FCS Education Leadership Academy have implemented a program that nurtures and multiplies leaders as outlined in the model’s conceptual design. Further analysis of the themes revealed in this chapter indicated some connection to the components of professional development which were adapted for inclusion into the Academy’s conceptual model and framework.

**Critical Issues**

Several issues were identified from the interviews from each of the participant groups. These issues may be viewed as criticisms or challenges of the Academy model or of the FCS graduate program. These issues emerged from the interviews as concerns that may require attention for the continued success and survival of the program. The issues that emerged were: limited campus interaction, concern for ensuring program quality and rigor, and continued support for the program and its faculty.

**Limited Campus Interaction**

One sentiment expressed by a visiting scholar relates to the academic stimulation of being on campus. “Something is lost when students are only present
in the summer when the university is not functioning at its full capacity.” From one faculty’s perspective, traditional programs offer greater opportunities for a student to come in and talk to faculty. One visiting scholar expressed concern that “the mentoring that you normally would have if they were just down the hall is not taking place.” With the distance, it’s harder to have the face-to-face interaction, and would welcome the opportunity to be closer to the student to assist them as they’re doing the assignment. One visiting scholar who teaches online acknowledged that it was “kind of frustrating not to be able to meet them face to face.” Another visiting scholar added, “I think there is the potential for needing to be a structure that reinforces and helps to provide continuing feedback and interactions with students who may not be in the same location as their major professors and committee members.”

With that concern, students were asked about the challenge of completing degree requirements from a distance. The students described a “disconnect” that they felt after being on campus and then being at home. While on campus, students felt supported and ready to move forward. Yet when they returned home, they experienced a sense of loneliness and isolation. This was especially felt after students had completed their coursework and were involved in their independent research projects.

Although the students acknowledged the relationships they have formed with fellow students, the time constraints and demands they faced in juggling work, school, and family seemed to make the continued communication more challenging. One student added, “I would feel free to call anybody and talk to anyone, if I need help to get through this; everyone is very supportive of each other.” One goal of the
program focused on encouraging students to be self-directed. Students were expected to take the initiative to communicate, work with, and support each other throughout their educational journey. This was especially important because the students reiterated that the delivery format was what had enabled them to pursue the advanced degree. One student reflected upon the time spent on campus:

When you are there, you are focused. The activities are rigorous; yet, it is like a retreat where I can go to be focused on myself as a learner, myself as a leader, my work as a graduate student, and my progress. I think it is important to be at the Iowa State campus, even for such a short time.

In addition to the three week summer residential experience, students traveled back to campus for focused time to concentrate on coursework or research or seek guidance and assistance from the resident faculty. Students were encouraged to set up regular telephone appointments each week with resident faculty members to discuss their progress. The global world in which we live, with its technological advances, offered alternatives for helping students maintain their connection to the campus from a distance. Some of those alternatives included the chat function associated with the course management system (WebCT) and the email list serve that was created with the students’ home and university email addresses.

**Ensuring Quality and Rigor**

Perhaps the concern that has been most expressed Advisory Board members and visiting scholars relates to the assurance of quality and rigor of the program. Visiting scholars acknowledged that they were pleased with the quality of work submitted by the graduate students. As many institutions have moved to distance learning and online formats, Advisory Board members and visiting scholars
suggested that quality control should be a focus. Although the Academy is not solely a distance program, the same kinds of questions were raised.

Just because we’re shortening the period during which the contact hours take place, we’re not decreasing in any way the amount and the type of work that that is being expected.

Several students noted the “intense” rigor they experienced throughout the program. At this point, there has been no official, external evaluation of the program. Course goals are assessed through the completion of course assignments and through course evaluations given at the conclusion of each course. However, this study revealed and provided evidence of the realization of the program's goals, as outlined in Chapter 4.

The curriculum plays an integral role in program quality. Although the model was new to the graduate program, the original courses included in the curriculum were not. Having graduate courses already established enabled the graduate program to implement the model in less than a year; however, the curriculum and its associated coursework should be reviewed to determine whether it is providing adequate experiences for students. Several experimental courses have been designed within the five year period of this study; additional courses might be warranted to meet students’ needs as the model evolves. A specific example relevant to curriculum issues related to the students’ research preparation.

Students, who are pursuing an interpretive mode of inquiry, or qualitative research, need specific courses associated with their chosen methodology to adequately prepare them for that undertaking. The POS committee and the student should identify those needs, and the student should be open to taking the preparation
courses which will assist them in the research stage of their doctoral program. The Academy model is conducive to bringing in experts in specific areas to teach the courses, thus providing the opportunity to offer that type of coursework, along with many other areas.

**Continued Support for the Program and Faculty**

Although I feel as though I only have a small glimpse into the workings of the Academy, the workload issue is a concern that I have observed from conversations with each of the respondents. Each group represented expressed concern for the workload of the resident faculty who advised 64 graduate students at the conclusion of this study, as well as administering the program, teaching undergraduate and graduate classes, and fulfilling the responsibilities associated with service to the department, college, university, and profession. Administering the program is a full-time position, with all of the correspondence with current and prospective students, visiting faculty and Advisory Board members and with its day-to-day management. All of the participants recognized the “time consuming” and often “overwhelming” workload for the resident faculty. The visiting scholars teach courses within the program and work with individual students, while maintaining their current professional roles at their respective universities and serving in various leadership capacities within the profession. It was evident through the remarks made in the interviews that they are committed to the FCS graduate program. Those involved with the Academy recognized and praised the time commitment and dedicated efforts of both the resident and visiting scholars.
Even with the vision of the Academy model and the success of the program, the FCS graduate program and faculty needed an advocate. They found that advocate in their department chair who also had to overcome obstacles to make this model work and move the vision forward. She actively supported the program in numerous ways, including negotiations regarding the residency requirement for graduate students, securing tuition dollars from the Office of Continuing Education, and contracting with and paying visiting scholars, to name a few.

Of great concern to the respondents was the issue of continued support for the program, recognizing the faculty’s increased workload. Several visiting scholars questioned the impact or influence of the recent transitions in college administration on the Academy’s operation and funding. Continued assistance, in terms of faculty and resources, are necessary to maintain and sustain the program at its current level. The individuals who served in the positions of provost, dean, and the department chair at the time of the Academy’s conceptualization are no longer administrators at Iowa State. The key administrative players have changed and the question was raised as to whether the new administrators will continue supporting the model?

The respondents particularly expressed concern regarding the financial resources that would be needed to sustain the program. According to the students’ remarks and the Academy’s conceptual model, visiting scholars, who taught the courses and shared their expertise and experiences, played a vital role in the success of the Academy. Financial support to pay the stipend and/or salary for these individuals to teach the courses needs to be maintained and strengthened.
Without that support, the graduate program would not be able to bring in these key leaders, which could negatively impact student recruitment and, ultimately, the future of the program.

**Summary**

Initially when the research questions were conceptualized, I was focused on the contributions that the Academy could make to the profession. Immersed in the richness of all of the participants’ experiences, I realized that perhaps the greatest contribution of the Academy was on the individual lives that were involved, both on personal and professional levels. The stories revealed more than what was originally expected. Their stories shared a passion in their professional practice, richness in the relationships formed, and a greater understanding and appreciation for what it means to be a leader in FCS Education today. In becoming reflective professionals and leaders, it was the experiences and accomplishments of the students that were “giving recognition to what the graduate degree in FCS Education was actually doing . . . the best marketing is to have its students become successful.” I firmly believe that the creative concept of the Academy model has provided an exceptional platform for all participants in the program to accomplish higher levels of achievement. I feel that participation in the Academy has greatly contributed to the lives of the students, myself included, and to the profession.

The FCS Education Leadership Academy’s goals were to develop professional leaders through a series of components and/or aspirations. Through the nurturing process provided by the Academy concept, the lives of all participants were changed. Regardless of positions to be held or ranks to be attained by those
touched in this program, leadership skills were developed. Changes in individual lives lead to changes in multiple lives!

No program is without challenges and concerns which may pose problems and obstacles. The issues which may influence the continued and future success of the graduate program need to be further explored and addressed. These challenges call for everyone involved in the Academy to consider possible alternatives and solutions for resolving these issues and to gain the necessary support to sustain the program.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION: LESSONS LEARNED AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

The purpose of this study was to trace the evolution of the Academy, an alternative delivery method for the FCS Education graduate program at Iowa State University. Integral to the study were the respondents who shared their knowledge and experiences of the FCS Education Leadership Academy. The primary source of data included semi-structured interviews with resident faculty, university administrators, Advisory Board members, visiting scholars, and graduate students enrolled in the program. The data collected provided an historical account of the FCS Education graduate program’s transformation from a traditional delivery method and offered insight into the personal and professional experiences affected by one’s participation in the Academy. In this chapter, several lessons that were learned through the study are presented. These lessons summarize the key findings from this study. Implications for the FCS profession and recommendations for future research and practice will complete the study. Finally, the researcher shares a personal reflection about the study and its findings.

Lessons Learned

There are valuable lessons that can be learned from this case study of a single institution’s delivery format for its graduate program that could offer insight for leaders of other departments or institutions considering the use of a similar model. Involvement in the Academy impacted the lives of those who participated in the graduate program in both personal and professional ways. Learning how the coursework and experiences associated with the Academy model has impacted
those individuals who chose to be involved in the Academy was crucial to this study. As a result of this study, lessons were learned about leadership, collaboration, graduate education in general, and about the FCS Education Leadership Academy model.

**About Leadership**

Many of the principles of self-organizing systems (Wheatley, 2005) were evident in the conceptualization and realization of the FCS Education Leadership Academy. Promoting the graduate program as the FCS Education Leadership Academy gave the program an increased identity. Sharing information and building relationships were critical components to the success of the Academy model’s development and implementation.

An important lesson learned from this case study of the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy is that leaders are committed professionals. The commitment demonstrated from these individuals who have full time responsibilities, yet they devoted themselves to this program and to serving the profession in this way, is inspirational. Their passion for the profession provides a model for new professionals who are presently providing leadership to, or in, the profession. Gentzler (1987) identified the first, and perhaps, most important component of professionalism: “Be rationally committed to the mission. . .as justifiably established by the profession” (p. 41). What better example of professionalism and leadership than the commitment evident in the lives of individuals associated with the FCS Education graduate program at Iowa State University? The key leaders who participated in the Academy demonstrated what
Spanier (2001) described as “an unusually strong commitment to nurturing the next generation of scholars and practitioners” (p. 18). This commitment must be sustained to develop future leaders in families, careers, communities, and the profession. If the profession is to thrive in the future, the next generation, our current students and new professionals, must believe in the profession’s mission and develop skills that will empower them to be leaders.

The commitment of current professionals is necessary to mentor students and provide them with appropriate educational experiences and leadership and professional development opportunities. The resident faculty and visiting scholars were not only instructors and teachers in the FCS Education graduate program, but role models and mentors who inspired their students to effectively pilot change in the profession and in society. This assumption supports Inana’s (1983) findings that “we in the field hope to become associated with beginners who will evolve into competent leaders [and] administrators” (p. 21).

**About Collaboration**

Another lesson learned from this case study is that leaders see beyond themselves and value collaboration with others. According to Vaughn (1994), the intention of collaboration with others should be “to marshal existing resources to improve the common good” (p. 6). The resident faculty and university administrators had to use their existing resources to launch the new delivery format. They sought out additional professional resources of key FCS leaders from higher education programs around the United States. Collaboration can be seen as a viable approach to problem solving and is an effective means for linking several
organizations with shared concerns. The developers of the FCS Education Leadership Academy recognized the profession’s critical need for leadership and, through the Academy model, brought together key leaders from various universities across the United States to create a solution to develop future FCS education leaders.

The collaborative efforts of everyone involved in the Academy demonstrated Senge’s (1990) principle that organizations allow for and build upon their differences and support growth within a cooperative effort. This effort in collaboration creates opportunities for learning new ways of addressing common issues. Similarly, Wheatley (2005) acknowledged that “Different people do things differently” (p. 78), where there is diversity, innovative solutions can be created. This was evident in the Academy model as the resident faculty, each whom possessed their own unique talents, strengths, and expertise, came together for the creation and implementation of the program.

“Every change, every burst of creativity, begins with the identification of a problem or opportunity that somebody finds meaningful” (Wheatley, 2005, p. 77). This was illustrated in this case study as the vision of the Academy, conceptualized by Yvonne Gentzler, emerged. When the resident faculty began to contact key leaders within the FCS profession, they exemplified Melvil Dewey’s idea of working together: “Whenever the world wants a thing done it first gets an enthusiast to take up the matter. Then he gathers about him a number of fellow workers” (Dewey, 1908, p. 1). The phone calls and letters were their attempt to gather fellow professionals in the quest to develop future FCS leaders. To me, this not only
emphasized the importance of coordination and collaboration among professionals
but among FCS programs as well.

**About Graduate Education**

Because the FCS Education profession has been predominantly female and
emphasizes the family as its central focus, balancing personal and family roles while
furthering education and maintaining a professional position is not uncommon. This
consideration was central to the design of the Academy model for graduate
education as the faculty recognized the parameters of juggling and prioritizing
personal, family, and work responsibilities and tasks. The Academy model provided
an opportunity for women, who were daughters, mothers, and wives, to share in the
experiences associated with graduate school and earn the advanced degree.

If meeting the needs of graduate students is a prerequisite for a successful
graduate program, then the Academy can consider itself successful. Although the
Academy model is not proposed to take the place for all graduate education, it is one
way to take university programs to the public, their consumers, and potential
students. Whether it will work in other graduate programs or in other professional
disciplines is yet to be determined, but it worked for the FCS Education program at
Iowa State University and for the greater profession of family and consumer
sciences. Both residential and alternative models can work in place with an
adequate number of students. It is not believed that the model will drive away
traditional, regular graduate programs; yet, some graduate programs might consider
restructuring and reorganizing with innovative solutions like those implemented at
Iowa State University. However, program administrators must realize that this model
is not the prescription for every program. Each of those programs must explore and answer the questions of why they are struggling and whether all of the components of the model are available and appropriate to the university and profession. For example, the commitment of professionals was the key to the success of the Academy model at Iowa State University. A crucial question is asking whether professionals from other disciplines or fields have that same level of commitment.

An awareness and understanding of the context of any university, college, and/or department is important in initiating and leading change in a graduate education program. Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt (2000) noted that the most successful leadership programs are “effectively situated within a specific context” (p.15). Hence, a strong relationship between the mission of the leadership program and the mission of the institution must exist. Linking the mission of the program with the institution is central to the success of a program. Therefore, these programs will need strong leadership and share well-defined values and a common theoretical framework. A common framework for courses taught within the Academy was the connection and application of leadership principles to course content. The individuals associated with the program must be committed to its framework and values. Successful programs ensure their sustainability with buy-in from across the university. Resident faculty worked with other faculty members and/or individuals at Iowa State University for approval of program-related coursework, policies, and procedures.

This case study was an example of a department chair and faculty exercising flexibility in adopting innovative ways to address current needs for graduate
education. In the political climate of a university, that flexibility may not be met with openness. In this case study, components of the program required some university policies and procedures to be adapted or modified for the alternative delivery format. Department administration and the resident faculty were committed to advocating for and supporting the program despite overcoming hurdles. For example, in the beginning, the curriculum included courses that were already in the university course catalog. University officials and individuals are encouraged to remain open-minded, be proactive, and see a vision of the future for the program.

As one visiting faculty noted, “The concept is worthy of imitation.” That became evident as another program in the same department as FCEdS at Iowa State University adopted the graduate program model. In the summer of 2004, the Child Nutrition Program Leadership Academy was initiated following the delivery format of the Academy. The program is offered by the Hotel, Restaurant and Institution Management and provides the opportunity to earn a PhD in Foodservice and Lodging Management.

About the Academy

Seeking an advanced degree, whether for professional, personal, or economic advancement reasons, was the deciding factor for enrolling in the Academy. The graduate students expected to earn an advanced degree; they did not fully expect the leadership, personal, and professional development that they experienced as a byproduct of their involvement. For the creators of the model, this growth and development was not a byproduct – it was central to the purpose, goals, and aspiration of the Academy model. The Academy was designed to identify,
develop, and nurture leaders to accomplish the mission of the profession. The graduate program has achieved that goal.

The most important lesson gleaned from this study, revealed in Chapter 6, focused on the impact and influence of participation in the Academy. The themes that emerged from the visiting scholars and graduate students’ experiences revealed examples of the Academy’s significant contributions in accomplishing the program’s goals of preparing competent professionals who will become the next generation of leaders within the profession. The first program goal encouraged individuals to demonstrate rational commitment to accomplishing the profession’s mission. Commitment to the profession was evident in the willingness of FCS leaders to participate in the Academy as an Advisory Board member or visiting scholar, while maintaining their positions in higher education and professional associations and fulfilling their own professional responsibilities. Graduate students spoke passionately about a sense of increased commitment to become actively involved in and sustain the profession.

Other program goals focused on preparing individuals who “provide beneficial services . . . deal with complex concepts . . . reflect critically upon their professional practice . . . and possess a sense of purpose that transcends self-interest” (adapted from Gentzler, 1987). Three of the themes that emerged from the study supported those goals. Graduate students shared that their perspectives and horizons were expanded and broadened through their experiences associated with the coursework, assignments, and activities within the graduate program. In addition, students confirmed that their leadership practices and philosophy had been enhanced and
that they were more confident of their own ability to address the issues facing individual and family life, as well as the FCS profession. This ability empowered students to augment the valuable services to individuals with whom they worked in their professional practice. Both visiting scholars and graduate students provided numerous examples of specific changes made within their practices as a result of their participation in the Academy. Changes in their professional practice and enhanced leadership are the true realization of this model of graduate education.

Finally, the program encouraged students “to participate in dialogue and interact with a community of peers” (adapted from Gentzler, 1987). Through the living, learning community and their courses, the students developed a professional network of peers and of nationally recognized FCS leaders. The opportunity to work with FCS leaders was a primary motivation for students to become involved in the Academy. Visiting scholars strengthened their professional network as they worked with and learned from colleagues in FCS. The graduate program was instrumental in establishing this valuable professional network, and participants were committed to sustaining the network through collaborative endeavors in educational and professional association settings.

The findings from this study support the importance of the living-learning component of the Academy model. Wheatley (2005) called for efforts “to support, strengthen, and nurture pioneering new leaders” (p. 170) through a community of practice which proposes that “learning is a social experience. . . [and] we learn best when in relationship with others who share a common practice” (pp. 171-172). For those students who experienced the living-learning community, learning did become
an intellectual and social experience. The students’ positive experiences, specifically associated with the FCS Education Leadership Academy agree with the benefits of these communities which include “learning from one another, exchanging advice and information, and supporting one another with true friendship” (p. 176).

The graduate students saw themselves as pioneers and were described by the faculty, administrators, and visiting scholars in the same manner as Wheatley (2005) characterized pioneering new leaders as “eager learners, willing to try new approaches, hungry for methods and ideas that will work” (p. 171). Just like the early pioneers of home economics who met in Lake Placid in 1899, the resident faculty, Advisory Board members, and the visiting scholars believed in the hope for a better tomorrow, not only at Iowa State University and in the profession, but in the families and communities in which we live. They recognized that, as pioneers, they had the courage to move beyond the present to the future. As pioneers for a new model for graduate education, these individuals have set the path for which the program will move forward.

Transforming professional practice begins by cultivating personal and internal change. Reflecting upon our own leadership definition, paradigm, and practices are the first step in the journey toward leadership development. One does not have to necessarily hold a particular position or leadership role as Vail reminded FCS professionals that “all of us have the potential to change and be change agents” (p. 259). This research shares one example of a graduate program that recognized the profession’s critical need for leadership, created a model to develop future FCS education leaders incorporated leadership development, and transformed its
program with an alternative delivery format. Each individual involved in the FCS Education graduate program, regardless of their role as faculty, administrator, advisor, or student, was able to become a change agent within their own lives and professional practice.

Wheatley (2005) indicated, “In the end, we can’t define a simple list of activities that were responsible for the organization shifting” (p. 73). Wheatley’s remarks concerning organizational shifts are supported by this research. Although it may not be possible to develop a checklist or pinpoint exactly what should be done within an organization, we learn from this study what can be gained by encouraging experimentation, learning constantly, seeking reflection and feedback, and developing a sense of camaraderie that occurs when everyone is engaged.

Implications for the FCS Profession

Even with the limitations and concerns associated with the Academy, resident faculty, administrators, Advisory Board members, visiting faculty, and students agree that the FCS Education Leadership Academy has contributed to the FCS profession by meeting the need for leadership, professional development, and a graduate program in FCS Education. One scholar recounted her thoughts during the joint meeting of resident faculty, administrators, Advisory Board members, and visiting scholars at the 2005 AAFCS Annual Meeting:

I was amazed when looking around the table to see that significant people in the field take the time to be involved in the Academy and care about it as much as they seem to. I was amazed that I was part of that conversation with deans from across the country and with people whose work I’ve read that are committed to this model. That is an indication of how important this model is.
The Academy model provides a format for FCS Education that cannot presently be received anywhere else. It is that format which is most advantageous to the program and its students. An Advisory Board member expressed her thoughts in this manner:

One must also identify the faculty as the most positive aspect of the program. Very few programs, if any, bring the best faculty in the profession from throughout the country to the campus. How fortunate the students are to take courses from these outstanding people. The list of people who have taught courses for the Academy is indeed impressive. The students may continue to teach at their home institutions while they are graduate students. Advantages to this approach are that the students may immediately implement what they are learning. They do not need to wait until they graduate and do not need to take leave or resign from their positions in order to attend graduate school.

The Academy model adds a dimension to graduate education that would not have been possible before. Because it “breeds new possibilities for educating a larger number of doctoral students in FCS Education,” the Academy model strengthened the viability of the graduate program at Iowa State University. The coursework and activities in the Academy have nurtured a community of committed professionals who share a common goal and have cemented a yearning for renewal for personal and professional growth. The model has addressed a need and transformed a program from a burning ember to a flaming glory. An Advisory Board member stated emphatically:

They [the Academy] are serving the needs of our profession for graduate programs. I think we definitely have people in Family and Consumer Sciences that want graduate programs, and we need to find alternative ways to help them get those graduate programs. Then, we must make sure those graduate programs are useful and productive.
The resident and visiting faculty and Advisory Board members associated with the Academy declared that it could potentially impact “leadership positions not only within our profession but in higher education in general where they can interpret what the profession is all about and the contributions our profession can make.” In their words, visiting scholars described the Academy as “a guiding light” and “the saving grace” of the profession.

**Suggestions for Future Research and Practice**

As a result of this study, it became apparent that a more comprehensive investigation of the Academy model would reveal implications for additional research and/or practice. The following recommendations are offered by the researcher that pertains to each of the guiding questions identified for the study.

1. Resident faculty should emphasize the completion of the follow-up survey after the summer resident program. The results of the long-term study could be analyzed as a means for supporting or contradicting the impact of the Academy.

2. Further studies should include the experiences of more students from each level of the program. That type of study could paint a descriptive picture of the students who choose to enroll in the Academy, their motivations, experiences, challenges, and accomplishments. Journaling or recording the experiences of a few students in the program from initial enrollment to graduation would provide a rich, narrative account of the students’ stories associated with earning an
advanced degree, while juggling family and professional responsibilities.

3. A future study could be based on the written journals and/or reflections of students during the three weeks on campus during the residential program and throughout their online coursework to see how the content is understood and applied in their professional contexts. The students could set their own goals, in conjunction with the program’s goals. These reflections over a period of time could explore the extent to which coursework and experiences are helping students to attain their goals.

4. An examination of the program to ensure that the total curriculum is adequately preparing students in all areas necessary for successful completion of the degree. This analysis could identify gaps within the curriculum and determine how those gaps could be filled with existing courses or with new ones.

5. Have students complete a leadership scale or survey prior to their enrollment, periodically through their program of study, and then again upon graduation. Used as a pre- and post- test, one could measure the impact and measure the differences in their leadership practices. Although this may not simply point to the sole impact of the Academy model on their leadership practices, it would offer a perspective on the type of leader they enter the program as and how those behaviors and perspectives have changed.
6. A similar study with a concentrated research focus using feminist theory and methodology might reveal additional outcomes associated with involvement in the Academy. This case study was designed to examine the leadership and professional development related to one’s involvement. There is potential for a feminist research approach to this study because FCS is predominantly female, and the Academy model is structured to accommodate a graduate education while fulfilling personal, family, and job-related responsibilities. This is especially true given that those responsibilities have been identified as hindering women’s ability to seek the doctoral degree.

Research in each of the components of the program could help to affirm the continued and full realization of the Academy model.

**Reflections of the Researcher**

As I reflect upon this study and its findings, it is important for me to acknowledge some of the lessons that I learned through my experience. I would be remiss to not share that I believe there is an untold story about the Academy and its conceptualization and implementation that may never be told. As stated before, this descriptive case study was simply one account of the Academy, not the complete account of the Academy.

To some, this account may seem unreal, as though there were no disagreements or turbulence that participants experienced throughout the process of developing and managing the FCS Education graduate program. If these did occur, the participants in the study did not share or acknowledge them. Some individuals
who participated in the study were not forthcoming with information, despite my continued probing or my asking the questions in a different way. These individuals were all still actively engaged in the activities and events of the program throughout the study. Although none of them expressed concern about any consequences associated with their responses, perhaps, they felt a sense of guardedness in sharing information that might be recorded and somehow linked to them personally. Because the interviews were held several years after the initial events occurred, several of the respondents honestly disclosed that they could not remember some of the facts or exact order of events.

As I interacted with and listened to the participants, I felt an overwhelming sense of responsibility to provide an accurate rendering of an historical account and a meaningful interpretation of the participants’ responses. It was important to me that the story be told with a balanced approach from a variety of perspectives and not be limited to only one person or one group of individuals. I experienced some turmoil as I would get conflicting facts or parts of a story; however, I exercised great care in confirming the facts and my understanding through the use of multiple data sources, including documents and interview transcripts.

This study sought to explore the conceptual framework which served as the philosophical foundation for the Academy model and to look at the “bigger” picture of the impact and influence that one’s involvement might have on an individual. The study was not designed to examine the day-to-day management of administering a graduate program or to outline specific procedures for adapting or modifying university policies and procedures regarding graduate education. This account only
briefly identified some of the management issues that had to be addressed in implementing the Academy model.

The study focused primarily on the conceptualization of the model and the first few years of the program. Throughout the time frame of this study, policies, procedures, and courses, for example, were being modified, changed, and/or updated. The program was evolving. Naturally, these changes were necessary to adapt to current trends and needs of students, the program, and the university.

Although this study was bound to a five-year time frame (2001–2006), I believe that it is important to note that in the Spring of 2007, new admission to the FCS Education graduate program was suspended. According to a message written on the Academy website, the suspension resulted from increased student enrollment and the program’s continued efforts to provide a high quality learning experience. The Dean of the College of Human Sciences ordered the suspension based on the need to ensure that currently enrolled graduate students would be given greater attention and focus to complete the program. A university program review was recommended to provide feedback regarding the program. With this suspension and pending review, the challenges brought forth in this study and outlined in Chapter 6 may be addressed. These challenges focused on ensuring a rigorous, high quality program for students, making students feel like they were receiving adequate support and attention, and recognizing the enormous workload of resident faculty members in directing such a large number of student research projects, in addition to their other faculty duties. Perhaps, the results of this study will prove valuable during the program review.
Regardless of what emerges in the coming months regarding the outcome of the Academy, the people who were involved in the program during the five years of this case study represent a community of professionals committed to the mission of family and consumer sciences and bound by a very unique experience not easily described. The commitment goes beyond words and lives in the irreplaceable relationships and experiences of those who were fortunate enough to participate in a program that aspired to strengthen Family and Consumer Sciences by inviting collaborative participation in reflection, renewal, and development of professional scholarship and engagement.

**Summary**

I am honored to have been able to chronicle the FCS Education Leadership Academy through the voices of its participants for the purpose of recorded history and the contribution it makes to understanding one graduate program at this point in time. Wheatley (2005) explained that, “We need to hear their stories, celebrate their successes, and continue to support them as our beacons to the future” (p. 175). The Academy model could be revolutionary as a means for educating graduate students, especially those who are place-bound because of personal, work, and family commitments. Based on its history that dates back to 1871 and outlines many firsts, family and consumer sciences at Iowa State University has had a rich heritage of accepting the challenge of creating a vision for the future and then carrying that foresight into action. Iowa State University can add the FCS Education Leadership Academy to that long list of firsts.
The phrase “transform your life” is written across the bottom of the Academy’s first promotional brochure. From the accounts that I have heard in the process of conducting this research and from my own experiences, it is evident that the skills and understanding and philosophy of leadership that the graduate students have taken away from their experiences have transformed them in some way. Results of this study reveal that what the students have learned in this unique program is reflected in their current professional practice, thus indicating that lives were transformed.

Mooney (1957) wrote, “Research is a personal venture, which, quite aside from its social benefits, is worth doing for its direct contribution to one’s own self–realization” (p. 176). This has been a personal journey for me.

\[
\text{Two roads diverged in a wood, and I —} \\
\text{I took the one less traveled by,} \\
\text{And that has made all the difference.}
\]

These final lines from Robert Frost’s poem, “The Road Not Taken,” most accurately describe my leadership journey. As I look back on the choices made and the roads taken, I’ve always followed “the one less traveled by.” Sometimes this decision has met with excitement and enthusiasm, and others with shock and disappointment. There has been pressure to follow a specific path and sometimes the paths of those before me. The paths chosen are not well trodden, and I have sometimes been afraid or cautious to take that step. Significant people and events in my life have given me the courage to take those steps. One by one, each step has made a significant difference in my leadership journey!
The Academy model continues to provide people and events to equip its students for leadership in the profession. As cited in Dodd (1992), Peter Drucker stated, “Any organization develops people; it has no choice. It either helps them grow or stunts them” (p. 362). When I think about the person I was when I stepped out in faith to begin a doctoral program in 2002, and the person I am today, I cannot help but think, “My, my, how I have grown!”

The Academy was conceptualized to nurture leaders for the future of Family and Consumer Sciences. With the commitment of current professionals as mentors and with appropriate educational experiences for professional and leadership development, the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy has set a standard and model for graduate education that has the potential to impact the FCS profession and enhance the quality of life for individuals and families, thus accomplishing our professional mission.
CLOSING VIGNETTE

At the close of the three-week summer session in 2003, resident faculty members and graduate students gathered to celebrate the end of another summer spent together learning and networking. In keeping with the previous summer’s celebration, the event was one filled with emotion and meaning for all who had participated. It was fitting that Yvonne Gentzler shared the following poem causing those in attendance to reflect upon their experiences as she reflected upon her vision of the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy.

Reflections on a Vision

An idea.

A beginning.

An ending.

A process—and trusting that process.

Curriculum, Program Development, International Perspectives, and Supervision

—all designed to enhance professional leadership.

A new group of leaders;

leaders at home, community leaders, leaders in the profession.

Bonded with common experiences—touching the core of our being.

Collaboration and competition

--orchestrated to establish networks of colleagues, mentors, cohorts and friends.

Intertwined with relationships—mothers, fathers, daughters, grandmothers.

Photographs capturing each moment.

Living, learning, and sharing.
The sorority house, meals, late night work sessions, early morning walks; surrounded by the smell of warm cinnamon buns and grilled chicken. Receptions, a fashion show, lectures, interviews, guest speakers, staff, faculty. The perfect prescription for mentoring.

Laughter, tears, more tears, smiles, an occasional wink, frustration, triumphs, celebrations, a warm exchange, a new understanding, a pat on the back, a hug, an encouraging word.

Aspirations, new aspirations, goals attained and goals reestablished. Leaders prepared with the strength and traditions of the past—at the site of the first land grant institution to award the Home Economics degree. Surrounded by the energy of those who paved the way, who set the stage for our passion.

A step closer to a dream—bonded with invisible ties of pride and accomplishment. The vision realized.

-- Written by Yvonne S. Gentzler (August, 2003)

Used with permission.
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Informed Consent Document

**Title of Study:** From Conceptualization to Realization: A Case Study of the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy

**Investigator:** Lori A. Myers, M.S.
Family and Consumer Sciences Education Doctoral Candidate
College of Human Sciences, Iowa State University

This is a research study. Please take your time in deciding if you would like to participate. Please feel free to ask questions at any time.

**INTRODUCTION**

This qualitative research study is designed to explore and understand the process of how the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy (hereafter referred to as the Academy) was conceptualized, developed, and implemented. The purpose of this case study is to trace the Academy’s history and evolution as a way of learning about and understanding this graduate program. Furthermore, the study will tell the story of what the Academy is, why it came to be, and how its vision and mission has been realized through the voices of key leaders, administrators, faculty members, and students.

You are being invited to participate in this study because you have been identified as someone who has (a) worked closely with the Academy and possesses intimate knowledge of the context in which the Academy was developed, how and why it was created, as well as being central in moving forward to implementation and realization of its mission and goals; (b) taught classes in the Academy and interacted with resident faculty and students; or (3) participated as a student in the Academy.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES**

If you agree to participate in this study, your participation will last for the duration of this project, which will begin with approval from Iowa State University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The approximate time frame for your involvement is August, 2005, to August, 2006. Your participation will involve one or more interviews or phone conversations, each of which will most likely last not more than an hour or two. During the study, you may expect the following procedures to be followed.

You are being asked to participate in an in-depth, semi-structured interview including open-ended questions to encourage conversation and dialogue. The interviews will take place either face-to-face in a location mutually agreed upon or on the telephone. As the researcher, I have prepared a list of questions to guide the audio
conversational interview. You will be asked to provide consent to audiotape the
interviews. It is possible that I may want further contact following the interview if a
gap in the research is discovered and we agree that you might be able to address it.

RISKS

There are minimal risks associated with participation in this study. Use of audio
tape equipment may make you feel uncomfortable; therefore, permission to use this
equipment will be sought before the interview begins. You may skip any question
that you do not wish to answer or that makes you feel uncomfortable.

BENEFITS

If you decide to participate in this study there may be no direct benefit to you. It is
hoped that the information gained in this study will benefit the Academy, Iowa State
University, FCS education programs, the FCS profession, and graduate education,
in general. The study could offer valuable information regarding the development of
this model that sets the stage for curriculum reform and innovative delivery of
graduate education. The process and actions taking place in the Academy’s
conceptualization and implementation may serve as a model for other programs.
The historical account of the Academy will be useful to see how the lessons learned
in its development contribute to the principles and practices that will guide the
Academy’s future.

COSTS AND COMPENSATION

You will not have any costs from participating in this study. You will not be
compensated financially for participating in this study.

PARTICIPANT RIGHTS

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may refuse to
participate or leave the study at any time. If you decide not to participate in the
study or leave the study early, it will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to
which you are otherwise entitled.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be
identified with you will remain confidential. During the transcription process, you will
be assigned a pseudonym to ensure confidentiality of your responses. At the end of
this informed consent form, you may provide consent to be quoted by name in the
dissertation. No names will be cited in the study unless you give consent to be
quoted. The audio tapes and the transcriptions will be maintained in a locked file for
a period of three years following the completion of the dissertation. Participants will be asked to make the choice whether the audio tapes are to be maintained for archival purposes or to be destroyed after this time period.

QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS

You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study. For further information about the study contact Lori Myers, Doctoral Candidate, 505 Dayton Drive, Ruston, LA 71270; (318) 254-8651; lmyers@iastate.edu. If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the Human Subjects Research Office, 1138 Pearson Hall, (515) 294-4566; austingr@iastate.edu or the Research Compliance Officer, Office of Research Compliances, 1138 Pearson Hall, (515) 294-3115; dament@iastate.edu.

************************************************************************

SUBJECT SIGNATURE

Your signature indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the document and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered. You will receive a copy of the signed and dated written informed consent prior to your participation in the study.

Interviewee’s Name (printed)___________________________________________

____________________________________  ______________________
(Interviewee’s Signature)      (Date)

Interviewee’s Address ________________________________________________

Interviewee’s Phone _____________________ Email________________________

You have my permission to use my name in the presentation of data.
  □ No  □ Yes

You have my permission to maintain the audio tape for archival purposes.
  □ No  □ Yes
INVESTIGATOR STATEMENT

I certify that the participant has been given adequate time to read and learn about the study and all of their questions have been answered. It is my opinion that the participant understands the purpose, risk, benefits, and the procedures that will be followed in this study and has voluntarily agreed to participate.

____________________________________  ______________________
(Signature of Person Obtaining (Date)
Informed Consent)

Interviewer’s Name (printed)____________________________________________

____________________________________  ______________________
(Interviewer’s Signature)      (Date)

Interviewer’s Address _______________________________________________

Interviewer’s Phone ______________________ Email______________________
Interview Protocol and Questions

Each participant group (i.e., resident faculty, administrators, advisory board, visiting faculty, and students) will be asked to answer questions regarding his or her involvement in and experiences with the Academy. The first question (in boldface type) in the list of questions is the framing question. The remaining questions will be used as extending and probing questions that frame the study.

Interview Questions for Resident Faculty

1. **How did the concept of the Academy begin?** What happened between the time when the idea first took shape to when the Academy actually first met or came together? What was it that created the need for the Academy? What was the catalyst for the graduate program to be offered in an alternative format? How would you describe the motivating factors for the Academy concept/model?

2. **When was the Academy concept/model developed/conceived?** How did it take shape in the initial discussion? What happened? How were you involved? Can you go back to that time and tell me what the discussion was like?

3. **Who were the people who played a role in the conceptualization of the Academy model, and what roles did they play?** Can you give me an example of what they did? What perspective did they bring? What experiences did they bring? Why were those people included? What were the dynamics of the interaction that occurred during the initial discussion? How did you get support for redesigning graduate education?

4. **What is the mission of the Academy? What are the guiding principles and values of the Academy?** What was its purpose? Has the mission, principles, or values changed? If so, how?

5. **What was the focus of the Academy work in the beginning? How has the focus changed over time?** Do you remember some of its activities? Its priority issues? How was most of the time spent? In what ways has the conceptualization developed been realized? What work is remaining?

Interview Questions for Current and Former Administrators

1. **When were you first informed about the idea of the Academy?** What were your initial reactions to the idea?
2. **What was the climate in the university, college, and/or department at the time the concept was introduced?** What was it that created the need for the Academy? How would you describe the motivating factors for the Academy concept/model? What were the motivating factors for the Academy?

3. **What made you feel that you could or could not support the Academy model?**

4. **Of all other graduate education or leadership and professional development efforts, how is this model different?** How are its results and impact different? Tell me why you think this is so.

### Interview Questions for Advisory Board Members and Visiting Scholars

1. **When was your first involvement with the Academy? What was that involvement about? What was it like?** What happened? Can you think back to that time? How were you involved? Why did you become involved? What has been your involvement since that time?

2. **What do you think it means to be involved in the Academy?**

3. **What impact do you think the Academy could have on graduate education? The FCS profession?** Where do you think the impact could be most significantly felt? Can you give me examples of how you think the impacts can be seen? Why do you think it has been successful/not successful in its endeavors?

4. **Of all other graduate education or leadership and professional development efforts, how is this different?** How are its results and impact different? Tell me why you think this is so.

5. **These are your perspectives. What do you think others believe about the curriculum and/or focus of the Academy and its impact?** Why do you think they believe that way?

6. **What issues should the Academy have addressed?** What shouldn’t it have addressed? What should be done differently?

### Interview Questions for Graduate Students

1. **How did you first learn about the Academy?** Recall or reflect upon your initial thoughts and questions about the Academy? Why did you decide to become involved in the Academy?
2. What do you think it means to be involved in the Academy?

3. How would you describe your experiences with the Academy? What influence have your experiences had on you personally? On your leadership ability and skills? On your professional development? What have you learned from those experiences? How would you describe the living, learning community within the Academy? How would you describe the networking and support within the Academy?

4. How do you believe that the Academy is accomplishing its mission and goals? What evidence can you provide? How have your classes reflected the Academy’s mission and goals? How would you describe what you have gained from your involvement with the Academy? How has your involvement impacted your understanding or the manifestation of leadership? What evidence do you have?

5. Of all other graduate education or leadership and professional development efforts in which you have been involved, how is the Academy different? Why do you think it is different? Are these differences significant? What makes the Academy’s efforts significant?
Letter to Participants

(Date)

Dear (Participant's Name):

As a doctoral student at Iowa State University, I am writing this letter to request your participation in my research study of the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy (hereafter referred to as Academy). You are being invited to participate in this study because you have been identified as someone who has (a) worked closely with the Academy and possesses intimate knowledge of the context in which the Academy was developed, how and why it was created, as well as being central in moving forward to implementation and realization of its mission and goals; (b) taught classes in the Academy and interacted with resident faculty members and students; or (3) participated as a student in the Academy.

It is important that I obtain your informed consent to be a part of this study entitled “From Conceptualization to Realization: A Case Study of the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy.” The study is designed to explore and understand the process of how the Academy was conceptualized, developed, and implemented. I believe the process through which it was conceived and evolved should be documented for the FCS profession, the university, the college, the department, and, most importantly, for the key leaders, faculty members, and student scholars who share its story. The qualitative case study methodology will be employed to study the history and evolution of the Academy as a means for (a) (understanding the departmental, unit, college and university) context that led to its conceptualization and implementation, (b) gaining insight into the goals and principles of the program, and (c) discovering its impact on those individuals closely involved with the Academy.

Please read the attached Informed Consent Document to learn more about this research study and to consider the benefits and risks associated with your involvement before granting your consent to participate in the study. Your knowledge of and perspectives about the Academy are most valuable to me and to the successful completion of my dissertation. Your consideration of this request is much appreciated. If you have any questions, please contact me at (318) 254-8651 (home) or through email at lmyers@iastate.edu. If you agree to participate in the study, please return the consent form by mail or by fax (318-257-4014).

Sincerely,

Lori A. Myers
Doctoral Candidate
Iowa State University
APPENDIX C

List of Case Study Respondents

List of Reviewed Documents
List of Case Study Respondents

The following administrators, resident faculty members, Advisory Board members, visiting scholars, and graduate students were interviewed for this qualitative case study from August, 2005 to January, 2007.

1. Yvonne Gentzler, PhD
2. Cheryl Hausafus, PhD
3. Beverly Kruempel, PhD
4. Carol Meeks Roskey, PhD
5. Mary Gregoire, PhD
6. Beverly Crabtree, PhD
7. Dorothy Mitstifer, PhD
8. Sally Williams, PhD
9. Jan Bowers, PhD
10. Penny Ralston, PhD
11. Virginia Clark Johnson, PhD
12. Laurie Stenberg Nichols, PhD
13. Marsha Rehm, PhD
14. Lorna Browne, PhD
15. Merrilyn Cummings, PhD
16. Virginia Vincenti, PhD
17. Daisy Stewart, PhD
18. Janet Laster, PhD
19. Francine Hultgren, PhD
20. Kendra Naef
21. Jill Conlon
22. Karen Nelson, MS
23. Cindy Waters, PhD
24. Renee Ryburn
25. Lindsey Shirley
26. Bernice Dodor
27. Ingrid Adams
List of Documents Reviewed

The following documents were collected and reviewed for inclusion in this study:

1. Advisory Board Minutes – June, 2005 (written by Gretchen Mosher)
2. FCSELA Course Matrix
3. Course Descriptions
4. 5 Page Information (March 6, 2002)
5. 2003 FCSELA Bios
6. Academy Aspirations and Attributes (November 6, 2002)
7. Open-ended Question Responses
8. Letter to Advisory Board (January 2, 2002)
10. Academy Poem
11. Map: Geographic Location of Participants
12. Logo Explanation
13. Iowa State University CFCS 2004 Annual Report
15. Letter sent to Visiting Scholars
16. FCS Leadership Academy Fall Retreat Minutes (September 2, 2004)
17. Suggestions for Improving the Web CT courses at the FCSELA
18. FCSELA Faculty Meeting Minutes for the Following Dates
   a. February 24, 2003
   b. March 10, 2003
   c. March 24, 2003
   d. March 31, 2003
   e. April 14, 2003
   f. April 28, 2003
   g. August 22, 2003
   h. September 4, 2003
   i. September 23, 2003
   j. October 7, 2003
   k. October 22, 2003
   l. February 17, 2004
20. Investing in FCS Leadership” brochure
21. Logo/Conceptual model for academy
22. Undergraduate Research Internship (Spring 2003)
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