Review Panel Report
on the
Graduate Programs in the Department of Teacher and Counselor Education
in the
College of Education
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon

Review Committee

Becky Donatelle Associate Professor of Public Health, Oregon State University *
Jane Evans, Principal, North Albany Middle School
Thomas Greene, Associate Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, University of Portland
Arthur Horne, Dean, College of Education, University of Georgia
Walt Loveland, Professor, Department of Chemistry, Oregon State University*

June 8, 2009

* Representing the Graduate School Council
**Forward:** This document is prepared for the OSU Graduate School by the review committee in response to a review of a self-study conducted by the Department of Teacher Education regarding its graduate programs. Findings are based on the material provided and a site visit involving interviews with administration, faculty, staff, and students. This report is written in response to the stated graduate school standards and in compliance with format and procedure directives from the OSU Graduate School. Since the committee was provided with separate self study reports for the counseling and teacher education programs, the committee has responded in kind with separate sections devoted to counseling education and teacher education.

The visitation team met with Sally Francis, Graduate Dean, on Sunday evening, June 7, to review the charge to the review committee and to address any questions or concerns of the reviewers.

Monday, June 8 the following schedule was followed:

8:00 - 8:45 am Meet with TCE Department Chair SueAnn Bottoms, Michael Dalton and Mark Stauffer, Power Point Presentation and Overview, Ed Hall (Ed Hall 107)

8:45 - 9:30 am Dean, Sam Stern (Ed Hall 215A)

9:30 - 10:15 am [Program Administration] Meet with Program Leads - Ed Hall 107:

1. Cass Dykeman, Counseling
2. Jean Moule, Immersion
3. Nora Cohen, 2-year
4. Ken Winograd, 2-year
5. Sue Helback, EdM
6. Kathleen Cowin, MAT Cascades
7. Kathy Biles, Cascades Counseling
8. Sara Williams, Administrative Assistant

10:15 - 10:30 am Break

10:30 - 12:00 pm [Curriculum] Meet with Program Faculty - Ed Hall 107

1. Kathy Biles
2. Gene Eakin
3. Tom Guss
4. Deb Rubel
5. Kay Stephens
6. Joyce Mphande-Finn
7. Daniel Stroud
8. Kathryn Ciechanowski
9. Karen Higgins
10. Lori Blackman
11. Liz White
12. Linda Wallace
13. Jay Casbon
14. Candace Brey
15. Cass Dykeman
16. Jean Moule
17. Nora Cohen
18. Ken Winograd
19. Sue Helback
20. Kathleen Cowin

12:00-1:00 pm  Working lunch for Review Panel (Ed Hall 109)
1:00 - 1:45 pm  Campus Tour (College of Education Ambassadors)
1:45 - 2:45 pm  Work time for Review Panel (Ed Hall 109)
2:45 - 3:00 pm  Break
3:00 - 3:30 pm  Meet with TCE Department Chair SueAnn Bottoms, Michael Dalton, and Mark Stauffer, Ed Hall 109
4:00 - 5:00 pm  Graduate Students (Conference call (Room 109) students will call in from their intern/practica locations)
5:00 – 6:00 pm  Executive Session Ed Hall 109
Counselor Education Emphasis

1. Overall Recommendation

Reduce and/or restructure with attention given to recommendations from the self study and the graduate school review team’s recommendations

2. Summary of Findings and Recommendations

The Counselor Education program is one of the oldest and most established counselor training programs in the country, having initiated counselor education courses in 1916 and degree programs in 1929. It is nationally accredited by CACREP (The Council on Accreditation for Counseling and Related Educational Programs) and was recently reaccredited for seven years, the maximum granted by CACREP. The program is also accredited by NCATE (the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education).

The counseling master’s programs have two areas of emphasis and students select one of the two, either community counseling or school counseling. The community counseling program will be undergoing change in the near future as CACREP is stopping accreditation of community and instead is accrediting mental health counseling programs. The faculty indicated they would be developing the mental health program offering in the future in time to be ready for the next CACREP accreditation visit. The two master’s programs admit approximately 50 students per year. The admissions standard for the master’s programs is low, with students who earn an undergraduate grade point average of 3.0 being admitted; if they have a lower gpa they may still be considered for admission. Graduates of the program appear to do well, for they have a “pass rate” of approximately 97% on a national standardized examination, and most obtain relevant employment and state certification or licensure.

The doctoral program in counseling admits approximately 6-10 students per year and is a part-time program, requiring students to complete two courses a quarter for two years, followed by an internship. The program is a blend of on-line and face-to-face, and it is also a CACREP accredited program. Graduates of the program appear to do well in employment, with the majority taking faculty roles in colleges and universities.
Students in both the masters and doctoral programs report satisfaction with their programs and indicate there are good relationships between faculty and students; further the students are, overall, quite satisfied with their programs, based upon follow up surveys and self report of students. However, a limited number of students participated in the follow up evaluation.

It is recommended that, based upon student outcomes (test scores, employment, satisfaction) and national accreditation (CACREP, NCATE) the programs should be continued, but there are suggested steps that faculty are encouraged to take to address specific areas of program integrity. The areas of concern and recommended steps are described below.

3. Detailed Findings
   Introduction

Each of the programs reviewed at the masters and doctoral level presented mission statements and the missions as stated were in agreement with the mission statement of the college and the University. The mission seems to be relevant, appropriate, and reflects the commitment that OSU has to the public and to addressing the educational needs of the state and region.

While there is a clearly stated mission, there is concern about the specific lack of direction for the counselor education program, for while there is a mission statement and goals, there does not seem to be a specific plan to carry out the mission. Rather, there seems to be an attempt to use new delivery models (on-line, e-campus) to attempt to deliver as much program as possible with the limited resources available. It may be beneficial to step back and re-focus on the direction of the programs within the college to determine strengths, niche, and other relevant topics, followed by a strategic plan that clearly identifies goals and resources. There seems to be an inadequacy of resources to fulfill the stated mission with the quality expected of a national leading counselor preparation program.

Quality of Students and Admissions Selectivity

The admissions process seems to be missing a pre-screening piece. Currently the admissions process seems to be more oriented toward a self-selection experience, for applicants identify their interests, meet with faculty to discuss their intentions, and then the majority of applicants who follow through are admitted. It may be more beneficial to establish an application and pre-screening process. For example, instead of spending time interviewing an extensive number of applicants for a program, time might be better spent with re-designing the materials in a clear
format that lays out the expectations and time commitment required of the program, including the expected admissions standards. A first level paper-screen might then result in fewer face-to-face interviews being required. The current process is time consuming and focuses away from other duties that may be more beneficial to the school and personnel. A restructured procedure may also help by tightening the selection and admissions process, resulting in fewer admissions but of students who better suited to the programs, thus reducing the numbers of students that do not matriculate for whatever reason. While the graduates of the program appear to do well in placement and employment, there is some level of program-leaving, which indicates that the program may not be targeting the students most appropriate for the program. When as many as one-third do not finish a program, a follow-up survey, study, or exit interview should be conducted.

The graduates do well on national examinations and state and regional placement, which is indicative of talented graduates. On the other hand, most graduate programs require additional criteria of potential success in graduate training, including Graduate Record Examination scores and other indices of potential success.

**Level of Financial Support for Students**

An area of concern expressed by students was the minimal level of funding available. The programs are presented as part-time graduate programs available to students who are currently employed in relevant work settings, but the lack of sufficient assistantships and other forms of financial aid was voiced by students in the follow-up report completed by graduates. This lack of financial support for students also impacts the quality and experience of doctoral students, for there is a very limited opportunity for students to engage in scholarship, research, and teaching with their advisors or other faculty.

**Curriculum Strength**

The masters and doctoral programs are nationally accredited, demonstrating that they meet the curricula expectations of at least two national accrediting agencies. The course syllabi appear to have clearly defined objectives and outcomes, and the coursework appears to have sufficient rigor. Clearly the students accomplish sufficient learning to master the national standardized examination required for licensure, and so their achievement appears to be satisfactory.

**Quality of Personnel and Adequacy to Achieve Mission and Goals**
For the large number of students enrolled, there are insufficient numbers of tenure track faculty available for teaching, research, and mentoring. For 2008 there are four faculty with .500 teaching assignments (full load) and an additional 3 with a lower load (.250 or .125). On the other hand, there are significant numbers of term-to-term faculty employed to offer the courses necessary to staff the programs. Currently, given the number of doctoral students enrolled, the tenure track faculty who are eligible for advising and dissertation direction are supervising large numbers of doctoral students, as many as ten students per faculty member. In their self-study report the faculty identify their shortage of sufficient positions to adequately cover the research supervision and the teaching demands. This has resulted in the move to employ faculty from other institutions to assist with research projects of graduate students or to allowing non-tenure track faculty to direct the student research programs. Additionally, while the plan to develop an alternative dissertation model may be for educational purposes, the faculty move to change the dissertation requirement from a standard dissertation to a series of articles may also be reflective of the inability of faculty to adequately supervise doctoral research programs that result in a fully developed dissertation. The decision to alter the dissertation model should be based on educational expectations rather a limitation of sufficient numbers of faculty.

With approximately 100 graduate students being admitted each year, and with heavy course- oriented degree programs and minimal support staff, the burden on the tenure/tenure-track faculty is exceptional. Research and scholarly activity have largely vanished among the tenure-track faculty members. The “in-print, refereed “ publications of the tenure/tenure-track faculty amount to slightly more than 1 paper per faculty member in a five year period. The journals in which the articles appear are not, for the most part, top-tier, but second or third tier. This is not commensurate with a research university and bespeaks more of a “service and teaching emphasis” rather than a research intensive or research extensive graduate program. Again, though, the CACREP and NCATE accreditation visits may have resulted in more in-depth analyses of the scholarship and there may be more substantive work than was identified by this current review team.

The mission of the College of Education includes preparing professionals who excel as educational leaders. This should apply to their faculty and staff first, as they are the leaders and mentors for students. It appears that the workload made it nearly impossible for the current tenure-track faculty to adequately conduct research, remain abreast of current trends and best practices, and keep up with the increasing demands put on schools. While the faculty have managed to do a credible job with
what they have been doing, the longevity of continuing in the same manner may be fairly short and may be reflected in the recent departure of some of the faculty. Faculty and staff we met reported extensive work requirements and high expectations for productivity in teaching and supervision, but with few resources for professional renewal, ongoing scholarly productivity, or innovative approaches to educational practice, beyond the on-line model being developed and delivered. Several faculty suggested that there could be a better use of time; for example having an assistant who would do some of the program processes, including admissions, rather than high paid faculty who engage in administrative or clerical work out of necessity. This may also assist in the student funding issue described earlier.

With the commitment to research, scholarship, and social justice that is advocated by the counseling faculty there is concern about the practice of having instructors supervise Ph.D. dissertations and there is unease over the employment of approximately 65 term-to-term instructors, who are paid <0.50 FTE, making them ineligible for benefits. Many of these people seem to have been employed for multiple years in this category with one person citing ten or more years of employment. This employment model appears to be in conflict with AAUP guidelines on teaching faculty.

The counseling programs have valuable faculty who care very much about their teaching and supervision and they are well-regarded by their students. For the tenure track faculty, though, there is a concern about how they will be able to maintain an adequate program of scholarly research sufficient for them to attain tenure and promotion, and how they will advance themselves as scholars within their field. A reexamination of the plan to employ so many term-to-term instructors may result in an action that would lead to pooling resources to provide for fewer part-time faculty and the employment of more full-time, research/teaching/supervision faculty. Several of the term-to-term positions may be combined to create 1.0 FTE positions that provide benefits. Additionally, Ecampus needs to support staff positions, such as a graduate advisor, to take this and similar chores off of the faculty (along with providing aid for the students in the program). The number of students in the program should be reduced to align better with the number of tenure/tenure-track faculty.

Currently there are, realistically, too many part-time or term-to-term faculty to get a true picture of how they truly teach other than student evaluations. Without taking
time to step back and do strategic planning, and without consistent leadership that guides the work and helps faculty stay on target with the mission, the viability of the programs will likely suffer.

All of the steps suggested for reducing term-to-term faculty and increasing the number of tenure track faculty will reduce the net revenue of the College and the TCE department but should result in significant improvements in faculty morale, faculty productivity of scholarship and teaching. Some of the decreased or “missing” revenue resulting from fewer students and additional tenure-track faculty may be recovered from the increased productivity of faculty through research grants and service contracts.

We did not have sufficient information about the three faculty in Bend, such as what credentials they possess, who oversees their work, whether they are tenure track or term-to-term instructors, and the degree of collaboration among the faculty of the various programs. This should be clarified.

**Level and Quality of Infrastructure**

The counseling programs need to establish a more sophisticated data utilization system. Many programs have developed student information sources that track student progress from the time they apply, all through the academic program, and following up with graduation, licensure, employment, and related information. This information is often used for program evaluation and improvement and includes ongoing sampling of student engagement and recommendations. The counseling faculty did have a survey that students took immediately upon completion of their program, but there was little additional information provided. Perhaps there was substantially more information available from other accreditation visits (CACREP; NCATE) but it was not presented as part of this review. Follow up surveys of one, three and five years out would be informative. This would give the programs an idea of whether graduates stayed in the field, utilized what was taught, or if there were areas for which the graduates were not prepared. Additionally, while there were interviews with supervisors, there was no follow up data on employer satisfaction, job performance, and related information. There was a comment that preparedness was an area of concern for the faculty across the several programs, but there was no follow-up information provided about a plan to address the concerns.

**Quality of Organizational Support**

Currently there is a need for increased support for the counseling programs. The facilities are presently undergoing a major external renovation and internal
modernization is planned. There is also a need for increased availability of instructional technology updating to keep the extensive on-line programs current and advancing, for as the College moves to increased on-line curricular offerings, there will need to be enhanced technology to foster the delivery of the programs.

Administrators provide support for the programs, but there is a need for overall strategic planning to address resource shortages across the faculty lines.

4. Conclusion:

The graduate programs in counseling are nationally accredited and have a long and rich history of providing counselor education in the state and region. The students appear to be academically capable, though the admissions criteria rely upon individual interviews, an undergraduate gpa of 3.0, and self-selection for the programs, which is insufficient for today’s accountability-oriented educational environment. The graduates of the program do well on their professional examinations. The faculty come from very good educational backgrounds and are highly committed to their educational programs. There are insufficient numbers of tenure-track faculty and the ones who are there are under-resourced for adequate scholarship and programs of research, resulting in them taking on a stronger identity as teachers and supervisors rather than as scholar/practitioners or academics with research programs. A strategic review of the programs, students, faculty, procedures, and resources would be beneficial for examining ways of aligning the missions, objectives, goals, and outcomes of each of the programs with the University, the College, and the individual programs.
Teacher Education Emphasis

1. Overall Recommendation
   Reduce and/or restructure with attention given to recommendations from the Self Study and the graduate school review team’s recommendations.

2. Summary of Findings
   Oregon State University has been preparing educators for nearly 100 years resulting in more than 14,000 graduates. The current College of Education was reestablished as an academic unit in 2002. In its earliest form, it was the Department of Industrial Pedagogy and it has been part of the College of Home Economics and Education, the New School of Education, and perhaps other forms. It has three departments: 4-H Youth Development Education, Adult Education and Higher Education Leadership Department, and Teacher and Counselor Education. In the latter, two master degrees (MAT and EdM) are the focus of this review. There are three delivery models for the MAT and EdM is provided on-line. The unit has a doctorate in Teacher Leadership, but the Teacher Education Self Study Notebook did not address this degree and the review team only acquired information about it from interviews. The visit occurred following an National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education site visit (NCATE) and a Oregon Teacher and Standards (TSPC) site visit with the results of these visits pending.

3. Detailed Findings

   Introduction

   The fit of the mission of the program and its relationship to the mission of the academic college and the University mission.

   The unit provides a strong conceptual framework on which practice is based that includes four core values:

   1. Ethics and Professionalism
   2. Reflective Practitioner
   3. Lifelong Learning
   4. Diversity and Equity

   Moreover, it emphasizes the knowledge, skills and dispositions associated with teaching and learning, the K-12 learner, assessment, and the content subject matter. This framework is compatible with national and state standards, the mission of the College of Education and the institution. While the institutional
and college missions and the unit conceptual framework have a degree of alignment, the observation is that the conceptual framework may drive instruction and curriculum, but it is unclear how it drives assessment practices in the unit.

The mission of the College of Education is “to be one of the most exemplary education units in the world”. This mission is guided by creativity, connection, culture, and caring. How these college values are related to the unit conceptual framework values is perhaps implied, but there is no specific documentation showing explicit linkage from mission to framework to practice (curriculum, instruction, and assessment). This linkage might provide greater focus and enhanced effectiveness. While mission statements are by nature lofty, it was the observation of the team that resources are inadequate to support current programming and definitely inadequate for becoming “one of the most exemplary education units in the world.”

Quality of Students and Admissions Selectivity

Admission requirements for the MAT are clearly identified and consistent with many other programs found in the State of Oregon. The requirements appear to be consistent across all three MAT program delivery models. Requirements increase as the candidate approaches clinical practice. The required NCATE Key Assessment table was provided for the MAT program. Attrition in the campus models appears to be about 15% for the years reported. The Cascades cohort model appears to have an attrition rate of about 3% for two years. Attrition rates are cited here as they are often indicative of admission decision success or failure. Team members commented that unit rejection rates appeared low, questioning if the criteria were discriminating.

Admission criteria to the EdM program were found in the required NCATE Key Assessment table and verified through interviews. While the entry criteria seem mostly appropriate, the team expressed concern that no nationally recognized graduate school admission test was required. Attrition in the EdM program is at 13%, but the data collection categories are not consistent across all programs, so while there may be little reason to compare attrition rates across two different degree programs, the inconsistency of measures would make it absolutely meaningless. Again, team members commented that unit rejection rates appeared low, questioning if the criteria were discriminating.
While admission criteria appear standard and observed, rejection rates are low, attrition rates are variable, and there is no cumulative data provided in the Self Study on the admitted students, i.e. average UG GPA, test scores, etc., to examine trends related to profiling admitted students. The review team expressed concerns about the lack of candidate selectivity in some programs.

Interviews with faculty suggest that low rejection rates at admission are associated with a discernment process during the pre-admission advising sessions.

**Level of Financial Support for Students**

The Self Study indicates that there are no graduate assistantships and graduate students enrolled through Ecampus are not eligible for scholarships. Graduate students applying for on campus graduate programs are eligible for scholarships and the financial support is through the College of Education. In general, faculty interviews indicated inadequate funding for graduate student tuition relief, although scholarships and awards are reported in Appendix D of the Self-Study.

**Curriculum Strength**

The curriculum in the MAT program appears to address national and state standards and reflect solid professional practice. Curriculum strength at the course level appears well planned with syllabi providing adequate information about the course. Many of the syllabi provide paragraphs describing the relationship of course content to the standards. Some syllabi provide a discussion of the linkages to the unit conceptual framework. Many of the syllabi provide adequate rubrics and protocols for assessment and evaluation. Many individual course assessments/assignments are implicitly linked to the objectives of the course, the unit conceptual framework, and standards, but explicit linkage from conceptual framework to national standards to course objectives to assessment is less frequent. When such linkages are noted in course objectives for example, a key for interpretation is sometimes missing. Such explicit linkage could provide greater focus for students and data about specific course effectiveness in assisting candidate attainment of program outcomes, specifically the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of the unit’s conceptual framework. In summary, there is variance in the breadth and depth of information provided to candidates.

Curriculum strength at the program level is positive according to the graduate survey results summarized in Appendix D, although the summary does not
indicate which comments are EdM or MAT, so specific program assessment is limited. In the Self-Study, the data were disaggregated, but the frequencies are not sufficient for valid and reliable conclusions. The MAT is an initial preparation program with numerous assessments described in the various MAT handbooks, Self Study and exhibits. This excellent overview of assessments suggests that the unit provides comprehensive assessment and evaluation practices. No data associated with the assessments was provided. The data associated with the assessments could be used in program evaluation providing a measure of curricular strength beyond the graduate survey self-reported results. Collecting, aggregating and disaggregating data from these various assessments might provide additional data about curricular strength and other program qualities and outcomes. The graduate survey data does provide a metric of the self-reported attainment of knowledge, skills, and dispositions outlined in the conceptual framework. Many of the assessments in courses and program benchmarks could provide useable data for examining program effectiveness beyond graduate self-reported data. Using multiple measures reflects best practice.

The EdM degree appears to have its own conceptual framework (EdM Handbook page 18-19) and program outcomes. It is not explicit about how the EdM conceptual framework and the program outcomes are related to the unit’s conceptual framework or state or national standards for advanced practice. All previous statements about the qualities of syllabi, in the MAT program appear to be true of the syllabi in the EdM program. In short, some are detailed and provide the student with the general structure and content of the course, but explicit information about the alignments of conceptual frameworks, objectives, class sessions and assessments are infrequent.

This issue has been wisely noted by the faculty in its own Self Study. In the short term program goals section, the faculty has indicated the need for alignment in recommendations 3 and 5 (Self-Study p. 37 and 38). The team recommends that each program be reviewed for alignment and that the data related to the various assessments be collected, analyzed, and used in driving program direction. This should precede any program or service expansion endeavor. The graduate survey was the only assessment with data provided, beyond enrollment and exit statistics. The team also had questions about the quality of the survey data. Data from multiple assessments for each assessment benchmark are necessary to reflect current best practice.
Quality of Personnel and Adequacy to Achieve Mission and Goals

For the number of students enrolled, there are insufficient numbers of tenure track faculty available for teaching, research, and mentoring. In such heavy course-oriented graduate degree programs with minimal support staff, etc., the burden on the tenure/tenure-track faculty is too large. Research and scholarly activity have suffered, yet the faculty appear committed and resourceful in their dedication to the candidates and programs. Additionally, it appears there are too many part-time or term-to-term faculty to get a true picture of how they teach other than student evaluations. Concerns about the unit’s ability to provide cohesive learning experiences because of the number of part-time faculty were discussed by the review team. Without taking time to step back and do strategic planning, and without consistent leadership that guides the work and helps faculty stay on target with the mission, the viability of the programs will likely suffer.

Through interviews, the review team noted that fixed term instructors are chairing dissertation committees. This practice seems ill-advised for a research intensive university and should cease.

The review team believes that some of the issues associated with the previously mentioned challenges could be to direct Ecampus to support the unit directly, since the unit is using Ecampus for many course offerings. In particular, Ecampus could fund one or more graduate advisor/grad admissions positions to relieve the burden of the faculty and provide the missing student aid previously mentioned.

The review teams offers these additional suggestions: 1) condense the 65 non-benefits positions to a lesser number of positions that pay benefits, 2) hire new tenure track faculty and reduce the program size so that the load on the faculty is appropriate. Clearly this suggestion is difficult in this fiscal climate, but without some movement in this direction, the program will continue to be compromised and faculty productivity will not address all aspects of the university’s mission. These issues are the primary reason for the review team’s general recommendation for reduction and or restructuring.

The team did not have sufficient information about the three faculty members in Bend related to the OSU unit. For example, it was unclear who oversees their work, whether they are tenure track or term-to-term instructors, what budgetary resources are available, what governance structure exists, and the degree of collaboration among the faculty of the various programs. This warrants clarification. Faculty interviews provided some information, but Cascade budgetary and personnel authority and the relationship with the College
of Education Dean was not established within the time parameters of the review.

**Level and Quality of Infrastructure**

Education Hall is over 100 years old. The facility appears to be held together by a complete exterior wrap in cyclone fencing material. Inside there are classrooms, one that appears to be preferred, offices, and basic facilities. Fresh paint and interesting displays are invitational. The historic nature of the building is appreciated, but repairs and remodeling could enhance the learning experience and faculty productivity. Many courses are held in facilities off-campus, in Bend, or on-line, so the Education Hall is not the only learning environment for the College.

A robust data system would assist the faculty in program evaluation and candidate assessment from pre-admission to post-graduation benchmarks. Currently, assessment information and data are limited and therefore the use of data in making data driven decisions are limited and or compromised.

In general, the amount of instructional technology needs to be increased so that on line and in-classroom programs can remain current and advance.

**Quality of Organizational Support**

It appears to the review committee that there is adequate formal administrative support as outlined in the organizational charts, but some leadership roles are assumed by faculty which the review team believes contributes to the taxing load on the faculty. The review team expressed concerns about the governance issues related to the Cascade campus based program.

**Productivity**

**Level and Quality of Student Performance**

Since 2008, all candidates have been required to complete an exit survey at the time of program completion. Since that date, 130 candidates have completed the survey; eighty-six are graduate candidates. The frequencies of response in some programs are too low to ascertain valid and reliable data and Tables 8-10 in the Self-Study may combine initial and advanced teacher preparation results.

Given that teacher candidates in Oregon cannot complete an initial teacher preparation without meeting testing requirements for licensure, it is noted that
initial preparation candidates/completers meet that standard. There is no additional aggregated or disaggregated data in the Self Study or related exhibits that indicate that average scores on such key assessments as work samples I and II, three way evaluation scores for clinical practice, portfolio scores, GPAs, or binary data about meeting program benchmarks on time, etc.

The Self Study did indicate that five to ten graduate candidates each year participate with faculty state level conferences.

The review team notes that many assessments are required of students. Copies of the assessments and the related forms were provided in the exhibits, but no data on the assessments beyond the graduate survey were provided. This void compromises the team’s ability to comment further on the level and quality of student performance. Although student interviews, while limited in number, revealed program satisfaction among the candidates.

**Level and Quality of Faculty Performance**

OSU standards suggest that faculty members are to spend no less than .15 FTE on research, scholarship, or other creative activities. Interview results indicate that most faculty members must devote time beyond the full-time equivalency to accomplish this standard. Members of the review team concluded that the amount of evidence of research, scholarship, and other creative activities is not optimal for the stated goal of becoming one of the top ten land grant universities in the United States. The faculty has scholarly achievements in books, chapters, and articles, presentations, and grants.

Faculty members engage in service. A review of vita and the evidence in the Self Study indicate faculty are active in professional associations, scholarly societies, advisory boards, state committees and commissions, and school boards.

The review has previously noted serious concerns about adequate numbers of full-time tenured and tenure track faculty to support the array of programs. The review team provided some recommendations for consideration.

**Viability of Scholarly Community Within Which Students Can Interact**

A scholarly community exists within which students may interact. The quality of the community is stretched by inadequate numbers of full-time tenure track faculty, a reliance on part-time fixed term faculty, and the admission of too many candidates for faculty size. It is compromised by an apparent need to explore
more off-campus sites which will eventually commit faculty to more travel time, thus stretching the viability of the scholarly community. The plans for program expansion to other locations that were revealed in the interviews and other documents, seem ill-advised until curricula are aligned, faculty FTE increased, and strategic planning reviewed, etc. In fact, the recommendations and the short term goals for the programs outlined on pages 36-38 of the Self Study should be addressed before program expansion is considered. The Self Study recommendations do not suggest program expansion, but such expansion endeavors were discussed at some length during the interviews.

There appears to be a spirit of community among the faculty, staff, and administration. Interviews with candidates indicate program satisfaction and a high level of engagement in clinical aspects of the MAT program, but there was not sufficient information to conclude that the students felt they were partners in a viable scholarly community. Student interviews were very limited so substantive conclusions were not formed by the review team.

4. Conclusion:

The graduate programs in teacher education are nationally accredited by NCATE and state accredited by TSPC; renewals of these accreditations are pending. The candidates appear to meet admission requirements, stay in their respective programs with some attrition, complete their programs and aggregated data from the graduate survey results suggest candidates are satisfied. Further, candidate interviews indicated they were very enthusiastic about the clinical aspect of the program and their chosen profession. Faculty appear committed and enthusiastic about their work, but collectively indicate that the lack of resources and over extension of administrative and instructional duties compromise the research agenda. Clearly, faculty members are teachers, advisors and supervisors first, with research taking second place, a noble ordering of priorities, but this may not be in keeping with university and college mission statements. The review team has noted concerns in this area. While nationally and state accredited, there was an absence of candidate and program assessment data in the exhibits and Self Study available to the team in the time parameters of this review which compromises the ability to assess the level and quality of student performance or program quality beyond the limited data in the graduate survey. A substantive strategic review that carefully examines all programs, resources, policies, procedures and considers all Self Study recommendations and implements the suggestions from the review committee
would be beneficial in aligning missions, conceptual frameworks, objectives, goals, outcomes, and assessments of each of the programs with University and College missions, plus national and state standards.

The review team recognizes that interviews, exhibits, a Self Study, and a brief site visit have limitations in presenting a comprehensive view of the graduate programs in teacher education. The observations, suggestions, recommendations and opinions in this report are based upon a limited review. However, many of the observations of the team reaffirm the recommendations as found in the Self Study. The conclusion of the review team is to maintain these programs, but with strong encouragement to implement the recommendations in the Self Study and those found in this response before considering any program or location expansion.