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1. Overall Recommendation:
The Review Panel recommends that the admissions to the program be suspended for a time to allow for sufficient program review to consider and adopt specific recommendations made by the review panel. The basis for this recommendation is outlined in the next section, Summary of Findings and Recommendations with detailed discussion in the body of the report in section three.

An on-site program review was conducted for the adult education program at Oregon State university on Friday, November 22, 2013 by a team consisting of four individuals, Dr. Stephanie Bernell, faculty member in the school of public health at OSU, Dr. James Coakley, associate dean of the business school and Chair of the Graduate Council at OSU, and two external members, Dr. Joe Campbell, director of corporate training, Nike, Inc., and Dr. Talmadge C. Guy, professor of adult education at the university of Georgia. The review team collected information on a variety of categories specified by the Oregon State university guidelines for program review through interviews and a review of documents.

Recommendations

1. Clarify program leadership roles in order to provide adequate intellectual and administrative leadership for continuous program improvement.

2. Based on the dean's strategic vision for the college the program appears to be well situated to enhance the college’s strategic mission through adult education’s foci on lifelong and life-wide learning as fundamental conceptual foundation for program development. The program leadership may need to explore these connections with the college's leadership to better position the program for additional resources.

3. Work more closely with ecampus to develop a marketing campaign that has a broader outreach to increase the number of quality applicants.

4. Create a core faculty dedicated to adult education active in HRD and adult education professional associations.

5. Program faculty should consult with professional associations such as the Commission of Professors of Adult Education, American Association of Adult and Continuing Education regarding professional standards for graduate programs as it considers revisions and updates to the curriculum.

6. Support faculty engagement in national/international associations in human resource development or adult education professional fields.

7. Establish an advisory panel that would incorporate industry/professional representatives.
INTRODUCTION: OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW, PARTICIPANTS, ORDER OF EVENTS AND ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The review team conducted a program review of the Oregon State university adult education program on Friday November 22, 2013. The team was comprised of four individuals, two Oregon State university personnel, Dr. Stephanie Bernell, faculty member in the school of public health, Dr. James Coakley, Associate Dean of the Business School and Chair of the Graduate Council, and two external team members, Dr. Joe Campbell of Nike, Inc. and Dr. Talmadge C. Guy of the University of Georgia. The team held its initial meeting on Thursday, November 21 and was hosted at dinner by Graduate Dean Brenda McComb. The team made introductions, overviewed the review process, raised questions resulting from an initial review of the program self-study and discussed the agenda for the following day.

On November 22, the team convened at Furman Hall, College of Education to hold a series of meetings with program coordinator, Dr. Shelley Dubkin-Lee and Dean Larry Flick and Associate Dean Randy Bell and Dr. Sam Stern, faculty member and admissions committee member. At the conclusion of these meetings, the team traveled to Clackamas Community College in Wilsonville where program classes are held. The team held a working lunch and then met with first and second year cohort students, and program faculty including the disciplinary liaison, Dr. Darlene Russ-Eft, Jonan Donaldson, Dr. Lucy Arellano, and Lori Bosteder. The team concluded its visit with a business meeting at the where issues were identified, recommendations were discussed and decided and assignments made for the preparation of the report.

The following sections provide a detailed discussion of the team's observations and recommendations. The main sections of the report are divided into Inputs, Productivity, and Outcomes and Impact of the adult education program. The final section summarizes the Conclusions made by the review team. The team was unable to comment on some of the factors identified in the self-study guide as data were not available in the program self-study or in other program records.

INPUTS

Mission

The mission of the adult education program is “to prepare work force education specialists to lead education and training programs in the work place, the community and in community colleges.” (p. 5, Adult Education Program Self Study). The program emphasis recognizes the importance of developing leaders who promote, design and deliver lifelong learning opportunities in the context of the workplace. This is consistent with the mission of the college as specified in the college’s mission statement and that of the university. Based on the dean’s strategic vision for the college the program appears to be well situated to enhance the college’s strategic mission through adult education’s foci on lifelong and life-wide learning as fundamental conceptual foundation for program development. The program leadership may need to explore these connections with the college’s leadership to better position the program for additional resources.
Recruitment and Enrollment Trends

Program enrollment and matriculation trends are presented in Table 1. The absolute number of applicants to the program has increased since 2008 (2008: 18; 2009: 27; 2010: 48; 2011: 45 and 2012: 32). Although, from 2011 to 2012 there was a 29% decrease in the number of applications to the program. The percent admitted was 83, 89, 38, 33 and 40, in 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively.

The number matriculated is quite modest. (2008: 8; 2009: 20; 2010: 15; 2011: 13 and 2012: 11). Notwithstanding 2008 when about half of those admitted chose to actually enroll, most students who are admitted chose to matriculate.

These numbers suggest that while the number of applications per year is increasing, the same trend does not hold for actual enrollment. In 2008, 8 students were enrolled in the Adult Education program. In 2012, 11 students enrolled in the program. According to the self-study and meetings with faculty and program leadership, recruitment is done ‘word of mouth’ and via ecampus. If the goal is to increase the number of quality applicants, it may be the case that program leadership needs to work more closely with ecampus to develop a marketing campaign that has a broader outreach to quality applicants.

Table 1.
Program Enrollment Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Applicants</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Admitted</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Graduating</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11 (on track to graduate – 1 student is on leave)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Adult Education degree does not seem to have a rigorous screening process for applicants. Applicants are required to have a 3.0 GPA in the last 90 credit hours of work, provide 3 letters of recommendation, and write an essay describing why they wish to pursue the Adult Education degree. One or two faculty members review the applicant file and determine whether the applicant is a good match for the program. If the applicant is determined to be a good fit for the program, an interview is scheduled. The interview can be face-to-face, by phone, or via Skype. The program does not require GRE scores as part of the applicant screening. From conversations with faculty, it seems as though all acceptable applications are accepted; however, applications from other countries are discouraged.

GRE scores are not a perfect indicator of success in a graduate program; however, the metric can provide some useful information. It is possible that by not requiring the GRE scores, there may be a perception of ‘easy entry’ into the program.
Curriculum strength

The curriculum is a 45 quarter hour program offered on a cohort model in which students enroll for four credits across seven academic terms. Currently, the program offers a series of four credit hour courses that comprise the main content areas in the curriculum. Additionally, a one credit course offered each quarter that focuses on instructional technology and design. Students enroll for five credit hours each term except for summer when they enroll for nine credit hours. A required internship experience is intended to provide an integrative an opportunity for students to apply knowledge and concepts to practice. Internship experiences are identified and developed by students and approved by faculty. A capstone experience is also required in which students develop a portfolio designed as an integrative learning experience. Based on information provided to the review team, the curriculum has been revised on several occasions most recently in 2011. The program is offered exclusively through eCampus at the Clackamas Community College in Wilsonville.

There are three primary emphases in the curriculum-instructional technology and design, organizational development and leadership, and adult learning and instruction. A review of the courses as well as interviews with students reveals that the curriculum offers a set of experiences that can be disjointed. For example, students are required to take a series of instructional technology and design courses but are not able to put these skills to use in developing the final portfolio for faculty review. The curriculum map provided in the self-study does not provide a clear indication of the overall conceptual framework that drives the curriculum. While students expressed satisfaction with courses and instructors, particularly the instructional technology and design courses, they were less clear about the value and meaningfulness of the organizational development or leadership aspects of the curriculum. The learning outcomes specified cover a broad range of roles and competencies. However, based on the review of the content and curriculum design, there are several recommendations for improving the curriculum overall.

The curriculum currently focuses equally on developing competencies in five professional roles, four of which are defined by the International Society for Performance Improvement (ISPI). The equal weighting of these roles in the curriculum addresses breadth while sacrificing the depth one might expect from a successful masters candidate. To address this, the faculty should consider creating a core curriculum with options that allow more in-depth specialization in, for example, leadership, design or organizational development. This will allow candidates to specialize and tailor their program to specific professional pursuits. In its current design, each of the individual roles might be considered a certificate program. Together they do not constitute a degree of mastery over any role or the profession.

The current program is solely based on ISPI standards. There is a missed opportunity to consider perspectives from other professional bodies including The American Society of Training and Development (ASTD) and the American Association of Adult and Continuing Education’s Commission of Professors of Adult Education regarding professional standards for graduate programs. As a point of reference, the Commission of Professors has published a set of standards for graduate programs as a guide to program quality and program development. (See Standards for Graduate Programs in Adult Education, Revised November 2008-Commission of Professors of Adult Education.

http://cpae.memberclicks.net/assets/documents/CPAE%20Grad%20Standards%202008.pdf). There was some confusion overall whether the program is designed to develop training design
professionals and/or Adult learning experts. A curriculum redesign of the program should clarify design intent and consider some of the standards from other appropriate professional bodies in the redesign.

Quality of personnel and adequacy to achieve mission

The program is staffed by four full time faculty members and several part-time faculty. The program is housed in an organizational unit with two other programs, College Student Services Administration and Community College Leadership, share faculty resources across programs. As a consequence, there is no full-time dedicated faculty to the adult education program. Program leadership is provided by the Graduate Program Coordinator (Shelley Dubkin-Lee) and the Discipline Liaison (Darlene Russ-Eft). Full-time faculty teach in the adult education program as well as the concentration in Community College Leadership.

There are no dedicated faculty to the program as most faculty teach across the two programs in the academic unit, Adult and Higher Education. The leadership roles of Discipline Liaison and Program Coordinator together should provide intellectual and administrative leadership. However in conversation with the faculty it is evident that these roles are unclear and are being refined to clarify leadership responsibility. The consequence of this is a void in terms of intellectual leadership for the program. Critically important matters relating to vision, direction, strategic planning and resources remain underdeveloped.

Level and Quality of Infrastructure

The program is housed in Furman Hall on the Corvallis campus. The program is delivered at the Clackamas Community College Wilsonville Training Center. Given the hybrid format of the program (25 percent online, monthly delivery of the in-person sessions) the Wilsonville facilities are very adequate to support the curriculum. The students do not appear to need space outside of classroom activities.

The program coordinator indicated that most administrative support is provided by graduate students from other College programs on the main campus. Dean Flick indicated that administrative support was available from the Dean's office. There does appear to be some confusion on this issue, with the program suggesting they needed dedicated administrative support and the Dean's office indicating that such support was available.

Quality of Organization Support

Since the reorganization of the College of Education (merger with the Science and Math Education program from the College of Science and appointment of a new Dean), the organizational support structure for the Adult Education Program appears to be in flux. The program appears to be held together by Shelley Dubkin-Lee, the program coordinator. The Review Team was especially concerned that the Dean of the College was not familiar with the program.

The College is not providing adequate support to maintain sufficient academically-qualified faculty for delivery of the academic component of the program. The academic faculty (Russ-Eft, Stern, and Arellano) also support other academic programs within the College. While Russ-Eft is the academic director of the program, she only teaches one course in the program and has a very heavy advising...
load of doctoral students (approximately 20). Professor Stern teaches two courses in the program, and Arellano teaches one course. Of the 36 credits of academic coursework within the program, only 20 credits are delivered by academic faculty. The review team strongly recommends that adequate resources be provided for program leadership and faculty support.

Table 2.
AE Faculty and Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Course(s) Taught</th>
<th># of Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arellano</td>
<td>AHE 553 – Adult Learning Theory &amp; Adult Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHE 533 – Needs Assessment &amp; Research</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHE 534 – Organization &amp; Systems Theory</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHE 567 – Leadership &amp; Human Relations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern</td>
<td>AHE 531 – Instructional Systems Design I (Prog. Dev.)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHE 547 – Instructional Strategies for Adult Learners</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ-Eft</td>
<td>AHE 532 – Instructional Systems Design II (Prog. Eval.)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reese (Adjunct)</td>
<td>AHE 539 – Designing Training Documentation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenz (Adjunct)</td>
<td>AHE 522-525 – Instructional Technology I-IV – 1 Credit Each Term</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaldson (Adj.)</td>
<td>AHE 510 – Internships</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHE 505 – Reading &amp; Conference Portfolio Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRODUCTIVITY**
Summary data were not available for evidence relating faculty and student scholarly productivity. The review did note that Professor Russ-Eft is a noted scholar and has held leadership positions in professional associations related to the field of HRD. A new faculty member, Dr. Arellano has just been appointed with a degree in higher education and organizational change. Based on a review of faculty vitae, it does not appear that the faculty, apart from Dr. Russ-Eft, have a strong record of scholarly activity particularly in the fields of HRD or adult education. Students are part-time and are not involved in scholarly activities or research with faculty.

Data available in the program the self-study and through group interviews with students in both currently active cohorts indicate that students are generally satisfied with the program. Students did have some suggestions for improvement and the self-study notes this as well. Suggestions for improvement had to do with the additional faculty assistance with internships, eliminating duplication or overlap in course content across courses, and developing electronic portfolios to use skills learned in coursework.

**OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS**
The placement and success of graduates is one key success measure of any academic program and the self-study report and in-person reviews indicated anecdotally that graduates have had some success progressing or retaining positions. This was reinforced by conversations with existing students, several of whom said the course was opening up new opportunities. The final recommendation regarding placement is to consider the establishment of an advisory panel that would incorporate industry/professional representatives. This would be a direct way to ensure the programs are meeting the needs of potential employers.
4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The adult education program appears to be in a state of flux as it seeks to stabilize its faculty, curriculum, and organizational position in the college of education. This statement recognizes that the college itself is currently undergoing a state of transition in which the adult education is seeking to find its strategic position. This situation creates an excellent opportunity for the program to re-evaluate its market, curriculum, and goals.

The team recommends the following actions be taken.

1. Clarify program leadership roles in order to provide adequate intellectual and administrative leadership for continuous program improvement.

2. Based on the dean’s strategic vision for the college the program appears to be well situated to enhance the college’s strategic mission through adult education’s foci on lifelong and life-wide learning as fundamental conceptual foundation for program development. The program leadership may need to explore these connections with the college’s leadership to better position the program for additional resources.

3. Work more closely with ecampus to develop a marketing campaign that has a broader outreach to increase the number of quality applicants.

4. Create a core faculty dedicated to adult education active in professional associations in the field of HRD and adult education.

5. Program faculty should consult with professional associations such as the Commission of Professors of Adult Education, American Association of Adult and Continuing Education regarding professional standards for graduate programs as it considers revisions and updates to the curriculum.

6. Support faculty engagement in national/international associations in human resource development or adult education professional fields.

7. Establish an advisory panel that would incorporate industry/professional representatives.