

Memorandum of Understanding

College of Education
Department of Advanced Studies in Education and Counseling
Department of Teacher Education

October 14, 2008

The College has three departments: Liberal Studies; Teacher Education; and Advanced Studies in Education and Counseling (ASEC). Among these departments, there is one undergraduate degree offered (BA in Liberal Studies), a large number of basic, advanced, and masters' credentials, and three graduate degrees. The graduate degrees include the MA in Education, the MS in Counseling, and the MS in Special Education; there are also six combined master's degree-and-credential programs.

The remainder of this background information considers only the three stand-alone graduate degree programs. However, among the three graduate degrees, there are a large number of options, including:

MA in Education, options in
Educational Administration
Educational Psychology
Educational Technology
Curriculum and Instruction, Elementary Education
Dual Language Development
Early Childhood Education
Reading and Language Arts
Librarianship
Curriculum and Instruction, Secondary Education
Social and Multicultural Foundations of Education

MS in Counseling
Marriage and Family Therapy
School Counseling
Student Development in Higher Education

MS in Special Education (no options)

In addition to the three department chairs, there are many faculty who serve as program coordinators and/or program advisors; for example, for the MA option in curriculum and instruction, elementary education, or for the MS option in marriage and family counseling. Many of the options are so different from one another as to function as *de facto* separate degrees.

The graduate academic degree programs in the College of Education wrote nine self-studies for program review, which included all but two of the options above (Dual Language Development and Social and Multicultural Foundations).

For the program review, four external reviewers were invited to visit the campus but only three were able to attend. Nevertheless, all of the degree programs and options covered by the self-studies were also addressed by the three external reviewers' reports received. The program reviews took place in Fall 2006.

The Program Assessment and Review Council parceled out the nine self-studies among four program review teams. The four PARC reports were written to address the following sets of degree

programs (and options):

- 1) MA in Education, options in Educational Administration, Educational Psychology, Educational Technology, and Librarianship
- 2) MA in Education, options in Curriculum and Instruction, Elementary and Secondary Education, , Early Childhood Education, and Reading and Language Arts
- 3) MS Counseling, options in Marriage and Family Therapy, School Counseling, and Student Development in Higher Education
- 4) MS Special Education (no options)

For the ease of completing the program review process, a global MOU has been drafted to accompany all of the PARC program review reports and external reviewer reports. The recommendations suggested by the internal and external reviewers at the degree program level were fairly similar across programs and options in most cases. Similarly, the recommendations suggested for the college level were also quite similar. This approach should provide adequate recognition of the strengths of each program as well as identification of areas for improvement, while maintaining consistency among the recommendations directed at the college level.

This Memorandum of Understanding outlines the consensus reached by the MA in Education, the MS in Counseling, and the MS in Special Education programs in the departments of Teacher Education and Advanced Studies in Education and Counseling, the College of Education, and the Division of Academic Affairs, based on the recently conducted program review. It describes the goals to be achieved and the actions to be undertaken by all parties to this MOU to achieve these goals during the next program review cycle. Progress toward goals is to be addressed in the annual report.

The program review revealed the strengths of the graduate degree programs offered by the College of Education. While graduate degrees are not accredited per se, most programs have adopted professional standards to guide curriculum, pedagogy, and learning outcomes. The faculty demonstrates a high level of quality and a rigorous work ethic. The College has a history of community engagement and provides training and practica for working professionals. Students are enthusiastic and praise their faculty for pushing them intellectually. The College has a sound plan for assessment of student learning and recently hired a tenure-track faculty member who dedicates the majority of his time to this effort. Faculty expressed appreciation for the support they receive from the program coordinators and administrators of the College, and the faculty as a whole enjoy collegial working relations.

The reviews also noted some areas for improvement. Concerns emerging from the program review include these issues.

1. There are many options offered, especially under the MA in Education. Many of these options share few if any courses, are housed in different departments, and are operated as *de facto* independent degree programs. This makes it difficult to offer all the courses students need to graduate in a timely manner.
2. A related concern is the small number of full-time, tenured or tenure-track faculty responsible for the support of the curriculum and delivery of instruction in each of the many options offered (not counting the certificate and credential programs), e.g., only one tenured faculty member in Librarianship. One external reviewer suggested that NCATE may consider this to be a resource issue if programs do not meet the minimum FTEF expectations for accreditation. Another

implication is that the college cannot meet current demand in some areas, much less take advantage of the growth opportunity expected in the areas of Special Education and School Counseling, as well as Marriage and Family Therapy and Student Development in Higher Education.

3. As many as half of all required courses are taught by part-time instructors in some programs. It takes substantial time and effort to recruit, hire, orient, and supervise numerous part-time instructors with a high turnover rate. Students expressed less satisfaction with part-time instructors, especially in respect to advising.

4. A relatively high student-faculty ratio was observed in some courses, e.g., research methods and clinical practicum that do not lend themselves to large class formats. Large class sizes are challenging for faculty who strive to help all students to meet stipulated learning outcomes.

5. While the College is commended on its attention to assessment, this has placed a burden on administrative and support staff, program coordinators, and faculty. Some of the burden is generated by increasingly rigorous accreditation standards, but another factor is the need for documentation in a large number of programs and options (as well as credentials and certificates). Also, outcomes need to be made more explicit to students in some programs by tying them to courses and assignments.

6. An important problem at the College level is keeping accurate records concerning student classification into the appropriate program(s). Data available to the College from the campus CMS (Peoplesoft) system consistently shows more students enrolled in academic degree programs (as well as credentials and certificate programs) than does data from the University's Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Students are often miscoded as well. One reason is that the type and format of the data collected by IR&A is largely determined by directives from the CSU systemwide office. Data from IR&A does not reflect students who are simultaneously enrolled in degree, credential, and certificate courses, students with minors, students on leave, students not enrolled for the current semester, etc., whereas CMS does show all these students. Another contributing factor is that students may be counted twice in CMS, once when they enroll for a graduate degree and again when they enroll for a credential or certificate, whereas they would only be counted once in IR&A. Neither data set is providing a current and complete picture of enrollment.

This in turn affects the College's ability to predict demand for the required and elective courses in each degree and option using CMS or IR & A data. As a partial solution, the College has created its own database on student admission, yield, and graduation. However, this not only is a duplication of effort and an increase in staff workload, it also could pose a potential security risk.

7. Improved support was indicated for some programs, such as smart classrooms, library resources and computer labs for Librarianship, assistive technology for Special Education, videos and DVDs for Counseling, and updating of the Educational Psychology Clinic.

It is therefore agreed that:

1. The College should evaluate the need for more support staff in the programs, with or without a move toward more centralized responsibility for program functions such as admissions, assessment, scheduling, and graduation checks.

2. The College should examine the possibility of consolidation or elimination of some options with low enrollments, low graduation rates, or small numbers of graduates where demand is not expected to increase, and/or cross-listed courses open to students in multiple degree options.

3. The College should develop a priority list for the allocation of existing (vacant) and/or new faculty lines among the degree programs and options according to the number of students in each, student-faculty ratios, expected growth, and other important factors.
4. The College should pursue additional funding for technology (especially in support of the Special Education and Librarianship and other technology-dependent programs) and for smart classrooms, as well as more academic journals, software, and also more video/DVD materials for the programs that use them (e.g., Counseling), and upgrading of the Clinic.
5. The College will work with the AVP for Academic Technology, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, Office of Enrollment Services, and other appropriate parties to ensure that information on student enrollment is both accurate and up-to-date.

This MOU has been read and approved by:

Department Chair _____ Date _____

Department Chair _____ Date _____

College Dean _____ Date _____

Vice Provost _____ Date _____