

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW 2002-2003
UNIVERSITY PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL'S EVALUATION
for the
M.Ed in Adolescent Education
GRADUATE PROGRAM

I. COUNCIL'S GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE PROGRAM

The self-study ratings were based on future program growth, not past and current program status. As such, the reviewers lowered the ratings on some of the self-study indicators. Although the revised program shows tremendous potential, there simply is not enough evidence at this time to support higher ratings.

<u>Focus of Evaluation</u>	<u>Self-Study Eval</u>	<u>Council's Eval</u>
----------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

QUALITY INDICATORS

II. Summary of Program's Overall Quality Council's Observations:	Exemplary	Strong
---	------------------	---------------

Program changes are relatively recent and there is not enough evidence to consider the program's quality as exemplary; the program's substantial revisions show a great deal of promise, but more evidence is needed before coming to this conclusion.

IIA. Curricular Adherence to Quality/Accreditation Standards Council's Observations:	Exemplary	Exemplary
---	------------------	------------------

National Board of Professional Standards alignment; prepares students for National Board Certification; strong and distinctive emphasis on greater preparation in content areas than other competitors.

IIB. Quality of Faculty Supporting the Program Council's Observations:	Exemplary	Strong
---	------------------	---------------

Self-study contained only scholarship records of departmental faculty; while these faculty have an exemplary record, the scholarship record of the content area faculty was not included in the report and should be considered as well; faculty are involved in delivery of both graduate and undergraduate programs and there may be some differences in scholarship expectations across faculty; while potential for an exemplary rating is strong, it is difficult to justify an exemplary rating without having the information of all faculty involved in delivering the program.

IIC. Quality of Facilities, Equipment, Learning Resources, And Placements Council's Observations:	Exemplary	Strong
---	------------------	---------------

No available office space and classroom space is only adequate; strong support units (e.g., TEAC, TRAC, Ed Tech, OFEP); a rating of exemplary cannot be justified if there are any space needs.

IID. Quality of KSU's Annual Financial Investment Council's Observations:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
--	---------------------	---------------------

Request for 5 new lines is based on projected enrollment growth, not actual growth. Evidence to justify anticipated cohort growth is not provided. A clear and specific plan is needed to explain how many positions are required to deliver the program and its multiple cohorts. The program design is progressive and ambitious, but requires a complicated delivery model that needs to be considered. A clear understanding of the university's commitment to resource needs should be clarified.

Program Review for **MEd in Adolescent Education**

<u>Focus of Evaluation</u>	<u>Self-Study Eval</u>	<u>Council's Eval</u>
<p>II.E. Use of Advanced Technology for Program Delivery and Support Council's Observations:</p> <p>Traditional use of technology is well integrated into the curriculum; should explore using additional technology resources (e.g., discussion groups, online advising, etc.) to meet needs of a cohort program.</p>	Exemplary	Strong
<p>II.F. Quality of Program Advising, Enrollment Management & Student Services Council's Observations:</p> <p>Nothing particular appears to be done for the special format of a cohort program; role of support staff and faculty in advising is unclear; assessment of advising programs should be conducted and used to make decisions about expanding advisement services.</p>	Strong	Satisfactory
<p>II.G. Program Graduates' Competitive Advantages Council's Observations:</p> <p>Advantages were discussed only in terms of increased salary opportunities, which is likely no different from any other Master's program in the field; what is the marketability of graduates from our program specifically? Are they considered master teachers? No evidence is presented to demonstrate market advantage or quality of our graduates; access to this evidence may be premature given the revised program's "youth." Given the current distinctiveness of this program, the potential for competitive advantages of our graduates is strong.</p>	Exemplary	Satisfactory
<p>II.H. Faculty's & Program's Diversity & Global Perspective Council's Observations:</p> <p>Diverse faculty and curriculum.</p>	Exemplary	Exemplary
<p>III. Endowments, Scholarships, Gifts, Grants, and Fees Council's Observations:</p> <p>Of scholarships mentioned, most are not specific to the MEd program; primarily discussed grant opportunities rather than grants obtained; other than NSF grant, few grants have been acquired.</p>	Exemplary	Satisfactory
<p>II.J. Program's Honors, Awards & Recognition Council's Observations:</p> <p>Received national recognition because of NBPTS alignment</p>	Strong	Strong
<p>II.K. Honors of Program's Students, Graduates & Faculty Council's Observations:</p>	Exemplary	Exemplary
<p>III.L. Success of Program's Graduates Council's Observations:</p> <p>Difficult to judge based on evidence reported; need to focus on the success of cohort graduates; what are the program outcomes and the measures you use to demonstrate students are meeting those outcomes? More systematic assessment of success of graduate's is needed.</p>	Exemplary	Unable to Judge

Program Review for **M.Ed in Adolescent Education**

<u>Focus of Evaluation</u>	<u>Self-Study Eval</u>	<u>Council's Eval</u>
IIM. Stakeholder Satisfaction with Program Council's Observations: Some preliminary survey results are presented; as in IIL, more systematic assessment is needed from school system personnel and measures of the success of the students our graduates teach.	Exemplary	Satisfactory
IIN. Selectivity & Achievement of Students Council's Observations: This program has the 3rd highest average GRE scores of all grad programs at KSU. Need to provide more evidence of the quality of their students (e.g., average G.P.A. of students and classes).	Strong	Satisfactory
IIO. Program's Responsiveness to Assessment, Change & Improvement Council's Observations: Appear to have turned this program around; distinctive and quality-driven	Exemplary	Exemplary

PRODUCTIVITY INDICATORS

III. Summary of Program's Overall Productivity Council's Observations: Productivity projections definitely on the “upswing”; would like to see a 5-year plan outlining the need for the 5-9 lines requested and how these lines will be allocated. Are some of these lines intended for the undergraduate program, i.e., to replace the current faculty who were redirected to teach in the graduate program? As noted with some of the quality indicators, the revised program has not been in existence long enough to generate sustained evidence for some of these indicators. It is difficult to justify a rating higher than satisfactory when the new program has yet to have any graduates.	Strong	Satisfactory
IIIA. Enrollment of Graduate Students in Program Council's Observations: Our evaluation was based on current growth (up 11%) rather than projected growth. The self-study appears to rate itself on anticipated or expected program growth.	Strong	Satisfactory
IIIB. Program's Annual Degree Completions Council's Observations: The new program has yet to produce a graduating cohort. The program is 7th among KSU programs on this measure; difficult to compare current program to other USG programs because of uniqueness.	Satisfactory	Weak
IIIC. Graduation Rate & Program Completion Efficiency Council's Observations: Difficult to measure with cohort program because it is so new; “old” program is below average for BCOE programs; third at KSU with a 59% ratio.	Strong	Satisfactory to weak
IIID. Efficiency & Clarity of Curricular Design Council's Observations:	Exemplary	Exemplary

Program Review for M.Ed in Adolescent Education

Page 4

<u>Focus of Evaluation</u>	<u>Self-Study Eval</u>	<u>Council's Eval</u>
IIIE. Scheduling Frequency & Sequencing of Required Courses Council's Observations: Much clearer on cohort model	Exemplary	Exemplary
IIIF. Enrollment Levels in Required Courses Council's Observations: The rationale for the size of each cohort (20) is not provided in the self-study. Council discussions by BCOE representatives indicated the classes are primarily lab oriented, hands-on and interactive and need to be somewhat limited in size. This appears to be a quality issue.	Exemplary	Strong
IIIG. Diversity of Program's Majors & Graduates Council's Observations: Mostly female; few blacks & Hispanics; teachers at surrounding schools are more diverse than the students in this program; are we satisfied with this?	Satisfactory	Weak
IIIH. Faculty's Instructional Productivity Council's Observations: 17th out of 28 departments at KSU with average 739 weighted semester credit hours per faculty member.	Exemplary	Strong
IIII. Cost-Effectiveness of Program Instruction Council's Observations: \$96 per credit hour; 12th out of 28 departments; more cost-effective than other programs with field placements and supervision components.	Strong	Satisfactory
IIIJ. Responsiveness to State Needs & Demand for Graduates Council's Observations:	Exemplary	Exemplary
IIIK. Program's Ranking in the University System Council's Observations: 4th in the state; who is above us and why? NBPTS alignment and increased hours in content area will likely increase this standing in the system.	Exemplary	Strong
IIIL. Program's Contribution to Achieving KSU Mission Council's Observations:	Not Rated	Exemplary
IV. PROGRAM'S VIABILITY AT KSU Council's Observations: Given the recent changes in the program and the lack of assessment evidence available at this time, a viable rating is justified. The significant changes made in the last 2 years suggest a promising and viable program.	Viable	Viable

Program Review for **M.Ed in Adolescent Education**

Page 5

Focus of EvaluationSelf-Study EvalCouncil's Eval

V. MODEL PROGRAM POTENTIAL

Not Rated**Strong**

Council's Observations:

If others are looking at this model and developing similar programs, how will this affect the market and our projected enrollment growth?

VI. COUNCIL'S OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE PLANS FOR IMPROVING QUALITY
& PRODUCTIVITY

Other than requests for new lines, specific plan for improving quality and productivity is not provided.

VII. EXPAND, MAINTAIN, CONSOLIDATE, OR DISCONTINUE

Enhance & Expand Maintain

Council's Observations:

COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP

- **Suggest developing a plan to market the program especially as other programs in the region will likely follow our lead and reduce our distinctiveness.**
- **Suggest a specific plan outlining need for additional faculty lines to stimulate growth, which in turn justifies allocation of additional resources.**
- **Need stronger systematic assessment plan**
- **Suggest developing a specific plan to enhance diversity of students**
- **Develop a specific plan for recruitment and retention of quality faculty in today's competitive market.**