

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW 2002-2003
UNIVERSITY PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL'S EVALUATION
for the

M.Ed in Early Childhood Education
GRADUATE PROGRAM

I. COUNCIL'S GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE PROGRAM

Program revisions and new delivery model should be commended. However, program is only in its first year. Additional assessment of quality and productivity is needed before a recommendation to expand the program can be made.

Focus of Evaluation

Self-Study Eval

Council's Eval

QUALITY INDICATORS

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

Strong

Satisfactory

Evidence does not yet support this conclusion. It appears too early to tell and greater enrollment of high quality students (GRE eliminated) and specific metrics will either support or not support program effectiveness. We would suggest obtaining "on-going" customer feedback rather than waiting for a cohort to graduate given the track record of this program.

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

Strong

Satisfactory

NCATE accredited; Clearly curricula appears to embrace NSPTS' standards yet evidence of quality needs to be reflected in revised curricula approaches which embrace outcome performance. We strongly urge courses be redefined now, along with delivery and processes, to ensure program proactively embraces evolving standards. Clear outcomes measures need to be defined for courses and the program.

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

Very Strong

Strong

It appears academic publications could be increased in terms of some faculty. Scholarship expected of graduate faculty is not clearly evident. We feel the innovative redesign and program effectiveness of cohorts would be areas contributing to external colleague scrutiny and provide another valuable source of ideas for continuous improvement.

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

Weak

Satisfactory

We certainly acknowledge the plight of this graduate program yet feel it has minimally adequate facilities, equipment, etc which is the case with most graduate programs at KSU. Perhaps different scheduling in the summer may provide opportunities for students and faculty to gain access to facilities and equipment, etc. (i.e. evenings and weekends). We strongly suggest that increased use of current technology be employed to help address program needs.

IID. Quality of KSU's Annual Financial Investment

Satisfactory

Strong

Council's Observations:

Very little explanation provided; the faculty-student ratio appears quite low compared to other similar graduate programs. Requests for additional faculty are based upon projected enrollment, not actual growth. A greater analysis of current faculty utilization compared to other KSU programs is recommended.

IIE. Use of Advanced Technology for Program Delivery and Support
Council's Observations:

Strong

Strong

The curriculum reflects use of technology. However it is not clear how much technology is used in the actual delivery of the program. It is suggested that faculty and program administrators visit other graduate programs on campus and share their current practices and adopt “best practices” which could enhance the delivery of this program.

IIF. Quality of Program Advising, Enrollment Management & Student Services
Council's Observations:

Satisfactory to Strong

Satisfactory

One aspect of advising and enrollment management is to obtain feedback on enrollment trends and customer satisfaction. This allows for continuous improvement and immediate program adjustments/changes to reflect the two-way communication. We would encourage on-going feedback, with metrics, to measure the degree of success of the program, and program advising. We would also suggest determining the market size and make enrollment projects based upon data. Unclear how advising is done

IIG. Program Graduates' Competitive Advantages
Council's Observations:

Strong

Satisfactory

Need data to determine elements of competitive advantage and measures, which support the self-study evaluation of strong. Other than noting how specific aspects of the curriculum prepares students, there is no evidence to indicate that our graduates have a market advantage over other M.Ed graduates

IIH. Faculty's & Program's Diversity & Global Perspective
Council's Observations:

Satisfactory

Satisfactory

Faculty representation is heavily weighted with females. A continued effort to increase diversity is recommended in terms of faculty. Faculty is diverse with an exceptional number of black faculty; no information on curriculum's global perspective was provided.

III. Endowments, Scholarships, Gifts, Grants, and Fees
Council's Observations:

Satisfactory

Weak

No external support of any kind was noted; additional efforts to obtain grants is recommended and may be related to the cohort process.

IIJ. Program's Honors, Awards & Recognition **Strong** **Satisfactory**
Council's Observations:

We see no external comparison programs, which would reflect where the faculty wants this program to be. There are listings of awards yet reviewers have no context in which to determine whether the award is adequate or superior. Where is this program in terms of others in the University System and where does the faculty want it ranked? Other than one KSU award, no other awards or recognition noted.

IIK. Honors of Program's Students, Graduates & Faculty **Not Given** **Weak**
Council's Observations:

Efforts need to be made to identify components of these categories and metrics established to collect data in terms of graduates and students. Perhaps advising groups could be helpful in this endeavor. Some recognition of faculty, but nothing on students or graduates; need stronger assessment on this indicator.

IIIL. Success of Program's Graduates **Strong** **Weak**
Council's Observations:

Enrollments and graduation rates are the only data provided and do not reflect success upon completion of a graduate program. We strongly recommend that efforts be made to immediately implement your improvement opportunities. Again, looking at what other programs in the University System use might be helpful, as well as those in the profession. Need stronger assessment on this indicator.

IIIM. Stakeholder Satisfaction with Program **Strong** **Satisfactory**
Council's Observations:

The graduate analysis feedback provided does not support a strong rating. The survey never indicated the number of surveys sent out – only the 17 returned. Once recommendations are made to address some key areas, and additional information is obtained, it may be appropriate to evaluate this indicator as strong. Also need evidence from employers and students our graduates teach.

IIN. Selectivity & Achievement of Students **Strong** **Satisfactory**
Council's Observations:

Criteria has changed to assess the quality of students selected for this program. Elimination of the GRE makes comparisons difficult; is a principal's recommendation a valid and reliable substitute for GRE scores?

IIO. Program's Responsiveness to Assessment, **Satisfactory** **Satisfactory**
Change & Improvement
Council's Observations:

Responsiveness is viewed as embracing stakeholder feedback, primarily customer feedback, and making appropriate changes. You are to be commended for the program redesign. You are to be commended for identifying accreditation shifts to outcome performance measures. As identified in your opportunities for improvement (p. 21) these can be worked on immediately regardless of faculty recruitment efforts.

PRODUCTIVITY INDICATORS

III.	Summary of Program's Overall Productivity Council's Observations:	Very Strong	Strong
	You indicate that enrollment was decreasing yet, comparing Fall 2000 and Fall 2001, numbers remained stable; you then introduce “selected” numbers from other semesters. We suggest consistency of numbers when making comments. Perhaps total in each academic year would be a better reflection of productivity trends as presented by other KSU programs. We are suggesting “apples to apples” for comparisons. Revised program has clearly enhanced enrollment		
IIIA.	Enrollment of Graduate Students in Program Council's Observations:	Very Strong	Strong
	Again the data is not presented well. You provide some numbers and then replace for percentages. We wonder why you continue to use different statistical comparison groups – at times Fall semesters, other times selected semesters, and other times academic years. Current cohort enrollment is strong with some schools on a “waiting list”		
IIIB.	Program's Annual Degree Completions Council's Observations:	Very Strong	Strong
	6th at KSU and 6th in USG; the “potential” of the cohort model program will likely elevate this rating in the future. There is no market data indicating potential for this market. We feel there are two parts to drawing conclusions about the productivity of this program: (1) internal comparisons, and (2) external comparisons. Internally the enrollment reversal is commendable yet it must be sustained. Again you make claims of this program productivity to other KSU graduate programs yet do not provide supporting evidence. You indicate an improvement opportunity to expand online delivery of the program across the state. What is your competition doing? Do they already provide online programs? What have you done to begin exploring this opportunity?		
IIIC.	Graduation Rate & Program Completion Efficiency Council's Observations:	Very Strong	Strong
	Again you make statements comparing your graduation rates and completion efficiencies with other KSU graduate programs yet do not provide comparative data. Looking at MED Early Childhood degrees conferred for Fall semesters 1997 – 2001 (pg. 23) we see a decline in numbers of degrees conferred and a small number compared to other KSU graduate programs. However, all students in first cohort completed the program suggesting retention is strong.		
IIID.	Efficiency & Clarity of Curricular Design Council's Observations:	Strong	Strong
	Difficult to understand from information provided in this section.		
IIIE.	Scheduling Frequency & Sequencing of Required Courses Council's Observations:	Strong	Strong
IIIF.	Enrollment Levels in Required Courses Council's Observations:	Strong	Satisfactory

What are your average sized classes? These data should be converted to semester hour classes for the academic years.

III.G. Diversity of Program's Majors & Graduates	Weak	Weak
Council's Observations:		

There is ample room for improvement in terms of students; very few men (2%) and 92% white

III.H. Faculty's Instructional Productivity	Strong	Satisfactory
Council's Observations:		

One challenge with reviewing this evaluation is determining exactly which faculty is dedicated to teaching in the degree program. We would suggest you consider a measure of perhaps ½ time or more to determine the graduate faculty member graduate faculty status. Need to compare instructional productivity measures to other KSU programs/departments.

III.I. Cost-Effectiveness of Program Instruction	Strong	Satisfactory
Council's Observations:		

III.J. Responsiveness to State Needs & Demand for Graduates	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Council's Observations:		

While some cohorts have been mounted, there is a high demand for the program and not enough KSU resources to deliver.

III.K. Program's Ranking in the University System	Not Rated	Weak
Council's Observations:		

6th in USG

III.L. Program's Contribution to Achieving KSU Mission	Very Strong	Very Strong
Council's Observations:		

IV. PROGRAM'S VIABILITY AT KSU	Not Rated	Viable
Council's Observations:		

V. MODEL PROGRAM POTENTIAL	Not Rated	Strong
Council's Observations:		

This cohort approach, with embracing technology and executing changes outlined in the program opportunity sections of the report, could achieve model program potential. However, competition could quickly adopt a similar approach so program differentiation and distinction will be required

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

VII. EXPAND, MAINTAIN, CONSOLIDATE, OR DISCONTINUE **Expand** **Maintain**

Council's Observations:

To early to make the determination to expand.

COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP

- It is essential that goals and measurements of program quality and productivity are identified and tracked.
- A specific plan to allocate dedicated faculty to this program and to measure contribution levels is crucial.
- Specific productivity measures need to be put into place consistent with KSU guidelines.
- The market potential needs to be identified and a plan put into place to proactively recruit a high quality market share.
- Aligning performance outcome measures in a proactive manner, in terms of curriculum and customer performance should be occurring.
- Stronger assessment of the quality of students, success of graduates, and stakeholder views of effectiveness are necessary.