

The Graduate School



EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY™

TO: Dr. Linda Reven, Graduate Coordinator
Master of Science in Education in Elementary Education

Dr. Joy Russell, Chair
Department of Early Childhood, Elementary, and Middle Level Education

FROM: Robert M. Augustine, Dean

RE: First Choice Consultation Summary

DATE: Final Report December 10, 2012

Part 1 Consultation Program Team & Review Board

Master of Science in Education in Elementary Education Program Team
Joy Russell, Ph.D., Chair
Linda Reven, Ph.D., Graduate Coordinator
John Bickford, Ph.D., Team Member
Sham'Ah Md-Yunus, Ph.D., Team Member
Carrie Dale, Ph.D., Team Member
Diane Jackman, Ph.D., Dean College of Education & Professional Studies

Council on Graduate Studies Review Board
Wesley Allan, Ph.D., Review Board Chair
Jacquelyn Frank, Ph.D., Review Board Member
Newton Key, Ph.D., Review Board Member
Bill Elliott, M.S., Assistant Dean of the Graduate School
Robert M. Augustine, Ph.D. Dean of the Graduate School

Part 2 Consultation and Review Summary

Initial Consultation October 9, 2012
Consultation Report November 9, 2012
Program Review Request TBD
First Review Report October TBD
First CGS Review November TBD
Review Report and Recommendations TBD

Part 3 Consultation Report

Program Mission: The Graduate Program in Elementary Education advances scholarly preparation by providing quality teaching and promoting excellence in research/creative activity in order for graduate students to exemplify best teaching practices for children from birth through age fourteen. The graduate curriculum encompasses comprehensive content knowledge and promotes the use of critical thinking and problem solving to cultivate teacher-researchers who are empowered to serve as leaders in the profession. Faculty members challenge students to bridge the gap between theory and practice as they

develop the skills required for ethical and effective collaboration and communication within the local school community and a culturally diverse, technologically advanced global environment.

Overview: The CGS Review Board considers that the MSED in Elementary Education program most likely meets Criteria 2 through 5, but more information is required to verify if Criterion 1 was met for the sustained period. Providing clear concise evidence that the program meets its enrollment expectations for the sustained three-year period is essential for a Full Review. Details are provided in the report that follows. Overall, the Program Committee is to be applauded for a well-organized report that illuminates the program's strengths. The Consultation Program Team worked together to present each of the segments which demonstrated their commitment to meeting the criteria. This was clearly a department-wide effort with full support and engagement of the faculty.

Criterion 1: The program documents sustained achievements in strengthening the quality, diversity, and internationalization of the University's student body by attracting candidates who have the potential for academic and professional achievement and who complete degrees and succeed as alumni. Rating = 3. The evidence presented indicated the program needs to clearly state its enrollment and diversity expectations and to clearly state if it is meeting its intended enrollment and diversity goals for the sustained three-year period.

Table 1
Application, Admission, Yield 2009-2012

	2009		2010		2011		2012		09 to 12	
	Fall	%	Fall	%	Fall	%	Fall	%	Total	%
Applications	30		17		30		11		88	
Offers	15	50%	11	65%	19	63%	11	100%	56	64%
Yield	13	87%	7	64%	15	79%	11	100%	46	82%
Denied	15	50%	6	35%	11	37%	0	0%	32	36%
	Spring		Spring		Spring		Spring			
Applications			12		13		8		33	
Offers			8	67%	5	38%	4	50%	17	52%
Yield			6	75%	5	100%	4	100%	15	88%
Denied			4	33%	8	62%	4	50%	16	48%
	Summer		Summer		Summer		Summer			
Applications			16		15		10		41	
Offers			12	75%	8	53%	5	50%	25	61%
Yield			5	42%	7	88%	4	80%	16	64%
Denied			4	25%	7	47%	5	50%	16	39%
	2009		2010		2011		2012			
Applications	30		45		58		29		162	
Offers	15	50%	31	69%	32	55%	20	69%	98	60%
Yield	13	87%	18	58%	27	84%	19	95%	77	79%
Denied	15	50%	14	31%	26	45%	9	31%	64	40%

1ai-Enrollment Management/Recruitment Plan: A clear plan for meeting application, enrollment, and diversity goals. Rating 3: For a Full Review the Board recommends clear evidence the recruitment processes currently being used have been in place for at least 3 years, which is the definition of the sustained period. The Rating of 3 reflected that it was not yet clear if the recruitment plan and enrollment goals had been in place and were being met for the sustained

period. The rating of 3 was also tied to several important related areas that would need to be addressed in a Full Review. During a Full Review, the Board would like clarity on the specific diversity goals of the program and clearer information on whether or not the program is satisfied it is achieving its diversity goals within the context of the regional population that it serves. Finally, the Board required clarification on the program's specific enrollment goals. During the three year period of this report, did the program enroll the number of students it desired so that it is meeting its enrollment expectations?

The Board noted the following achievements in this area. The program documented it uses a comprehensive set of recruitment tools and a well-focused plan to achieve its enrollment goals. The program provided examples of electronic recruitment tools including an on-line journal that it uses to amplify the program's research focus and a new video created as part of the IGM-Institute to promote enrollments. In addition, the program also uses print materials and a newsletter to advance recruitment. Other recruitment tools included networking at national, regional, and state conferences and participating in the Graduate School Recruitment Day. These tools are attracting students to the applicant pool. The program noted its professionally focused graduate program is designed to meet the teaching profession's needs regionally and throughout the state; so its recruitment efforts focus on currently certified teachers who practice within driving distance of the region and can attend evening and weekend classes. The Consultation Team noted it focuses on attracting candidates from across the region to create a diversity of teaching professionals in its program. The Board would like clarity on whether the Team believes it is meeting its diversity goals using this approach. For example, can the program verify that the teachers in the program meet diversity criteria related to undergraduate preparation, school district or community size, or related criteria that demonstrate that the educators in the program bring many perspectives to the graduate classes? The Team explained that international students and students outside of Illinois may not initially qualify for the graduate program if they do not hold a current teaching certificate. The program provides advisement and mentoring to non-certified candidates and offers opportunities to pursue both a teaching certificate and graduate degree.

1a-ii-Enrollment Management/Selection Criteria: A rationale for selection decisions; fulfilling its expectations for quality. Rating = 4. The program's selection criteria include a) 3.0 GPA, b) current teaching certificate, c) 2 letters of recommendation, d) professional resume, e) formal letter of application, f) completion of the "Advanced Candidate Self-Assessment." The Consultation Team explained a rubric is used by the Admissions Committee to rate the candidates among these criteria for an admission decision. The Review Board identified this as a very effective practice for admissions. The program makes admissions throughout the year. As noted previously, applicants without a valid teaching certificate may enroll in a post-baccalaureate teaching certificate program in order to earn this credential prior to pursuing the master's degree. The program provided a rationale for using the established criteria by stating the criteria ensures that candidates have the required background in the teaching profession and the foundation in education required to successfully pursue an advanced degree.

Table 2
Enrollments 2009-2012

	2009	2010	2011	2012	Mean
	Fall	Fall	Fall	Fall	Fall
Full-time	11	14	13	6	11
Part-time	53	51	53	44	50
Total	64	65	66	50	61
	Spring	Spring	Spring	Spring	Spring
Full-time	8	10	10	9	9
Part-time	49	49	56	52	52
Total	57	59	66	61	61

	Summer	Summer	Summer	Summer	Summer
Full-time	3	10	7	4	6
Part-time	52	47	55	37	48
Total	55	57	62	41	54

1a-Enrollment Management/Acceptance Rate: Desired applicants accept admission offers. Rating = 4. The program reported it is meeting its enrollment goal of 50 part-time and 9 full-time students for an average of 59 students over the three-year period. The Graduate Coordinator explained students admitted typically accept admission offers although sometimes they delay beginning. The Coordinator noted the program is very satisfied it attracts the candidates it seeks and those they admit, accept the offers. The primary deterrent to yield is financial and insuring that the candidates have the waivers or related financial support required to begin impacts when the candidates begin their graduate studies. The program further noted it will offer provisional admission for students whose GPA falls below 3.00 and offer degree candidacy only if the students earn the required 3.00 on 12 hours of study.

1b-Assistantship/Scholarship Management: Rating = 3. The program documented the availability of both Graduate School Awards, and philanthropic awards to support its candidates and needs to clarify these awards met desired outcomes for the 3 year period.

Table 3
Graduate Assistantship Summary

Academic Year Assistantships	2009	2010	2011	Mean	Current Rate
Annual Allocation	6.5	7	6	6.5	\$865
Competitive Awards					
Grants or External Awards					
Philanthropic Awards					
Other Campus Assistantships					
Total Academic Year	6.5	7	6	6.5	\$865
Summer Assistantships					
Annual Allocation					
Competitive Awards					
Grants or External Awards	1	1	0	0.7	\$865
Philanthropic Awards					
Other Campus Assistantships					
Total Summer	1	1	0	0.7	\$865

1bi-Assistantship/Scholarship Management/Annual Awards: The awards attract desired applicants; teaching, research, or service experiences add value to the degree. Rating = 3. Since the Board offered a rating of 3 for this area, further clarification should be provided in a Full Review. Offering clearer evidence of the academic record of the graduate assistants it attracts is critically important to a Full Review. The Team also needs to specify what teaching, research, or service responsibilities are performed that enhance the graduate degree experience for these candidates. The program explained it uses an interview process to make the selection and noted the program selects 6 candidates from an application field of 8-14 students. The Consultation Team explained that preference is given to candidates from the program and in the past 2 years all came from their program; however a Full Review requires achievement over a three-year period and the program should demonstrate that it was successful for the sustained period. Because a majority of the candidates the program serves are practicing teachers in the region; many cannot afford to leave their full-time job to study; therefore, an assistantship may not provide required support needed to complete the degree. Showing that the program was successful with attracting candidates from its discipline during the sustained period would reflect

an important strength of the program. The Consultation Team also noted they host two endowed awards for graduate students. These include the Helwig and McNutt Awards. The Consultation Team offered a candid view of the challenge of inviting candidates with jobs and job security to leave these and accept assistantships to study full time. They also offered a summary of the ongoing conversations they have initiated to find financial options similar to an assistantship that also considers the job security that most candidates cannot afford to lose. Again, documenting effective use of graduate assistantships by providing assistants with opportunities to hone their discipline knowledge is important to a successful Full Review. .

1c-Matriculation Management: A targeted graduation rate; candidates consistently meet the program's degree completion expectations. Rating = 3. The rating of 3 reflected the need for evidence of 3 years of sustained effort. It would be useful in a Full Review to provide three years of data and show that the candidates in the subsequent years are tracking in similar fashion and the program demonstrates a pattern of degree completion among the candidates it admits. The program provided data to show that of 45 students admitted in the Fall of 2006; 58% complete the program in 2 years (6 semesters); 31% required more than 2 years (7 to 11 semesters), and 11% required less than 2 years to complete the program. .

1d-Graduate Placement: The program can document sustained placements; earning of required credentials; making important contributions to society; pursuing an advanced degree. Rating = 4. The program reported that 77% of its graduates return to their full-time existing teaching positions. Amplifying that returning highly educated teachers to their original classrooms, in contrast to finding new or different positions, would strengthen the Review. For example, providing evidence the completion of the MSED contributes to persistence in the field, advances in school districts, and the earning of tenure would offer evidence of the value of this degree in the work place. The Consultation Team noted another 12% secured new positions. The data indicated that 4% pursued advanced studies. The program noted placements in multiple school districts including Villa Grove, Hoopeston, Arcola, Charleston, Mattoon, Decatur, Robinson, Mount Zion, Effingham, Chicago, Champaign, and Olney as examples of the diversity of their graduate placements.

Criterion 2: The program documents sustained achievements in fostering advanced scholarship through a depth of knowledge, critical thinking, problem solving, oral and written communication, application of technology, research/creative activity, and commitment to professional ethics. Rating = 5. The evidence demonstrated sustained achievements in fostering advanced scholarship were achieved.

2a-Center for Academic Support and Achievement documents that assessment data are used to improve student learning, to guide improvements to the curriculum and to achieve academic excellence. Rating = 5. The program offered a summary of its formative assessment program that samples student behaviors at the beginning, mid-point, and end of their graduate studies. The assessment data guides support for candidates throughout the program. The program documented indirect and direct measures to sample student learning outcomes. The presenters noted the assessments are aligned with state standards in addition to program and Graduate School standards. The presenters explained the data is shared at an annual program retreat. Following the retreat a plan is developed to address curricular changes driven by the assessment data. The presenters also shared data to show how they are meeting their assessment expectations. An impressive part of the program's documentation was evidence of the many ways it has used its data to advance the quality of student. The well-focused plan was recently nominated by the Dean of the Graduate School for the Provost's Assessment Award. The report verified the program has a sustained record of using its assessment to advance its student learning.

2b-Graduate School documents that assessment data are used to improve student learning based on CGS Criteria. Rating = 5. Graduate School Reviews documented the program meets assessment across all of the areas approved by the Council on Graduate Studies. In addition, the program uses its data to inform and advance curricular changes. Examples include elimination of a "phases" approach to the curriculum and implementing a core and area of

emphasis approach. The program added new courses to strengthen the program, revised the research components of the program and developed a Handbook for Action Research. The program has sustained evaluations of excellence from the Dean of the Graduate School.

Criterion 3: The program documents sustained achievements in expanding the curriculum with rigorous advanced courses and options offered through lectures, laboratories, seminars, forums, practicum field experiences, internships, and partnerships with education, business, and industry. Rating = 4 to 5. The evidence demonstrated sustained achievements in expanding the curriculum.

3a-Sustained Mission and Planning Leadership: Articulates a clear mission; aligned with current and future trends in the discipline; states the program's strengths. Rating = 5. The program explained the process it uses to review and advance its mission as part of its annual program retreat. The mission review section also explained how discussion of the mission is then translated into departmental committee goals that address discipline changes. The program most recently updated its mission in 2012. The Board agreed that the program met the mission criteria and felt it was an exemplary accomplishment.

3bi-Administrative Leadership: Documents how its administrative structure and leadership advance the quality of its curriculum. Rating = 5. The report provided an effective summary of how administrative duties are organized so that program leaders effectively collaborate to achieve and advance program quality. The chair reported that a Graduate Coordinator position was added in 2008 upon the advice of the Dean of the College of Education and Professional Studies and the Graduate Dean. The addition of a Graduate Coordinator for the program has contributed substantially to advancing the quality of the program because the Coordinator maintains a focus on issues of graduate education as a priority. Chair and coordinator hold weekly meetings to review duties and responsibilities and ensure that issues of graduate education are prioritized and addressed. The chair explained the coordinator's role in advancing graduate assessment, advancing graduate student research, and developing the new reading certificate program. The examples documented the program's sustained ability to advance the quality of graduate study.

3bii-Graduate Faculty Leadership: Documents the significant role of the graduate faculty with advancing the curriculum through curriculum committees or appropriate curriculum processes. Rating = 5. The report described an effective Graduate Studies Committee that comprehensively evaluates and proposes advancements to the program. Numerous examples of graduate faculty input were provided. A faculty member is now serving as Off-Campus Cohort Liaison for the graduate program. The program holds regularly scheduled Graduate Faculty Meetings and uses sub committees to insure strong faculty input on the graduate program. There is an annual goal-setting meeting for the graduate program and all of the faculty have completed the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) related to research preparation. In addition, the program works to insure representation from other departments on thesis committees and has realigned department resources to include resources for student travel for research presentations and graduate awards. The examples confirmed evidence of strong and sustained involvement of the graduate faculty in guiding the graduate program.

3c-Sustained Curricular Leadership by External Review: Sustained excellence based on external reviews as appropriate to the mission/discipline. Rating = 5. The program documented 4 types of external review used to guide the program. These included accreditation through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, use of an Advisory Committee of alumni to advance the program, use of the annual Illinois Board of Higher Education Review, and also input from the Reading Practicum. Each of these external reviewers assist the program with maintaining currency, maintaining high standards, and remaining connected with teaching professionals. The examples confirmed evidence of strong and sustained involvement of the external groups in guiding the graduate program.

3d-Sustained Capstone Leadership: Requires a rigorous capstone appropriate to the mission and documents the impact of each of its capstones on the quality of learning in the degree program. Rating = 3. Note that providing evidence of implementation of the capstones over the sustained

period is required in a Full Review. The report provided a comprehensive review of how each of its capstones, the action research project in ELE 5900, the thesis via ELE 5990, capstones related to specific options in the program such as the theory-to-practice assignments incorporated in language arts and social studies methods, and the Illinois Reading Teacher Content Test offer evidence the candidates successfully integrate the content of their various courses into an integrated whole as they conclude their study. The expectation that every candidate will complete one or more capstones confirmed use of capstones to enhance program rigor. Verifying the capstones have been in place for the sustained period will confirm achievement.

3e-Sustained Student Leadership: Fosters participation of its graduate candidates on student advisory boards. Rating = 4. The program documented a history of student leadership through the Graduate Student Advisory Council and further noted that a candidate from the MSED in Elementary Education has been selected as Student Dean of the Graduate School in 2010. In addition, Dr. Carrie Dale, a member of the graduate faculty and representative on the Graduate Student Advisory Council serves as faculty liaison to GSAC. These achievements indicate sustained commitment to student leadership.

3f-Sustained Alumni Leadership: The program documents how it fosters participation in alumni programs sponsored by the Graduate School Alumni Advisory Board. Rating = 5. This was an area of exemplary leadership. The program's alumni are fully engaged with the program. The program has an annual alumni awards program, a program newsletter, and an annual meeting with alumni at the state conference to retain strong alumni connections. In addition, several impressive scholarships funded by alumni donations are available. The program also noted that alumni were responsible for funding the program's new facilities. The program has consistently had its alumni selected for Graduate School Alumni Awards. Alumni relations were considered an impressive strength of the program. Finally, program alumni contribute to the program via an Alumni Advisory Board. The many opportunities for alumni to engage with the program confirmed sustained achievement in this area.

3g-Sustained External Partnerships: Sustained external partnerships appropriate to its mission; assets of partners advance the program's quality. Rating = 5. The report provided a list of the program's external partners who contribute to the program. Examples included the Department of Educational Leadership, the Charleston School District, the Department of Secondary Education and Foundations and the East Central - EIU Reading Council. These examples verify sustained achievement using partnerships to advance the program.

Criterion 4: The program documents sustained achievements in research/creative activity with graduate students and faculty. Rating = 4. The evidence demonstrated sustained achievements in research/creative activity with graduate students and faculty.

4ai-Research Productivity: Has an annual research productivity goal and documents that its candidates meet or exceed the completion of those products. Rating = 4. As part of the discipline's research commitment, students experience a culture of research across the graduate curriculum by producing research through one of two capstone projects; the thesis or the action research project. The program documented that during the sustained period, students produced a yearly average of 14 capstone projects and a range of 6-23 capstone projects. In addition, students also produced 7 publications/presentations with faculty and 4 independent projects. The program noted that it strives to have students produce 2 theses, 10 action research, and 3 non-capstone projects (publications, presentations) annually and is satisfied that it is achieving its goals.

4aii-Research Engagement: Graduate candidates achieve a sustained record of scholarships through presentations, performances, or exhibits. Rating = 4 to 5. The program has developed and sustained a culture of research as evidenced by the new Handbook for Action Research and requirements to produce research as part of the program's capstone. Students know they are expected to engage in research. The program requires that projects must be submitted and meet expectations to complete the degree program.

4b-Research and Travel Grants: Rating = 3 to 4. Clarification that the program has been active in pursuing research and travel grants during the sustained period will be required in a Full Review. The program has a sustained history of earning research travel grants to support student research presentations through programs in the discipline, in the department, in the college, and the Graduate School.

4c-Showcasing Scholarship/Creative Activity: Rating = 5. The program documented that students are presenting their work at regional and national conferences as noted previously in this report. Examples included the Midwest ATE and International Reading Conference. The program uses the Graduate Exposition, its on-line journal, and the College of Education and Professional Studies Research Fair to showcase its projects. The program demonstrated a sustained effort to showcase scholarship.

4d-Awards Participation: Rating = 4 to 5. The program has a sustained record of earning awards that confirm the criteria were met. Examples include Distinguished Graduate Students (2008 – 2012), King-Mertz Research/Creative Activity Award in CEPS (2011), and Master's Thesis Award in CEPS (2011)

Criterion 5: The program documents a sustained record of developing opportunities for the discovery and application of knowledge with graduate faculty members who reflect the University's teaching and mentoring priority and who have a record of research/creative activity and professional service. Rating = 5. The evidence demonstrated sustained achievements in a sustained record of developing opportunities for the discovery and application of knowledge.

5a-Coordinator Leadership: Rating = 5. The report documented the leadership at the department and University levels. Examples include service as a member of the Council on Graduate Studies, service on numerous CGS Awards Committees, and service on a CGS leadership committee titled the Enrollment Quality and Diversity Board. In addition, the Coordinator serves across numerous departmental committees including assessment and syllabi development. Finally, the Graduate Coordinator was instrumental in developing the Reading Certificate and advancing the Assessment Plan.

5b-Graduate Faculty Scholarship: Rating = 5. The report provided a summary of the scholarly contributions of the faculty, the grant success, and awards earned for scholarly work. The conference presentation record was especially impressive with 105 over the 3 year period. The report documented the productivity and leadership contributions of the faculty.

Exemplary Achievements Exceeding Criteria Expectations

The Review Board's analysis of Criteria 2 through 5 indicated that these criteria appeared to have been met. The Review Board noted several exemplary achievements.

- Criterion 2a and 2b CASA Assessment and Graduate School Assessment: The development of assessment rubrics was considered exemplary and served as a model of best practices for other graduate programs. The rubrics are being used effectively to guide program development.
- Criteria 3d Capstones and 4a Research Engagement: The Handbook for Action Research and the On-line Journal tied to the completion of capstones were considered exemplary ways to conclude the program while simultaneously engaging students in research. These were impressive additions that offer an exemplary model for other programs.
- Criteria 3b Administrative Leadership and Faculty Leadership: The impressive administrative collaboration between the Coordinator and Chair in combination with the use of an impressive subcommittee structure to address graduate study needs was considered exemplary administrative structures that are advancing the quality of study in this program.

Areas that must be Clarified or Improved for a Full Review

- Criterion 1 Quality and Diversity: During a full review the program needs to insure that all of the criteria were met for the sustained three-year period
- Criterion 1ai Recruitment Plan: It is critical that the program team provide clear and concise evidence that it has specific enrollment goals and that its enrollment goals have been achieved during the sustained period
- Criterion 1bi Assistantship/Scholarship Management: The Program needs to ensure that its assistantship program was successful with attracting full-time candidates during the entire sustained period and provide more details regarding the specific teaching, research, or service responsibilities performed that enhance the graduate degree experience for these candidates.
- Criterion 1c Matriculation: the Program needs to provide clearer evidence that its students are completing the program as planned and that it has an effective way to track part-time candidates who may step out and then return.
- Criterion 3d Capstones: The program clearly has exemplary capstones; however providing evidence of implementation of the capstones over the sustained period is required in a Full Review
- Criterion 4b Research & Travel Grants: Clarification that the program has been active in pursuing research and travel grants during the sustained period will be required in a Full Review.

Scale Definitions

- Standard: Standard means the program has an identified goal(s), targeted performance, or expected processes that it is intentionally seeking to meet.
- Sustained Period: Refers to meeting the standard three (3) or more years.
- Exceeds Standard: Means that the program has achieved a level of performance that is higher than, or better than, the targeted goal, performance, or process.
- Meets Standard: Means that the program has achieved the identified goal(s), targeted performance, or expected process.
- Standard Not Specified: Means that the reviewers failed to show that the program has an established goal, targeted performance, or expected process.

Scale

- 5 = Exceeds Standard **and** Exceeds Sustained Period
- 4 = Meets Standard **and** Meets Sustained Period
- 3 = Meets Standard **but** Not Sustained Period
- 2 = Fails to Meet Standard
- 1 = Standard Not Identifiable by Reviewer

Contact the Dean of the Graduate School if you would like to arrange a time to discuss the Consultation Report.