



TO: Dr. Lisa Taylor, Graduate Coordinator
Master of Science in Family and Consumer Sciences

Dr. Karla Kennedy-Hagan, Chair
Department of Family & Consumer Sciences

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 Family & Consumer Sciences
Karla Kennedy-Hagan, Ph.D., Chair
Lisa Taylor, Ph.D., Graduate Coordinator
Linda Simpson, Ph.D., Team Member
Betsy Pudliner, Ph.D., Team Member
Lucy Campanis, Ph.D., Team Member
Jeanne Snyder, Ph.D., Associate Dean College Business & Applied Sciences

Council on Graduate Studies Review Board
Nora Pat Small, Ph.D., Review Board Chair
Wesley Allan, Ph.D., Review Board Member
Clinton Warren, 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 23, 2012
Consultation Report November 30, 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 Master of Science in Family and Consumer Sciences graduate program prepares students through teaching and experiential learning, research, and theoretical application to improve our diverse, global society. The program's integrative approach is designed to prepare graduates

for leadership positions by advancing critical thinking, reflective practice, knowledge, and communication skills.

Overview and General Summary: The CGS Review Board considers that the MS in Family & Consumer Sciences meets many of the criteria established to achieve the First Choice Designation, but more information and documentation is required to verify if many of the criteria were met for the sustained period. Providing clear and concise evidence that the program meets these areas for the sustained three-year period is essential in preparation for a Full Review. Details are provided in the report that follows. Overall, the Program Committee is to be applauded for a report that illuminated the program's strengths.

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 = 2 to 3. The Review Board identified Criterion 1 as an area that would require more documentation during the three-year sustained period to verify achievement. The individual areas below provide additional details of what would be required.

Table 1 – Application, Enrollment, and Diversity Summary

Enrollment Data	F 2009		F 2010		F 2011		3 Year Mean	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
# of Applications	69		70		65		68	
# of Admission Offers	50	72	60	86	55	85	55	81
Admission Yield	25	50	26	43	20	36	24	44
Continuing Candidates	79		49		50		59	
Total Enrollment	94		75		65		78	
Diversity Rates Based on Total Enrollment								
Undergraduate Diversity	33	35	13	17	9	14	18	23
Domestic Diversity	0	NA	2	3	0	NA	1	1
International Diversity	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	3
Gender Diversity	89	95	65	87	58	89	71	91

1ai-Enrollment Management/Recruitment Plan: A clear plan for meeting application, enrollment, and diversity goals. Rating = 2 to 3. The program documented use of standard recruitment strategies. These included correspondence, word-of-mouth, and faculty recruitment in undergraduate classes. The program also discussed special recruitment events such as meeting with all current and prospective students, participation in Graduate School Information Day and in EIU Career Day. The Coordinator explained that she uses these special events to review questions and provide guidance. The program also uses its Website as a recruitment tool. The program reported securing an average of 90 applications during an admission cycle. The program also noted that it admits all candidates who meet expectations and has an acceptance rate ranging from 72 to 87% over the 3-year cycle. The program also noted strong diversity rates ranging from 15 to 24%. The Coordinator reported that the program works hard to seek male applicants, but did not specifically describe its efforts. The program noted that most applicants are from the state of Illinois and that it had a Chicago cohort that ended and was not continued. The program further explained that the dietetics option became an independent degree program in 2008. The rating of 2 to 3 indicated that during a full review, the program should offer a clear indication of its annual intended application and enrollment rates so it is very clear that the program meets or exceeds its intended enrollment expectations. The report and the presentation only noted that the program was “maintaining the number of applicants, admitting the students with the right background, GPA, and goals that make them a good fit for the program, secure acceptance from 90-100% of those offered admission, and retains 95% of candidates per year.” It was not clear to the Board, since enrollments had declined during the past 3 years, if the program intended to enroll fewer students. The Board also felt that the program's recruitment processes were standard and that there was no indication that it was using best practices in its

discipline or that it planned to implement strategies to attract more male applicants. All of these issues should be clearly addressed in a full review.

1aii-Enrollment Management/Selection Criteria: A rationale for selection decisions; fulfilling its expectations for quality. Rating = 2 to 3. The program provided its selection criteria that included undergraduate GPA, letter of intent, 2 letters of recommendation, and a resume or vita; however, according to the information provided during the presentation, only the Coordinator is involved in the admissions process and the faculty are only consulted for provisional admissions. The Coordinator also explained why the program offers provisional opportunities to some candidates. The Review Board recommended that the program consider adopting best practices by using a faculty engaged process to rank candidates for admission. In addition, the Review Board recommends that the program consider adopting selection criteria for degree candidates that would be higher than the minimum required by the Graduate School so it could increase its selectivity and reserve provisional candidacy for those with undergraduate GPAs from 2.75 to 2.99. The Review Board noted that First Choice Programs use these best practice models and use higher admission standards. Adopting these approaches would strengthen the quality of the student body as required for this criterion. In addition, developing a clear and concise plan to attract more male applicants would demonstrate the program's commitment to diversifying its applicant pool.

1aiii-Enrollment Management/Acceptance Rate: Desired applicants accept admission offers. Rating = 4. The program documented (as noted in 1ai above) its admission offers are accepted and documented an acceptance rate ranging from 72 to 87% over the 3-year cycle

1b-Assistantship/Scholarship Management: Rating = 3 to 4. The program documented a sustained record of assistantship management, but additional details will improve the program's consideration during a full review.

Table 2 - Graduate Assistantship Summary

Academic Year Assistantships	2009	2010	2011	Mean	Current Rate
Annual Allocation	6.5	5	4	5.2	\$865
Competitive Awards	0	0	0	0	
Grants or External Awards	2	1	0	1	Variable
Philanthropic Awards	0	0	0	0	
Other Campus Assistantships	5	4	5	4.7	Variable
Total Academic Year	13.5	10	9	10.8	
Summer Assistantships					
Annual Allocation					
Competitive Awards	1	0	0	.3	\$865
Grants or External Awards					
Philanthropic Awards					
Other Campus Assistantships	3	2	0	1.7	Variable
Total Summer	4	2	0	2	

1bi-Assistantship/Scholarship Management/Annual Awards: Attracting desired applicants; teaching, research, or service experiences add value to the degree. Rating = 3 to 4. The program reported that its 4 annual assistantships are offered and accepted by the best and brightest applicants and further noted that students who choose not to attend the program often note they would have attended if offered funding. Graduate assistants support the teaching, research, and service mission of the program. The Coordinator explained that service to the textile and child development labs and support for the FCS student organization are essential duties of graduate assistants. The Review Board recommended that in a full review, the program provide significantly more details about the teaching, research, and service assistance performed and explain how performing these duties strengthens their academic experience. The Board also

suggested that the program provide data and evidence that assistants have more competitive credentials than those who are not offered awards.

1bii-Assistantship/Scholarship Management/Competitive Awards: Competitively acquires additional assistantships; attracts additional desired applicants; teaching, research, or service add value. . Rating = 4. The program provided evidence that it secured grant funding in the past to support 3 additional graduate research assistants during the sustained period and was working to establish new partnerships with local businesses to support additional awards. The Review Board noted that these additional awards were effectively attracting applicants to the program and providing research experiences that enhanced their degree program.

1c-Matriculation Management: A targeted graduation rate; candidates consistently meet the program's degree completion expectations. Rating = 3. The report and presentation noted a matriculation rate ranging from 23 to 62 during the sustained period and provided an explanation regarding the impact of the dietetics program. The report also provided information on the implementation of rubrics to assess student performance on comprehensive exams to provide better feedback to promote degree completion and the creation of a "Frequently Asked Questions" document to better prepare candidates for the comprehensive exam process. Finally, the program reported the creations of the "Toolkit for Success" resource for students to further enhance exam performance. The Review Board recommended the program develop matriculation expectations for a 3 to 5 year period that included its expectation for part-time candidates so it could more clearly track its graduation rates and show that it is meeting its expectation.

Table 3 - Matriculation Management

Entering Term	#	Degree Completion Term							
		S 2009		S 2010		S 2011		F 2011	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
F 2008	43	3	7	25	58	28	65	29	67
F 2009	25	0	NA	0	NA	13	52	13	52
F 2010	26	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA	3	12
F 2011	20	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA	0	NA

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 maintains contact with its alumni and can track the placement of its graduates. The program verified that its graduates secure placements in Ph.D. programs, secondary schools, in colleges and universities. It also verified that its alumni hold positions as administrators for human service programs, directors of non-profit agencies, caseworkers, human resources managers, psychotherapists, addictions counselors, legal advocates, intake coordinators, domestic violence counselors, extension specialists, public health nutritionists, claims analysts, social workers, as college administrators, and as clinical dietitians. Based on the analysis, the Review Board believed the program documented a sustained record of placements and could improve its report in a Full Review by providing a detailed list and completing a table similar to the one below.

**Table 4 – Three-Year Graduate Placement Rates
(Program's Summary)**

Year Completed	#	Employed		Adv Study		Unemployed		Unknown		Goal	Status
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
S 2008											
S 2009											
S 2010											

Total											
-------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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 = 3. The evidence demonstrated that the program appears to be meeting the criteria, but has not done so for the sustained 3 year period. See details below.

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 = 4. The Board noted the program has developed an assessment plan that addresses CASA guidelines and now is also addressing the learning outcomes identified by the Council on Graduate Studies. The Program documented that in response to the CASA Director, it has developed rubrics to assess written and oral comprehensive exams, improved rigor of program by reviewing and updating the core curriculum and adding a statistics class, and adding assessment data to collect and analyze for program improvement. Based on these findings, the Board verified this 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. The program reported that it added all of the assessment goals required by the Council on Graduate Studies in 2011-2012. The program needs to collect assessment data in all areas for a sustained period of 3 years to meet this criterion.

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 = 3 to 4. While the program has a process for reviewing and advancing its mission, the Review Board felt that the current mission was too broad and difficult to articulate. Additional details are summarized in that section of the report. Many areas of this section were believed to have been met; however several other recommendations are also included in the appropriate section. The overall rating reflects the range of performance.

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 = 3. The Review Board acknowledged the work of the faculty to develop a new mission statement in 2010 that would meet the guidelines of the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences, as well as values that were important to the program. These include concepts such as improving society for individuals, families and societies; however, this type of broad mission statement is difficult to align with career preparation and pathways that can be assessed to determine if the program's mission is actually being achieved. The Review Board recommends that the program return to the mission statement and add language that could better focus the mission and clarify the career pathways this program is preparing students to enter and find ways to assess if the mission is being met.

3bi-Administrative Leadership: Documents how its administrative structure and leadership advance the quality of its curriculum. Rating = 4. The report provided an effective summary of how administrative duties are organized to ensure effective collaborations among program leaders to sustain program quality.

3bii-Graduate Faculty Leadership: Documents the significant role of the graduate faculty with advancing the curriculum through curriculum committees or appropriate curriculum processes. Rating = 2 to 3. The Review Board recommended that a full review include more significant details about the subcommittee structures and roles and responsibilities that faculty have regarding the development of the curriculum. While the role of the Admissions Committee was

outlined, it was not clear how the faculty are integrated with processes used to advance the curriculum. For example, does the program have a Graduate Curriculum Committee, a Graduate Assessment Committee, or a Graduate Capstone Committee or related committee structures that insure that faculty members in collaboration with the Coordinator and Chair have input into the curricular processes. Earlier in the report, it was noted that assessment data was used to drive curricular change. A clear description on the role that the faculty played in determining that the update was best served by a new course in statistics, or a description on how the faculty developed the rubrics that assessed with the comprehensive exams would be useful. Additional details on the frequency of meeting, how the faculty are asked to participate in the creation of exams, how the thesis process is used, or how the internship process is reviewed would be required to better define the role of the faculty.

3c-Sustained Curricular Leadership by External Review: Sustained excellence based on external reviews as appropriate to the mission/discipline. Rating = 3. The Review Board commended the program on the use of an Advisory Board to help guide its decision making; however, it appears that the Board is not yet convened; therefore the sustained period has not been met.

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 = 4. The report provided a comprehensive review of how each of its capstones; the thesis, the independent study, the comprehensive exams, and the internship all contribute to the quality of the program. The Coordinator explained that if the student selects the internship or independent study she/he must also complete comprehensive exams. The independent study capstone is an end product such as a resource guide, video, or data to guide new programming. The internship requires 150 clock hours of work at the agency guided by an on-site supervisor. The comprehensive exams include a 2-hour written exam and a 2 hour oral exam. Candidates must answer the written questions at acceptable levels in order to move to the oral questions. The Review Board noted that each capstone requires the candidate to achieve an appropriate level of scholarship in order to be eligible to complete the capstone. Completion of the capstone provides evidence that expected program competencies have been met. Each capstone is evaluated to insure that each retains its rigor and value at the end of program experience. The report confirmed sustained achievement in this area.

3e-Sustained Student Leadership: Fosters participation of its graduate candidates on student advisory boards. Rating = 2. The Review Board asks the Team to re-examine the criteria in this area as there was no documentation provided to specifically address the criteria.

3f-Sustained Alumni Leadership: The program documents how it fosters participation in alumni programs sponsored by the Graduate School Alumni Advisory Board. Rating = 2. While the report noted that Jayne Ozier was honored with an Outstanding Graduate Alumni award in 2012, there was no further review of how the program engages its alumni. The Review Board asks the Team to re-examine the criteria in this area as well because there was no documentation of achievement in this area.

3g-Sustained External Partnerships: Sustained external partnerships appropriate to its mission; assets of partners advance the program's quality. As with criteria 3e and 3f, the Review Board asks the Team to re-examine the criteria in this area as there was no documentation provided to specifically address the criteria.

Criterion 4: The program documents sustained achievements in research/creative activity with graduate students and faculty. Rating = 4. The Review Board felt that is was a strong area for the program with most of the criteria being met. See areas for details in each area.

4ai-Research Productivity: Has an annual research productivity goal and documents that its candidates meet or exceed the completion of those products. Rating = 4. The program provided evidence of completing 19 theses since 2008 and noted that each candidate must provide a presentation in a core class in research and statistics. The report documented that this criterion was met.

4a-Research Engagement: Graduate candidates achieve a sustained record of scholarships through presentations, performances, or exhibits. Rating = 4. The program has developed and sustained a culture of research. Students know they are expected to engage in research. The program requires that students present their work and all members of the graduate faculty are invited. In addition, some faculty open the thesis defense sessions so all faculty can attend. The evidence supported this criterion has been met.

4b-Research and Travel Grants: Rating = 3 to 4. The program has initiated a history of earning research and travel grants to support student research presentations through programs within the Graduate School and through travel support through the department. The report noted that 2 students received Williams Travel Grants (2008 and 2012). The Review Board advises that the department clearly mark the departmental support as travel grants to better document the support and for the program to continue its competition for Graduate School grants. Providing clear documentation during the sustained period would strengthen this section.

4c-Showcasing Scholarship/Creative Activity: Rating = 4. The program has a sustained record of programs to showcase student scholarship both on and off campus. On campus examples included the Graduate Exposition, the Graduate Video Showcase Series, FCS 5900 (Research Methods) where all candidates are required to showcase their work during a class poster presentation event, and FCS 5901 (Statistics) where all candidates are required to showcase their projects with an oral presentation. The Coordinator reported that during the past three years, students have showcased their scholarly work in venues beyond the University, including the Illinois Council on Family Relations, Illinois Association of Family and Consumer Sciences; National Council on Family Relations. The evidence suggested that this criterion was met.

4d-Awards Participation: Rating = 4. The program provided evidence that candidates have earned awards for the quality of their work. Examples included that candidates received the Outstanding College Thesis Awards in 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012. In addition students earn annual Distinguished Student Awards. The report also explained that candidates earn college or departmental awards but did not provide enough detail regarding how many of these awards had been earned during the sustained period. Providing clear documentation during the sustained period would strengthen this section.

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 = 4 to 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 an impressive list of Coordinator leadership roles at the department, university, and discipline levels. Examples included services as a member of the Council on Graduate Studies 2007-2010, Chair of the Council on Graduate Studies 2009-2010, member of the Faculty Senate 2010-present, member of the Committee on the Assessment of Student Learning 2007-2010, member of the School of Family and Consumer Sciences' Executive Committee 2009-present, member of the Feminism and Family Studies Section Officers of the National Council on Family Relations (premier professional organization for family services) 2005-present, chair of the Feminism and Family Studies Section of the National Council on Family Relations (2009-2011), member of the National Council on Family Relations' Program Planning Committee (2010 and 2011), chair of the FCS Family Services Screening Committee 2011-2012, recipient of an Achievement and Contribution Awards in 2007 (research) and 2010 (service), member of the 2012 Achievement and Contribution Awards Committee, Member of the IVP-ITS Screening Committee (2010-2011), Co-Chair of the Hamand Scholar Society Committee (2010-2012), service to the Executive Committee for the HOPE of East Central Illinois' Board of Directors (2009-2012), and recipient of the EIU "Dr. Ralph B. Weller Memorial Scholarship" award for service to Alpha Sigma Alpha sorority (2010). The report acknowledges the impressive service and scholarly contributions of the Coordinator and confirms that this criterion was met.

5b-Faculty Scholarship: Rating = 5. Faculty scholarship was well documented with 34 publications and 100 presentations. Examples included books, chapters, articles, and presentations the faculty members have completed during the past three years. The evidence further included contributions at state, regional, national, and international levels. The programs' faculty are active scholars who have contributed to the discipline through their scholarship. In addition, many have served in critical leadership roles on the campus such as CGS Chair and numerous additional leadership roles. The report acknowledges the impressive scholarly contributions of the faculty and confirms that this criterion was met.

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 5a Coordinator Leadership:** The Coordinator's comprehensive contributions to leadership across the campus and in the discipline were considered exemplary achievements that others should model.
- **Criteria 5b Faculty Scholarship:** The faculty have developed an model of excellence in scholarship for graduate students to observe and the Review Board commended the program's excellence in this area.

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 in this section 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 the program has specific enrollment goals and that its enrollment goals have been achieved during the sustained period including a plan for the recruitment of men.
- **Criterion 1bi Assistantship/Scholarship Management:** The Program needs to provide more evidence that its assistantship/scholarship programs were successful with attracting candidates during the entire sustained period and provide more details regarding program specific awards.
- **Criterion 1c Matriculation:** The Program Team needs to provide clearer evidence that its students are completing the program as planned and that it has an effective way to track candidates who may step out and then return.
- **2b Assessment/Graduate School:** The Program Team needs to insure that meeting the CGS assessment guidelines has extended throughout the sustained period.
- **3bi, Mission:** The Program should examine mission statements to insure that its mission statement is clear and that its assessment plan provides clear and specific evidence that the program is meeting its mission.
- **3bii Faculty Role:** The Program Team should provide clear evidence of the structures used to deeply involve the graduate faculty in the admission and curriculum decisions.
- **3c External Review:** The program should insure that the external review process has extended through the sustained period.
- **3e, 3f, 3g Students, Alumni, Partnerships:** The program will need to provide evidence to support these specific areas.
- **4b Research/Travel Grants:** The program should add information on department and college awards.

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 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.