

Report on the UW Tacoma Education Program Review September 20, 2006

Internal Reviewers: Julie Brines (Sociology, chair), Bruce Burgett (IAS, UW Bothell), Stuart A. Sutton (Information School)

External Reviewers: Phyllis J. Edmundson (Professor and Dean Emerita, Graduate School of Education, Portland State University), Gail Schneider (Professor and Chair, Dept. of Administrative Leadership, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee).

Review Process

The review committee was tasked with assessing post-baccalaureate degree and certification programs offered by the Education Program at UW Tacoma. At the time of review, these included a Teacher Certification Program (TCP), a Master of Education (M.Ed.), an Educational Administrator certificate (Ed Ad), and a Professional Certificate. In recent years, the TCP and M.Ed. programs each have drawn annual cohorts of 50-60 students, with approximately 20 students enrolling in the Ed Ad program each year. The more heavily-subscribed programs have been in existence the longest: The M.Ed. program began in 1992, TCP in 1994, Ed Ad in 2001, and the Professional Certificate in 2002-2003.

In advance of the UWT site visit (Feb. 28-March 1 2006), the internal members of the committee met with the director of the Program, Dr. Ginger McDonald. Because the Program conceives of its mission in ways that include service to local school districts and other community partners, separate interviews were conducted with administrators, teachers, and other personnel at the local district and school levels. In addition, a field visit was made to a local elementary school that hosts interns from TCP and the Ed Ad program; interns and others with program ties were interviewed at this school. The committee also sought input from community partners who are collaborating with Program faculty on grants and the development of internship opportunities. During the two-day site visit, members of the full committee met with tenure-track and adjunct faculty, field supervisors, staff, students and alumni of the program. Other interviews took place with allied UWT faculty in Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (IAS) and with campus administrators and faculty leaders familiar with the Program and its recent history.

The self-study upon which this review is based was submitted to the UW Graduate School in October 2004. In the year between submission of the self-study and this review, planning and growth of the faculty and changes to programs as foreshadowed in the self-study have continued. As a result, the review committee has been faced with three different impressions of the Program—the Program as we found it in the October 2004 self-study, the Program as we found it during the site visit, and the future Program where planning envisions it to be for the 2006-07 academic year. In the following report, we discuss the review committee's assessment of the existing programs of study as presented in the self-review, in

public documents, and through discussions with faculty, staff, students, alumni and community stakeholders. We will then discuss the Program's future plans for degrees, certificates and endorsements currently pending before the Graduate School.

History of the Program and Current Institutional Context

The UWT Ed Program was launched a few years after UW Tacoma opened its doors in 1990, and its rapid growth since then mirrors that of the Tacoma campus. The Program started in 1992 with three faculty members who developed the first degree offering – the Master of Education. A year and a half later, there were over 100 part-time students in the Program, with the unit reaching a target FTE of 35 shortly thereafter. By the time of the Program's first review (1998), there were six full-time faculty members supporting two degree/certification programs, and the unit was in the process of hiring a new director.

The 1998 review lauds the enormous amount of energy and talent brought to the task of building the Program, and the quality of teacher preparation that emerged as a result of this effort. At the same time, this earlier review identifies institutional factors that threatened to interfere with the Program's mission and growth trajectory. Among these were an "unreasonably high" faculty workload, funding formulae that did not adequately underwrite the true cost of student recruitment, training, and advising, and the lack of campus resources for grant support and staff development.

In the years since, both the University and the Program have made efforts to respond to these issues. The UWT campus now has a full-time grants administrator who is working actively with Program faculty. The staff we talked to seem satisfied with campus opportunities for professional development. And in line with the recommendations of a recent UWT self study, the Program has moved to re-position preservice teacher training as a degree option in their Master's program, which should result in more appropriate levels of funding and relieve some of the work overburden associated with TCP.

As is most likely typical of programs during the first decade and a half of the UWT campus's existence, the Education faculty had to exhibit extraordinary commitment to the startup of a new academic unit—building from scratch a faculty, curriculum, student body, and reputation. From nearly everything the review committee has observed, the faculty, administration and staff of UWT Education have done an excellent job of building a strong academic program and an exemplary reputation at UWT and in its Tacoma service area.

Nevertheless, some of the risks identified several years ago remain, and new pressures have emerged. The more long-standing risks derive from ongoing rapid growth in the scale of program operations with which resource allocations have not kept pace. Faculty workloads remain extraordinarily high as program-building proceeds at a brisk clip, largely in response to escalating demands from the local K-12 education community for well-certified teachers and administrators. Moreover, recent unfunded educational mandates and demands for accountability have imposed new reporting burdens on Program faculty and staff. This work

has proceeded without the benefit of an institutional history that might have provided a stable framework for internal policies and decision-making procedures.

Even given these formidable challenges, the achievements of the UWT Education faculty, administration and staff are substantial. Faculty, staff, and program alumni are making a very significant difference in the quality of K-12 education in the Tacoma area. For these contributions, the Program is deserving of great praise.

This review committee believes that the Program finds itself at this time in a transition between its early period of entrepreneurial building and a more stable period of strategic planning. The committee recommends that the Program adopt a model of measured growth that builds on its hard-earned strengths and solidifies community partnerships through teacher and administrator education and community service. The committee further encourages the Program to take a deliberative stance toward major program reform, one that relies on phased implementation and draws amply from the knowledge, expertise and input of program faculty and staff. In addition, the committee believes that the Program has reached a point where it is appropriate to develop and document carefully its internal procedures and policies.

In the sections that follow, we report our findings regarding the Program's degree options and the perceptions of faculty, staff, students and other constituencies about the state of UWT Education. This survey informs our assessment of the Program's pending reforms for the M.Ed. degree and our recommendations for the Program as it charts a future course.

Academic and Teacher Education Programs

At the time of this review, the Program offered the Master of Education degree (with four currently-available study options) and three certificate programs including the first-level K-8 Teacher Certification Program (TCP), the second-level Professional Certificate, and the Educational Administrator Certificate certifying principals and school administrators. It also offers an undergraduate minor in education that is not subject to this review.

K-8 Residency Teacher Certification Program (Residency Certificate)

The first-level Teacher Certification Program (TCP) was, at the time of review, a one year, full-time post-baccalaureate program leading to a *Washington State Residency Teaching Certificate* with a primary endorsement in Elementary Education and a supporting endorsement in Reading. UWT Education is planning this year to integrate the TCP into the M. Ed. degree program. We discuss this proposed change in a later section of this review.

UWT Education admits a cohort of TCP students each summer. Because the curriculum leading to teaching certification is highly sequential in structure, students are expected to consistently progress through the four quarters of the one-year program. Upon completion of the TCP course of study and the successful passing of the Praxis II examination for Elementary Education, UWT Education recommends a student to the Washington Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for a *Washington State Residency Teaching*

Certificate. This certificate is valid for five years during which the teacher must complete the Professional Certificate (see below).

Internship at a local school is an integral component of TCP student training. The program places students in internships with the Tacoma, Federal Way, Fife, and University Place school districts. Cooperating teachers at participating schools and field supervisors team with program faculty to provide students with on-site teaching experience supported by coursework and reflective seminars.

TCP was lauded by teachers and administrators in the Tacoma area for its emphasis on evidence-based practice, which TCP students carry into the field first as interns and later as newly-certified teachers. On a number of occasions, administrators in UWT's service area said that UWT was among the area's preferred institutions from which they hire new faculty. The program is viewed as being very attentive to changing demands on educators for accountability and for meeting standards of student assessment tied to recent educational reforms.

However, some concerns were expressed about the field-experience component of TCP, primarily around issues of coordination. For example, there is a perceived need for improved communication between supervisors and TCP faculty about course assignments that apply to the internship experience. Different "messages" from UWT faculty and field supervisors occasionally result in students having to do separate versions of work (e.g., two lesson plans instead of one) to satisfy disparate requirements. More broadly, there appeared to be few documented policies or procedures for field supervisors, although it was reported that a handbook for field supervisors was in development. And while district schools rely heavily, and appropriately, on UWT interns for knowledge transmission, tensions occasionally emerge between cooperating teachers and the interns they mentor, who are eager to import new practices into established classroom settings. Finally, tighter control might be exercised over the selection of cooperating teachers. In some school districts, principals recruit cooperating teachers; in other districts, any teacher who volunteers is assigned an intern. The review committee was told that compared to the "principal-recruited" cooperating teachers, the "volunteers" are of more-variable quality, and that this affects the quality of the intern experience.

Student-teacher internships involve many personnel who perform different functions in support of field training, so it is not surprising to learn that calibration of the internship experience with coursework and other aspects of TCP remains a challenge. Some tensions might involve tradeoffs that are difficult to reconcile. It was unclear, for example, how the UWT program might intervene to ensure more uniform quality in the mentoring of interns while preserving field opportunities across participating districts. But other lacunae in coordination and communication can and should be remedied. The committee encourages the Program to consider implementing some changes in this regard; we specify these in the Recommendations section of this report.

Master of Education (M. Ed.)

All students in the M.Ed. program complete a common five-course core equaling thirteen credit hours of study. In addition to the common core, the program provides a set of study options—each with its own prescribed set of courses. At the time of this review, the following study options were available: Special Education, At-Risk Learner, Science Education, and Integrated Curriculum. A Technology study option is currently suspended due to the loss of the qualified tenure-track faculty member responsible for this area.

The Program has a substantial revision to the M.Ed. pending before the UW Graduate School. We discuss in a later section of this review the Committee's observations with regard to these proposed changes.

Professional Certificate

The Professional Certificate is a second-level teaching certificate mandated by the State of Washington. Admission to the Professional Certificate program is through application to the UW Graduate School. Study for the Professional Certificate must be finished within five years of completing first-level certification (see TCP above). The Professional Certificate is available as part of the M.Ed. or as a Professional Certificate only. Course work for the Certificate is completed prior to the courses leading to the M.Ed. degree. Thus, a student wanting only the Professional Certificate may complete the certificate in one year and then discontinue study for the masters.

Several personnel working in local school districts were interested in seeing more resident teachers pursue second-level certification at UWT because of its excellent reputation for teacher training, but reported that it is viewed as “outrageously expensive” in comparison to alternatives available in the local area. Some interviewees reported that UWT is pricing itself out of the market for this credential.

Educational Administrator Certificate

The Education Administration option leads to a *State of Washington Residency Administrator's Certificate*. Admission to the Educational Administrator Certificate program is through the UW Graduate School. UWT Education admits a cohort of Educational Administrator students each summer. The Education Administration Certificate program is highly regarded in the service community for its rigor. The program is viewed as intense, and as offering a good match between coursework and field experience that strikes an excellent balance between theory and practice.

Among the program's perceived strengths is its emphasis on the education and training of principals to be instructional leaders with good management skills. The program draws substantially for its enrollment from emerging leaders in local school districts. In fact, the committee was told that local districts expect to rely on UWT in coming years to train

replacements for a large cohort of retiring principals, especially at the elementary and middle-school levels. District personnel also see a role for the program in building the candidate pool for assistant high school principals. In general, those we interviewed about the Ed Ad program consider it very important to the preparation of local school administrators.

In the course of this review, we discovered some interest within the Program in moving forward with plans to offer a Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.) in Educational Administration. Enthusiasm for such a move is no doubt linked to the high regard for EdAd Certificate program and demand from the local community of educators for doctoral-level training. The review committee believes, however, that initiating an Ed.D. program at this time would be a mistake. Despite the talents of UWT faculty in the area of Educational Administration, the Program has not assembled a critical mass of full-time tenured faculty with established research portfolios on whom successful doctoral programs rely for graduate advising and research training. In fact, the current Ed Ad program is run and staffed by nontenured faculty, including many part-time instructors. The requisite faculty resources are simply not in place to support a credible doctoral program in this area, and the review committee believes that the Program should concentrate on building faculty strength before it pursues the possibility of offering an Ed.D. degree.

Faculty

During the site visit, the review committee conducted formal and informal interviews with faculty. We met with assistant professors as a group, associate and full professors as another group, part-time faculty as a third group, individual faculty members in one-on-one sessions, and a few faculty members from other programs at UWT. As we have noted elsewhere in this report, the UWT Education Program is very lucky to have such a hard-working, diverse, ambitious, and entrepreneurial faculty, both full-time and part-time. The students with whom we met consistently singled out the effort and competence of the faculty as the greatest strength of the Program.

Our review of faculty vitae confirms these on-site impressions. In addition to shouldering the very large administrative load of an emerging institution and a rapidly developing program, the faculty carries a heavy teaching load, both formally in their classroom teaching and informally in their capacities as advisors, mentors, and initiators of community partnerships. They also maintain an impressive research profile. Whether this high level of administrative, teaching, and research activity is sustainable remains a perpetual question at new campuses like UWT. The faculty did report, however, that the campus and the Program seem to be moving in the right direction by providing some release time for junior faculty, as well as some cover for all faculty at different points in their careers. They also noted that more institutional support of core faculty endeavors would be of great benefit, including the clarification of procedures for securing and managing externally-funded research grants.

We were struck repeatedly during the site visit with how much curricular ground this relatively small faculty was being tasked with covering. There was some evidence that despite valiant efforts, the program did not have the breadth of personnel to deliver in practice what it offered on paper. In areas where a critical mass of 3-4 faculty members has developed (such as

Special Education), students reported great satisfaction; in other, thinner areas (such as Technology and Science), students were much less happy. Several students reported that they had entered the program with the intention of pursuing one emphasis, but were now (less happily) pursuing another because the first was inadequately staffed (though it continued to be advertised in the Program literature). A parallel problem manifested itself in our interactions with the faculty. When we attempted to follow up with many of them about how the Program was thinking about its planned build-out to 17 M.Ed. study options (discussed below), they seemed either to be unaware of that plan or to have little sense how it would be staged and strategically implemented.

In our discussions with faculty, some expressed satisfaction with the relative stability of the Program in the current moment and credited that stability to the way that decisions are made and carried out. Others described the same scenario differently, emphasizing what they perceived as a lack of consultation in both major and minor programmatic initiatives and, in some cases, faculty reward structures. Given our brief time on campus, it is difficult for us to gauge the history and relative merits of these opposing viewpoints, but we can say that divisions clearly exist among this relatively small faculty over questions of Program sustainability and governance.

The review committee believes that these divisions might be keeping the Program from doing its best work, and might also affect its ability to recruit and retain the best faculty available. If faculty cannot articulate a shared understanding of how the Program will grow and/or if the process of making decisions is not transparent, then some members of the faculty will become alienated from and even antagonistic to the Program's future directions. With respect to concerns about staffing and capacity, our sense as a committee is that the Program faculty does what it does extremely well. But we also fear that the Program claims to do more than it can deliver. Take as an example the Ed Ad track. Students and community partners were unanimous in their praise of this track. But it is a cohort-based curriculum staffed by one full-time untenured faculty member. While part-time faculty may do an excellent job, they cannot be counted on to build or deliver a sustainable program.

Staff

The members of the staff work on the frontlines of the Program. They are the first to interact with prospective students; they are the first to encounter unhappy students; and they are often the ones who provide continuity when faculty members are not on campus. In our meetings with the Program staff, we were impressed with their high level of dedication and professionalism, as well as their capacity to work collaboratively. It was very clear that they all care – individually and collectively – about the Program (and campus), its mission, and its students. Like the faculty, they are hard working, diverse, ambitious, and extremely competent. They reported satisfaction with their treatment by the institution as a whole, and were content with their opportunities for professional growth.

Given the pressure that is often borne by these staff positions, we were not surprised that they also reported a more extreme form of some of the disquiet expressed by the faculty.

Most notably, staff members emphasized the need for clarity in terms of the future directions of the Program and for commitment to following through on (implicit or explicit) curricular promises made to incoming students. They also highlighted the need for the Program and the campus administration to follow up on decisions with oversight of the logistics of implementation, including the timely updating of print and web-based information for current and prospective students. Finally, some staff reported unease with what they perceived as a tendency of the Program to move consistently toward new growth areas without having established firmly the sustainability and excellence of existing areas.

Our impression from these meetings was that the knowledge of the staff might not be sufficiently tapped in programmatic decision-making. Because staff members play an active role in administering many field sites, advising current students, explaining the program to prospective students, and dealing directly with student dissatisfaction and complaints, they accrue a wealth of knowledge about what works in the program – and what does not. Although faculty governance over curricular and programmatic planning ought to be central, those decision-making processes should incorporate staff insights and should include consideration of how those decisions will be implemented by staff. Our sense is that this is an opportunity that the Program is not currently taking full advantage of.

Students

The committee met with M. Ed. and TCP students in four different classrooms, as well as several former graduates of the Ed Ad program. Overall, we were impressed by the students' thoughtful remarks about the Program and its goals, their appreciation of the high quality of the faculty, and their commitment to talking with us about how things could be improved. Clearly, they have a strong sense of investment in the Program and are tremendously appreciative of what it is doing for them. As noted above, students' sense of satisfaction with the Program varied depending on the track that they occupied in it: those in Special Education were more satisfied than those in Technology or Science (largely because of the latter's limited course options). Similarly, those in the Master's program seemed happier than those seeking a Teaching Certificate, due in part to the greater cohesiveness of the former group.

The 1998 program review reported some student dissatisfaction with the connection between theory and practice, but we heard no complaints in this regard, nor did we get a sense that the students viewed any aspect of the program as a "hoop-to-jump-through." We did hear much discussion from the Master's students about limited course and faculty options in some areas (even as they highly praised the one or two faculty members in those areas). And we heard a consistent desire for more specialization and, at times, for more focus on the pragmatic aspects of classroom teaching. The latter comment emerged in a research-oriented course and may have betrayed a lack of clarity about the relation between research and practice. The Master's students also unanimously praised their faculty, though they distinguished between the full-timers and the part-timers, suggesting that the latter were less fully integrated into the Program and its goals. While this observation may be inevitable, it also may be a call for more

explicit learning objectives in and across individual courses and for better procedures for orienting part-time faculty to program-wide goals.

The comments of the TCP students were more varied. They applauded the Program's linking of theory and practice, its "great" and "committed" faculty, and the collaborative nature of its classroom based learning. But some students suggested that the Program was "too demanding," that there were factions within the faculty who adhered to antagonistic schools of thought about education, that some program requirements were unclear, and that finding financial support was a persistent problem. To be fair, nearly all of these comments were balanced by the remarks of others (that a "demanding" program is good; that faculty diversity is enlivening; and that the Program advisors did an excellent job of explaining the Program to students and of helping them to find funding). But the comments as a whole index the perpetual problem of creating coherence among students who arrive with diverse needs, expectations of the Program, and levels of commitment to its course of study.

These comments by the TCP students might become irrelevant since the program is scheduled to be phased out in the next year and to be replaced with a combined Master's degree. When asked about this change, students expressed general support, though many of them also indicated that the greater financial commitment (for graduate-level tuition) and the longer time to degree would have made the program unfeasible for them. This last comment is particularly worrisome since it echoed concerns voiced elsewhere by faculty and staff about how this transition might make the program more elite and less diverse, a tendency that runs directly counter to the program's (and the campus's) stated commitment to the model of a "metropolitan research university." In none of our discussions did we encounter anyone who had an answer to this problem: staff seemed to have differing and even contradictory understandings of what diversity meant; faculty were concerned, but seemed unsure what could be done. No one recalled a serious discussion of this emerging problem.

A different issue affecting students is linked to perceived disputes among the faculty over the theory and practice of K-12 teaching and learning. In the committee's discussions with students, alumni and employers, we were told of tensions between adherents of direct instruction and those advocating a constructivist approach, tensions that to students seemed irreconcilable and occasionally marred their seminar or field experiences. These tensions were also manifest in reports that some faculty members convey messages in class about acceptable as well as unacceptable points of view. As the Program moves key programmatic activities (e.g., TCP) into the Master's program, an emphasis on open, respectful inquiry will become increasingly important if the Program is to enhance its intellectual rigor. The Committee also thinks that an open atmosphere of inquiry will better prepare teachers to address the intellectual challenges of successful classroom practice.

Despite the abovementioned concerns, current students across the Program were generally high in their praise. Former graduates applauded the Program for the education it had provided them, and added that they had grown more appreciative of that education as they had moved forward in their professional careers. The last comment is, in many ways, the true measure of the Program's success. The challenge will be to maintain that level of success as the Program grows.

Cross-programmatic Alliances

The committee met with three members of the faculty and staff from areas outside of UWT Education: Katie Baird (IAS); Carol Hert (UWT Research Coordinator); and Robert Jackson (Chair of the UWT Faculty Assembly). These meetings offered a sense of the Program's alliances with other units on campus – both those that currently exist and those that might develop in the future. Clearly, there is a wide range of potentially powerful partnerships available between Education and IAS, particularly with regard to educational policy and administration. The Center for the Study of Education and Poverty (C-STEP), for example, could serve as a hub for this activity if its potential were tapped. Similarly, the research and faculty governance units on campus could provide coordination between programs (in the former case) and collaborative leadership opportunities for newer faculty (in the latter).

While these possible developments are promising, our sense is that they are currently not being animated. This translates as an impression that the Ed Program is going it on its own without tapping into campus-wide resources that would be extremely beneficial to faculty working in this relatively small unit (and trying to do so much in that unit). We recognize that this higher degree of coordination can seem daunting and may be perceived as “extra work,” but we believe that the pay-offs would more than equal the effort. Similarly, many faculty members reported that they had ties to UW Seattle, though few of those linkages appeared to be institutional. Wise coordination with Education (and related programs) at UWS could greatly benefit UWT as well.

Programmatic Proposals Pending before the Graduate School

The Ed Program has had a major curriculum revision proposal under review by the UW Graduate School to: (1) convert the Teacher Certification Program (TCP) from a post-baccalaureate program of study to a new Teacher Education study option within the M. Ed. degree; and (2) make other substantive revisions to the Master's degree program. Existing TCP courses were repurposed for graduate level and subject to the required curriculum review and approval, and conversion of TCP into a new study option within the M.Ed. program was approved by the Graduate School in May 2006.

Under the proposal, the general organization of studies leading to the M.Ed. will remain the same, with all M.Ed. students taking the same common core of courses and then completing coursework in one of five study options. There was some concern expressed by the review committee that the very broad student diversity of backgrounds and experience in the K-12 educational environment might have a negative impact on learning when brought together in core Master's level courses. Over the next few years, the Program will want to assess carefully the collective performance of students in the core of this reconfigured Master's program to identify any unintended impacts on learning, and to gather information that might enhance the design of the M.Ed. “core” given the newly-consolidated group of Master's students.

In addition, the review committee notes that changing TCP from a post-baccalaureate program of study to a Master's program might have a deleterious impact on the enrollment of

students from historically-underrepresented groups, who might be less able to pay the higher graduate tuition or commit to a program requiring additional time-to-completion. While a student in the new Master’s level “Teacher Education” program would be able complete the course work for the *Washington State Residency Teaching Certificate* and stop without completing the M.Ed. degree, such a student would nonetheless be paying graduate tuition for course credit that could previously have been earned at undergraduate tuition rates.

However, the review committee’s primary reservations about the proposal rest with the revised architecture for M.Ed. specializations beyond the “core.” This new structure consists of an array of “focus areas” (17) under each of the five study options. These focus areas are closely aligned to areas of certification and endorsement. According to the plan, a few of the currently-existing study options will be re-designated “focus areas,” to be subsumed under new study options. The results of the revisions are illustrated in the table below, with currently-existing study options displayed in italics. The “Certification/Endorsement” column identifies whether the focus area may fulfill the current Washington State Residency Teaching Certificate (Residency), the current Professional Certificate (Professional), or the current Residency Administrator’s Certificate (Ed Admin-Residency). A specific endorsement is identified in the “Certification/Endorsement” column following the “»”.

Study Option	Focus Area	Certification » Endorsement
Teacher Education	Elementary Ed Program	Residency » Elem Ed
	Elementary/Special Ed Program	Residency » Elem & Special Ed
	Secondary Education	Residency
At Risk	<i>At Risk Learner</i>	Professional
	ESL	Professional » English as a Second Language
	Reading/Literacy	Professional » Reading/Literacy
	<i>Special Education</i>	Professional » Special Ed
Science/Math	<i>Science</i>	Professional » Science/Biology/Earth Science
	Mathematics	Professional » Mathematics
	Middle Level Math/Science	Professional » Middle Level Math / Science
Humanities	English/Language Arts	Professional » English/Language Arts
	Middle Level Humanities	Professional » Middle Level Humanities
	Multicultural Education	Professional
	Social Studies	Professional » Social Studies/History
Leadership	Principal/ <i>Ed Admin</i>	Ed Admin Residency
	Teacher	Ed Admin Residency
	<i>Technology (suspended)</i>	Professional

The review committee finds it problematic that the Program is publicly committing itself in the proposed revisions to an array of study options/focus areas that may be unsupportable in the short-term. For example, the current Technology study option has been suspended due to the loss of a single tenure-track faculty member. In like fashion, the

conceptual and administrative lead for the Educational Administrator Certificate is currently filled by a nontenured faculty member of high caliber. A number of the new focus areas have no tenure-track faculty as leads and will rely on non-tenure-track faculty to staff these areas.

While the quality of the Program's non-tenure-track faculty is not at issue, the review committee observes that UWT Education's hard-earned reputation is put at risk by offering focus areas with no full-time, tenure-track faculty serving to anchor these areas, or having insufficient faculty numbers to nurture a robust and varied intellectual environment for many of these areas. The committee notes that the areas where the Program is best developed are those where they have achieved some faculty depth in terms of numbers.

Recommendations

Capacity: In different ways, students, staff, and faculty all expressed concern that the Program is promising more than it can deliver or, put differently, that the programmatic "vision" is not always successfully connected to the Program's mission or to clearly-established procedures for implementing this vision. The Committee has similar concerns about the programmatic reforms currently targeting the M.Ed. degree.

Recommendations:

1(a) The Program should review the new Teacher Education M.Ed. degree option (formerly TCP) at the end of its first year of operation.

1(b) As part of this review, the Program should file a report with the Graduate School that addresses impacts as they relate to the Program's mission to serve learners in diverse communities, and to its self-identified need to increase the diversity of its student body (Self Study, p.17).

2(a) The Program should create a strategic plan detailing how, when, and under what circumstances the proposed expansion to 17 M.Ed. study options will be put into operation. This plan should discuss the resources (staff and faculty) required to ensure the vitality of existing areas of strength while developing sustainable new curricular areas.

2(b) The committee encourages the creation of a plan that builds out a revised suite of M.Ed. study options in stages, and includes a working timetable for phasing in these options through new faculty and staff recruitment, along with any reassignment of existing personnel and resources.

2(c) We also strongly recommend that this planning include consideration of how the Program can build synergies across campus that will enable it to meet prospective curricular needs.

3. The Program should undergo another review by the Graduate School in five years.

Governance: When we recommend the immediate development of a detailed strategic plan, we recognize that the process through which that planning takes place is as important as the content of the plan itself. The Program is currently divided into faculty and staff factions that risk damaging its short- and long-term future. These divisions are exacerbated by unclear policies and procedures for communicating information about upcoming decisions, for soliciting input, and for ensuring participation in actual decision-making.

Recommendations:

4(a) Strategic planning should be taken as an opportunity to create working collaborations across Program factions, to build trust among all faculty and staff members, and to generate equitable leadership pathways for newer faculty.

4(b) If this process requires an external facilitator, then we highly recommend that one be used.

4(c) We recommend that these discussions also take campus-wide governance issues into consideration.

5. The Program should develop clear procedures for faculty and staff participation in matters of governance and, particularly for staff, program implementation. These procedures should permit flexibility in response to evolving resource and service environments while ensuring stability in the processes governing decision-making and program administration.

Curriculum Design: Student and staff concerns were expressed about program coherence and the clarity of certain degree requirements. Other issues arose over the orientation of part-time faculty and field staff to Program-wide goals. The Committee also felt that opportunities to recruit students through greater cross-program coordination were underdeveloped.

Recommendations:

6. Sustained efforts should be made to better integrate part-time faculty into the Program and to help calibrate their teaching with Program-wide goals.

7. The Program is encouraged to adopt clear and consistent criteria for culminating projects under the M.Ed. degree program.

8 (a) Mechanisms should be established to facilitate communication and coordination between teacher-education faculty and field supervisors, so that the latter need not rely on what interns report about course-related field requirements.

8 (b) To clarify roles, the Program should consider drafting a set of working policies and procedures for field supervisors.

9. The Program should consider building a student recruitment pipeline in partnership with the IAS Education minor.

Support and Development: Faculty in Education (and elsewhere) at UWT are both receptive to and wary about recent moves to enhance campus-wide support for faculty research. They are receptive because those moves are good; they are wary because they are not sufficient. Although staff were generally satisfied with opportunities for professional development, ensuring equitable access to these opportunities remains a priority.

Recommendations:

10. The University needs to do more to support the research of Program faculty, both in terms of seed money and other financial resources and with regard to the cultivation and administration of externally funded research support. Although not something that the Program can do alone, it should push for those changes and consider taking a leadership role in getting other UWT units involved.

11. The Program should work to develop internal pathways for individual and collaborative faculty and staff development, and in ways that ensure equal access to existing or new Program resources.

Diversity: The committee observes a disconnect between the prominence given to diversity in the Program's mission statement and self-study, and organized program practice. Individual faculty are involved in projects and partnerships that afford opportunities to serve and recruit from diverse communities, but the Program as an entity does little systematically to honor this mission.

Recommendation:

12. The Program should more aggressively a) pursue funding that supports outreach to underrepresented student populations, b) cultivate potential campus (e.g., IAS, C-STEP) and local school partnerships that extend and diversify recruitment pipelines, and c) revisit ideas for program options (e.g., a part-time/evening program for paraprofessionals) and forms of student support that target the needs of underrepresented groups.