School of Education and Intervention Services
Program Review Committee Report

The School of Education and Intervention Services prepared a self-study following program review guidelines. An external review team reviewed the self-study and other documents provided. They interviewed unit personnel and university administrators, and submitted a written report. The Program Review Committee (PRC) read the self-study and the external report. A PRC committee representative solicited feedback from the department chair and faculty members regarding the self-study and external report. This document reflects the PRC’s findings and recommendations.

SUMMARY OF THE SELF-STUDY

The School of Education and Intervention Services traces its roots to the founding of the University as a normal school in 1910. Since 1999-2000 it has been one of four schools in the College of Education and Human Development (from 1985-1997, the College of Education and Allied Profession). The School consists of two divisions, the Division of Teaching and Learning (DTL), with 30 faculty positions, 2300 undergraduate majors, and 500 graduate majors; and the Division of Intervention Services (DIS), with 23 faculty positions, 500 undergraduate majors, and 200 graduate majors. Many activities of both divisions—including undergraduate teacher-preparation—are influenced or governed by teacher-licensure requirements of the State of Ohio. The newest such change—a requirement for up to 12-semester hours of new reading courses for the undergraduate majors in both divisions—illustrates the extent to which the School and its faculty are influenced by state policies. Since licensure requirements changed very substantially in 1998, the School decided to collect self-study data from fall 1998 through summer 2003.

Mission

As its broad mission, the School seeks “to advance learning through high quality professional programs for prospective and practicing educators and counselors, at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Our faculty embrace the notion that graduates should be prepared to engage in effective decision-making, problem-solving, and creative thinking in an ever-changing, culturally diverse, and technologically advancing society.” The School seeks to pursue that broad mission by (among other things) “providing exemplary teaching and education experiences,” “analyzing, evaluating, and modeling leadership . . . and professional development,” “generating, integrating, and disseminating knowledge through research [and] service,” cultivating and maintaining “productive relationships with schools, agencies, [and] organizations,” and “advocating for . . . access for all individuals and their families to appropriate education and intervention services” (p. 3).
The DTL mission statement echoes the School mission statement with regard to the preparation “of early childhood, middle childhood and adolescent educators, as well as literacy specialists for all levels of formal education;” and it stresses “development of the reflective practitioner” through (among other things) use of technology, meeting the needs of a diverse population, research and dissemination of effective teaching and learning principles, and collaboration among educators (p. 3). The DIS mission does not so much reflect the School’s broad mission as adapt that mission so as to emphasize the Division’s commitment to advocacy for access to education and intervention services: “The mission [of DIS] is to advocate for and participate in effecting access for all exceptional individuals and their parents to free and appropriate special education and related services. DIS will pursue that goal by (among other things) preparing special education teachers, developing new knowledge through research, cultivating relationships with schools and agencies, and participating in professional leadership (pp. 3-4).

The mission of the School exists in a complex relationship with the College’s Vision Statement, the University’s Vision Statement and Core Values, and the Vision Statement of the Ohio Department of Education. There is little discussion of this matter, but some significant points of congruence are evident between these statements (as they are sketched on pp. 4-6) and the School’s broad mission. There is little discussion of the distinct relationships of the Divisions to the University mission in the report’s separate sections on Centrality to University Mission (85-86, 172-173).

The School’s Climate of Change

Change and the need to respond to change are significant parts of the College environment. For instance, there have been three different deans and six different assistant or associate deans since 1994, when Dean Sternberg was appointed and began discussions leading eventually to a major reconfiguration of the College.

The School and both its divisions have, in the years covered by the self-study, had to respond to a major change in Ohio’s licensure requirements (effective 1998) and related changes, such as those the Educational Testing Service made in the Praxis examinations for prospective teachers, an increased requirement in reading for prospective teachers, and increasing complexity in the relationships of the College and DTL with other colleges and departments involved in the preparation of teachers.

Considerable structural change has been, and continues to be, a fact of School life. The present four-school structure of the College was adopted in 1999, following four years of planning and development by the College. Within three years, the School’s two-division structure had been judged ineffective, and reconfiguration efforts are now well underway to disband the School and establish DTL and DIS as separate schools.

The Chairs of both divisions—individuals who have been alternating as School Director—strongly support the reconfiguration, which they see as a move back to a more desirable organizational arrangement that was set aside in the 1999 reconfiguration of two separate departments into one school. Program leaders in both divisions essentially echo
that sentiment. All these people see the move to independent schools within the college as positive: eliminating a layer of administration; emphasizing the traditional tenuring units (as the pre-1999 departments become the new schools); and not reducing cooperation and joint efforts (which, they say, were good before 1999 and are expected to be good in the future).

The Self-study Report

The self-study report was developed by a small group charged to draft in consultation with other faculty. Predictably, because it had already decided to divide itself into two schools, the self-study had little information or evaluation regarding the current school, for instance about: policies governing relationships between divisions and between the divisions and the School and the College; school activities and resources in support of divisions; College policies and resources in support of the School. Rather, after some eight pages, the self-study volume divides into independent sections about the two divisions, and no overall conclusion brings a school perspective to the information and judgments of the two main sections.

Much similarity of language exists in parts of the DTL and DIS reports, including the sections about assessment of learning outcomes and a number of goals and action steps in the concluding Unit Plan sections (pp. 103-07 and 181-85). The summary treatment of faculty accomplishments in both sections (pp. 55 and 145) obscures the scholarly and professional profiles of faculty by reporting books and book chapters in a single category. The main self-study volume is rich in descriptive information and comparatively lean in evaluation, some of the most pointed and useful of which appears in the presentations of program strengths and weaknesses in DTL tables 24 and 25 (pp. 70 and 75) and in DIS tables 55 and 56 (pp. 158 and 162). The lack of overall conclusions means that there are no overall school perspectives about the judgments and priorities stated and implied in the DTL and DIS reports.

The appendices volume provides additional details (most of it centered on DTL) on personnel policies, governance, programs of instruction, and student assessment. Many of these documents seem to describe the situation in the pre-1999 Educational Curriculum and Instruction department, rather than the present policies and approaches of the School’s two divisions. The Appendices-Vitae volume provides faculty CVs, organized by division.

Division of Teaching and Learning

DTL offers the B.S. degree programs in early childhood education, middle childhood education, adolescent/young adult education, foreign language education, business education, and marketing education; there is significant involvement of other colleges and departments in many of these majors. Undergraduate majors have doubled since 1998 (from 1770 to 3322), with the major growth in the early childhood, middle childhood, and adolescent/young adult programs [p. 25]–each of which is among the largest majors at the University. Students are primarily from Ohio (98%), women (76%), and full-time students
(86%); the 7% non-white minority students include 2% African American, 2% Hispanic, and 2% unknown.

DTL offers M.Ed. degree programs in classroom technology, reading, curriculum and teaching, and business education. It offers the Ed.S. (specialist) degree in reading and mathematics supervision. [N.B. This degree has been changed recently. According to files in Registration and Records, the Specialist in Education currently includes choices of three “fields,” as follows: Educational Administration and Supervision, Reading, and School Psychology.] Graduate enrollment has more than doubled since 1998 (from 155 to 428), with most of this growth coming in curriculum and teaching (from 67 to 309 students) [tables on 35-39]. Students are primarily from Ohio (94%), women (86%), and full-time students (61%); the 11% non-white minority students include 3% African American, 6% Hispanic, and 3% American Indian. Most students enter with degrees from Ohio colleges and universities. A significant number of part-time graduate students (39%) are in-service teachers from the northwest Ohio area.

The number of full-time instructional staff–currently 30–has increased from 22 in 1998. Between 1998 and 2003, the number of non-tenure line teachers also has increased to the point that 37% of the instructional staff is non-tenure track and 30 part-time teachers teach DTL courses. Faculty members have six-course equivalent loads and all except first-year faculty are involved in advising. Faculty members also are much involved in service roles within the College and across the University. The summary of research and publication on pp. 56-57 shows that, since May 2000, all but two of 22 tenure-line faculty members have three or more professional accomplishments (publications, conference papers, grants, editorships, etc.). The size of the faculty limits DTL’s ability to oversee student teachers with faculty members, something DTL notes as an intractable problem solvable only with the addition of an unreasonable number of new lines.

DTL has clearly articulated general learning outcomes for undergraduate and graduate students (Tables 26 and 27, pp. 77-78, Appendix I). But the report indicates that the University’s efforts promoting student learning outcomes have not been well received because of mismatch between what is expected in SAAC reports and what is mandated by NCATE and ODE, and because of the perception that there is no follow-up to reports that have been filed.

The DTL report ends with brief discussion of seven planning goals (pp. 103-107). A number of the goals seem rather generic (indeed, some are essentially the same as goals in the DIS unit planning section). These goals are discussed in reasonable detail, and some of them–Goal 2, reformulating policies and procedures and Goal 4, seeking technological enhancements for a broad range of purposes–seem particularly important for a new school. On the other hand, a number of areas highlighted as program strengths and weaknesses (tables 24 and 25, pp. 70 and 75) do not seem to be part of the DTL unit plan, nor do some matters of high concern in the document (e.g., the future of the Weber Reading Center and of EDCI 100 and 121).
Division of Intervention Services

DIS offers a complex array of B.S. and M.Ed. programs as well as endorsement programs. These are delineated compactly in the exhibit on page 108.

The number of undergraduate student majors has declined by about 40% since fall 1998 (from 494 to 295), in part because new licensure requirements eliminated some dual majors. Students are primarily from Ohio (95%), women (91%), and full-time students (96%); the 7% non-white minority students include 3% African American, 1% Hispanic.

The number of graduate student majors has increased by about 21% overall since fall 1998 (from 184 to 224) because DIS development of new “cohort” groups caused strong growth in the Intervention Specialists program and because of modest growth in the School Psychology program. Students are primarily from Ohio (89%) and women (83%). There are nearly as many part-time as full-time students (41% and 59%); the 22% non-white minority students include 15% African Americans.

The number of full-time instructional staff—currently 23—may appear unchanged since fall 1998, but the current figure includes four people who joined the faculty since 1992. Faculty members have six-course equivalent loads and all except first-year faculty are involved in advising. Faculty members also are much involved in service roles within the College and across the University. The summary of research and publication on p. 145 shows that, since May 2000, all but two of 21 tenure-line faculty members have three or more professional accomplishments (publications, conference papers, grants, editorships, etc.). A number of individuals administering funded grants do comparatively little publishing.

DIS has clearly articulated general learning outcomes for undergraduate and graduate students (tables 57 and 58, pp. 165-166). However, the report indicates that the University’s efforts promoting student learning outcomes have not been well received because of mismatch between what is expected in SAAC reports and what is mandated by NCATE and ODE, and because of the perception that there is no follow-up to reports that have been filed.

The DIS report ends with brief discussion of four planning goals (pp. 181-85). A number of the goals seem rather generic (indeed, some are essentially the same as goals in the DTL unit planning section). Generally, these goals are developed in little detail. A number of areas highlighted as program strengths and weaknesses (tables 55 and 56, pp. 158 and 162) do not seem to be part of the DIS unit plan. The narrow focus of Goal 4, using technology for teaching and assessing student portfolios, may restrict the benefits technological enhancements could bring DIS (in managing information, for instance). And one goal essential for the DIS seems absent from the unit plan: review of governance and procedural matters and reformulation as appropriate for an independent school within the College.
The external evaluators found the School made up of a “strong faculty with a critical mass of promising young scholars.” They describe the faculty as involved in teaching and scholarship, as well as “numerous grant awards, preservation of traditional undergraduate and graduate programs, adjustment to licensure and testing policies, and the establishment of field-based cohort programs.” Leadership in the School and divisions is solid, they said, mentioning the current directors specifically, and noting the importance of the various “coordinators [who] assist in the administration of programs.” Within the individual divisions, they felt that faculty “complement and are bonded to each other by a shared mission: to prepare the best and brightest educators for Ohio’s schools.” And they felt that over the past decade the School had “demonstrated resilience in meeting education imperatives of our time” and that both faculty and administrators have been “participating simultaneously in unprecedented ‘sea changes’ of two worlds: academia and public schools.” Nevertheless, they noted, prevailing opinion in DTL and DIS “is that the College and University will be better served if the divisions become separate schools.”

The student body, the evaluators said, “is wholesome with a flourishing graduate enrollment and a growing undergraduate enrollment, fluctuating somewhat in several programs. Over the last six years DTL enrollment increased nearly 40 percent. During the same period DIS undergraduate student enrollment decreased substantially while graduate student enrollment increased.” They noted modest ethnic diversity in the student body in fall 2003–4.4% minorities in DTL and 5.6% minorities in DIS (overall figures which mask the higher diversity among graduate students, especially in DIS). Similarly, they noted the lack of ethnic diversity among the faculty. Overall, the external evaluators were optimistic about the future for DTL and DIS:

The School of Education and Intervention Services has been a solid unit representing the College and University extremely well. . . . If the strengths of the School can be maintained and the weaknesses addressed, the School could become a top 5 program among its peer institutions.

Before delineating strengths and weaknesses, the evaluators devoted several pages to the completeness and adequacy of the self-study. Overall, they wrote that “the report does not adequately showcase the strengths of the unit;” that “it is not apparent that the inherent benefit of engaging in self-analysis, which is the intent of a self study, was maximized during the process;” and that “some of the faculty and coordinators we interviewed did not seem to have input or opportunity to read the self-study report.” They noted that “[n]o structure seems to exist in the College or School that systematically collects, stores, accesses, analyzes, and disaggregates various forms of data over time to prevent duplication.” As a result, even though a “good deal of rich descriptive data, charts and tables were presented,” there were significant gaps in substantial data. Here are examples of missing or limited information mentioned by the evaluators:

- “Data was missing from the Self Study that described outcomes and the impact of programs.”
• “The data on graduation rate was not disaggregated by colleges, schools, and divisions [making difficult] an understanding of how long it actually takes a student to graduate from an EIS degree program designed for 4 to 4 1/2 years.”
• “Information on peer institutions in the state and nationally, as determined by the University and College, would help in understanding statements about how the Division compares to other universities.”
• “No evidence was presented about the effectiveness of collaborative relationships within the school and with the College of Arts and Sciences.”
• There was “[n]o information or long range plan for the evaluation of the cooperating teachers, university supervisors, on-site coordinators, or any other personnel involved in implementing the field component of EDTL.”
• “No information was presented on the last evaluation of Martha Gesling Weber Reading Center” nor on “the evaluation of the Cohort Programs.”
• “No information was presented on the evaluation of the Graduate Programs,” such as how long it takes “students to complete the degree? What is the graduation rate? How many of them advance on the job after earning degree and how many are promoted or hired into higher level jobs?”
• “Information is needed on the evaluation of the Education Specialist Degree, generally” and on the evaluation “that informed the decision to eliminate the education specialist degree in mathematics supervision.”

Strengths. The external report identified the following as strengths of the School:

• “Faculty productivity in teaching, research, and service appear consistent with the mission and goals of the college and university, and are comparable to other institutions with similar missions. Faculty members make scholarly contributions nationally and are very productive in securing external and internal grant funding.” The junior faculty includes a “critical mass of outstanding people.”
• There is a strong mentoring process for junior faculty, something which was discussed “favorably by the junior faculty” and to “which senior faculty [are] committed.”
• The quality of School and Division administrators is high.
• The Division has shown responsiveness to state and national mandates, the success of which is reflected in “students’ success on the Praxis exams . . . and the number of grant awards.”
• There is good flexibility of “[a]dmistrators and faculty alike . . . amidst changes in deans, and reorganization of the College, [and . . .] state and national mandates that changed the teacher education enterprise significantly.”
• The school is successful in grantsmanship, which in DTL has involved nine faculty members and resulted in funds ranging “from a high of $1,558,141 in 1999 to a low of $330,591,” and DIS has increased grant awards “from 5 in 1998 to an average of 15 [averaging $808,000] each year from 1999 to 2003.”
**Weaknesses.** The external report noted the following as significant weaknesses of the School:

- There seems “little vision for how the unit will accomplish the College and University mission over the next seven years,” and “goals and mission are not clearly articulated and appropriate within the unit’s plans for the next seven years.”
- There is “[n]o unit or program assessment plan to provide data to direct programmatic decision-making.”
- There is “[n]o organized pathway for data and information sharing among Colleges or within the university and the College of Education.
- There is “[n]o systematic plan to increase the number of field sites nor to evaluate the quality of those field placements.”
- There are no formal policies clarifying “workload and its relationship to allocation of effort as reflected in faculty evaluation” and giving a “rationale for providing release time for administration and coordination responsibilities.”
- The Division seems not to “take [SAAC] seriously” and does not “produce adequate SAAC reports.”
- There is a “[l]ack of full-time, tenured faculty involvement in field placement observation and supervision.”

**Recommendations.** The external report included these statements among its final list of recommendations intended to enhance the School’s future endeavors:

- Engage faculty, staff, students, and administrators in on-going discussions about the information in the self-study and use it as a platform for continuous future planning and decision-making.
- Establish a data unit in the College with sufficient staffing and resources.
- Develop a plan to systematically evaluate all programs and support units, including the field placement office.
- Create an aggressive and energetic plan to recruit and retain ethnic minority faculty and students.
- Identify peer and aspiration peer institutions for benchmarking in all essential areas of the School (student enrollment, test scores, graduate programs, faculty productivity, faculty hiring, and salary comparisons).
- Clarify differences and similarities between workload and allocation of work effort, and present this as a written policy for faculty and administrator reference.
- Examine overlap in coordinator positions’ roles and tasks, and reduce where possible.
- Make informed decisions about closing or merging programs and reallocating resources.
- Examine the relationships between programs and grants, how funded projects impact resources, and how they contribute to the vision and mission of the College and University.
- Work with University administration to identify rewards and incentives for winning grants and expanding the use of indirect costs.
- Nurture and expand international programs.
• Hire full time faculty members in the Educational Technology program.
• Involve more senior faculty and those with on-going classroom experience in methods courses and field experiences.
• Evaluate the quality of student advising from the students’ perspectives.
• Increase the amount of time students [spend in] field experiences, if possible.

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE FINDINGS

The Program Review Committee concurs with the external evaluators that the School has a strong faculty—appropriately productive in research and, particularly, in securing grants supporting School programs—that is committed to serving Bowling Green State University and its students and that is looking forward to providing this service within the organizational structure of two separate schools. The following findings and recommendations are intended, in large part, to increase the effectiveness of those new schools as they interact and compete with other schools within the overall policies and procedures of the College.

The PRC is pleased to report that the Dean of the College has already begun to take concrete actions to address two significant findings in this report: an inadequate data base for program planning and evaluation and the DIS and EIS disconnection from the university’s student assessment process. The Dean also expresses general agreement with the other findings and indicates that he will take an active role in implementing recommendations of this report.

Findings Requiring Action

1. Reconfiguration into Two Schools. The PRC has concerns that the reconfiguration went forward without regard to program review. The decision to eliminate the School by elevating each division to school status was made (and approved by the University) after just three years and without the sort of detailed information and focused evaluation the scheduled program review could have made available to the faculty and administration. Rather, the decision seems to have been driven by general perceptions about unwieldy unit size, inequitable unit representation within the College, duplicated committee work, and the like. (This finding is addressed in recommendations on “policies for school administration” [1], “college-wide policies for administration” [2], and “college-wide policies for evaluation and planning” [4]).

2. Information Gathering. The self-study and external report suggest that while the School and its divisions have much information about themselves, they lack other important data and, even more significantly, they lack administrative systems (at both College and School levels) as well as general evaluative approaches to help them make sense of the information so that they can use it as a basis of planning and decision-making. (This finding is addressed in recommendations on “information-based planning” [3] and “college-wide policies for evaluation and planning” [4]).
3. Approaches to Planning and Program Evaluation. The self-study and external report suggest that the School lacks strong and effective traditions and approaches in planning, decision-making, and program evaluation. (This finding is addressed in recommendations on “information-based planning” [3], “college-wide policies for evaluation and planning” [4], “prioritization of school programs” [5], and “diversity” [6]).

4. Future Operation as Independent Schools. DTL and DIS face complex challenges involving personnel and other resources, including the new state requirement to teach additional reading courses; the need for more faculty involvement in the Educational Technology Program and in field-work supervision; the goal of reducing high teacher-student ratios; and needed improvements in facilities. The difficulty of finding resources for these and other needs will not diminish as the divisions become independent, and so competitive, schools within the College. Probably, this situation will not unduly strain faculty relationships, since each new school has such recent memories of its operation as an independent department within the College. But the situation may become complicated as the two new schools evolve their own approaches to planning, management, and self-interested politicking, particularly if one school evolves approaches that make it significantly more effective in winning resources for its programs. Each new school should bear these matters in mind as it attends to issues of administrative structure, information gathering, planning, and program evaluation mentioned in other findings. The College should provide overall structure for the development of appropriate school policies and procedures, as well as ongoing review of policies and procedures, in order to help both new schools operate effectively within the five-school College. (This finding is addressed in recommendations on “college-wide policies for administration” [2], “information-based planning” [3], and “college-wide policies for evaluation and planning” [4]).

5. Variations in Program Strength and Effectiveness. Each new school has some programs that show considerable growth (DTL’s undergraduate Early, Middle, and Adolescent majors and its graduate Curriculum and Teaching program, for instance, and DIS’s Intervention Specialist program) while others are not growing and some seem to be in decline. (This finding is addressed in the recommendation on “prioritization of school programs” [5]).

6. The Ohio Base of School Programs. That the undergraduate and graduate programs of DTL and DIS chiefly enroll students from Ohio may be seen as strength in state service—something to build on in planning and resource allocation—or, particularly with regard to graduate programs, as a sign of low national profile that should be addressed in planning and resource allocation. (This finding is addressed in the recommendation on “prioritization of school programs” [5]).

7. Ethnic Diversity. Ethnic diversity among students varies across the School, with greater diversity in DIS, partly because of its development of special grant-funded programs and its on-site cohort programs in urban areas. There is little ethnic diversity among faculty members. And there seems little awareness (particularly in DIS) of the need for conscious planning of efforts to increase faculty and student diversity. (This finding is addressed in the recommendation on “diversity” [6]).
8. Student Assessment. The disconnection both DTL and DIS seem to show from assessment of student learning within the University’s structure seems, at least in part, related to the fact that the divisions are required by ODE and NCATE to spend much time and energy working with other forms of student assessment. The fairly hostile faculty perception that SAAC provides little guidance, direction, or feedback likely reflects a kind of assessment fatigue of people working within the exacting requirements governing teacher-preparation programs. (This finding is addressed in the recommendation on “university assessment of learning outcomes” [7]).

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Policies for School Administration
Since the decision to elevate the divisions to school status was based on perceptions about such things as unwieldy size, limited representation within the College, and excessive committee assignments, both new schools should develop policies to prevent such conditions from developing in the future by the subdivision of discrete programs or emphases within the two schools. These policies should be developed within the two new school charters and provided to the dean for review and recommendation, in consultation with the provost. [Bears on Finding 1.]

2. College-Wide Policies for Administration
The College should develop policies, or clarify and publicize existing policies, that (a) assure that the College’s several schools understand the various responsibilities of schools and colleges (for information gathering, planning, resource allocation, student assessment, faculty recruitment and review, program evaluation, and the like) so that they are all accomplished, without duplication, at school and college levels; (b) restrict administrative structures below the school level to curricular matters; (c) maximize organizational effectiveness for all schools in the College; and (d) assure that significant organizational changes in the future are made in light of information and evaluation from the University’s program review process. Copies of these College policies should be provided to the provost for review and recommendation and used by the dean in reviewing the charters of the College’s several schools. [Bears on Findings 1 and 4.]

3. Information-Based Planning
As they begin the transition to independent schools within their College, DTL and DIS should revise their respective unit plans, in both focus and specificity, so that they can serve as functional guides in future planning. They also should review their current approaches for gathering and managing data (such as those in the evaluators’ list of missing or limited information above). In light of that review, each new school should (a) identify the kinds of information needed; (b) identify existing systems or implement new systems to collect these data; and (c) develop procedures to use these data in planning for the future, building cases for the support of critical programs, and evaluating program effectiveness. By an appropriate date established by the dean, each school should prepare a report on its progress and give it to the dean for review and recommendation. [Bears on Findings 2, 3, and 4.]
Future self-studies of the several schools within the College should provide information and evaluative judgments about (a) how the school operates in relation to other schools, the College, and other units and colleges with which they cooperate; (b) the consistency of school policies and practices across the College; (c) the consistency of College policies toward the schools; and (d) the effectiveness of College support of schools with regard to information-gathering and resources (including technological) necessary for planning and program evaluation. This recommendation should be noted by future Program Review Committees and made clear to school directors at the time of future program reviews. More immediately, the dean should inform the various school directors of this recommendation so that they can begin appropriate preliminary planning. [Bears on Findings 1, 2, 3, and 4.]

5. Prioritization of School Programs
With the direction and support of the College, each of the two new schools should, over the next two years, carefully study which of its programs provide the greatest opportunity to become or to continue to be strong (perhaps nationally-recognized) programs, and which of them may need to be reduced or curtailed in order to allow key school programs to develop. The detailed conclusions of this study should be reported to the dean for review and recommendation by an appropriate date established by the dean in consultation with the provost. Information from this study should be part of the rationale in the plans and resource requests of the two new schools beginning August 2005. [Bears on Findings 3, 5 and 6.]

6. Diversity
With the direction and support of the College, each of the two new schools should work, over the next twelve months, to assure (a) that increased diversity of the faculty and the student body is an important planning goal; (b) that this goal is embodied in the action steps of other planning goals; and (c) that it is enacted in school policies and procedures bearing on recruitment and retention of faculty and students. Results of this work should be reported to the Dean for review and recommendation, at a date to be agreed on by the provost. [Bears on Findings 3 and 7.]

7. University Assessment of Learning Outcomes
The Dean of the College and the directors of the five schools should explore with the Provost and SAAC the possibility of developing greater connection and coherence between evidence of student assessment acceptable to the University and the student assessment required by ODE and NCATE. The effort, here, should be to achieve an understanding by January 2005 or other appropriate date established by the dean. [Bears on Finding 8.]

The two new schools to be formed from the School of Education and Intervention Services should report annually to the Dean of Education and Human Development, with a copy to the Provost, on the implementation of these recommendations.