Below are our responses to the report of the PRC. We will respond to the PRC Findings (pp. 9-11) and the PRC Recommendations (pp.11-12). We will provide responses to each finding and recommendation by number and title and refer you to the attached document that contains the PRC report. We will then provide a reflective summary of our responses to the report and to the program review process in general.

Responses to the Findings

1) Reconfiguration into Two Schools.
This finding implies that we should have waited to move into two schools until we had the benefit of the university program review process. The finding assumes that this change was made without detailed information and focused evaluation which is simply not true. We have been collecting data and evaluating the benefits and liabilities of being one school for nearly four years. Both our recent NCATE accreditation review in 2002-2003 and our own internal review clearly demonstrated the need to divide into two schools and thoroughly supported this change. We trust this response will clarify our position regarding reconfiguration.

2) Information Gathering:
We agree that there is a significant problem with information gathering, but this is a university-wide and college-wide problem not just a problem for EIS. The university and the college need a much stronger, centralized data gathering and dissemination process. There was no consistency across the college with regard to which data are gathered by whom and for what purpose. The College is currently developing this type of data base and our schools will be involved in this process. At the time of the self-study and external review, this process was under consideration, but it had not yet been implemented.

3) Approaches to Planning and Program Evaluation
This finding appears to be based on the assumption (and perhaps misinterpretation of the self-study) that the university program review process drives our program planning and evaluation. However, our Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) and NCATE drive our program planning and evaluation. Our planning and evaluation are standards-based and therefore strong, effective, systematic and well within the traditions of our profession. We will work to link our external accreditation processes with the University Program Review process. We will work on this and discuss it over the next year.
4) **Future Operation as Independent Schools:**  
Because EDTL and DIS have always had a positive relationship that balanced competition, cooperation and collaboration both when we were each separate departments and when we were in the same school, (EIS), we do not perceive this to be a significant problem. This is because we have essentially operated as separate units, independent of each other for the past six years.

5) **Variations in Program Strength and Effectiveness:**  
We will continue to monitor planned growth and prioritization because we believe this to be an accurate finding. There will be a continuing effort to prioritize our programs and report the results of this effort by May, 2005.

6) **The Ohio Base of School Programs:**  
Currently, EDTL has three (3) of the largest programs (pre-majors and majors) in the university (ECE, MCE, and AYA) and DIS is among the top 10 largest in the university. Is this finding suggesting that we get even larger by adding more out of state and/or international students or should we be eliminating a segment of our Ohio students from our programs and replacing them with out-of-state and/or international students? We believe that we would be better served by an examination of the size of our programs to determine if we can balance quantity and quality with existing resources. If feasible, our programs should be down-sized in areas where there is an over supply of teacher candidates (e.g. ECE, AYA: Social Studies) and supported in recruiting students for high need areas (e.g. special education, physical sciences (AYA), math (AYA), foreign languages and business education/marketing education both within Ohio and across the country.

7) **Ethnic Diversity:**  
Because we “recruit” students from within the population of students the university recruits, we believe this is a university-wide problem and not just a problem for EIS. The finding is also contradictory because it cites DIS as working to increase diversity through its grant-funded programs and on site cohorts then criticizes DIS for having “little awareness of the need for conscious planning of efforts to increase faculty and student diversity”. This last statement is simply incorrect. We believe we do focus on targeted recruiting to bring more underrepresented populations to our programs. We also attract students with disabilities because we believe that they are also an underrepresented population, which is currently unrecognized as such by the university. We will work with Marti Gaustad, associate dean, EDHD, to develop a recruiting brochure that reflects our emphasis on diversity by May, 2005.

8) **Student Assessment:**  
Student assessment is already an integral part of the requirements we follow for our SPAs and NCATE. We are deeply committed to assessment within the boundaries of these requirements identified by our accrediting agencies. The SAAC process was never emphasized within the College prior to this year (2003-2004). We believe this finding is accurate, and we concur with it.
Responses to PRC Recommendations

1) **Policies for School Administration:**
This is an excellent recommendation that is largely being done as a natural outcome of establishing the two schools.

2) **College-Wide Policies for Administration:**
We agree with this college-wide recommendation, but we question its relevance to our program review.

3) **Information-Based Planning:**
We agree with this recommendation but see it as part of a much larger College and University-wide problem and not as a problem indigenous to EDTL and DIS.

4) **College-Wide Policies for Evaluation and Planning:**
We agree with this recommendation but see it as part of a much larger College and University-wide problem and not as a problem indigenous to EDTL and DIS.

5) **Prioritization of School Programs:**
We agree with this recommendation overall, but we do this as an on-going process for the self-studies that are required by NCA, our SPAs and NCATE. However, this recommendation implies that our programs are not nationally recognized. What evidence from the self-study or from the external reviewers supports this, and how does this relate to prioritization?

6) **Diversity:**
Diversity planning continues to be a major priority of the schools and the College. It is one of the College’s five major themes. We also strongly recommend that the University add to its definition of diversity to include persons with disabilities. Diversity is also a major emphasis within our SPAs and NCATE. We will continue in our efforts to successfully meet these standards as well.

7) **University Assessment of Learning Outcomes**
We agree with and support this recommendation.

Reflective Summary of EIS Responses

As might be discerned, we perceive the PRC report to contain a mixture of excellent recommendations, accurate findings, misinterpretations and areas that need further clarification. For that reason along with several others we will present below, we find the entire program review process to be of questionable and limited benefit for our schools in particular and similar programs in general. The entire process is highly duplicative of what we already do for NCATE, ODE and our Specialized Professional Associations. Therefore, we would strongly recommend that in the future, program review be correlated with our NCATE and ODE review and that the findings of our accrediting agencies be allowed to substitute for or be correlated with the PRC report.
Clearly, EDTL and DIS are more similar to professional schools (e.g. law, engineering, pharmacy, etc.) than we are to computer science or history. We should be reviewed as professional schools governed by professional standards and not as a department that may have one undergraduate and one or two graduate programs. For us, program review should be governed by our national standards and not by financial and/or economic exigencies.

Because any group of external reviewers that would be appropriate to review us would be operating from an NCATE perspective, it would make considerable sense to use our NCATE reviewers as external reviewers. Our NCATE external reviewers would be able to speak specifically to our program needs which, unfortunately, did not happen with the EIS Program Review this time. As a result, none of the findings or recommendations in the PRC report refers to specific programmatic (e.g., ECE, MCE, AYA, BUSE, H.I., M.M., Rehabilitation Counseling, Guidance and Counseling, etc.) issues or concerns but rather to administrative, recruitment, organizational, and informational issues and concerns. This appears to be a school or division review and not a program review. There is very little in the PRC report that gives us any sense of direction programmatically. So, in conclusion, we urge the PRC to revisit how they view and review professional schools such as EDTL and DIS and allow us to use NCATE reviews instead in the future.