



1600 Maple Street
Carrollton, GA 30118

Date of Visit
October 8-10, 2001

Response to the Report of Substantive Change Committee

March 7, 2002

Report Prepared by Ed.D. Committee

Sonja Bagby
Tena Crews
Gus Douvanis
Cher Hendricks
Marie Holbein
Deb Jenkins

Jon Marshall
Harry Morgan
March LaFountain
Paul Phillips, Director
Keith Tennant
Barbara McKenzie

Table of Contents

<u>SECTION I: PRINCIPLES AND PHILOSOPHY OF ACCREDITATION</u>	1
<u>1.2- APPLICATION OF CRITERIA</u>	
<u>I. Recommendation #1</u>	
Attachment 1 Committee Minutes January 16, 2002 and Memos	
Attachment 2 The UnCatalog	
<u>SECTION III: INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS</u>	3
<u>3.1- PLANNING AND EVALUATION: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS</u>	
<u>II. Recommendation #2</u>	
Attachment 3 Evaluation Plan	
Attachment 4 Core Competency	
Attachment 5 University Course Evaluation Form	
Attachment 6 Course Instructional Assessment	
Attachment 7 Curriculum Committee Minutes	
Attachment 8 Professional Portfolio	
Attachment 9 Ed.D. Graduate Survey	
Attachment 10 Student Survey of Services and Operations	
<u>SECTION I: PRINCIPLES AND PHILOSOPHY OF ACCREDITATION</u>	9
<u>1.2- APPLICATION OF CRITERIA</u>	
<u>III. Recommendation #3</u>	
<u>SECTION IV: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM</u>	10
<u>4.8.10- CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION</u>	
<u>IV. Recommendation #4</u>	
Attachment 11 Committee Minutes February 13, 2002	
Attachment 12 College of Education Faculty Handbook	
<u>SECTION V: LIBRARY AND OTHER LEARNING RESOURCES</u>	12
<u>5.1.1- PURPOSE AND SCOPE</u>	
<u>V. Recommendation #5</u>	
<u>SECTION VI: ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES</u>	14
<u>6.1.5- ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION</u>	
<u>VI. Recommendation #6</u>	
Attachment 13 Organizational Flow Chart	

STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA

Response to SACS Recommendations: Ed.D. Program

SECTION I: PRINCIPLES AND PHILOSOPHY OF ACCREDITATION

1.2- APPLICATION OF CRITERIA

I. Recommendation #1

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the University have adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints.

“During the course of the Substantive Change Committee’s visit, questions arose concerning whether the University had adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints. Further inquiry revealed that the University does have a number of policies that address written student complaints: Sexual Harassment, Civil Rights Grievance Procedures for Students, and Procedures for Appeals of Grade Determination and Academic Dishonesty. The Faculty Handbook also contains relevant policies, Dispute Resolution and Grievance Procedures, which delineate both a mediation process and a formal hearing process.

“However, during a meeting with faculty teaching in the Doctor of Education program, including the Program Coordinator, a question of how written student complaints were handled was answered by referral to the Doctor of Education Student Handbook provisions dealing with a Student Advisory Committee, not by reference to the University Student Handbook. The Student Advisory Committee, as described in the Doctor of Education Student Handbook, is not one that deals with written student complaints.

“At several places, including on pages 17 and 18, the Criteria contain language requiring that, where the Criteria mandates a policy or procedure, the policy or procedure be in writing, be approved through appropriate institutional processes, be published in institutional documents accessible to those affected by the policy or procedure, and be implemented and enforced by the institution.

“The Committee determined that the University has, by appropriate procedures, developed adequate written policies for handling written student complaints, but that they are not published in all of the appropriate publications, and that the faculty and administration of this program are unaware of all of these policies, and therefore do not implement and enforce them.”

Response

By Ed.D. Committee approval and implementation, as documented in Attachment 1 (Committee Minutes for January 16, 2002), the following have been carried out:

- The University’s policies for handling written student complaints have been or are scheduled to be published in the following documents: (1) *Graduate Catalogue* (2002-03); (2) *Student Handbook* (May 1, 2002); and (3) program Web site at <<http://coe.westga.edu/edd/grievance.html>> (February 22, 2002).
- The University’s policies, published in *The Uncatalog* as documented by Attachment 2 (*The Uncatalog*, pages 38-51), have been affirmed. The Ed.D. faculty in discussion of this recommendation have become aware of the University’s policies and have affirmed their commitment to student rights and to the policies for handling written student complaints. This awareness and commitment to the policies and procedures will be implemented and enforced when needed.
- Information concerning methods for addressing written student complaints will be routinely distributed at new student and faculty orientations.

SECTION III: INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

3.1 PLANNING AND EVALUATION: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

II. Recommendation #2

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the University develop and implement procedures to evaluate the extent to which formulated educational goals are being achieved and to use the results of these evaluations to improve the programs, services and operations.

“The University has a comprehensive system of planning and evaluation for all aspects of the institution. Recently, the University completed a strategic planning process that involved faculty, representatives of the non-academic divisions, institutional research, students, and a community representative. The resulting documents and goals related to that process were shared campus wide. Throughout the process and the final stages, documents were approved by the Faculty Senate and the administration alike. That effort documents the importance of the new doctoral program in school improvement to the overall vision and goals of the University as it moves into the future.

“The University has developed a clearly defined purpose for the Ed.D. program in School Improvement that is consistent with the University’s mission. Educational goals consistent with the University’s and the program’s purpose are clearly articulated in writing for each course within the curriculum and for the overall program. Procedures to evaluate the extent to which these educational goals are to be achieved are established and documented. Appropriate guidelines and procedures to evaluate the program’s effectiveness, including the quality of the student learning, research, and services, have been established.

“All academic programs in the College of Education are required to undergo a three-stage review process. A Board of Regents programmatic review is required every four years and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education is required every five years. In addition, the University has established a process of internal education program review. This process is broad-based and includes a Program Review Advisory Committee composed of faculty members, and also includes a formal self-study and external review.

“However, to date, the evaluation process for this new program has primarily been informal and anecdotal. Discussions have taken place between faculty members that have resulted in changes and improvements to the educational program, but documentation does not seem to exist. One major component of the evaluation includes the development of a student portfolio. Extensive study and discussion has taken place to ensure that the portfolio truly reflects the educational growth of the student and does not simply become a scrapbook. However, because the first cohort of students is only beginning its second year, no portfolios currently exist.

“Currently, the University has no formal procedure in place that captures the assessment results for either core competencies or programmatic effectiveness and the use of those results for improvement of this program.”

Response

We appreciate the encouragement and opportunity to formalize and make systematic our evaluation plan at this early stage of the Ed.D. program. We have recently approved and begun to implement such a process. The purpose of our plan is to evaluate the effectiveness of the Ed.D. program in achieving its mission. The evaluation includes assessment in three areas: instruction, curriculum, and services and operations pertinent to the program. The program evaluation plan is displayed in Attachment 3 (Graphic Display of Evaluation Plan).

A. Assessment of the Delivery of Instruction. The goals of instructional assessment are: (1) to measure student development in the core competencies; (2) to measure student perception of instructional effectiveness; (3) to analyze core competency and student evaluation data to modify instruction; and (4) to provide data for the assessment of the curricular arenas.

1. Measuring Student Development in the Core Competencies. At the end of each course, instructors will complete a Core Competency Matrix (CCM) for each student. The CCM will be established before the course begins and will be based on the goals and objectives for each course. An example of such a matrix is included in Attachment 4 (Core Competency). Instructors will use the CCM to determine the extent to which certain competencies are being developed. This will enable instructors to alter and improve instruction during subsequent

semesters. In addition, instructors will be able to work together to follow up on students who have deficiencies in core competencies.

2. **Measuring Student Perceptions of Instructional Effectiveness.** At the end of each course, students will complete the University's course evaluation, appended as Attachment 5 (University Course Evaluation Form). The Ed.D. Committee will develop additional items specific to the program related to core-competency information. Instructors will use student-provided information to strengthen the courses that they teach.
3. **Analyzing Core Competency and Student Evaluation Data to Modify Instruction.** After evaluation of CCM data and course evaluations, instructors will complete an assessment form, which is included in Attachment 6 (Course Instructional Form). This assessment will be used to modify instruction. Copies of the assessment will be sent to the Program Director and will also be used during assessment of the curricular arenas (teaching and learning, research, school improvement). The following table specifies the process for such assessment of instruction.

Table 1
Assessment of the Delivery of Instruction

Action	Person Responsible for Action	Action Schedule	Documentation of Action	Results of Action
Analyze CCM data, student course evaluations, and instructor's observations and reflections	The instructor of each course	By beginning of the sixth week in the semester following that when the course was taught	Course Instructional Assessment Form (CIAF)	Modification of instruction as documented in the CIAF

B. Assessment of Curriculum. The goals of curricular assessment are: (1) to determine the extent to which the curriculum leads to the development of core competencies; (2) to establish ways to improve the design and delivery of the curriculum; and (3) to evaluate student perceptions of the power of the program to produce change agents. The process will include an assessment of each curricular arena and an assessment of the overall curriculum.

1. **Assessing a Curricular Arena.** For each curricular arena (research, teaching and learning, school improvement) faculty will meet to discuss issues pertinent to student development in that arena.

This meeting will take place in the semester following delivery of all courses in that arena.

CCMs, course evaluations, and CIAFs will also be used at this level.

Based on observations of the teaching faculty and on feedback from students in the first cohort, a curriculum committee was established in Fall 2001. The need to begin revising the curriculum was obvious because of the following reasons: (1) the core competencies, which were developed after the curriculum had been designed, were not clearly articulated in course syllabi; (2) teaching faculty were identifying areas of overlap and content omissions as core competencies were integrated into the courses; (3) we learned from the SACS Self-Study Report that we needed a formal and systematic process for assessing the curriculum; and (4) a sense of urgency developed as we began delivery to the second cohort. Attachment 7 (Curriculum Committee Minutes) documents the formal process of assessment that we will be implementing.

We plan to complete assessment of the curricular arenas by Fall 2002, at which time the revised curriculum will be submitted to the Ed.D. Committee for approval and then processed through established UWG review procedures. The goal is to have the revised curriculum approved by the Committee on Graduate Studies and by the Dean of the Graduate School in time for the 2003 cohort. The following table summarizes the process for our assessment of curricular arenas.

Table 2
Assessment of a Curricular Arena

Action	Persons Responsible for Action	Action Schedule	Documentation of Action	Results of Action
Analyze CIAF data to modify a curricular arena	Faculty who have taught a course within a curricular arena	1. Teaching and learning: Spring 2002 and each subsequent cycle 2. Research: Fall 2002 and each subsequent cycle 3. School improvement: Fall 2002 and each subsequent cycle	1. Committee minutes from curricular-arena meetings 2. Committee minutes from Ed.D. Committee meetings	Evaluation, modification, and improvement of the design and delivery of the curriculum as documented in the assessment of a curricular arena

2. Assessing the Overall Curriculum. At the end of the two-year instructional cycle, faculty from all arenas will meet to discuss curriculum issues including, but not limited to, course sequencing, course goals, program integration, program efficiency (overlap in content, assignments, etc.), and program goals. Minutes will be taken at these meetings and will serve to document the program's evaluation. The faculty will then make final recommendations for curricular change to the Ed.D. Committee.

After students complete course work, instructional faculty will review their professional portfolios. Successful completion of a portfolio establishes a student's candidacy in the program. Criteria and procedures for evaluating the professional portfolio have been clearly established and are provided in Attachment 8 (The Professional Portfolio: Entry Instructions and Scoring Rubrics and Guides).

Graduates will also be asked to complete an evaluation of the Ed.D. program. An Ed.D. subcommittee has begun the process of creating this evaluation, which is included in Attachment 9 (Ed.D. Graduate Survey), and it will be pilot-tested with the first cohort. We anticipate that the first surveys will be completed in Fall 2003. Graduates will complete this evaluation after graduation and then again one year after graduation, providing information regarding ways they have facilitated change in the schools in which they work. They also will be asked to describe their perception of the Ed.D. program's effectiveness in reaching its mission to create change agents in the schools.

Data collected for curricular assessment include rubric evaluations of individual student portfolios, minutes of committee meetings from the end of each curricular arena cycle and the biannual instructional cycle, and student surveys completed by Ed.D. graduates. These data will be analyzed to evaluate overall effectiveness of the curriculum and instruction in creating change agents. Based on analysis thereof, actions will be taken by the Ed.D. Committee to modify the curriculum. These actions will be documented in the minutes of committee meetings. The following table specifies the process for assessment of the curriculum.

Table 3
Assessment of Overall Curriculum

Action	Persons Responsible for Action	Action Schedule	Documentation of Action	Results of Action
Analyze data and consider recommendations from assessments of curricular arenas	Faculty who teach in the program	Fall 2002 and each subsequent fall thereafter	1. Curriculum Committee minutes 2. Ed.D. Committee minutes	1. Recommendations for changes approved by the University 2. Delivery of modified curriculum in Summer 2003
Collect and analyze data from students' professional portfolios	Faculty who teach in the program	Fall 2002 and each subsequent fall thereafter	Students' professional portfolios	Students advance to candidacy.

C. Assessment of Services and Operations. The goal of assessment here is to determine whether University services and operations meet the needs of students in the Ed.D. program. This will be accomplished through the use of a student survey and focus-group interview.

First, students will be asked to complete a survey related to services and operations of the Ed.D. program. This includes admissions, advising, appeals processes, library resources and services, distance learning, and University resources. The Ed.D. Committee has begun developing this instrument, which is included in Attachment 10 (Student Survey of Services and Operations), and will pilot-test it with the first cohort in August 2002. Students will complete the survey after finishing their course work.

Students will then be asked to participate in a focus group with a team from the Ed.D. Committee and the Ed.D. Program Director. This focus-group interview will occur after analysis of the services-operations survey, allowing for the collection of detailed information from students regarding difficulties with services and operations as well as suggestions for ways to improve in these areas. Transcripts of the focus-group interviews will serve as documentation. Findings related to University services and operations, such as library or technology services, will be provided to appropriate departments. (Note: Irvine Sullivan Ingram Library has its own action plan regarding assessment of library services, which can be found in Recommendation 5).

SECTION I: PRINCIPLES AND PHILOSOPHY OF ACCREDITATION

1.2- APPLICATION OF CRITERIA

III. Recommendation #3

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the University publish in appropriate publications all policies which provide procedures for addressing written student complaints. As noted in 1.2 above, written procedures for addressing student complaints have not been published in appropriate publications that are readily accessible to those affected by them.

Response

Kindly see our response herein to Recommendation #1.

SECTION IV: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

4.8.10- CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION

IV. Recommendation #4

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the University develop a statement against which the performance of each faculty member teaching in the Ed.D. program will be evaluated.

“The performance of individual faculty members is evaluated at least annually through systematic procedures described in the Faculty Handbook. Procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion are also detailed in the Faculty Handbook. These criteria give little explicit detail about expectations for research, publication, and other scholarly activities. However, the College of Education Faculty Handbook provides detailed guidelines, criteria, and procedures for evaluating faculty performance, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review, including expectations for research, publication, and scholarly activities.

“There are no formal policies in place that ensure that faculty members who commit substantial amounts of time and effort to the Ed.D. program will not be disadvantaged in their home departments during review for salary increases, promotion, tenure, etc. Only an informal process, whereby the Ed.D. Program Coordinator confers with each doctoral faculty member’s department chairperson about that faculty member’s contribution, is in place.”

Response

The following statement against which teaching faculty will be evaluated was recently approved by the Ed.D. Committee, as documented in Attachment 11 (Committee Minutes for February 13, 2002: which includes, Memo-Dean Miller, Memo Chair, Department of Management and Business Systems). The statement uses the criteria for the selection of teaching faculty as its foundation.

Statement Against Which Teaching Faculty Will Be Evaluated

The teaching faculty of the Ed.D. program will be evaluated in regard to the extent to which they (1) keep current in the content area of the course(s) they teach, through activities such as professional presentations and publications, participation in professional development seminars, and keeping current with the professional literature; (2) demonstrate a convincing commitment to school improvement through their involvement in P-12 schools; (3) work collaboratively and actively to deliver an integrated program; and (4) participate actively in the evaluation and modification of instruction through student course evaluations and peer evaluations.

In order to “ensure that faculty members who commit substantial amounts of time and effort to the Ed.D. program will not be disadvantaged in their home departments during review for salary increases, promotion, tenure, etc.” the following actions have been taken. These actions serve to establish formal policy, strengthen the position of Coordinator, and ensure support for faculty. The actions are documented in Attachment 1.

- The position of Coordinator has been changed to Director and has been placed on the Administrative Council of the College of Education (COE). The Administrative Council led by the Dean of Education is comprised of the assistant and associate deans and department chairs. The Administrative Council oversees and coordinates the functioning of the COE.
- A formal means has been approved by which the Director provides feedback on the Ed.D. faculty member’s activities and contributions for the purpose of annual review as well as promotion and tenure. The Director will deliver a letter annually describing the contributions to the program of each Ed.D. faculty member, as documented in Attachment 1. The letter will be submitted to the chair of the faculty member’s home department. The weight of the letter will be commensurate with the percentage of time the faculty member spends with the program. The criteria published in the COE *Faculty Handbook* (see Attachment 12 COE *Faculty Handbook* pages 56-59) or appropriate college or department documents will be the standards by which the performance of Ed.D. faculty will be evaluated.

SECTION V: LIBRARY AND OTHER LEARNING RESOURCES

5.1.1- PURPOSE AND SCOPE

V. Recommendation #5

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the Library establish regular and systematic evaluation procedures to ensure that the Library is meeting the needs of the Ed.D. program in School Improvement.

“The Library has a well-developed mission statement which is broad enough to cover the Ed.D. program. The Library provides an excellent breadth and depth of electronic resources and an appropriate collection of print and non-print resources. Both students and faculty in the school improvement doctoral program express great satisfaction with library resources, services, and the quality of library staff.

“In the area of evaluation of library services and collections for the doctoral program, the Library has reached out to the faculty to promote library services and to inform students about the availability of resources and specialized services. Now that the program has been in existence for two years, it is time to implement a formal evaluation of library services and collections for the doctoral program and implement needed improvements based on the evaluations.”

Response

The Library Liaison Program serves as the foundation for a regular and systematic procedure to evaluate the adequacy of library resources for the Ed.D. program in School Improvement (SI). As a result of this procedure, the following actions have already been completed:

1. The library liaison consults with each member of the SI faculty and reviews course syllabi at least once per year.
2. The liaison performs ongoing evaluation of the library collection and, when appropriate, consults SI faculty to determine the continuing adequacy of collections to support the Ed.D. program.

Liaison funds are used to fill gaps that exist within the collection.

The following represent plans for ongoing action that we stand committed to undertaking:

1. The general acquisition budget will include a minimum of \$5,000 per year for the SI program assuming that library funding continues at the present level. The funds will be spent by the library liaison to the SI program based on consultation with faculty and continuing evaluation of the collection.
2. The liaison will utilize Collection Development Reports and Interlibrary Loan (ILL) Request Reports.
3. The liaison to the SI program will work with faculty to identify and appoint students to serve as a focus group to gather feedback yearly on services.
4. Each semester the liaison will conduct individual interviews about library services with a group of stratified, randomly selected students enrolled in the SI program. Written summaries of all interviews will be compiled. Results will be used in decision-making regarding the SI program.

SECTION VI: ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES

6.1.5- ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

VI. Recommendation #6

Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the University clearly identify the administrative authority and responsibility for all administrators and committees involved with the Ed.D. program in School Improvement.

“The fact that the Ed.D. program in School Improvement is not administered by a single home department presents unique administrative challenges for the University. The problems with evaluation of doctoral faculty performance have been discussed previously in Section 4.8. There are also other administrative infrastructure issues that must be resolved.

“The role of the Program Coordinator appears to be in a continual and ever expanding state of flux, with responsibilities in some areas, like student advising, steadily approaching an unacceptably heavy level as more new students are admitted to the program each year. This is exacerbated by the fact that the students are not assigned a committee chair until completion of their portfolios, typically after several semesters in the program. The Coordinator also has many of the duties of a department chair, but does not have commensurate administrative status. His role in visiting with external constituents (e.g., school superintendents) might also be enhanced by a title more descriptive of his actual duties and responsibilities.

“The respective spans of authority of the College of Education Dean and the Graduate Dean, as well as that of the Ed.D. Committee and the Committee on Graduate Studies, also need to be clarified as well. Program evaluation, in particular, might benefit from such clarification, but the role of the Graduate Dean in other areas important to the Ed.D. program—like strengthening formal credentials required for graduate faculty status, regular review of those credentials, and dissertation review—should be clarified.”

Response

Attachment 13 (Organizational Flow Chart) displays the actions taken in response to this recommendation. The administrative status of the position of Coordinator has been strengthened by (1)

changing the name from Coordinator to Director; and (2) placing the position on the COE's Administrative Council.

The respective lines of authority have been formally established in order to clarify the functions of the Ed.D. Committee and the Committee on Graduate Studies as well as the span of authority of the Dean of Education, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the Program Director.

Specifically, the Dean of Education is responsible for the program. The Ed.D. Committee along with the Program Director carry out assessment. Through the Program Director, the Ed.D. Committee recommends curricular changes, establishes policy and procedures, and selects teaching faculty and dissertation committee members. These recommendations flow through the regularly established channels of the Associate Dean and Faculty Council to the Dean of Education.

The Dean of the Graduate School will sign off on all curricular modifications approved by the Council on Graduate Studies, all dissertations, and graduate-faculty status. As stated in response to Recommendation #4, a formal means has been established by which the Program Director delivers a letter annually describing the contributions of each Ed.D. faculty member.

Ed.D Program Evaluation



