Dear Elliot:

I’m writing to let you know that I have received eight (8) responses to the e-mail below approving the proposal to deliver an Education Specialist (Ed.S) degree in Teaching and Learning.

The eight Council members who approved the proposal are: Enrico Bonello, Ginny Bumgardner, Theresa Early, Rob Perry, Ruth Peterson, Harald Vaessin, Ingrid Werner, Karla Zadnik.

I did not receive a response from Margaret Newell, Jim Phelan, or John Sheridan.

I’ll let you know if I receive additional responses.

Susan Reeser
Thank you.

Susan Reeser – 247-7413
Graduate School
Reeser.1@osu.edu
What follows is a lengthy chronology of the interactions between our Curriculum Committee and the College of Education leading to the approval of the current proposal for an Ed.S. Degree in Teaching and Learning. Please send to CAA with the current proposal draft.

6/11/2008

Dear Sandy,

Please forgive me for this memo being so long in the writing—but we’ve been reaching closure on many fronts at Quarter’s end and I know that I would need a good block of time to sort out the Curriculum Committee’s reactions to the several items that came from your college at its last meeting.

Let me start with the Ed.S. proposals, which came in three flavors—a generic version for the College, a School Psychology one from PAES, and one from T@L. First, School Psychology, because there is some confusion that needs to be clarified at the outset before we can figure out what direction we’re heading with this. I should note that the Committee was supportive of pursuing this direction, but seeks clarification on some major points. As you know, the present MA that School Psychologists are getting is granted “in Education” and, contrary to the statement on Page 3, PAES does not have “10 graduate programs.” Are you proposing that the School Psychology Master’s be “tagged” and will it become a Master’s in School Psychology (MSP)? Similarly, will the Ed.S. as proposed here simply be an Ed.S. “in Education” or do you wish it to be granted “in School Psychology,” making it something like an Ed.S.SP in name? In page 9’s discussion of the Master’s examination, please note that the Graduate School’s rules require a four hour examination (not 3 as listed here) for non-thesis students. On page 10 (and other places) there is confusion about the differences between the Internship and the Practica experiences. Part of the problem stems, I think, from the heading on the bottom of Page 10 which relates to the “Intern Experience” and the text that follows which focuses on the “practica experiences.” Differentiate between the two experiences and at what point in the program the student takes them. There was also a good deal of confusion and some concern about the sequencing of courses. Is it an expectation that the MA courses are all completed “cleanly” and “first” before going on to the Ed.S. curriculum? Should/will both degrees be granted concurrently at the end of the completed program, thus making sequencing and course availability considerably less of a concern? Finally, the Committee asked for a letter of concurrence from the Psychology program, which would be especially important if, indeed, you are seeking tagged degrees here with the word “Psychology” in the degree names.

In terms of focus, the Committee had much greater concerns about the Ed.S. degree proposal emanating from Ed T@L because the nature of the course work required is so open-ended. In the Committee’s view, this would work to encourage the very Balkanization and proliferation of programs that already is a concern in the College. Much greater specificity is necessary to define the Research courses and Specialization areas in which the Ed.S. can be earned. Is there a “core” common to all students who earn the Ed.S. that serves to define the focus of the degree? Should there be? What, specifically, are the various specialization requirements? Other concerns were more general in nature. For example, the Committee wished to see greater and more explicit referencing/documentation about what your expectations are for your Ph.D. program based on the impact of the Ed.S. Who will move to the Ed.D.? This, of course, all relates to the rationale offered for the degree. A concern was also expressed about those rare students who might wish to transfer from the Ed.S. to the Ph.D. program. It appears difficult to see how such a transfer could actually occur and be articulated and it was suggested that obtaining the Ed.S. degree 45 hours past the Master’s degree would leave very little room for any Ph.D. course work. Is it not the case that such a transfer (from Ed.S. to Ph.D.) could only really occur early in the student’s Ed.S. program prior to the receipt of that degree?

Most broadly, the Committee expressed a concern regarding both of the above proposals (School Psychology and Teaching and Learning) that, since the Schools don’t have a graduate program, the College does, shouldn’t the Ed.S. degrees all be given by and housed at the College level. In effect, the Committee had difficulty understanding the rationale for multiple Ed.S. degrees from a single graduate program (except, perhaps, insofar as the School Psychology degree might be “tagged.”) The Committee expressed great reluctance to go down the road of these multiple degree proposals and, instead, suggested that the revised proposal might be better served with a single Ed.S. degree proposal to include a structure of strongly articulated and well structured tracks such as, for example, present School Psychology proposal.....

How to proceed, Sandy? I’m happy to meet with you to talk this all through, arrange for a meeting between you and the Committee’s members, or have you deal with this internally if that makes the most sense. It strikes me that the Ed.S. will be a reasonably easy sell once the three versions are addressed and reconciled. And treating the School Psychology one as tagged with specific content could readily work as well—it may be fundamentally different than others that are more “generic.”But you are the best judge of that. As for the Urban Education proposal, there’s a lot more amiss there. The Committee simply couldn’t get their hands around it because it they couldn’t really agree on what was being sought and for whom. So, here’s the starting point. We can go whatever you feel is the best direction from here.

Best,

Elliot

The Curriculum Committee of the Graduate Council has now reviewed your revised submission for the Education Specialist degree proposal from the School of Teaching and Learning (Ed.S.T@L). The Committee was pleased to see that most of its requests for revision were very well addressed in the current submission. Some additional revisions were requested in light of the Committee’s review and, as well, additional vetting by our Director of Graduation Services, Tim Watson, to insure that the program would satisfy graduation requirements. I’ve listed the remaining concerns that need to be attended to in what I hope will be a final revision of the proposal for Committee and subsequent Graduate Council approval.
1. Under your curriculum description (page 2) it is indicated that 45 quarter hours beyond the Masters degree will be needed for the Ed.S. degree. Is it your intention that excess hours in an OSU Master’s program meeting Ed.S. requirements will be counted towards the Ed.S.? I wouldn’t expect such an occurrence to happen regularly “going forward” as students ought to know where they are headed with any additional degree pursuit at the conclusion of their Master’s, but won’t this be a significant concern for present post-Master’s students “languishing” in your doctoral program who may seek transference to the Ed.S?

2. On bullet point three in that section regarding the Maximum number of transfer hours beyond the Masters that, theoretically can be counted towards the Ed.S., extending the present “80% Rule” from the Masters to the Ed.S. means that we would accept nine such hours for transfer (not ten as per the present proposal draft). The bullet point should also include the stipulation that such transfer crediting can only occur if the courses have not already been applied to another degree. Finally, please include the addition that such transference must be approved by your GSC (as indicated) and “by the Graduate School.” (presently not in the proposal)

3. On page 3’s discussion of the Ed.S. Committee please note that the Advisor needs to have Category P Graduate Faculty status. (Present drafting calls for two graduate faculty).

4. For consistency in your course listings, please add the notation (3 credit hours) after EDU T@L 881 as you have done in the courses listed earlier on page three. Similar credit hour attribution should be added for the courses on the top of page 4 (P@L 785, T@L 874).

5. Also on page 4, under “Specialization”, it remains unclear whether the School is seeking transcript designations for each of the bullet pointed specializations listed in the proposal. If the answer is “no,” then the GSC discretion suggested by the proposal for approving courses to meet the 21 hours is fine. If, however, transcript designations are being sought here for these areas of “in depth study” they will need a good deal more specification and articulation. That is, the degrees of freedom that are implicit in GSC review (without transcript designations) will need to be greatly constrained by specific acceptable course lists submitted for approval, or something pretty close to that, if transcript designations are being sought here.

6. On page 5’s discussion of the “Culminating Project/Thesis” please clarify the distinctions (if any) between the two. For anything characterized as a “thesis,” please indicate that the final document must be submitted to the Graduate School. What is your intention for a “Culminating Project?” Will there always be a written document that should be required for submission to the Graduate School? Thoughts?

So, I think, we’re almost there. A great deal has been accomplished to bring this to the doorstep of approval by the Curriculum Committee. It strikes me that the remaining revision requests, for the most part, can be easily addressed and, in all instances, the suggestions will bring greater clarity to the proposed program. We’ll return to the processing of the Ed.S proposal from Teaching and Learning as soon as these remaining matters are addressed in what I hope will be a final revision of the proposal.

All Best,
elliot

5/6/2010

Many thanks to you both…We’ll get this out to the Committee to add it to the agenda for a (lengthy) meeting a week from Friday. Do take care...
Best,
elliot

---

From: Jackie Blount [mailto:jblount@ehe.osu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:47 PM
To: Elliot Slotnick
Subject: FW: FW: Ed.S proposal from Ed-T@L

Hello, Elliot –

Thanks so much for sending such clear and helpful guidance regarding needed revisions of the Ed.S. in T&L proposal. Azita Manouchehri (and her team) worked very quickly to address each concern. Please find the most recent version of the proposal attached to this message.

We’re getting closer all the time....

Warmly,
Jackie

---

5/21/2010

From: Elliot Slotnick [mailto:slotnick.1@gradsch.ohio-state.edu]
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2010 6:33 PM
To: Jackie Blount
Cc: Dena Myers; Elliot Slotnick; Cheryl L. Achterberg
Subject:
Dear Jackie,

I write with the happy news that, save for a couple of remaining minor changes and one significant clarification, we are “there” with the Curriculum Committee’s endorsement of your Ed. S. proposal. This is, of course, only the first step along the proposal’s curriculum journey, though we like to think that since we get proposals in their original and most “primal” form, our review process is the most rigorous and substantive among the various steps you will go through. Clearly, the Committee was quite satisfied with your responsiveness to the last iteration of its remaining concerns. Note was taken that you do not wish to seek transcript designations for your thematic specializations so, therefore, greater specification of their course content was not seen to be necessary. Thus, all that remains to be attended to before taking the proposal to the full Graduate Council (from which it will go on to CAA/RACGS, University Senate, OSU Trustees, Ohio Regents) is the following:

- Page 3’s section on Core Courses refers to “attached syllabi.” The referenced syllabi were never submitted with the proposal so they should be added to the final submission or the reference to them should be removed. Your call.
- Page 5’s discussion of Applied project/thesis (second line) the word “and” should be inserted between “specialization” and “should.”
- More to the point, the Committee seeks additional clarification on the differences between a “project” and a “thesis.” Are they two different things or fundamentally the same? What “makes” something a “project” and what makes something a “thesis?” If the differences between them are not of a magnitude that requires different nomenclature, it would be much preferable to utilize one title for your exit project/thesis.

And that is “it” as far as the requests for final revisions to the document. The Committee will return to its vetting as soon as these remaining items are addressed.

Best,
elliott

5/25/2010

Hello, Elliot –

Again, thanks for all of your help as well as that of the Grad School Curriculum Committee! Azita in T&L has produced a very fast turnaround for this proposal. I have just reviewed changes and believe they address the concerns you’ve outlined toward the bottom of this message. Please find this most recently revised proposal attached. I think we’re ready for the next stage.

Be well,
Jackie

From: manouchehriazita@gmail.com [mailto:manouchehriazita@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Azita Manouchehri
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2010 7:28 AM
To: Jackie Blount
Cc: Rebecca Kantor-Martin; Sarah Lang; Bryan Warnick; Cynthia Tyson; George Newell; David Bloome; Barbara Lehman; Scot Danforth; Cheryl L. Achterberg
Subject: Re: Next steps for Ed.S. proposal

Hello Jackie:

Thanks for your message. We are happy that the first phase of review process is almost over.

Please find the current draft reflecting the changes Elliot requested.

We removed the reference to course syllabi on page 3.

We changed the title of Applied Project/Thesis to “Applied Project.”

We inserted “and” between specialization and should on page 6.

Please let us know if you have any additional suggestions.

Thanks much.

On behalf of everyone on this end,
Azita

On Mon, May 24, 2010 at 8:22 AM, Jackie Blount <jblount@ehe.osu.edu> wrote:
Hello, Azita and Rebecca (and Sarah, Bryan, Cynthia, George, David, Barbara, Scot, and Cheryl) —

Good news for the Ed.S.! Save for the three bulleted items below in Elliot’s message, the Ed.S. proposal is almost ready to roll on to the next level of review. The Graduate School Curriculum Committee has been incredibly helpful by going over the proposal several times with a fine-toothed comb. Their work maximizes the odds that the proposal will fare well down the line.

If you would, please send me a revised version of the proposal along with the requested attachments. When you do, I’ll give it a quick double-check and then send it on.

Thank you,
Jackie

July 2, 2010

Dear Jackie,

Please forgive the very slow turnaround on the very minor revisions that were sought (as per below) in your Ed.S. proposal before sending it on through our approval processes. At bottom, for me, the end of quarter onslaught was followed by the start of Summer “catch-up” (sometimes known as doldrums) and, now, finally, I can return to the curriculum fold—including your proposal.

Everything is pretty much ready for the Ed.S. to go to the Graduate Council for a final endorsement prior to sending it on to Randy Smith and CAA. The only things that now need to be done on (yet another) marking up of the electronic draft are the following:

1. There are a few remaining references to a “thesis” on page 1 (last para) and page 5 (second line at top of page). In both instances there is still a “project/thesis” reference
2. On page 3’s subhead (near top of page) for the Ed.S. Committee please change to Ed.S. Advisory Committee for consistency with the text and the rest of the proposal.
3. Same page’s second reference to Committee members should read, “Both committee members should be **graduate** faculty of the School of Teaching and Learning.”

That’s it! I will not be circulating the returned clean copy to Committee but will go straight to an electronic version on to Randy and CAA. I’d make these changes in the document myself, but I want them to be reflected in the final version that you have as your own working document. I’ll look for it after the holiday—which I hope you both enjoy.

Best,
elliot

July 6, 2010

Dear Susan,

Attached is the revised proposal for the delivery of an Ed.S. degree in Teaching and Learning that has been endorsed by our Curriculum Committee. It needs to be approved by the Graduate Council, in what was planned to be an electronic Summer voting process for those remaining proposals needing only minor revisions since the time that they were introduced at the final 2009-2010 Council meeting. We should give Council members a “reasonable” yet relatively short leash to register their up or down votes, say a week’s time (Pat?). I will have a few more (2-3) proposals like this in the coming days but, in the interest of getting them to Randy/Melissa/CAA as soon as possible I would opt for separate voted on these as I get them to you rather than trying to bundle them in any way.

Ideally, I would welcome getting this across to Bricker by the end of next week after returning from CGS. We can do that, I think, once we receive the go ahead from a majority of Council members and nobody has raised a significant concern. Thanks, in advance, for getting this in motion.

Best,
Proposal for an Education Specialist in Teaching and Learning Degree

in the School of Teaching and Learning

College of Education and Human Ecology

Introduction

The proposed Education Specialist degree (Ed.S.) is a graduate program that provides the opportunity for educators with a Master’s degree to further their professional development with a strong grounding in and application of diverse theory and research. The program offers a set of experiences and courses for specialists in PreK-Grade 12 instructional leadership positions, such as teacher/team leaders, mentor teachers, department chairs, curriculum developers, praxis evaluators, or other school- and district-based roles. In such roles, highly qualified, experienced educators may serve as catalysts for school change, reform, and program/curriculum development. Additionally, the Ed.S. program provides a coherent professional development experience that can be aligned with other professional development plans, such as the State of Ohio’s residency program and career ladder for teachers, endorsements in reading, mathematics, and Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL) or obtaining National Board Certification. Teachers may include school district Local Professional Development Committee requirements for professional development work within the program. In some cases, the Ed.S. degree may also serve as the foundation for the pursuit of a Doctoral degree.

Designation, Rationale, and Focus of the Degree

The degree proposed here will be designated as the Education Specialist (Ed.S.) in Teaching and Learning degree, a professional, terminal degree that will fall approximately halfway between the Master’s and Ph.D. degrees.

Definitions of terms

*Education specialist.* A school-based educator with the depth of theoretical knowledge and wisdom of practice in a defined specialization to provide leadership within a school district, to help shape policy, to design and direct programs, to support and evaluate teaching and learning, to mentor early career educators, and to translate relevant research and theory into sound practice.

*Specialization.* Courses taken within an area of concentration or focus area that support teachers in the completion of an apprenticeship and a culminating project. Specializations may include coursework for state licensure programs such as the P-6 mathematics specialist endorsement, the literacy specialist, or the teacher leader license.
Rationale

Many teachers earn a Master’s degree with their initial licensure program (e.g., M.Ed.) or as part of their professional development (e.g., M.A.). There are many teachers with such degrees who would like to continue their professional development, but have very few options available to them that would support their professional work in a coherent and systematic manner. Some of the options include a second Master’s, a hodgepodge of continuing education courses, or the pursuit of a Doctoral degree. At the same time, the School of Teaching and Learning has refocused its Ph.D. as a research degree, oriented toward preparing graduates for R1 university faculty placements. Many teachers who are interested in a degree beyond the Master’s would not be a good match with a research-oriented Ph.D. program. Thus, for many teachers these options are not appropriate or professionally rewarding paths.

On the other hand, there also are teachers who may seek a terminal degree in education, but do not know initially whether completing a Doctoral degree program will ultimately align with their professional and personal goals. The Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree program is designed to help professional educators choose the best program in-line with their goals as school- and district-based educational leaders. (Students would need to decide by the end of 16 credit hours whether to continue in the Ed.S. program or apply to the Ph.D. program. The two core courses must be included in these 16 hours. [See “Core Courses” below].)

The College of Education and Human Ecology (EHE) at The Ohio State University has a long tradition of producing educational leaders, and the need today is greater than ever. The current local, state, and national policy contexts present challenges that require responsible leaders at the school and classroom levels who can knowledgeably assess the quality of education in their schools and districts. School reform needs informed practitioners to work with parents and administrators to implement sound research, theory, and practice in response to educational mandates as well to changes in their school and community demographics. In particular, the EHE’s long-standing commitment to urban teacher education coincides with the development of leaders where they are most needed. Specifically, education specialists could serve as important liaisons between the University and schools as teacher leaders, as co-instructors for pre-service teacher education programs, as cooperating/mentor-teachers, or as M.Ed. program managers. The proposed new Teacher Leader license that is part of Ohio House Bill 1 also would correlate well with an Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning.

Description of the Curriculum

General requirements for the degree:

- 45 quarter hours beyond the Master’s degree.
- All coursework for the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning must be taken within a six-year period from the date of admission.
- Maximum number of transfer hours beyond the Master’s is 9 credit hours (including any credit hours taken as a non-degree student at OSU). Hours can only be transferred that have not already been applied to another degree. (Additional credit hours must be approved by the Graduate Studies Committee and by the Graduate School upon petition)
- Maintain a 3.0 GPA or higher average.
Course work and experiences

_Ed.S. Advisory Committee_

A student should set up an advisory committee (approved by the GSC) of a minimum of two graduate faculty, before accumulating 9 credit hours in the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning program. Both committee members should be graduate faculty of the School of Teaching and Learning, with expertise relevant to the student’s area of specialization, and at least the major advisor must have P status in the Graduate School.

**Core courses (8 hours)**

EDU T&L 975 Theories of Teaching and Learning in Social Contexts (4 credit hours)

EDU T&L 977 Theories of Teaching and Learning as Change (4 credit hours)

These two courses provide the theoretical underpinnings for all advanced study of teaching and learning in the School of Teaching and Learning. They emphasize sociocultural psychological theories of learning and ecological models of teaching, learning and change. They also provide students with theoretical understandings of how culture and social context influence teaching and learning in classroom and other educational settings. These two courses are sequenced and coordinated so that field-based projects begun in EDU T&L 975 are continued in EDU T&L 977. (Thus, students need to take the two core courses in consecutive quarters [similarly so when the shift is made to semesters].) The field-based projects provide an opportunity for students to use the theoretical frames from the course to examine the specific educational settings in which they are working (e.g., a classroom) or if they are not currently in an educational setting then a setting in which they anticipate working. Note that EDU T&L 975 and EDU T&L 977 are two of the three core courses also taken by first year Doctoral students. We believe this situation to be appropriate and desirable. Regardless whether a student is getting an Ed.S. or a Ph.D., it is our view that they need a solid grounding in theories of teaching and learning.

As also noted above, these two courses must be included in the first 16 hours before students decide whether to continue in the Ed.S. or apply to transfer to the Ph.D. program.

**Multicultural Education and Diversity in Education (3 hours)**

EDU T&L 881 Theory and Practice in Multicultural Education (3 credit hours)

If the above course (or equivalent) has been taken as part of a Master’s program, with permission of the student’s adviser and approval of the Graduate Studies Committee, one or more advanced courses may be taken which address the goals of understanding diversity in education and in multicultural education.
Research (6 hours)

EDU P&L 785 Introduction to Inquiry, Principles, Strategies and Techniques (3 credit hours)

EDU T&L 874 Classroom Based Inquiry or EDU P&L 890 Action Research to Understand and Improve Educational practices (3 credit hours)

If any of the above courses (or equivalents) has been taken as part of a Master’s program, with permission of the student’s adviser and approval of the Graduate Studies Committee, more advanced courses may be taken which address the goal of using action-oriented research.

Specialization (21 hours minimum)

The Ed.S. offers in depth study in the following areas:

- language and literacy (including reading and writing education)
- literature for children and young adults
- mathematics education
- science education
- multicultural education and diversity/equity studies
- social studies and global education
- inclusive education
- early childhood education
- foreign and second language education
- integrated teaching and learning

With consultation of the adviser and approval of the Graduate Studies Committee, the student will take 21 hours (approximately seven courses) in one of the areas above (all courses should be at the 800 or 900 level). These courses may be selected from courses in the School of Teaching and Learning, from the College of Education and Human Ecology, or from elsewhere in the university. The area “Integrated Teaching and Learning” was pioneered at Ohio State University in the 1970s. It emphasizes inquiry-based, cross-disciplinary curriculum and pedagogy. Students specializing in Integrated Teaching and Learning take courses providing depth in inquiry learning and problem-based (cross-discipline) curriculum.

Apprenticeship (6 to 9 hours)

In order to apply and practice a particular set of leadership skills, students should develop and arrange, in consultation with their advisors and approval of the Graduate Studies Committee, an apprenticeship in their school/district setting or at the university. For example, students might co-teach a methods course, plan and lead a series of professional development
workshops for their district/school, etc. The apprenticeship could be connected to the culminating project.

Applied Project

An Applied Project must embody the results of a study of some issue directly related to the candidate’s area of specialization and should directly benefit the student’s professional goals. It should demonstrate the candidate’s ability to apply his or her knowledge of the program and ability to conduct practice-based research/inquiry. The topic of the Applied Project must be approved in advance by the candidate’s Ed.S. advisory committee. The project must include a written product (or an electronic equivalent – e.g., a multimodal, digital thesis with the quality and rigor equivalent to a traditionally written thesis) and meet the advisor's and Graduate Studies Committee's approval of its design. A copy of the final product will be submitted to the Graduate School. There must be an oral examination conducted by the student’s Ed.S. advisory committee (minimum length, 90 minutes).

Administrative Arrangements

There are no new administrative arrangements required to offer this program. The students will enroll in courses co-populated by M.A. and Ph.D. students, be advised by our regular team of advisors and oversight for the program itself will be covered by the standing Graduate Studies Committee. Initially, we do not anticipate large numbers of students in the Ed. S. program. (See "Recruitment and projected enrollment" below.) After the first three years of program implementation, the GSC would conduct an evaluation of the Ed. S. program and make any modifications necessary to the course work and other program requirements, such as the apprenticeship or culminating project.

Evidence of Need

Many other state universities in Ohio (e.g., Kent State, Miami, Wright State, Toledo) and University of Dayton already offer an Ed.S. in one or more program areas. However, only Kent State, Wright State, and Toledo offer an Ed.S. in Curriculum and Instruction, the primary focus of our proposed Ed.S. program. Students who have graduated from the School of T&L’s M.A. and M.Ed. programs, have indicated on numerous occasions to our faculty their desire for such a degree at OSU. These prospective students would like to continue their education at OSU, but currently have no means for doing so, except in a Ph.D. program. As we have indicated earlier, this option is not always desirable or appropriate for them.

Nationally, R1 institutions, such as Wisconsin, Michigan State, Indiana, Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, and Florida (among others) offer an Ed.S. degree, as well. As we have noted earlier, OSU’s College of EHE has been a long-time national leader in Education, and this would be another opportunity for EHE to demonstrate its continued leadership and foresight on the national level.

Prospective Enrollment
Enrollment in comparable programs in Ohio

The only enrollment figure we have is from Kent State where 92 students are currently enrolled in Ed.S. programs.

Recruitment and projected enrollment

Projected enrollment is drawn from two sources: part-time Ph.D. students who have not graduated, M.A graduates and M.Ed. graduates.

Within the past 5 years 53 part-time Ph.D. students have been admitted who have not graduated. Although the pace of their matriculation varies the fact that they are part-time and that they have not yet graduated may indicate their greater suitability for an Ed.S., rather than to the commitment and focus required for a Ph.D. If this is so, then we might assume that as many as 10 such (53 divided by 5 years) students per year would be interested in an Ed.S.

In addition, the EHE Office of Outreach and Engagement estimates that it serves about 1,000-1,200 teachers per year. These in-service teachers, many of whom may have Master’s degrees, would be a potential source of recruitment for the Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree.

Admission to the program (applications to be reviewed as a constellation of criteria)

- Bachelor’s degree from an accredited institution.
- Master’s degree in Education or other related field from an accredited institution
- A minimum GPA of 3.0.
- Teacher certification in K-12 education
- Minimum of three years of professional experience in an educational setting.
- Graduate Record Exam scores
- Three letters of reference. At least two of these should be academic references.
- Statement of intent
- Academic writing sample
- CV/resume

Retention

One of the keys to retaining graduate students in the Ed.S. is high quality academic advising. Each student will be assigned to an advisor based on the students’ background and academic interests as described in the statement of intent and other relevant sources.

We will evaluate the admissions process, especially its early phases. We will consider whether criteria or practices are screening out candidates prematurely or unnecessarily. We may increase the use and weight of the interview versus paper credentials.

Efforts to Enroll and Retain Underrepresented Groups The School of Teaching and Learning conducts intensive recruitment for underrepresented groups for all of its programs and will for this one as well. Currently, we are administering a large, 5 year federal grant which will create additional resources for recruitment. We anticipate that this recruitment will benefit all of our programs.
Availability of Faculty and Facilities

The proposed Ed.S. in Teaching and Learning degree program would not require any new courses, as all coursework would be drawn from existing Master’s and Doctoral offerings. Thus, Ed. S. students would be enrolled in the same courses, most of which have room for more students. Current facilities and faculty are adequate for this program.

Projected Costs

There would be no additional projected costs for this degree program.

July 5, 2010