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Executive Summary

Introduction

Evaluation of progress is a vital component as Texas A&M University moves toward the accomplishment of the goals outlined in Vision 2020 (See in this volume). To this end, the following document has been prepared to report information regarding the intricacies and inner workings of the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture. Many departmental components and attributes have been examined, including the administrative structure, faculty and student profiles with demographics, the size, stature and stability of each program, and specific program requirements.

The information presented in this document has been prepared for a team of external reviewers who have been charged by the Executive Director of the Office of Graduate Studies to evaluate the academic programs of Teaching, Learning and Culture. The External Review Team is comprised of Dr. Richard Duschl (Chair) of Pennsylvania State University, Dr. Eugene Garcia of Arizona State University, Dr. Renée Clift of The University of Arizona, and Dr. Norman Stahl of Northern Illinois University. The Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture thanks these distinguished professionals for their contributions to this process.
Letter from the Department Head

Dear Review Team:

On behalf of the faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) at Texas A&M University, I would like to thank you for providing your invaluable professional service as a member of a highly qualified program review team. The review team will help us to assess our current programs and, most importantly, how the department needs to adapt to the future. More specifically, we need your help with the following two questions that are embedded in the review process: (1) What concepts, conditions, and resources do we require to continue our progress in preparing elementary and secondary teachers for a digital future? (2) Does our graduate program prepare future practitioners and professors for a digital future and what resources and conditions are needed to strengthen this program?

We have prepared a comprehensive Academic Program Review (APR) document online that provides information about our department, faculty, and students as well as assesses the strengths and challenges of our department. You will review a newly revised Undergraduate Teacher Education Program, a Ph.D. Program, a Graduate Secondary Program, an Accelerated Secondary Certification Program, an online Masters, and a newly established Executive Online Ed.D. Program. You will also have an opportunity to meet with faculty, students and administrators during the review team’s onsite visitation (2.28.10-3.3.10) to gain more in-depth information. However, as you review materials, please let me know if you would like any additional information.

Once again, I would like to thank you for your service on this review team. We are looking forward to your visit and welcoming you to Aggieland. If you need any assistance in preparation for your visit, please do not hesitate in letting me know.

Best Regards,

Dennie L. Smith, Professor

Department Head

Claude H. Everett, Endowed Chair for Leadership
Overview of Previous Program Review in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC)

External Review of Graduate Programs, 2001

The previous Program Review, completed in October 2001, focused exclusively on graduate programs. The strengths of the program were identified as Diversity of Faculty and Students, External Funding, Faculty Productivity, and mentoring Doctoral Students.

At that time, Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) had one of the most diverse departments in the University with almost 25% diversity among faculty members and 48% diversity among students enrolled in doctoral programs. While the majority of external funding had been acquired by a small number of faculty members, most faculty members had been successful in acquiring some type of external funding. Much of the funding involved collaborative efforts in which the faculty members were co-principal investigators with faculty members from other departments and colleges. The faculty was recognized for being actively engaged in research, teaching graduate and undergraduate classes, and participating in professional service activities. Research in Teaching, Learning and Culture entailed at least seven cognate areas, yet there was a mutual respect among the faculty for the uniqueness of the department, and there were concerted efforts to support the diverse activities. The graduate faculty was recognized for their commitment to work closely with their doctoral students in facilitating their progress from the beginning of their program to the completion of their dissertation.

The review committee identified five areas needing improvement: National Student Recruitment Efforts; Research, Publication, and Grant Writing Experiences of
Doctoral Students; Graduate Assistantships; Faculty Recruitment in High Need Areas; and Graduate and Undergraduate Teaching Demands.

The committee noted that a common goal of a preeminent department is to have a diversity of students from across the nation and around the world. Although the Department had been successful in achieving diversity of ethnic groups, the review team suggested a need to develop a national recruitment program.

In addition, a recommendation was made to more closely monitor the research and publication experiences of doctoral students to ensure that all students receive adequate opportunities to participate in research and publication processes resulting in scholarly products.

An identified need for greater funding opportunities to attract and support doctoral students resulted in several recommendations. Most students received $1,000.00 per month for the nine month academic year, with summer funding limited by the lack of financial resources available. It was recommended that the amount of a stipend to graduate students be increased to at least $12,000.00 per year, plus benefits, since a tuition waiver or remitted tuition was not available for the vast majority of graduate assistants. An expectation was set for graduate faculty to increase efforts to obtain externally funded research grants that would include graduate student support.

A void in two high needs areas was identified. TLAC did not have a tenure track faculty member whose expertise was in Early Childhood Education and had lost two of three professors in the ESL/International Education program, the largest doctoral program in TLAC.
Graduate and Undergraduate Teaching Demands was the area of greatest concern. Eighty-five percent (85%) of students in TLAC were undergraduate students. However, most professors were required to teach both undergraduate and graduate courses on a regular basis. During that academic year, tenure track faculty members taught 23 undergraduate and 22 graduate courses each semester. Additionally, non-tenure track faculty, many of whom were part-time faculty members, taught 132 sections of undergraduate courses, while graduate teaching assistants taught 22 undergraduate courses. The faculty shortage impacted both the teaching of undergraduates and the number of doctoral students who could be served. Due to lack of funding, there was no apparent solution other than limiting the number of undergraduate students admitted to teaching programs. It appeared that the TLAC department would have to utilize an enrollment management system for undergraduate programs, which would result in graduating fewer students in the teaching profession while the State of Texas was experiencing a teacher shortage.

See Volume 7, Appendix 1 for TLAC Department Head, Dennie Smith’s 2006 mid-review response to the Provost regarding the 2002 external review.

See Volume 7, Appendix 2 for TLAC 2007-2008 Goals.

A brief report of two additional external reviews is included in this study—our last NCATE review and a Texas Education Agency review. See Volume V, Programs.
History of the University

When Texas A&M was founded in 1876, Louis Pasteur was proving the existence of microorganisms and dispelling the concept of spontaneous generation. Gregor Mendel was perfecting the basic concepts of genetics through his experimentation with peas. Fewer than 100 microscopes existed in the entire United States. Maps of Texas showed West Texas as Indian Territory.

The "faculty" of Texas A&M College consisted of one mathematician and one person designated to teach agricultural chemistry and scientific agriculture. Science as a discipline and education in the classical form at the new land-grant institution were disapproved of by the governor and state legislators, whose concept of the land-grant college was limited to teaching practical applications and job skills. Science and mathematics existed merely to supply instruction to applied fields. This was a new concept to higher education; so new that when the president of the college, Thomas Gathright, and the faculty were unable to meet these objectives, they were relieved of their duties - after only three years of service.
Texas A&M itself was a college until the 1960s, and as such, it had "schools" rather than colleges. In 1924, it's School of Arts and Sciences was established with four distinct subject areas: liberal arts; business administration; preparation for teaching; and science. Chemistry and physics were actually within departments in the School of Engineering.

After World War II, encouraged by America's entrance into the atomic age and its rising faith in science, more students sought training in the pure and natural sciences. This effort was aided by the success of the Texas A&M Research Foundation, established by President Gibb Gilchrist in 1944. Between 1948 and 1958, the proportion of students enrolled in the School of Arts and Sciences rose rapidly in comparison to enrollment in agriculture and engineering. By 1957, it comprised 25 percent of the student body.

Following Texas A&M's elevation to university status in 1963, the University grew to become a nationally and internationally recognized university in many disciplines. Currently, Texas A&M is a university known for its rich traditions and remarkable history as well as its academic stature and research presence. As the state's oldest public institution for higher education, Texas A&M's past successes, current directions, and future visions are due to the vision and leadership of its presidents and faculty. Past presidents of Texas A&M range from former governors and legislators to professors and researchers. Some have guided the university through the nation's darkest hours; some have helped further Texas A&M as a national and international leader in teaching and research. Faculty includes many world renowned individuals who have earned the
respect and honors of their peers, from Nobel Prize winners to Presidential Honor Recipients.

History of the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD)

The College of Education and Human Development originated in 1969 and first opened its doors to students on Sept. 1 of that year. 2009 marks the 40th Anniversary of the college. As that milestone is celebrated, milestones of achievement are also evident. Student enrollment has grown to 3,822 undergraduate students and 1,321 graduate students in Spring 2009. The College of Education currently is home to 126 tenured and tenure track faculty, 38 clinical faculty, and 55 lecturers as of Fall 2009. US News, in 2009, ranked the college 47th among all professional schools of education and 34th among all public professional schools. The Administration/Supervision program ranked 20th. In 2009, more than 76 faculty were engaged in externally funded projects, resulting in $19 million in expenditures. Our college had $12 million in new grant and contract awards that involved an additional 16 faculty and staff. Funding agencies include NSF, NIH, US Department of Education, numerous state agencies and private foundations. The College also is home to 11 endowed chairs and professorships supported by endowments totaling over 11 million dollars. Those in TLAC include Norvella Carter and Chance Lewis as the Houston Endowment Inc. Endowed Chairs in Urban Education;
James Kracht as the Marilyn Kent Byrne Chair for Student Success; Gerald Kulm as the Curtis D. Robert Endowed Chair in Mathematics Education; and Dennie Smith as the Claude H. Everett, Jr. Endowed Chair in Education.

Five deans have led the college since its establishment in 1969. They include:

- Frank W. R. Hubert 1969-1979
- Dean C. Corrigan 1980-1989
- Jane A. Stallings 1990-1995
- Jane Close Conoley 1996-2005
- Doug Palmer 2006-Present

**History of the TLAC Department**

Over the past 40 years, the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture has undergone many changes. These changes ranged from programmatic and administrative reorganizations to a new name. The Department has undergone three name changes including the current name, the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (since 1999). Previous name changes were less dramatic as the department shifted its name from Curriculum and Instruction to the Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction. This slight name shift occurred in response to cross-campus concerns that other departments were also involved with their own curricula and instruction. As expected, changes also occurred at the level of department head. Nine individuals have served in this capacity. Dr. Glenn Ross Johnson, the first department head, served from 1969-1974. Dr. Robert E. Shutes served from 1974 – 1980, followed by Dr. William H. Peters who headed the department from 1981- 1990. Unlike the two previous decades, the decade of the 1990s reflects more frequent shifts
in departmental leadership as five different individuals served as department heads. Dr. James B. Kracht served as department head from 1990-1993. From 1993 – 1995, Dr. Donna Wiseman served as interim department head while concurrently serving as Associate Dean for Undergraduate Students. Following Dr. Wiseman, Dr. William H. Rupley became department head from 1995 – 1997, then Dr. Francis E. Clark became the interim department head from 1997 – 1999. From 1999 – 2003, Dr. John P. Helfeldt served as the department head; since 2003, Dr. Dennie Smith has been serving as department head.

When the new Department of Curriculum and Instruction opened on September 1, 1969, it had already outgrown the university’s projections for enrollment. The number of students enrolling in the new department almost matched the total number of students that had matriculated in the undergraduate and graduate programs in the entire Department of Education. This created great demands for the limited resources of the new department from its inception. However, the faculty and students responded in a positive and determined manner to overcome all obstacles. Within its initial five years of existence, the new department had established a solid foundation for teacher preparation in undergraduate elementary and secondary education. The high quality of the Master’s and Doctoral programs was recognized across the State of Texas, and the programs attained accreditation by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

As an example of its early vision and accomplishments, it should be noted that the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Texas A&M University attained the Texas Coordinating Board’s approval for the first Kindergarten Endorsement Program in
the State of Texas. This was an accomplishment that stunned many educators throughout the State because they tended to view Texas A&M University as one known for its Colleges of Agriculture, Engineering, Veterinary Medicine, and its Corps of Cadets, but not as possessing a college that would create and initiate new programs in teacher education.

During the first decade of existence, departmental faculty deliberately searched throughout the United States of America for additional faculty members with doctorates from excellent universities. A review of the doctoral degrees held by faculty members in the tenure-track positions of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor listed for the department in the university’s 1974-1975 catalog revealed that EDCI faculty members received doctorates from well-regarded universities. These universities included Arizona State (1); Columbia University (2); Florida State University (1); Indiana University (1); University of Illinois (2); Iowa State University (1); University of Michigan (1); University of Missouri (1); Stanford University (1); University of Texas (1); and the University of Wisconsin (1).

The decade of the 1970s was marked by program developments in Curriculum and Instruction. For example, new courses were added to the department’s list of offerings in response to the educational demands for more specialized undergraduate and graduate level courses in the teaching of mathematics, reading, science, as well as comparative education, curriculum development, analysis of teaching behavior, patterns of Learning and supervision. This pattern of growth in courses and programs is reflected in subsequent Texas A&M University Catalogs, which listed 51 different courses at the undergraduate and grade level offered by the department.
During the 1970s, the department began to increase the number of semester hours required for undergraduate student teaching from six semester hours to fifteen semester hours by 1976-1977. This was in response to a growing recognition of the need for increased practical experiences in elementary and secondary classroom settings. However, Texas legislation at the end of the 1980s would reduce this requirement statewide to a maximum of six semester hours.

In the 1980s the department continued to develop new programs and new approaches to the preparation of teachers at all levels of the educational system. Many of those efforts were supplemented by funded and non-funded research studies, research grants, development grants, and dissertations in the areas of reading, bilingual education, early childhood education, special education, general elementary education, general secondary education, general curriculum and instruction, mathematics, science, language arts, social studies, geography, driver training, higher education, and education technology. By 1986-1987, in addition to offering the “Kindergarten Endorsement,” the department offered such additional diverse special endorsements as “English as a Second Language” and “Driver Training.”

During the decade of the 1990s and into the new millennium, the department has been responsive to state legislation and proactive regarding developing programs to address calls for the reform of teacher education. In the early 1990s, the State of Texas mandated the elimination of undergraduate education degree programs, and required that pre-service teachers complete fewer education courses and more subject matter courses. Simultaneously, there were national forums calling for the revitalization of teacher preparation programs to incorporate more field-based courses and experiences.
The Department, by now having changed its name to Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC), developed an interdisciplinary program designed to prepare elementary teachers initially, and a secondary program to prepare secondary school teachers who would graduate with a degree in the content field, such as biology, English, history, or mathematics.

In 2000, the State Board for Teacher Certification approved three certification levels (early childhood, middle level, and secondary) that would replace the existing elementary and secondary certification levels. Since then, TLAC faculty have responded and developed new programs designed to comply with the state certification regulations.

In 2004, the TLAC department became involved in a new effort for its secondary program. The traditional secondary program was eliminated and the implementation of the Post Baccalaureate Program became the means for certifying secondary teachers. During that same year, courses at the undergraduate level required more field-based work. Today our pre-service teachers usually complete approximately 750 hours in various field-based settings prior to graduation. The department has also stayed current with technology, and most courses have a technology component of some sort imbedded within the curriculum of each course. Students now produce electronic portfolios and use Smart Board, I-tunes, E-Learning and other electronic programs in their course preparation and presentations.

Currently, the department’s administrative unit includes two Associate Department Heads, one who works with the Undergraduate Program and the other who works with the Graduate Program. For a few years the Graduate Advisor, Kerri Smith
worked directly with Department Head, Dennie Smith on issues related to the Graduate Program. In January of 2009, Cathleen Loving was named Associate Head of Graduate Programs. She now works with Kerri Smith and the Graduate Advising Office. In response to the Texas Legislature, the Department changed its undergraduate degree option from EC-4 to EC-6 in the fall of 2009; with all students being certified in English as a Second Language. The middle school certification programs of mathematics and science or language arts and social studies continue to increase in enrollment each semester. In addition to developing new programs for the “traditional” preparation of teachers, many faculty members in TLAC are involved in efforts to address the imminent teacher shortage that is being experienced in the state, and perhaps, the nation.

Both the College and TLAC decisions related to Mission, Vision and Goals are guided by Texas A&M’s Vision 2020—a powerful document forged in 1997 by a broad-based committee under the leadership of President Ray Bowen.
Vision 2020

VISION 2020: CREATING A CULTURE OF EXCELLENCE

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
THE IDEA
On October 10, 1997 President Ray Bowen placed a stake in the ground. He proposed that Texas A&M University strive to be recognized as one of the ten best public universities in the nation by the year 2020, while at the same time maintaining and enhancing our distinctiveness. This goal set in motion the efforts of more than 250 people on and off campus to determine where we are now and how to narrow the distance between the place we are now and the goal President Bowen has envisioned. This is the foundation of Vision 2020.

THE BEST
In order that a course might be charted to our goal, significant research was undertaken to ascertain which public universities are regarded as “the best” and why. To identify qualitative and quantitative attributes of superior public institutions, two approaches were taken. The first was to consider the most prominent ranking systems and their results, as published by US News & World Report and the National Research Council. Six institutions are currently ranked among the nation’s ten best public universities by both of these sources: University of California – Berkeley, University of Michigan, University of California – Los Angeles, University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, University of California – San Diego, and University of Wisconsin – Madison. Comparisons are drawn between Texas A&M University and these six institutions at many points throughout this document. In addition, a number of other universities were deemed worthy of study, in order that all colleges and programs at Texas A&M University be accurately measured against leading academic counterparts. These institutions are Georgia Institute of Technology, University of California – Davis, University of Illinois – Champaign-Urbana, Pennsylvania State University, University of Minnesota, Ohio State University, Purdue University, University of Florida, and University of Texas – Austin.

OUR STRENGTH
Many characteristics distinguish us nationally. We fare very well in our ability to attract National Merit Scholars. Some programs, such as our nautical archaeology unit and its affiliated Institute of Nautical Archeology, are the best in the entire world. Our chemistry program is consistently identified as outstanding, the more remarkable for the dramatic growth it has experienced in the last three decades. The colleges of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Business, Engineering, and Veterinary Medicine are frequently cited as among the very best in the nation. Education for leadership is a fundamental and distinctive part of our campus life. Our ability to engender an attitude of good stewardship marks us; we have the lowest ratio of administrative to general costs of any university in the State of Texas. An expansive physical plant reminds us of the intensity of our growth. We have many existing strengths in which we can and do take pride. Our greatest strength, however, is our desire to be even better.

THE NEED
The need to improve is real. We are good but not good enough. We do not provide the resources that the best public universities in America do to fuel quality teaching, research, and outreach. Our faculty, while excellent, as a whole is not the equal of those at the best institutions in the land, when measured by objective assessment. Many of our programs are very strong, as evidenced by their national recognition; few of our humanities and social science programs,
however, have reached real strength. As an institution, we have accomplished much, but we must not become complacent. We need to be better if we are to effectively serve our students, the State of Texas, and the nation.

**OUR CORE VALUES**

Our core values have been re-articulated and re-affirmed during the extensive process of reviewing our progress. We are dedicated to the search for truth. We hold the public trust sacred. We seek excellence in all we do. We welcome all people. We desire the enlightenment brought by true diversity and global interaction. We will manage ourselves to the highest standards of efficiency and productivity. These powerful values undergird every aspect of our plan.

**OUR MISSION**

Our mission also has been clarified and affirmed. We seek academic, research, and service excellence; teaching excellence; and leadership and citizenship development for our students and all associated with the university. We expect managerial and service excellence from ourselves. Our values and mission set high targets for the future of Texas A&M University.

**OUR VISION**

A culture of excellence will be the hallmark of Texas A&M University in 2020. Our energy and boldness will distinguish us, guide our decision-making, and empower us to continue to improve. Our vision for 2020 addresses, through careful and honest analysis, our strengths and weaknesses. It reflects a steadfast determination to build on strengths, eliminate weaknesses, seek opportunities, and face threats creatively and energetically. We will create a culture of excellence that fulfills the need for an institution with quality of the first order. In 2020 Texas A&M University will be more distinctive than it is today. That distinctiveness will be created on a foundation of quality that is widely recognized and measured by world standards.

**THE TWELVE IMPERATIVES**

The process of Vision 2020 produced hundreds of ideas supporting our goal. Almost all of these suggestions have merit, and most earn acknowledgment in the body of this report. The precepts, focused goals, and measures can be summarized in twelve overarching ideas. We call these the twelve imperatives.

1. **Elevate Our Faculty and Their Teaching, Research, and Scholarship**

The world today is knowledge-based and constantly changing. In such a world, the quality research university is “a creator, organizer, preserver, transmitter, and applier of knowledge.” The foundation of these functions is an excellent faculty in adequate numbers. We need to increase substantially the size of our faculty (perhaps by half), and we must attract and retain many more top scholars, teachers, and researchers. We will have to review and strengthen hiring and tenure policies, enhance compensation, focus our scholarship, and transform our administrative culture. We cannot achieve our goal without a nationally recognized faculty with a passion for teaching and an academic environment that values and rewards innovation, great ideas, and the search for the truth.
2 **Strengthen Our Graduate Programs**

We must have a shift in our thinking about the role of graduate education to attain the level of excellence we desire. A substantially expanded graduate studies effort is critical to our academic aspirations and to our effectiveness as a great research university. Outstanding professors attract superior graduate students and, in many instances, the money to help support their research. But these professors by themselves will not be enough. We must create a dynamic, exciting, discovery-driven intellectual environment that will draw superior graduate students, comparable to those in the nation’s best graduate programs.

3 **Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience**

The core of Texas A&M University must be a residential, learner-centered community that attracts excellent students and provides quality learning and mentoring experiences. We must better prepare learners for lives of discovery, innovation, leadership, and citizenship by better inculcation of writing, thinking, and self-expression skills. Texas A&M University is proud of its history of developing student leaders. Our co-curricular programs are already an area of true distinctiveness, but we must continue to strengthen their substance and reputation and extend their benefits to a greater percentage of the student body. While our retention rate is the highest in Texas, it is low relative to the best national institutions; we must make an institutional commitment to graduate those we enroll. We must emphasize education more than training and significantly improve our student-faculty ratio. We must provide more opportunity for intellectual exchange between distinguished faculty and undergraduates. Our recruiting should be more proactive and produce a more broadly representative student body. We need to expand our honors, study/live-abroad, interdisciplinary studies, and course-assistance programs.

4 **Build the Letters, Arts, and Sciences Core**

Texas A&M University has historically placed less emphasis on the letters and arts. While many of our basic science disciplines are nationally acclaimed, the best public universities have stronger and deeper liberal arts programs and a fuller range of such programs with a significantly higher institutional commitment. Such strengthening is necessary for the true, enduring education of our graduates and the enrichment of their lives. It is abundantly clear that we will never be seen as a premier institution nationally without a far stronger letters, arts, and sciences program.

5 **Build on the Tradition of Professional Education**

Undergraduate education in all areas, including professional education, has been our traditional strength at Texas A&M University. At the heart of Vision 2020 is a belief that we will not only sustain but also continually strengthen our professional programs at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels. We expect that these programs will be the first (as some already are) to
represent Texas A&M University solidly and firmly in the top ten nationally. Our professional programs must also recognize the necessity to prepare their graduates more broadly for entry into a complex, changing, and unpredictable world.

6 **Diversify and Globalize the A&M Community**

The time has passed when the isolation of the Texas A&M University campus served a compelling utilitarian function. Information, communication, and travel technology have produced a highly connected global society. The ability to survive, much less succeed, is increasingly linked to the development of a more pluralistic, diverse, and globally aware populace. It is essential that the faculty, students, and larger campus community embrace this more cosmopolitan environment. The university’s traditional core values will give us guidance and distinctiveness, while preparing us to interact with all people of the globe. Texas A&M University must attract and nurture a more ethnically, culturally, and geographically diverse faculty, staff, and student body.

7 **Increase Access to Knowledge Resources**

Despite recent progress, the intellectual assets represented by Texas A&M University library holdings are underdeveloped and must be increased. Coincidentally, we must recognize that the technology related to the storage, access, and distribution of knowledge resources has changed as much in the last decade as in the 550 years since the invention of movable type. Texas A&M University must invest rapidly, but wisely, to gain parity with its academic peers. It must lead, not just grow, in forcefully developing new methods and measures of success in this rapidly changing arena. The wedding of communications and computer technology will, no doubt, yield the most formidable change in academe by 2020. Texas A&M University must lead the adaptation.

8 **Enrich Our Campus**

The physical environment of our campus should be conducive to scholarly work and study. Texas A&M University has an efficient and well-maintained campus. However, during our rapid growth over the past four decades, the physical unity of the campus has been diminished by the presence of Wellborn Road and the railroad tracks. Innovative planning and bold leadership are needed to redress this division for reasons of safety and convenience as well as aesthetics. West Campus has not maintained the human scale that exists on the Main Campus. Through judicious planning we need to attain the same pedestrian-friendly scale and green space that gives the Main Campus its character. The use of large areas for surface parking needs to be reconsidered so that the unity of the campus is maintained as new building occurs to accommodate growth. As more of the university’s current land holdings are consumed by non-agricultural uses, acquisition of land on or near the Riverside Campus for agricultural development should be a high priority.
9 **Build Community and Metropolitan Connections**

The way that we relate to the local community, Houston, and other metropolitan areas of the state will have a powerful impact on Texas A&M University and the communities supporting and supported by the university. In addition, it is critical that the community in which we live provide opportunities for families to work and grow. Spouses need high-quality employment opportunities. Faculty and researchers need private-sector sponsorships and commercialization support. As we attract a wider range of people to Texas A&M University, the enrichment provided through our connection to a large metropolitan area becomes increasingly important. Correctly choreographed, such a connection gives us the best of both worlds.

10 **Demand Enlightened Governance and Leadership**

Great universities have a clearly articulated vision, a stimulating intellectual environment populated by great faculty and students, and resources adequate to support quality offerings. One other characteristic often contributes to greatness: enlightened leadership. Clear, cooperative relationships between the university and the System must be the norm. To achieve our aspirations, strong, enlightened, stable, and forward-thinking leadership focused on academic quality is essential. We have made progress, but we must guard it zealously. Regents must continue to take the policy high ground. The System administration must acknowledge and nurture Texas A&M University’s role as a comprehensive research university with national peers. The university administration must be steadfast in its demand for quality in every decision. And finally, the university administration must make decisions through a process characterized by openness and appropriate faculty and staff participation. Our responsibility to the System as its flagship must be evidenced in all decision-making. Academic progress is fragile. Enlightened, shared governance and leadership are elemental to its achievement.

11 **Attain Resource Parity with the Best Public Universities**

The combination of rapid population growth, demand for government services and difficult economic times have placed a strain on the Texas treasury in recent years. A good and widely dispersed university system has provided access to a growing college-aged population. Access alone is no longer enough. Texas must have a few universities that offer opportunities equal to the best public universities, while taking complementary steps to maintain access. Competitive peer states have long recognized the economic necessity of comprehensive research universities in meeting the knowledge demands of an information society. States with the best universities are currently investing twice as much funding per student as at Texas A&M University. Texas A&M University and the University of Texas are ideally positioned to achieve recognition as top national institutions because of the state’s historical, constitutional financial commitment to them. Texas may also need additional institutions of this caliber. The institutions designated to fill this role must be acknowledged and supported in a way that is consistent with national competition. They must be provided the flexibility and exercise the wisdom and courage to price their offerings more in line with their value, while taking complementary steps to maintain
access. Finally, they must use their historical strength to generate more private capital. Texas A&M University must attain resource parity with the best public institutions to better serve Texas.

12 Meet Our Commitment to Texas

Texas A&M University is a creation of the state and in its origin was designed to prepare educated problem-solvers to lead the state’s development. This fundamental mission, born out of the land grant heritage of service, remains today. Texas A&M University’s aspiration to be among the best public universities in the country resonates with this historical mandate. The diverse population of Texas should have access to the best public education in America without having to leave the state. Texas A&M University must also reach out even more to help solve the most difficult societal problems, including those related to public education, crime, and the environment, and must honor its heritage of enhancing the economic development of all regions of the state. Texas A&M University, if it aspires to national prominence, must first stay committed to Texas.
Section 2: Visions and Goals

University Goals

Vision 2020: Creating a Culture of Excellence articulates Texas A&M University’s bold recognition of the necessary institutional evolution required to achieve its mission as a land, sea, and space grant institution of global preeminence. The foundation of Vision 2020 is the proposal that Texas A&M University strive to be recognized as one of the ten best public universities in the nation by the year 2020, while at the same time maintaining and enhancing our distinctiveness. For more information, visit http://www.tamu.edu/vision2020/about.html

Mission, Vision, and Values

Texas A&M University

Mission

Texas A&M University is dedicated to the discovery, development, communication, and application of knowledge in a wide range of academic and professional fields. Its mission of providing the highest quality undergraduate and graduate programs is inseparable from its mission of developing new understandings.
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through research and creativity. It prepares students to assume roles in leadership, responsibility, and service to society. Texas A&M assumes as its historic trust the maintenance of freedom of inquiry and an intellectual environment nurturing the human mind and spirit. It welcomes and seeks to serve persons of all racial, ethnic, and geographic groups, women and men alike, as it addresses the needs of an increasingly diverse population and a global economy. In the twenty-first century, Texas A&M University seeks to assume a place of preeminence among public universities while respecting its history and traditions.

**Purpose**

To develop leaders of character dedicated to serving the greater good. Our purpose statement carries with it the responsibility, the traditions and the forward thinking of Texas A&M University exemplified by all who are associated with the university — its faculty and staff, and its current and former students. This can be defined by six core values:

- Excellence
- Integrity
- Leadership
- Loyalty
- Respect
- Selfless Service

**Vision**

People are Texas A&M University's most valuable asset. The university strives to maintain an environment which encourages all employees to achieve their personal and professional goals and aspirations as we work toward achieving the university's mission. In this environment, each person's individuality and contributions are respected. Texas A&M University recognizes that all people have rights at work, including the right to be treated with respect and dignity, the right to be recognized and rewarded fairly for performance, and the right to a work
environment free from discrimination and harassment. The university is committed to these rights. All people at Texas A&M University are expected to treat each other in accordance with these rights. Texas A&M University recognizes the importance of communication, and is committed to an environment which stresses open sharing of information and ideas, and values input from all people. Texas A&M University will strive for a work environment in which all people accept responsibility to contribute to the success of the University, and are empowered to do so. Finally, for this vision to become reality and endure, it must be continually communicated, supported and upheld.

College of Education and Human Development

Mission

The College of Education and Human Development At Texas A&M University and its faculty, staff and students are committed to the preparation of students and the conduct of research, service and engagement to enhance education and health outcomes.

Vision

Our work transforms lives.

Strategic Initiatives and Goals

In an effort to continually improve and evaluate the college’s success, the following four strategic initiatives evolved that were deemed necessary in accomplishing the instructional, research and service/engagement mission of the college:

- Production of work that is of high quality and impact
- Promotion of synergy across teaching, research and service activities
- Establishment of a collaborative, supportive and diverse learning community
• Enhancement of access to fiscal, technological and facility-related resources to support excellence.

Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture

Mission

The central mission of the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture is to provide programs for the preparation and development of quality educators at all levels PreK - Higher Education through valuing collaboration, diversity, inquiry, and problem solving.

Vision

Our work transforms the learning of our students for a changing world

Strategic Initiatives and Goals

More specifically, the department is responsible for

• preparing entry and advanced level professionals in Curriculum and Instruction for teaching and teacher preparation

• offering concentrations within the graduate program for Mathematics Education, Science Education, Urban Education, ESL, Early Childhood, Literacy and Reading and Culture and Curriculum

• developing and disseminating applied and basic knowledge in the areas of specialization; and

• providing service activities to the public, private, and professional sectors.
College Goals

**CEHD Leadership Retreat Follow Up**

**SCHOLARLY DOMAIN:** Undergraduate Education

**Priority Goal 1: Increase diverse student enrollment to 20% in two years and 25% in five years (FY09 16.9%, FY05 12%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Targeted recruiting efforts (to include diverse backgrounds, first generation, high need fields) | • Demographics of Undergraduates  
• Demographics of freshman class  
• Demographics of transfer students  
• Track high schools for incoming freshman  
• Track students brought to campus | Already collected  
Already collected  
Available  
Already collected  
Will begin FY10 |

**COMMENTS:** Provide need based scholarships, bridge program/work study funds; use diverse students in recruitment; work with Honors (Dave Louie, Alonzo Flowers); partner with junior/community college; engage Byrne Center students; use learning communities, Governor’s school; highlight success stories; connect with early college high schools.

**Priority Goal 2: Improve retention and graduation rates (current first year retention rate 79.7%, minority % is less; 4 year graduation rate 45.8%, 6 year rate 64.2%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evaluate current retention efforts | • Retention rate of freshmen to sophomore year  
• Graduation rate 4 and 6 year  
• Retention of students once they are admitted into programs  
• Evaluate retention of students involved in learning communities | University data  
University data  
Need to coordinate  
Need to do |
| Identification of available (monetary resources | • Monitor distribution of scholarship funds  
• Monitor # of students with financial aid by major | Need to do  
University report |
| Retain through engagement and connections | • Student survey of college/department engagement | Need to do |

**COMMENTS:** Invest in the most successful programs; provide need/merit based scholarships, bridge programs and work study funds; utilize Honors Program (Louie and Flowers) and David Byrd; engage Byrne Center students, learning communities and Governor’s school; use tutors and other student mentoring

| Priority Goal 3: Ensure Students have Adequate Technology and Skill |
|---|---|---|
| Strategies | Indicators | Data Status |
| Develop scope and sequence for technology knowledge and skills for each undergraduate program in the CEHD. | • Technology skills tests | Need to develop |

**COMMENTS:**
## Priority Goal 4: Create a Climate that Fosters and Supports Development of Students with Diverse Backgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mentorship of students-Develop list of mentorship activities | • Numbers of students involved in research activities  
• Number of students in mentorship programs  
• Participation in out of class activities | Need to develop  
Need to develop  
Need to develop |
| • Engage students on research projects  
• Upper classmen mentors  
• Engagement in out of class activities | | |
| Increase opportunities for study abroad activities | • Number of students involved in study abroad  
• Study of change in perceptions after study abroad | Available  
Need to do |

**COMMENTS:** Engage appropriate student groups; reward GAs and faculty who mentor undergraduate students

## SCHOLARLY DOMAIN: Graduate Education

### Priority Goal 1: Manage Recruit, Retention and Enrollment (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Specify expectation concerning number of doctoral students a faculty member should mentor/graduate per year | • Time to graduation  
• # of graduates per program  
• and faculty member per year  
• # of students faculty members advise | University data  
University data  
Available |

Manage a strategic admissions process

**COMMENTS:** Note expectation on A1; recruitment needed
### Priority Goal 2: Prepare and Support Graduate Students for Success in Higher Education/Research Professoriate (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Specify expectations for placement of students in university with graduate program | • # of students to research institutions  
• # of students publishing *(FY 08 160 publications)*  
• # of students with grant management experience  
• # of students with grant proposal writing experience  
• # of students with teaching experience  
• # of students with research experience  
• # of students presenting research at conferences | Have partial  
Already collect  
Need to collect  
Need to collect  
Available  
Need to collect  
Available |
| Offer targeted support for students pursuing university career | • Track funding to student indicating interest in faculty positions | Need to do |

**COMMENTS:** Note expectation on A1; track progress; success stories; systematic strategies for mentoring; portfolios for teaching and research

### Priority Goal 3: Creating Climate that Fosters and Supports Development of Student and Faculty of Diverse Backgrounds through Research and Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Faculty mentorship and financial incentives  
Define mentorship activities  
• Participation in research activities  
• Research presentations  
• Publish together  
• Work with journal editors | • Measure the involvement with mentorship activities | Available at the department level, need to develop easy data summary capacity |

**COMMENTS:** Provide faculty incentives, continue to increase student stipends, partner with Region Service Center, potential development opportunities for students, climate survey
## SCHOLARLY DOMAIN: Research

**Priority Goal 1: Increase external funding in two years to $20 million and in five years to $25 million (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Provide college level assistance with proposal development | • # of submissions  
• External funding dollars (*FY08 $19.9 million*)  
• # of faculty involved as PIs (*FY08 66 of research faculty, 55% of TTR*)  
• # of collaborative grants – experience grant faculty team with faculty with little or no grant experience | Already collected  
Already collected  
Already collected  
Need to do |
| Staff mentor staff in proposal development and grant/contract management | • # of new awards | Already collected |
| | | |
| Improved and/or automatic routing of RFPs based on research interests | | |
| Reward faculty who engage in extramural funding proposal submissions as PI | • % of faculty that are PIs | Already collected |

**COMMENTS:** Need leadership from successful PIs; mentorship model; college workshops on grant writing; incentives rewards for faculty participation, promote/encourage interdisciplinary research; encourage faculty to sign up for existing national service; try to link students into grant alerts; improve communication with university (access to databases); promote one-time merit; profiles of funded faculty; create a culture where seeking grant funds is the norm; for promotion to professor would need to have grants, driving research, and support students with the grants; need campus support of UG research; utilize Kathy May/Windy Hollis as staff mentors; continue educating donors of impact of research to students/university/state/nation; share research developments with advisory council; invite researchers to council meetings;
### Priority Goal 2: Encourage/Increase Multi-disciplinary Partnerships (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify then remove barriers to collaboration-</td>
<td>• Updated policies and guidelines</td>
<td>Need to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct focus groups to discuss other barriers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build research groups around common interests</td>
<td>• Number of research groups</td>
<td>Need to count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of grant submissions from these groups</td>
<td>Data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate department-wide and college-wide research activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:** A-1 process revision; communicate in review requests for promotion and tenure that collaboration is valued in our college; senior scholars model of good collaborations; use college white papers as starting point; provide seed money; more web presence and provide additional support for web updates; list active grants

### Priority Goal 3: Increase Research Faculty Dissemination of Findings i

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate research to policy makers and practitioners.</td>
<td>• Number of publications in targeted communications</td>
<td>Need to collect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholder feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:** Use college communication office and VPR office.
## SCHOLARLY DOMAIN: Engagement

### Priority Goal 1: Increase use of Technology Mediated Instruction to facilitate access to high quality programs (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involve faculty and staff in technology training</td>
<td>• Number of faculty, GAs and staff involved in training activities</td>
<td>Need to collect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Build infrastructure for use of information technology | • Use of TMI courses in academic programs  
• Use of TMI courses in continuing education program | Have data for courses totally or at least 50% on line                     |

**COMMENTS:** increased efficiency; use of Moodle software;

### Priority Goal 2: Evaluate current needs of (communication, donor relations, other)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct SWOT analysis pertaining to communications and donor relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicizing data to constituents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:** Bridging connection between faculty to development to identify needs; donors observe classroom as a way to engage; linking specifically to department heads; college publicize activities first before other media venues; link faculty to donors and appropriate communications
Departmental Goals

CEHD Leadership Team Evaluation System
Dennie Smith, Department Head
Teaching, Learning and Culture

Goals for 2009-2010

August 26, 2009

Department

- Complete the development of a revised faculty evaluation system (Tenure and Clinical) with more specific expectations for merit (Faculty Initiative)
- Continue to establish and post on web site procedures, policies and systems for efficient operations
- Continue to implement distributed and participatory leadership model for departmental operations with leaders of the various concentration areas
- Provide student representation on department committees especially the graduate and undergraduate committee. (Currently the search committees have student representation)
- Reward faculty members for mentoring faculty seeking promotion and tenure
- Initiate conversations about strategy to select the next department head (2010-2011)
- Continue to establish and promote a diverse academic community
- Hire an Associate/Full Professor in Early Childhood Education
- Implement Learning Studio (former Verizon Lab) to assist students and faculty with digital projects
- Expand Reads and Counts Program to include a summer programs in local schools
- Expand and manage study abroad opportunities and international student teaching opportunities
- Increase the number of faculty involved in submitting and securing external grants
• Maintain Accelerated Online Certification Program enrollment (32) and move the course management system to Moodle

• Designate specific individuals to maintain and up-date TLAC website

• Ensure that all committee minutes are archived for easy access (secured on the Web)

• Establish strategies for improving communication through various meetings and through the use of technology

• Preparation for N1H1 virus with plan to offer all courses online

Graduate Education

• Increase the number of graduate students (10%) securing positions in universities.

• Increase the number of collaborative research projects and publications with faculty / students

• Increase the number of national presentations with faculty and students

• Recruit and begin 2nd online Executive EdD Cohort Spring 2010 semester

• Implement Clinical Faculty’s role of chairing Master and EdD committees

• Implement online annual review system for all graduate students

• Implement online assessment of Graduate Assistants

• Provide opportunities for graduate students to participate and present in national conferences (AERA and other major conferences)

• Continue collaborative development of EdD with TAMUI (50% split of courses for the next cohort.)

• Develop systematic orientation for Graduate Assistant orientation and training

Undergraduate Education

• Implement the new PreK-6 program for teacher preparation

• Increase opportunities for students to complete internships and student teaching with school systems throughout Texas and internationally
- Recruit a higher percentage of students to middle grades certification with an emphasis on science and math
- Implement new Walkabout App for observing and providing field experience feedback to students
- Develop new technology skills through practice and student projects
- Provide more options for tenure line faculty to teach undergraduate courses

Research
- Increase external funding to sponsor research and graduate students
- Increase the number of faculty (10%) involved in securing external funding to support research and graduate students through support and incentives
- Modify current system to ensure that Co PI’s are recognized in college and department reports

Teaching
- Continue to establish increased accessibility and overall quality of online and distance courses
- Increase the opportunities for international experiences for students to strengthen educational experience

Service
- Establish partner school, Pebble Creek, for field site to demonstrate technology applications for teaching and learning
- Document engagement (service) activities demonstrating impact on teachers and students (student teacher placements, collaborative grants, professional development, consultancy, curriculum development, etc.)
- Document engagement activities demonstrating national impact (offices held, board memberships, editorships, committee assignments, and other tasks)

## Departmental Goals merged with College Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLAC GOALS (College Merged with Departmental Goals Draft 10/29/09)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Note: Challenges listed at the end of this document)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Support Meeting CEHD Strategic Goals</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>Does not meet expectations</td>
<td>1.1 Enrollment Management&lt;br&gt;Math and Science majors can enroll at any time in the middle school program with Social Studies and Language Arts at a designated time. This strategy has already impacted (10-15% increase) the number of math and science teachers that will enroll Fall 09. Undergraduate advisors are emphasizing math and science opportunities in group and individual sessions with undergraduates. Submit a petition for departmental undergraduate programs to become designated as high impact due to enrollment increases without appropriate funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Graduate Education | Does not meet expectations | 1.3 Preparation of Professoriate<br>Action: The faculty has transformed the curriculum by |

---
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Meets expectations
Exceeds expectations
Outstanding

adding more research courses, increasing opportunities to refine students' teaching and presentation skills, and strengthening collaborative relationships as well as course content focused to producing publications before graduating. The journal format for dissertations has further facilitated the effort to focus on publications to qualify our graduate students for professorial positions. In addition, graduate students are expected to teach an undergraduate class or assist in teaching another professor before graduating. The department continues to recruit extensively in local and regional areas and many students are returning to leadership positions in their districts, especially the urban concentration group.

Graduated PhD’s
28 PhD 2009
30 PhD 2008
20 PhD 2007
19 PhD 2006

1.4 Preparation of Practitioners
Action: Online Executive Ed.D. was implemented January, 2009 with 11 students. The 2nd cohort will be implemented in January, 2010 for approximately 15 students. Plans are to implement 3 cohorts with an evaluation that explores both formative feedback as well as cost benefit analyses of the program’s effectiveness in order to determine future development and evolution of the program.

Many students, especially in the urban concentration, are enrolled in the Ph.D. rather than the Ed.D. degree program. Discussions will be initiated with the two endowed urban education professors to develop a plan for an Ed.D. degree designed to provide experience and service more closely aligned to the requests of the students and the requirements of the environments in which they will serve.

The M.Ed. had 99 graduates in 2008. Plans are to maintain this level of enrollment and increase the number in high need areas. There has been increased interest in the online M.Ed. and this program has the potential of growing significantly. Plans are to maintain its present enrollment level for next year and then assess the budget conditions for supporting growth. Approximately 75% of the
Graduate Secondary Certification students continue after achieving certification requirements to complete a master’s degree and the department will continue to support and maintain this level of enrollment. Due to economic uncertainties this year, the department will continue to focus on program quality in all degree plans and closely monitor those programs where it may be economically feasible to increase enrollments.

c) Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.3 All research faculty acquire extra-mural funding  
**Action:** Twenty faculty members in TLAC are serving as PI’s or Co-PI’s on grants (according to the College Report, Windy Hollis). Major grants in TLAC are under the direction of the following faculty members: Carol Stuessy, Cathy Loving, Chance Lewis, Trina Davis, Hersh Waxman, and Scott Slough. The importance of securing extramural funds has been discussed many times in department meetings and in other individual content area meetings and will continue to be a focus of the department’s overall mission. The Department incorporates an incentive for securing extramural funding in the faculty evaluation process and when possible, provides extra funding for travel or resources that might be required for securing grants. The current climate would make it difficult to emphasize more weighting for securing external funds in the faculty evaluation process; however, this will continue to be a priority issue for discussion with faculty, and I will continue to investigate the possibility of providing additional travel funds and time incentives for writing and submitting proposals for funding. In addition, I will explore the possibility of offering one month summer salary for any faculty member securing funds that generate salary savings and supports graduate students. Also, I will investigate the possibility of providing additional travel funds for writing and submitting for funding. The culture in the department does not reflect as much action as is needed to secure extramural funds. One faculty member recently secured state funding after five years advocating that external funds were not available in his area. The Department rewards extramural funding in the annual evaluation, but probably is not weighted enough in the overall context of what is important.

1.4 All research faculty disseminate findings in top-tier publications  
**Action:** Twenty one of twenty five (84%) research faculty disseminated findings in top tier publications. Three Assistant Professors and one Associate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Service/Engagement</th>
<th>Professor did not meet the requirement of two journal publications this year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7 Targeted dissemination of research findings that impact practice and policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action: The 8 journal editorships in TLAC may impact practice and/or policy but this is difficult to assess. One could submit, as they do, that the publications and research by faculty have national and international impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Synergy Across Scholarship Domains</td>
<td>1.5 Innovative, high quality preparation programs that impact education and health outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action: The certification of about 600 elementary and secondary teachers in the department occurs through a variety of models, ranging from traditional student teaching, paid internships, and graduate education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The year-long internship for undergraduate teacher preparation the undergraduate program has partnership districts who have agreed to pay, supervise and hire the six students in each district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Single Long Distance Student Teaching Districts (2008-09) have increased to 56 with 6 additional districts on the waiting list to offer internships for our future teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Graduate Secondary Program certified 73 teachers in 2008-09 who worked in 33 public school systems. Currently, 83 have signed up for the 2009-10 cohort. An average of 95% of students participating in this program have accepted positions in schools over the duration of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The accelerated online certification program continues to emphasize quality and extensive field experiences and has steadily increased in number, certifying approximately 26 teachers annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study Abroad programs and international student teaching experiences have provided additional, enriched opportunities for undergraduates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiences in using technology to enhance teaching and learning and certification in ESL are elements of the programs that give Aggie teachers a competitive edge in seeking positions. The Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
continues to attract recruiters to the campus to offer positions to our graduates (Career Fair Recruiting Districts = 152 in the Spring, 09 and 101 in Fall, 09). In addition, programs have been redesigned to meet state requirements, INTASC Teacher Education Standards, and ISTE Technology Standards to continue to prepare teachers for future classrooms. Determining the impact of our teachers in follow-up years is hampered due to not having access to individual student and teacher achievement data in Texas.

2.1 Instruction
The department continues to implement a peer teaching observation process for faculty (especially new faculty and graduate students) for the improvement of instruction. Faculty who volunteer to participate are randomly assigned to observe or teach a face-to-face class (or review an online class) once a year. The overall goal is for faculty to share their good ideas in instruction and to learn through the observation process. Eighty five percent (85%) of faculty have participated in this faculty development model.

2.2 Research
The department relies mostly on a traditional model for faculty mentorship whereby new professors are assigned a mentor by the department's leadership team. During the Fall 08 and Spring 09 semesters two different faculty members were assigned to mentor assistant professors as part of their workload. The assistant professors were brought together monthly and through individual conferences to assist them with research and publication. In addition, editorial support was also provided to assist with the finalization of publications. The group-oriented process coupled with an assigned mentor responsible for delivering information and supporting faculty research development has received positive response overall and seems to merit continuation.

The tenured faculty annually review and provide written feedback to all non-tenured assistant professors for progress toward tenure and promotion. The department head follows up with individual conferences with the assistant professor to discuss the feedback and develop support mechanisms for continued improvement (including, if needed, written action plans).

f) Collaborative, Does not 3.1 Create a work climate that fosters and supports
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportive and Diverse Communities</th>
<th>meet expectations</th>
<th>development of students and faculty of diverse backgrounds through a) research initiatives and b) instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A participatory management process occurs by using a committee structure to refine curriculum and present program recommendations to the faculty for approval. The Graduate and Undergraduate Committees study and make recommendations concerning academic matters. The Leadership Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Department Head and makes recommendations for the department as a whole.</strong> The diversity and/or different intellectual frames among the faculty requires considerable time and opportunity for discussion in order to facilitate the decision making process and to bring about specific courses of action. <strong>The TLAC faculty is respectful and highly professional in presenting differing points of view with other faculty and with the department head. Some committees, such as the Faculty Evaluation Committee, are formulated to deal with special issues. Faculty participate in elections for all college and departmental standing committees. The Graduate Student Association has input on graduate issues and is currently active with the department’s program review scheduled for review in Spring 2010.</strong> The overall departmental climate could perhaps be improved by including graduate and undergraduate students on most departmental committees and this issue merits future discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The TLAC Staff practices effective client relations in their interactions with students, faculty and each other. Their effective client relations are predicated on a commitment to take care of requests and to carry out their responsibilities in a positive and constructive manner. They function as a team, serving as a backup to each other in accomplishing the various functions of the department. The phone is answered professionally with the department’s name and/or function along with the identity of the person. In addition, a monthly staff meeting is conducted to deal with administrative matters along with any specific problem areas.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The department has been using a process and a communication mechanism called the “Concern Opportunity Form” (COF) for over 4 years to resolve student issues with a course or faculty member. The COF is attached to the syllabus provided by each</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
class taught by TLAC faculty. The form requests that the student put his/her concerns in writing and submit to the Department Head. It also encourages students to try to resolve issues with the specific faculty member before bringing it to the Department Head. Faculty are aware of the process and are informed of any issues related to their teaching responsibilities that are brought to the Department Head.

All students enrolled in online courses are surveyed during the first two weeks to deal with any concerns related to access or delivery of the virtual courses. The department has basically eliminated complaints related to the online courses with this process.

g) Fiscal, Technological, Staff and Facility-related Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.1 Partnerships to support renovations and construction of quality research and teaching facilities

The Classroom for the Future (CFF) and Learning Studio is envisioned as a place for faculty and students to develop knowledge and skills along with conducting research related to the use and impact of technology for teaching and learning. The Department has been actively working to increase the knowledge and skills throughout the preparation of undergraduate teachers. Also, graduate students are pursuing more research related to these new technologies. The Verizon Laboratory will be renamed and converted to the Classroom for the Future with the help of the Dean’s office’s technology funding. Undergraduate and graduate students will have support to develop new technology products and conduct research. A media resource staff member and work-study students will provide support in the learning studio. Also, the College will help to expand the concept over the next two years.

4.2 Identify funding strategies for development and implementation of innovative programs and outreach

The anticipated funding for the implementation and administration of the online Executive Ed.D. from the Provost’s office, as well as a proposal to the Office of Education did not materialize. Three cohorts (2009, 2010 and 2012) are planned for implementation within the current budget parameters. The budget along with possible blending of the cohort participants in other courses will determine the feasibility of annual or biannual cohorts.
4.3 Extramural funding support for 100% of Ph.D. students

Currently, the faculty in the department are funding 24 of 85 (28%) graduate students. The Leadership Team and faculty are aware of the effort to fund full-time graduate students through extramural funding. PRISE, an NSF-Funded Project (Dr. Carol Stuessy) has been supporting up to 10 graduate students annually through the grant with 5 students graduating this year. The engagement of faculty in grant writing to support graduate students and generate salary savings is embedded in the overall departmental reward and promotion system.

4.4 Allocation of discretionary resources to support research initiatives of faculty

The department has supported two assistant professors for research training in data analysis during the EPSY Summer Workshops and national data base training for two assistant professors in Washington D.C. Plans are being made to sponsor faculty to participate in a Washington, D.C. trip related to the upcoming Teacher Quality grant.

4.5 Interdisciplinary partnerships with corporate, state and federal entities –None to report

4.6 Recruit outstanding full-time faculty and staff

The department was not successful in recruiting for the Associate Professor position in Early Childhood Education due to the criteria of “experience in grant activity.” Only one staff member has been hired due to a vacant position created from a promotion. The collaborative, team atmosphere of the current faculty and staff contributes to a supportive work environment. The College has been receptive to equity pay adjustments to maintain a competitive pay structure for both faculty and staff.

4.7 Retain 95% of full-time faculty and staff

The retention of full-time faculty has been 100% this year (2009) with one retirement.

<p>| Complete review of undergraduate and graduate program | Appoint an Associate Department Head to facilitate the program review and gradually accept responsibility for coordinating the graduate program. (Cathleen Loving, Associate Professor was hired – Jan 09) |
| Complete the | Faculty, Department Head and Dean have approved |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of a revised faculty evaluation system (Tenure and Clinical) with more specific expectations for merit (Faculty Initiative)</th>
<th>New faculty evaluation criteria that has been aligned with university, college and department goals. The evaluation guidelines will be implemented for 2010 cycle.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide student representation on department committees (Currently the search committees have student representation).</td>
<td>Student representatives have been appointed to the Leadership Group, Graduate and Undergraduate Committees (differing degrees of access depending on committee).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate conversations about strategy to select the next department head in two years</td>
<td>Faculty is aware that the eight year term of the current department head ends August 2011. The dean has announced that the next department head will be appointed from within.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit 2nd online Executive Ed.D. cohort</td>
<td>The invitations to 15 students have been made to begin the 2nd cohort in January 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement online assessment of graduate students</td>
<td>Online portfolio system has been developed and will be used Spring 10. (Some delay due to new campus-wide “Compass” system being employed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more opportunities for funding graduate students to make presentations at national conferences.</td>
<td>Now allow doctoral students to be provided with $500 to attend national or international conferences; $300 for regional—encourages paper presentation, but not required for first-timers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended and was granted approval to implement Clinical Faculty’s Role for Chairing Master and EdD Committees</td>
<td>Approved by the College GIC committee in September 09. (Currently under consideration in Office of Graduate Studies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement the new Pre K-6 program as required by TEA to include state and national standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase opportunities for students to complete internships and student teaching with school systems throughout Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit a higher percentage of students to middle grades certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with an emphasis on science and math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement new APP for clinical professors to use for Walkthroughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Reads and Counts Tutoring Program to include summer programs in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Study Abroad opportunities for student teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement Classroom of the Future and Learning Studio to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support the development of new educational technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert Accelerate Online Credential Program learning modules to Moodle--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a new course management system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish school based sites to demonstrate the use of new technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as the Smartboard and itouch technology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Challenges**

Undergraduate enrollment will need to be managed/reduced due to available instructional
Managing enrollment at the undergraduate level is difficult due to university admission policies.

Recruitment and retention of more diversity in teacher education, especially males.

Recruitment of students for teaching in shortage areas such as science and math.

Gaining access to achievement data to measure impact of TAMU’s teachers on student achievement.

More emphasis on developing professional dispositions during the early teacher education classes.

Admission standards need to be revised, better defined and used to admit graduate students.

---

**Connection to Vision 2020 Goals**

The guiding document of Texas A&M, Vision 2020, is the standard upon which goals are set within the colleges and departments of the University. Goals which are set on the departmental level are guided by Vision 2020 in all aspects. In this way, all department and college goals are aligned with the University goals, creating a unified effort across the University to meet the guiding principles of Vision 2020.
A major focus of Vision 2020 is a Reinvestment of Faculty, which will be discussed further in Volume 2. Since the beginning of the focus on 2020, twelve (12) faculty members have been hired in the department, allowing for an expansion of the types of programs offered and enhancement in all specializations. Most of the seven concentration areas have been strengthened by the addition of carefully selected faculty members.
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Evolution of the Undergraduate Program

The Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture follows the motto, “Always expect more of Aggie teachers.” As the needs of the public schools evolve, TLAC has been proactive in preparing future teachers for a culturally and linguistically diverse student population. Below are examples of the department’s proactive efforts.

ESL Endorsed

In the 2000-2001 school year, Texas public schools had 570,453 English Language Learners. In the school year 2007-2008, Texas public schools had 775,432 English language learners (Texas Education Agency, Academic Excellence Indicator System). In response to the need for preparing future teachers to work with English Language Learners most of our pre-service teachers take nine hours of ESL course work. In 2004, TLAC had 3 teachers become ESL endorsed. In 2008, TLAC had 283 pre-service teachers became ESL endorsed.

Math/Science Teachers

It is estimated that over the next decade, schools will need 200,000 or more new teachers in science and math (Business Higher Education Forum). TLAC has been proactive in recruiting pre-service teachers for these high needs areas. In 2004, TLAC had 36 teachers become certified in math / science for the middle grades. In 2008, TLAC had 62 teachers become certified in math / science, and the enrollment in the middle grade math/science program continues to increase.
**Technology**

Technology is changing the way teachers interact with students, parents, and content. In an effort to make certain our pre-service teachers use their knowledge of subject matter to “enrich professional practice, and provide positive models for students, colleagues, and the community,” TLAC undergraduate courses have added the ISTE National Educational Technology Standards and Performance Indications for Teachers.

**TLAC Graduate Programs**

The original TLAC graduate program began under the direction of Dr. Glenn Ross Johnson and originally consisted of five faculty members. Prior to 1969, the graduate program, like the department, was located in the College of Liberal Arts where students received Master's of Education, Master's of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy degrees. In 1968-1969, Dr. Johnson, along with the five faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts, initiated the process for graduate program approval from the Texas Coordinating Board of Higher Education. The Board approved the Doctor of Philosophy degree that included a 64-hour program with 51 hours of coursework beyond the master's degree and 13 hours for dissertation research. Likewise, as the Ph.D. was approved, so were the Master's of Education and Master's of Science degree.
The Department’s first doctoral students included those who had transferred from the College of Liberal Arts. On May 24, 1970, the first six students received their Doctor of Philosophy degree from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. Since that time, more than four hundred students have received their Doctor of Philosophy or Doctor of Education degrees from TLAC.

Like the undergraduate elementary and secondary teacher education programs, TLAC’s Graduate Programs also have undergone dynamic changes over the years. The graduate program described in the 1973-1974 Graduate Catalog indicated that the department offered coursework in higher education, elementary education, secondary education, general curriculum and instruction, reading mathematics, science, language arts, and social studies. In addition, coursework in research and theory at the graduate level accelerated the development of the program. Increasingly, faculty and students became involved in conducting research, obtaining externally funded grants, and publishing journal articles and textbooks.

Early Childhood Education, as an area of specialization, appeared for the first time in the 1975-1976 Graduate Catalog. By 1980-1981, the Graduate Catalog included additional areas of specialization such as Curriculum Director; Instructional Leader; Research, Planning and Evaluation; and Supervision. Soon, Educators for Diverse Settings was added to the list as was Instructional Development and Training and Development.

During the 1990s, graduate programs were refined further. For example, Reading (RDNG) expanded with ten different graduate level courses and became a separate listing from the other courses offered under Education Curriculum and
Instruction (EDCI). In addition, there was a focus on strengthening the doctoral courses in the curriculum and instruction and research and design cores and revised courses in the cognate areas in the M.S., M.Ed., and Ph.D. Programs. The Bilingual/ESL cognate areas enrollment increased significantly and this cognate area merged with the Multicultural Education cognate area.

In 1999, the College of Education was reorganized. As a result of reorganization, Education Technology was transferred to Educational Psychology. In June 2000, Bilingual Education was moved to Educational Psychology and soon became known as Hispanic Bilingual Education, with courses that are co-listed with TLAC. In response to this programmatic shift, the graduate level Multicultural Education, Urban Education and ESL/International cognates merged to become the Multicultural/Urban/ESL/International Education cognate area.

Since its inception, the primary goal of the department’s doctoral program has been to prepare its graduates to assume various types of academic and professional roles that range from professorships in higher education to leadership positions in K-12 schools, businesses, government and other educational agencies. Graduates of our programs are expected to be contributors of new knowledge to the professional literature, as well as evaluators for the existing knowledge base and leaders in implementing best educational practices. Graduates are expected to understand and use research skills in a highly competent manner.

All doctoral degrees granted by TLAC are in Curriculum and Instruction. Students specialize in at least one program area such as Curriculum and Instruction/Foundations, Early Childhood Education, Mathematics Education, Multicultural Education, Urban
Education, English as a Second Language/International Education, Reading Education, Science Education, or Social Studies Education. Originally these areas of specialization were called academic research units. Currently, they are deemed as concentration or cognate areas.

The day-to-day operation of the graduate program is under the direction of a faculty member, who serves as the Graduate Coordinator, and recently as the Associate Department Head of Graduate Programs.

**Changes which have occurred in the previous 5 years**

In the past five years, there have been a number of changes in the department. Some of these changes include an increase in technology in both undergraduate and graduate classes, international teaching and learning opportunities for students and faculty, and development and implementation of field-based certification programs at the undergraduate level. Below are indicators of change for each of the categories described.

**Faculty and Student Technology Use**

- Blackboard to deliver university on-line and blended courses; Moodle used as an alternative course management system
- Department support of Professional Development related to technology use in courses and on-line course development
• Podcasting seminars; University iTunes; Multimedia sym-poiums with Smart boards
• Verizon Classroom development and conversion to “Classroom of the Future” project
• On-line course increase at undergraduate level and graduate level
• Technology projects included in courses (Syllabi to provide examples)

**International Teaching and Learning Opportunities**

• Faculty Teaching and Conducting Research in Doha, Qatar
• Primary Educator Preparation Program (PEPP): Sept 2004 – June 2009
  (Program has been a collaborative project of the College of Education and Human Development at TAMU and the College of Education at QU).
• Reading, ESL, Mathematics, and Sciences Methods courses developed and co-taught by TAMU TLAC faculty and QU faculty
• TLAC faculty involved in Education for a New ERA research grant January 2008 – January 2011
• Study Abroad opportunities involving faculty and students (most are undergraduate, a few new ones with graduate students)

**Other Important Curriculum, Instruction and Research Changes**

• New EC-4 and 4-8 Programs created based on new state certification grade levels.
• New Generalist EC-6 certification courses implemented in fall 2009
• Secondary Program phased out based on changes in state requirements for teacher certification.
• Clinical Faculty line created to support teaching courses at the undergraduate level (some have various levels of Graduate Faculty Status as well)
• Part-time faculty reduction and increase in full-time positions and graduate student teaching responsibilities
• Class size in increased in undergraduate primary level methods courses from ~20 to ~40.
• New faculty hires to support placements of student in field-experience at junior and senior level and during student teaching
• Reinvestment efforts between 2004-2009 resulting in TLAC hiring 16 full-time faculty, including 11 tenure track and 5 clinical faculty
• More courses taught on-line or blended using Blackboard or Moodle
• Revised admission requirements and greater public relations to show strengths of Aggie Teacher Graduates
• Increasingly successful Career Fair with 150+ school districts

**Departmental Attributes**

• Prepare teachers for the 21st Century
• Prepare educational researchers
• Prepare curriculum leaders
• Pre-service teachers are certified in ESL
• TAMU produces one of the highest numbers of mathematics/science teachers in the State of Texas
• Large enrollment of Regents’ Scholars – first generation college students
• College Learning Community for first year students
External Review

- Study Abroad experiences in international schools
- Diverse settings for field-based placement for undergraduate students
- Most diverse college on TAMU campus

**Shared Governance--a statement from TLAC Department Head, Dr. Dennie Smith**

Shared Governance is widely used in the Teaching, Learning and Culture department as a process for generating ideas that are fully and mutually supported by faculty, staff and students. Shared governance is characterized throughout the Department by transparency in the sharing of available data and reasons for various decisions in an atmosphere of mutual respect and open discussions. Stakeholders accept and share in the responsibility for setting the agendas for meetings, provide input, participate in making decisions, and assist in supporting ideas for implementation. Distributed leadership principles are utilized by the Department Head to decentralize decision-making processes whenever possible to guide and facilitate curriculum development, teaching, and faculty evaluation processes.

The department is divided into seven academic concentration areas that are instructed by tenured and clinical faculty and in some cases, advance degree graduate students. These areas include Mathematics Education, Science Education, Reading/Literacy, Early Childhood, English as Second Language, Culture and Curriculum, and Urban Education. Each of these areas has a leader who manages the academic processes, scheduling issues, review of graduate students and other matters related to the group. The Concentration Leaders are members of the TLAC Leadership Team chaired by the Department Head who meet monthly. The meetings are guided by agendas of important issues that impact concentration areas at the departmental, college, or university level. Leaders are responsible for communicating and representing their group as a member of the Team. Discussion of agenda items and actions are communicated to faculty through email and concentration group meetings. Decisions are
presented at monthly departmental meetings with the opportunity for other faculty to discuss and/or call for a vote if deemed appropriate.

In addition to the Leadership Committee, the Department has a Graduate Committee chaired by the Associate Department Head and an Undergraduate Committee chaired by a clinical faculty member. Each of these committees also meets monthly. These groups primarily monitor and develop curriculum along with making recommendations to the Leadership Team and/or the Department Head regarding issues that impact their groups. In addition, the Graduate Committee makes recommendations about graduate faculty status. Both committees make recommendations for faculty to consider in departmental meetings.

The Department Head is responsible for developing the vision and goals of the Department, providing leadership in the accomplishment of these goals, managing academic and budgetary matters, evaluating and hiring faculty and other personnel, as well as implementing state and university policy. The Department Head represents the department in individual meetings with the Dean, as well as other College and University administrative committees. In addition, regular meetings are scheduled with departmental staff to resolve issues, develop procedures, and monitor service to the faculty and students. The Department Head views input from all committees as valuable for making decisions and in the event that a decision is made contrary to a committee recommendation, reasons are always provided to explain the action.

A significant aspect of the shared governance process within the department involves communication. Faculty are kept informed of recent university, college, and department matters through regularly scheduled meetings, websites, email, and the department publication, TLAC FLASH. In addition, the Department Head maintains an open door policy for faculty, students, and staff to discuss issues and concerns.

The following standing committees provide the basis for faculty to work together in their respective concentrations for teaching, research, and service. The Department Head attends
many of these meetings upon request to respond to specific concerns in the concentration areas.

**Departmental Committees/Groups**

**Departmental Meetings**
Meetings are scheduled monthly to discuss issues and to vote on critical issues.

**Concentration Area Meetings**
Monthly meetings are scheduled to consider issues unique to the domains as well as other matters before the department.

**Leadership Group**
The Leadership Committee is chaired by the Department Head with seven elected members representing the respective concentrations.

**Graduate Committee**
The Graduate Committee is chaired by the Associate Department Head with seven elected members representing the respective concentrations.

**Undergraduate Committee**
The Undergraduate Committee is co-chaired by two clinical faculty members with three other faculty members, Student Teaching Coordinator, Field Placement Coordinator, and the Director of Undergraduate Advising.

**WEB Site Committee**
TLAC staff members serve on the seven-member WEB Committee.

**Evaluation Committee Tenure A-1/A-2**
Faculty elects three Professors, two Associates, and one non-tenured faculty member to serve on the evaluation committee and make recommendations for merit to the Department Head.

**Evaluation Committee Clinical/LecturersA-1/A-2**
Faculty elects two Clinical Full Professors, two Associates, and one Lecturer member to serve on the evaluation committee and make recommendations for merit to the Department Head.

**Tenure and Promotion Committee for Tenure Line Faculty**
All tenured faculty are members of this committee and vote on tenure and promotion of Assistant and non-tenured Associate Professors. Only Full Professors vote for tenure and promotion of Associate Professors to Full Professor.

**Promotion Committee for Clinical Faculty**
All Clinical Associates and Clinical Full Professors are members of the committee voting on promotion of Assistant Clinical Professors. The Clinical Full Professors are members of the committee voting on promotion of Associate Clinical Professors.
University Faculty Governance Representation

University Faculty Senate
The Department of TLAC has one elected representative who serves on the Faculty Senate.

CEHD Faculty Advisory Council (FAC)
The FAC has one Faculty Senate representative.

CEHD Graduate Council Committee
The Department of TLAC has one elected representative serving on this committee.

CEHD Council of Principal Investigators
The Department of TLAC has several representatives serving on the CEHD Council of PIs.
# Section 4: TLAC at a Glance

## Undergraduate Enrollment Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>03C</th>
<th>04C</th>
<th>05C</th>
<th>06C</th>
<th>07C</th>
<th>08C</th>
<th>09C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLAC</td>
<td>Pre-K through 4th</td>
<td>PK-4</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School ELA &amp; SS</td>
<td>ENS</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Sch Math &amp; Sci</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECR</td>
<td>PK4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misc Options</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>08A</th>
<th>09A</th>
<th>08B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLAC</td>
<td>Pre-K through 4th</td>
<td>PK-4</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School ELA &amp; SS</td>
<td>ENS</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Sch Math &amp; Sci</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECR</td>
<td>PK4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misc Options</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Graduate Enrollment Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>03C</th>
<th>04C</th>
<th>05C</th>
<th>06C</th>
<th>07C</th>
<th>08C</th>
<th>09C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLAC</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDS</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Data

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Number of current undergraduate majors-Fall 2009</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Number of current undergraduate majors-Fall 2003</td>
<td>2,043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Number of graduate degrees offered</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Number of students in graduate degree programs (88 male, 327 female; Master’s 202, Doctoral 213)</td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Number of undergraduate credit hours produced per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Year 2008-2009</td>
<td>65,447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>18,484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Number of graduate credit hours produced per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Year 2008-2009</td>
<td>31,175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>12,075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Number of tenure or tenure-track faculty</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Number of clinical faculty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Number of full-time Lecturers and Assistant Lecturers 4
10. Number of graduate assistant teacher (GAT) positions 24
10. Number of graduate assistant non-teaching (GANT) positions 17
11. Number of graduate assistant research positions (GAR) 18

12. Graduate student stipends (9 months)
   Master's
   Doctoral
   $9,000.00
   $13,500.00

Resources

13. Total state funded departmental budget, including salaries $4,481,139.00

Comparison of Instructional load

14. Average course credits taught per academic year per full-time employee (FTE), by classification
   Tenure or tenure-track faculty
   Clinical faculty
   Graduate Teaching Assistants
   12 hours plus
   24 hours
   3 or 6 hours per semester

Scholarly Activity 2009

15. Total number of full peer-reviewed journal publications by tenure or tenure-track faculty 2009 86
16. Total number of external grant dollar expenditures from grants of tenure-track faculty to date 2009 $1,868,787.00
16. Total number of external grant dollar expenditures from grants of tenure-track faculty to date 2010 $1,676,411

For more information on weighted credit hours, see Volume 7, Appendix 3: Undergraduate Weighted Credit Hours by Course
## 18 Characteristics of Texas Public Doctoral Programs

### Texas A&M University

This is data gathered for the State of Texas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Learning and Culture</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provided by OGS, OISP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Completes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Degrees Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Degrees Per Year</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average, 2007-2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling three-year average of the number of degrees awarded per academic year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Rates</th>
<th>57.89%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Starting 1997-1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling three-year average of the percent of first-year doctoral students who graduated within ten years. First-year doctoral students: Those students who have been coded as doctoral students by the institution and have either completed a master’s program or at least 30 SCH towards a graduate degree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Time to Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Time to Degree</th>
<th>5.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Starting 1997-1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling three-year average of the registered time to degree[3] of first-year doctoral students within a ten year period. [3] Registered time to degree: The number of semesters enrolled starting when a student first appears as a doctoral student until she completes a degree, excluding any time taken off during graduate study. The number of years is obtained by dividing the number semesters by three.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Profile</th>
<th>Description of admission factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed in Academia</td>
<td>55.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed as Post-Doctorates</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in Industry/Professional</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in Government</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>22.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Admission is based on Verbal and Quantitative GRE scores, GPR, Professional experience including publications, presentations, and grants, recommendations, written essay about a signification issue related to the field. *(TLAC suspended use of the GRE for the Summer and Fall, 2010 admissions while an Admissions Committee designs (for faculty approval) an improved metric to be ready for Spring, 2011 admissions).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Full-time Students (FTS) with Financial Support</th>
<th>67.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>In the prior year, the percentage of FTS (≥ 18 SCH) with support/the number of FTS</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Financial Support Provided</th>
<th>$18,190</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>For those receiving financial support, the average financial support provided per full-time graduate student (including tuition rebate) for the prior year, including research assistantships, teaching assistantships, fellowships, tuition, benefits, etc. that is “out-of-pocket”</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student-Core Faculty Ratio</th>
<th>4.85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Rolling three-year average of full-time student equivalent (FTSE) /rolling three-year average of full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE) of core faculty. Core Faculty: Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who teach 50 percent or more in the doctoral program or other individuals integral to the doctoral program who can direct dissertation research.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Faculty Publications</th>
<th>3.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Rolling three-year average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, juried creative/performance accomplishments, book chapters, notices of discoveries filed/patents issued, and books per year per core faculty member.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Faculty External Grants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Rolling three-year average of the number of core faculty receiving external funds, average external grant $ per faculty, and total external grant $ per program per academic year. All external funds received from any source including research grants, training grants, gifts from foundations, etc.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of the Number of Core Faculty receiving external funds</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average External Grant $ per Faculty</td>
<td>$74,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total External Grant $</td>
<td>$2,007,949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Full-Time Students</th>
<th>46.90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Rolling three-year average of the FTS (≥ 9 SCH)/number students enrolled (headcount) for last three fall semesters</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Core Faculty</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Number of core faculty in the prior year</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Teaching Load</th>
<th>137.19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Total number of semester credit hours in organized teaching courses taught per academic year by core faculty divided by the number of core faculty in the prior year</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Diversity

Core faculty by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender, updated when changed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Diversity

Enrollment headcount by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender in program in the prior year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Date of Last External Review

Date of last formal external review, updated when changed

- Mar-02

### External Program Accreditation

Name of body and date of last program accreditation review, if applicable, updated when changed

- Currently - Texas Education Agency and Southern Association of Colleges and Schools


### Student Publications/Presentations

Rolling three-year average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, juried creative/performance accomplishments, book chapters, books, and external presentations per year per student

- 1.92

To view more TLAC Data Charts (faculty and students), see Volume 7, Appendix 4, “College Strategic Planning Data Chart.”
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Section 1: Faculty

Faculty
# Current Faculty

## Tenure / Tenure Track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norvella Carter</td>
<td>Lynn Burlbaw</td>
<td>Mary Margaret Capraro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Clark</td>
<td>Robert Capraro</td>
<td>Tracy Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Helfeldt</td>
<td>Stephen Carpenter</td>
<td>Trina Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malt Joshi</td>
<td>Zohreh Eslami</td>
<td>Quentin Dixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kracht (Executive Associate Dean – Academic Affairs)</td>
<td>Chance Lewis</td>
<td>Erin McTigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Kulm</td>
<td>Yeping Li</td>
<td>Blanca Quiroz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Larke</td>
<td>Cathleen C. Loving</td>
<td>Bugrahan Yalvac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Rupley</td>
<td>Scott Slough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Sadoski</td>
<td>Carol Stuessy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Slattery</td>
<td>Lynne Walters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennie Smith (Dept. Head)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersh Waxman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Clinical Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Boettcher</td>
<td>Larry Kelly</td>
<td>Edie Cassell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Erwin</td>
<td>Janet Hammer</td>
<td>Lori Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Goldsby</td>
<td>Valerie Hill-Jackson</td>
<td>Teresa Jimarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Parker</td>
<td>Radhika Viruru</td>
<td>Robin Rackley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Norvella Carter
- Frank Clark
- Jack Helfeldt
- Malt Joshi
- James Kracht (Executive Associate Dean – Academic Affairs)
- Gerald Kulm
- Patricia Larke
- William Rupley
- Mark Sadoski
- Patrick Slattery
- Dennie Smith (Dept. Head)
- Hersh Waxman
- Lynn Burlbaw
- Robert Capraro
- Stephen Carpenter
- Zohreh Eslami
- Chance Lewis
- Yeping Li
- Cathleen C. Loving
- Scott Slough
- Carol Stuessy
- Lynne Walters
- Mary Margaret Capraro
- Tracy Collins
- Trina Davis
- Quentin Dixon
- Erin McTigue
- Blanca Quiroz
- Bugrahan Yalvac
- Cynthia Boettcher
- Barbara Erwin
- Dianne Goldsby
- Dawn Parker
- Larry Kelly
- Janet Hammer
- Valerie Hill-Jackson
- Radhika Viruru
- Edie Cassell
- Lori Graham
- Teresa Jimarez
- Robin Rackley
- Nancy Self
- Pat Wiese
### Lecturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>* Part Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Burnett</td>
<td>*six additional part-timers have been hired for Spring, 2010. Some veterans are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla Eidson</td>
<td>Betty Helfeldt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Thomas</td>
<td>Doug Koebernick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debbie Leland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burcu Ates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Contact Information for faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOETTCHER, CYNTHIA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:c-boettcher@tamu.edu">c-boettcher@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURLBAW, LYNN</td>
<td><a href="mailto:burlbaw@neo.tamu.edu">burlbaw@neo.tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNETT, SHANNON</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sburnett@tamu.edu">sburnett@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPRARO, MARY</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmcapraro@tamu.edu">mmcapraro@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPRARO, ROBERT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rcapraro@tamu.edu">rcapraro@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARPENTER, STEPHEN</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bscarpenter@tamu.edu">bscarpenter@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARTER, NORVELLA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nncarter@tamu.edu">nncarter@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASSELL, EDIE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cassell@tamu.edu">cassell@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARK, FRANK</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fclark@tamu.edu">fclark@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLINS, TRACY</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tecollins@tamu.edu">tecollins@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIS, TRINA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:trinadavis@tamu.edu">trinadavis@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXON, L. QUENTIN</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gdxion@tamu.edu">gdxion@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIDSON, KARLA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keidson@tamu.edu">keidson@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERWIN, BARBARA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:berwin@neo.tamu.edu">berwin@neo.tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESLAMI, ZOHREH</td>
<td><a href="mailto:zeslami@tamu.edu">zeslami@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLDSBY, DIANNE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dgoldsby@tamu.edu">dgoldsby@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM, LORI</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lgraham@tamu.edu">lgraham@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMMER, JANET</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhammer@tamu.edu">jhammer@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELFELDT, JACK</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhelfeldt@tamu.edu">jhelfeldt@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILL-JACKSON, VALERIE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vhjackson@neo.tamu.edu">vhjackson@neo.tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSHI, R.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mjoshi@tamu.edu">mjoshi@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY, LARRY</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lkelley@tamu.edu">lkelley@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOEBERNICK, DOUGLAS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dkoebernick@tamu.edu">dkoebernick@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KULM, GERALD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gkulm@tamu.edu">gkulm@tamu.edu</a></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Profile

**Gender Distribution of Tenure / Tenure Track Faculty**

**Gender Distribution of Tenure / Tenure Track Faculty by Count**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors (Tenure Track)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors (Tenured)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors (Tenured)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Teaching, Learning and Culture
External Review
Gender Distribution of Tenure / Tenure Track Faculty by Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors (Tenure Track)</td>
<td>3.44%</td>
<td>20.68%</td>
<td>24.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors (Tenured)</td>
<td>20.68%</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
<td>34.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors (Tenured)</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
<td>41.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>56.66%</td>
<td>43.34%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age Distribution of Tenure Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ethnicity of Tenure Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENURE / TENURE TRACK FACULTY</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity of Male Tenure / Tenure Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MALE FACULTY</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage of Male Faculty (17)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Faculty (29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.77%</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.77%</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.58%</td>
<td>41.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.60%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity of Female Tenure / Tenure Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEMALE FACULTY</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage of Female Faculty (12)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Faculty (29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>13.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>20.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.38%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rank of Tenure / Tenure Track Faculty

### Tenure / Tenure Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENURE / TENURE TRACK FACULTY</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors (tenure-track)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (tenured)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors (tenured)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Male Tenure / Tenure Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MALE FACULTY</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage of Male Faculty (17)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Faculty (29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors (tenure-track)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (tenured)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.30%</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors (tenured)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.62%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Female Tenure / Tenure Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEMALE FACULTY</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage of Female Faculty (12)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Faculty (29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors (tenure-track)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (tenured)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors (tenured)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.39%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>41.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Endowed Chairs

James Kracht | Byrne Endowed Chair for Student Success

To provide resources for encouraging academic success in a number of ways throughout the year

Gerald Kulm | Curtis D. Robert Mathematics Education Endowed Chair

To provide endowed professorship to support academic endeavors of the recipient of the Robert Fellowship. Donor is the Ed Rachal Foundation

Norvella Carter | Houston Endowment Endowed Chair

To provide resources for a program to provide quality teachers for the greater Houston area
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chance Lewis</th>
<th><strong>Houston Endowment Endowed Chair</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To provide resources for a program to provide quality teachers for the greater Houston area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dennie Smith</th>
<th><strong>Claude H Everett Jr. '47 Endowed Chair</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair holder from College of Education to broaden students' education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2: Key Staff

Main Office

Joan Davison       Administrative Assistant
Tammy Reynolds    Assistant to the Department Head
Kelly Freeman     Academic Business Administrator
Andrea Caldwell-Williams  Business Coordinator II

Technology Support

Chalon Hawkins       Information Technology Consultant
Kristie Reddick-Eyres  Digital Media Coordinator

Graduate Advising Office

Kerri Smith       Senior Academic Advisor II
Amber Hopkins    Administrative Assistant (50%)

Undergraduate Advising Office

Justin Smith   Assistant Director
Amanda Mather  Academic Advisor II
Vince Hernandez Senior Academic Advisor I
Erin Bogue     Academic Advisor I
Joan Berry     Lead Office Assistant

Student Teaching Office

Kim Parish       Associate Director
Mary Ronsonet   Administrative Assistant
Kathryn Seale   Program Coordinator

Reads & Counts Office

Tina Wells       Program Coordinator
Accelerate Online Program Secondary Credential Program
Lynn Beason                  Program Coordinator

State of Texas Educational Research Center (ERC)
Jacqueline Stillisano        Associate Director and Research Associate
Amber Hopkins                Administrative Assistant (50%)

SSMA Journal
Heather Rodriguez            Editorial Assistant
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Section 3: Faculty Awards

Teaching, Research, and Public Service awards

Many faculty members of the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture have been recognized for outstanding achievements in teaching, research, and service. This recognition has been granted on many levels, including University, State, National, and International Awards. A summary of the faculty accomplishments is represented in the following Tables.

Faculty Awards presented in 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Faculty Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Burlbaw</td>
<td>Fulbright-Hays Award, Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Fulbright Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Hammer</td>
<td>Fulbright-Hays Award, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Fulbright Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Walters</td>
<td>Fulbright-Hays Award, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Fulbright Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Boettcher</td>
<td>Distinguished Achievement Award for Teaching Association of Former Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norvella Carter</td>
<td>Student-Led Award for Teaching Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Graham</td>
<td>Student-Led Award for Teaching Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Janet Hammer                      | Student-Led Award for Teaching Excellence  
| TX A&M University               |
| Robin Rackley                   | Student-Led Award for Teaching Excellence  
| TX A&M University               |
| **College Level**               |                                             |
| Janet Hammer                    | Distinguished Achievement Award for Teaching  
| Association of Former Students  |
| Erin McTigue                    | Outstanding New Faculty Award  
| College of Education & Human Development |

Faculty Awards presented in 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2008 Faculty Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Carpenter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | J. Eugene Grigsby, Jr. Award  
|      | Committee On Multiethnic Concerns (COMC) |
|      | University Level    |
|      | Stephen Carpenter   |
|      | CHUD Fellow  
|      | Center for Housing and Urban Development |
|      | Valerie Hill-Jackson|
|      | Teaching Award  
|      | Association of Former Students |
|      | Valerie Hill-Jackson|
|      | Traditions Camp Namesake  
|      | TX A&M University |
### College Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Award and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Capraro</td>
<td>Montague Teaching Award, College of Education and Human Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Awards presented in 2007

### 2007 Faculty Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Level</td>
<td>Quentin Dixon</td>
<td>Fellow, Institute for Education Sciences (IES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quentin Dixon</td>
<td>Fellow, Mexican American and U.S. Latino Research Center (MALRC) Fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valerie Hill-Jackson</td>
<td>Fulbright-Hays Award, China, The Fulbright Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Larke</td>
<td>Fulbright-Hays Award, China, The Fulbright Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| College Level    | Robert Capraro            | Joann Treat Research Award Winner, College of Education and Human Development |
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## 2006 Faculty Awards

### National Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Award Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Capraro</td>
<td>Outstanding Reviewer, American Education Research Association, Educational Researcher, 2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quentin Dixon</td>
<td>Fellow, Mexican American and U.S. Latino Research Center (MALRC) Fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance Lewis</td>
<td>Junior Scholar Research Award, 2nd Annual Brothers of the Academy National Think Tank in Atlanta, Ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanca Quiroz</td>
<td>Fellow, Mexican American and U.S. Latino Research Center (MALRC) Fellows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Award Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Burlbaw</td>
<td>College Teaching Award, Association of Former Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norvella Carter</td>
<td>College Teaching Award, Association of Former Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Faculty Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Boettcher</td>
<td>Distinguished Achievement Award for Teaching Association of Former Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Boettcher</td>
<td>Fish Camp Namesake Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Boettcher</td>
<td>Tradition Camp Namesake Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Productivity

Three areas of responsibility are assigned to faculty members: teaching, research, and service. Each faculty member is assigned a time allocation for their particular duties. Tenure and tenure-track faculty members are given unique time allocations for teaching, research, and service. Clinical faculty members are given time allocations for teaching and service.

Teaching

Tenured faculty generally teach graduate level courses, if the graduate course does not make (does not meet enrollment requirement), the faculty member usually will then teach an undergraduate course. The current priority for teaching courses in TLAC is: Tenure/Tenure Track, Clinical, Full-time Lecturer, Graduate Students and Part-time Faculty. The changes in the number of courses taught each semester is fueled by enrollment, and if it is a base year. The number of part-time faculty can vary from each semester. If faculty members have resigned or retired after a semester schedule has been made, the department must hire more part-time faculty to fill in the courses that are vacant. There is not much effect on the department budget from these changes.

Teaching Loads

Faculty teaching loads are determined by rank and tenure and effort listed on A-1. Graduate students are not allowed to work more than 20 hours per week. The department considers 1 course for a graduate student equivalent to 10 hours per week.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>2 courses Fall and 2 courses Spring 4 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>1 course Fall and 2 courses Spring 3 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>4 courses Fall and 4 courses Spring 8 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Lecturer</td>
<td>4 courses Fall and 4 courses Spring 8 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>1-2 courses Fall and 1-2 courses Spring, 4 courses maximum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Part-time Faculty 1-4 courses Fall and 1-4 courses Spring 8 courses

Faculty Research, extramural funding, and departmental support

Summary of Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Research Expenditures</th>
<th>New Awards</th>
<th>Total Grant Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,094,000</td>
<td>1,620,000</td>
<td>2,864,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>637,000</td>
<td>1,458,000</td>
<td>1,966,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,225,000</td>
<td>2,364,000</td>
<td>7,447,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>984,000</td>
<td>3,350,000</td>
<td>2,002,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>527,000</td>
<td>1,122,000</td>
<td>2,297,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Principal Investigators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Principal Investigators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Grant Expenditures
Research dissemination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLAC Faculty Publications</th>
<th>Total Publications</th>
<th>Peer Reviewed Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Publication Update

Faculty Publications
Journal Articles, Books and Book Chapters

Peer Reviewed Journal Publications

Notes:
➢ Only journal articles, books and book chapters are counted by tenure/tenure track faculty
➢ “In press” publications are excluded from dataset
➢ 2008 publications are expected to at least equal or exceed 2007 publication count after next year’s update appending “in press” publications (n=148; will be added to 2007 going forward)
➢ Faculty are publishing about 2 articles per calendar year
➢ The number of tenure/tenure track faculty members remains level around N=122 for past 3 years

2008 publication Facts:
271 books, book chapters and journal articles were published by 96 tenure/tenure track faculty members totaling 321 publications.
➢ 227 publications with 1 CEHD author
➢ 39 publications with 2 CEHD authors
➢ 4 publications with 3 CEHD authors
➢ 1 publication with 4 CEHD authors
96 of 122 tenure/tenure track faculty members published in 2008 (78%).
57 of the 96 authors published with a student (58%)
Service

There are many avenues in which faculty members participate in service. Many TLAC faculty members currently serve as editors and/or co-editors for peer-reviewed journals. Others serve on review panels or participate in professional organizations. Some faculty members serve as advisors for undergraduate or graduate student organizations, while others serve on committees for the department, college, or university.

Current Journal Editorships *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Editor/Co-Editor</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum History</td>
<td>Lynn Burlbaw</td>
<td>Co-Editor</td>
<td>1993 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larry Kelly</td>
<td>Co-Editor</td>
<td>2008 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy</td>
<td>Patrick Slattery</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>2002 to 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environments</td>
<td>Hersh Waxman</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>2000 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Chance Lewis</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>2006 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional Paper Series</td>
<td>R. Malatesha Joshi</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>1989 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal</td>
<td>William Rupley</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>1989 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Psychology</td>
<td>Gerald Kulm</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>2006 to 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Science and Mathematics</td>
<td>Norvell Carter</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>2006 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Journal of Urban Education and Practice</td>
<td>Norvell Carter</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>2006 to present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If we go back to 2005, we can add two who served as co-editors of AERJ-Teaching, Learning and Human Development – 3 years- R. Capraro and C. Loving; two who served as editors for Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education – 3 years (C. Loving and C. Stuessy), and several others.
Grant Summary

Individual Grant Summary

**TLAC Projects**
**Report - October 2009 (for 09 fiscal year)**

**Lynn Burlbaw** – *Fulbright-Hays Summer Seminar* – Research Grant - $22,000

**Lynn Burlbaw** – *Teachers as Immigrants and Migrants: The Colorado Experience, 1880-1930* – Research
Grant -- $1,500 – 9/1/2008 – 8/31/2009  TAMU Liberal Arts – Glasscock Center

**Booker Stephen Carpenter** (Trina Davis) – *Humanities in the Metaverse: Establishing a TAMU-Digital Humanities & Visual Culture Education and Research Island in Second Life* – Research Grant –
$10,000 -- 9/1/2008 – 8/31/2009  TAMU Liberal Arts – Glasscock Center

**Trina Davis** (Hersh Waxman, Jacqueline Stillisano, Jon Denton, Arlen Strader, Amber Hopkins. Patrick Carlson) – *Evaluation of Readiness for Online Testing in Texas* – Research
Grant -- $90,383
5/5/2008 – 12/21/2008  Pearson Education

**Karla Eidson** (Patricia Wiese, Janet Hammer) – *Getting to Know Europe Grant* – Internal Grant –

**James Kracht** – *Continuing GK-12 Fellows Integrate Science/Math in Rural Middle School* – Teaching
Grant -- $1,743 – 1/1/2007 – 12/31/2009  NSF

**James Kracht** – *Science Promotion in Rural Middle Schools: Phase I & II* – Teaching
Grant -- $1,620
9/1/2007 – 6/30/2012  DHHS-PHS-NIH

**Gerald Kulm** – *Editorial Support Services for the Journal School Science and Mathematics* – Service Grant –

**Chance Lewis** – *Collaborative Research: BPC-D Improving Minority Student Participation in the Computing Career Pipeline with Culturally Situated Design Tools* – Research Grant –

Cathleen Loving – *Professional Learning Community Model for Entry into Teaching Science* – Research Grant
$258,386 – 9/1/2004 – 8/31/2009  NSF

Erin McTigue – *Increasing the Extent of Multicultural Literature Integration within Content Area Literacy* – Teaching Grant -- $800  TAMU Center for Teaching Excellence

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board


Carol L. Stuessy -- *Plant IT Careers, Cases, and Collaboration* -- Research Grant -- $194,775 – 9/1/2007 – 8/31/2010  Botanical Society of America

Carol L. Stuessy – *Planting Science Research in Education* – Research Grant -- $142,958 – 9/1/2007 – 8/31/2012  Botanical Society of America

**TLAC Faculty Funded Projects 2009-2010**

**Elimination of Educational and Health Disparities**

Jim Scheurich (PI), EAH; **Robert Capraro (Co-PI)**, TLAC; James Morgan (Co-PI); and **Mary Margaret Capraro (Co-PI)**, TLAC

Morgan is with Texas A&M Civil Engineering
North Texas STEM Center
Texas Education Agency

Three-year project with total funding of $2,538,612

2009  $1,282,863

---

**Carol Stuessy (PI), TLAC** and James McNamara (Co-PI), EPSY

Policy Research Initiative in Science Education to Improve Teaching and Learning in High School Science

National Science Foundation

Five-year project with total funding of $2,340,677

2009  $525,415
Felecia Nave (PI); Mary Alfred (Co-PI), EAHR; Fred Bonner (Co-PI), EAHR; Sherri Frizell (Co-PI); and Chance Lewis (Co-PI), TLAC; Nave and Frizell are with Prairie View A&M University Education Research Project: An Empirical Investigation of the Success Factors Impacting African American Students in Engineering and Technology at Historically Black Universities National Science Foundation Three-year project with total funding of $1,007,149 2009 $185,111

Hersh Waxman (PI), TLAC and Jacqueline Stillisano (Co-PI), TLAC Evaluation of "Gates GO Center Partnership" Program Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Three-year project with total funding of $100,000 2009 $47,902

Tiffany Barnes (PI); Chance Lewis (Co-PI), TLAC; Ron Eglash (Co-PI) Barnes is with the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, and Eglash is with Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Collaborative Research: BPC-D Improving Minority Student Participation in the Computing Career Pipeline with Culturally Situated Design Tools National Science Foundation Three-year project with total funding of $319,196 2009 $21,070

Hersh Waxman (PI), TLAC Evaluation of "Gates GO Center Partnership" Program College for All Texans Foundation Three-year project with total funding of $30,000 2009 $12,712

Larry Johnson (PI); William Klemm (Co-PI); James Kracht (Co-PI), TLAC and Dean’s Office; Vincent Cassone (Co-I); James Linder (Co-PI); Don Allen (Co-PI); Philip Yasskin (Co-I); Julie Harlin (Co-I); Tom Welsh (Co-I); Louise Abbott (Co-I), Jon Hunter (Co-I); and Jyhwen Wang (Co-I) All other investigators are outside CEHD Continuing GK-12 Fellows Integrate Science/Math in Rural Middle School National Science Foundation Three year project with total funding of $1,647,601
2009  $1,743

Larry Johnson (PI); William Klemm (Co-I); Elizabeth Browder (Co-I); Nicholas Millichamp, (Co-I); Charles Scanlan (Co-I); James Lindner (Co-I); Barbara Gastel (Co-I); James Kracht (Co-I), TLAC and Dean’s Office; E. Dean Gage (Co-I); William Moyer, (Co-I); Sandee Hartsfield (Co-I); E. Murl Bailey, Jr. (Co-I); and Julie Harlin (Co-I)
All other investigators are outside CEHD
Science Promotion in Rural Middle Schools: Phase I & II
Department of Health and Human Services-PHS-National Institutes of Health
Five year project with total funding of $1,351,569
2009  $1,620

Learning and Teaching Sciences

Susan Pedersen (PI), EPSY; Janie Schielack (Co-PI); Scott Slough (Co-PI), TLAC; and Douglas Williams (Co-PI)
Scheilack is with TAMU Mathematics; Williams is with the University of Louisiana at Lafayette
Engaging Middle School Students in Student Directed Inquiry Through Virtual Environments for Learning
National Science Foundation
Four-year project with total funding of $1,685,499
2009  $557,618

B. Stephen Carpenter (PI), TLAC and Trina Davis (PI), TLAC
Humanities in the Metaverse: Establishing a TAMU-Digital Humanities & Visual Culture Education and Research Island in Second Life
TAMU-Liberal Arts – Glasscock Center
2009  $10,000

Lynn Burlbaw (PI), TLAC
Teachers as Immigrants and Migrants: The Colorado Experience, 1880-1930
TAMU-Liberal Arts – Glasscock Center
2009  $1,500

Preparation of Education, Health and Human Resource Development Practitioners
Bruce Herbert (PI); Cathleen Loving (Co-PI), TLAC; Linda Crow (Co-PI); Maureen Loiacano (Co-PI); and Guy Sconza (Co-PI)
Herbert is with TAMU Geology and Geophysics, Crow is with Lone Star College, Loiacano is with Lone Star College, and Sconza is with Humble ISD
Professional Learning Community Model for Entry into Teaching Science
National Science Foundation
Five-year project with total funding of $710,749 for CEHD
2009 $258,386

Patrick Slattery (PI), TLAC; Norvella Carter (Co-PI), TLAC; Chance Lewis (Co-PI), TLAC; and B. Stephen Carpenter (Co-PI), TLAC
Summer Arts and Humanities Institute for Urban Leadership
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Three-year project with total funding of $750,000
2009 $250,000

Carol Stuessy (PI), TLAC
Plant IT Careers, Cases, and Collaboration
Botanical Society of America
Three-year project with total funding of $543,795
2009 $186,480

Carol Stuessy (PI), TLAC
Planting Science Research in Education
Botanical Society of America
Five-year project with total funding of $716,890
2009 $142,958

Trina Davis (PI), TLAC and Hersh Waxman (Co-PI), TLAC
Evaluation of Readiness for Online Testing in Texas
Pearson Education
Two-year project with total funding of $221,918
2009 $90,383

Lynne Masel Walters (PI), TLAC and Janet Hammer (Co-PI), TLAC
Seminar on China: The Place and the People
U.S. Department of Education
2009 $81,422

Jacqueline Stillisano (PI), TLAC and Hersh Waxman (Co-PI), TLAC
Evaluation of International Baccalaureate Program
International Baccalaureate
2009  $75,000

Jim Scheurich (PI), EAHR; **Robert Capraro (Co-PI), TLAC; and Mary Margaret Capraro (Co-PI), TLAC**
Professional Development Services
Waco ISD
Two-year project with total funding of $94,000
2009  $68,452

Kenneth McLeroy (PI); Jeffrey Guidry (Co-PI), HLKN; and **Carol Stuessy (Co-I), TLAC**
McLeroy is with TAMU Social and Behavioral Health and HLKN
A Comprehensive Approach for Addressing Science Education in Underrepresented Populations
University of Texas-M.D. Anderson Cancer Center
Two-year project with total funding of $79,690
2009  $61,210

**Karla Eidson (Co-PI), TLAC; Janet Hammer (Co-PI), TLAC; and Patricia Wiese (Co-PI), TLAC**
Getting to Know Europe Grant
TAMU-European Union Center
2009  $29,195

**Dennie Smith (PI), TLAC and Jack Helfeldt (Co-PI), TLAC**
Develop and Deliver Ph.D. Cohort Program
Texas A&M International University
Five-year project with total funding of $107,170
2009  $22,690

**Lynne Masel Walters (PI), TLAC and Teresa Jimarez (Co-PI), TLAC**
Pilot Study Abroad Program
TAMU Mexican American/Latino Research Center
2009  $20,000

Jim Scheurich (PI), EAHR; **Robert Capraro (Co-PI), TLAC; and Mary Margaret Capraro (Co-PI), TLAC**
Professional Development Services – Carver Middle School
Waco ISD
2009  $6,000
Chance Lewis (PI), TLAC
Pathways to the Doctorate Research Assistantship
Texas A&M Office of Graduate Studies
Two-year project with total funding of $30,000
2009  $5,000

Erin McTigue (PI), TLAC
Increasing the Extent of Multicultural Literature Integration within Content Area Literacy
TAMU Center for Teaching Excellence
2009  $800

Service/Editorships

Gerald Kulm (PI), TLAC
Editorial Support Services for the Journal School Science and Mathematics
School Science and Mathematics Association
Six-year project with total funding of $215,532
2009  $42,511

Faculty Use of Technology

Over the past few years, TLAC has used funds in support of technology to be used in the classroom at TAMU and in the public schools. These funds have come from instructional enhancement fees and salary savings generated by faculty on research funds. As a result, the department increased the budget for technology, and provided the latest technological advances for the faculty to use in their classes. Training has been provided to assist the faculty members to become proficient in the use of technology in their classrooms.

Some of the technology advances are listed below:

- Use of Blackboard to deliver university on-line and blended courses
- Department support of Professional Development related to technology use in courses and on-line course development
- Podcasting seminars; University iTunes; Multimedia sym-podiums with Smart boards
- Development of Verizon Classroom and conversion to “Classroom of the Future” project
• Increase in the number of on-line courses offered at undergraduate level and graduate level
• Technology projects included in courses (Syllabi to provide examples)

Faculty Salary Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>College Mean</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$6,944</td>
<td>$7,061</td>
<td>$6,972</td>
<td>$7,093</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$7,403</td>
<td>$8,690</td>
<td>$8,016</td>
<td>$7,917</td>
<td>$8,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>$9,568</td>
<td>$13,473</td>
<td>$11,128</td>
<td>$10,801</td>
<td>$10,967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4: Faculty Evaluation

Peer Review

Several years ago, a peer review process was begun within the department. The process is voluntary, but encouraged. The program has developed through the years and during Fall, 2009 38 faculty members volunteered for peer-review. Each participant receives a peer review from another faculty member and is assigned to perform a peer review for another faculty member. The volunteers are matched so that no individual is reviewed by a faculty member whom they review.

Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture
College of Education and Human Resources

Peer Review Guidelines
Fall 2009

1. Schedule review with faculty member.
2. Pre-Conference
   a. Course number/name
   b. Curriculum/syllabus
   c. Number of students in class
   d. Course objective(s) of session
   e. Teaching approach
   f. Assessment (if appropriate)
   g. Request area for feedback (teaching behavior/domain)
   h. Acquaint reviewer about special needs regarding students in class

3. Conduct Observation using instrument (see next page)

4. Post Conference
   a. Debriefing/feedback. Time to be determined by partners involved but
typically not to be more than two weeks after observation has taken place
   b. Conference
      i. Name/Course/Date
      ii. Short summary
         1. Include 2-3 key observations
         2. Address feedback area identified in the pre-conference
   c. Signed and dated by both parties

SAMPLE

Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture
Peer Review of Teaching
2009 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Fall, 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Faculty Member being reviewed</td>
<td>Edie Cassell. Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Class</td>
<td>INST 463 English as a Second Language (ESL) Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Reviewer</td>
<td>Cathleen Loving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Observation</td>
<td>11/9/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Post-Conference</td>
<td>12/11/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preconference

Dr. Cassell provided me with a syllabus and an outline of today’s lesson on ESL assessment.
The objectives for this course are listed at the back of the syllabus as part of the 6 Standards of the “English as a Second Language Generalist EC-6 Standards” document.

**Class Observation – November 9, 2009**

Dr. Cassell started by giving the class a chance to comment on how they were being assessed in the class. The syllabus shows eight different assessment components with varying point values—from 300 points to 10 points—with a total of 1000 points. Students agreed it was a flexible assessment system. Students freely commented on some areas where they thought that, perhaps, an assignment—such as a 2500 word paper should be worth more points than it had been allotted. Dr. Cassell was quite respectful and suggested they had made a reasonable case—and that she might reconsider that value.

This was a large class, probably 30+ students. They were **attentive and involved** as Dr. Cassell had **good rapport** as she interacted with them asking various questions about their own assessment, before moving onto discussions of assessment of second language students. I would characterize her **demeanor as firm, but allowing options when students made a case.**

The lesson **involved how to make up your own assessment system.** She had **two effective PPT presentations** related to this topic. One PPT showed a flowchart for high proficiency versus low proficiency students—and how much weight should be placed on language for their grades—depending on their proficiency as compared to their effort. The other PPT dealt with assessment portfolios—and how they can be used either to show growth—which is so important for second language students versus showing “end product” or “perfection.”

The final interactive discussion with students was about culture shock—and the different stages we all can go through when we are placed in a foreign environment where the language and daily cultural mores are different from our own. She called on various students in the class who had come from other countries to provide their examples, and she also used her own experiences overseas as effective examples. The entire lesson flowed smoothly.

Class Observation Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>INST 463</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>E. Cassell</th>
<th>Date 11/9/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Elements</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Was well prepared for class</td>
<td>Yes, very well organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Was knowledgeable</td>
<td>Seemed very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about subject matter</td>
<td>knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was enthusiastic about subject matter</td>
<td>Yes, was indeed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Spoke clearly, audibly and confidently</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Used a variety of relevant illustrations and examples</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Made effective use of media</td>
<td>Had an appropriate PPT (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asked stimulating and challenging questions</td>
<td>Was able to engage a number of students throughout the discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Effectively held class’s attention</td>
<td>Yes, and the classroom was full</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Achieved active student involvement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Treated students with respect and dignity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Treated students in accordance with TLAC Diversity Values</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post Conference – December 11, 2009**

Post-observation:

In addition to the comments I made earlier after the observations, I would like to say that Dr. Cassell’s student assessment for her class is varied, rigorous and does a lot to require reflection and substantive use of the course content. I especially like Assessment #1 and Assessment #8. The first is an autobiographical paper, which includes quite a bit of reflection and explanation about choices they have made. Assignment #8 involves several steps leading to a final draft of a research paper and a final oral presentation. I like the spacing of the assignment, the various benchmarks along the way, and the point counts for various important aspects of doing research, from submission of the articles to submission of a rough draft to the final oral presentation. I think there is excellent modeling of good assessment in this class by Dr. Cassell.

**Conference/Short Summary:**
As is often the case when someone is asked to do a peer review by random assignment, they are not sure if they fairly capture the essence of key concepts or the most important features of the instructor’s strengths and challenges. Dr. Cassell and I had an honest talk about the challenges of engaging busy students who were in the field in recognizing that what they were learning in class was, in fact, helping them with their current field experiences. She acknowledged trying hard to relate the classroom theories of second language assessment to what they were doing in schools. I told her I thought she seemed to be succeeding.

**Comments and Signatures:**

**Faculty Annual Review Process**

From 1999 to 2009, the TLAC faculty used the “GFED” evaluation document for their annual A-1 reviews. An elected Faculty Evaluation Committee composed of various ranks evaluated each A-1 and made recommendations to the Department Head—in terms of whether a faculty member met expectations in the categories of Research, Teaching and Service—and whether they deserved “merit” in any of the categories. The faculty member had to write a paragraph for each category in which they desired merit—making a case. Beginning in 2008 and culminating with approval in Fall, 2009, a new evaluation document was developed and approved by the faculty—and subsequently by the Dean this semester.

Since the new document is based on the best aspects of the old document, but makes more specific what “counts” and what value is placed on different aspects of research, teaching, and service, we present only the new document below. Copies of the “GFED” can be provided if the Committee desires.

In Volume 7, Appendix 17 is the new tenure/tenure track faculty evaluation document. In Volume 7, Appendix 18 is the new clinical faculty evaluation document.

**Example of Merit Calculations*”

Aggie Jones is an Associate Professor in TLAC and has earned the following performance points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Added Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Merit Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2 Category I articles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>points (40)</td>
<td>1 Category I article with a student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Category II book chapter on diversity in schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Category II article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>3 Category IV presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>1 Category I Co-PI proposal submitted, with faculty from Sociology and Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Category II Continuing member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching</strong></td>
<td>1 Undergrad course, 41 students, 4.3 PICA rating</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Grad courses, 8 students, 4.7 PICA and 12 students, 4.6 PICA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Peer evaluation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Developed a new 689 course</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentored an undergraduate student research project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td>Chair of 1 PhD graduate, placed at University of Georgia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair for 4 PhD continuing students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of 5 PhD continuing students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of 2 MEd graduates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of 6 MEd continuing students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advising Grad Students</strong></td>
<td>Associate Editor of national journal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer for 2 national journals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer for state conference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of 1 TLAC committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of 1 College committee on Diversity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of 1 University Senate committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number points for TLAC tenure-track faculty are as follows: Scholarship – 965, Teaching – 820, Service – 760. Prof. Jones’ share of the merit pools would be: Scholarship: 32/965 = 3.3% of the pool; Teaching: 37/820 = 4.5% of the pool; Service: 25/760 = 3.3 % of the pool. Note that these are NOT percentage raises; they are the percentage of the merit raise pool that is available for each category. For example, if there is $10,000 in the Scholarship merit pool, Prof. Jones would get 3.3% of $10,000 = $330 merit raise for scholarship. In addition, Jones would receive shares of the Teaching and Service pools. *All numbers in this example are fictitious and do not represent any individual, or any Department raises, past or present.

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

For TLAC T&P Guidelines see Volume 7, Appendix 19
Section 5: Faculty Reinvestment

Faculty Reinvestment Program

A major initiative of Vision 2020 is reinvestment in faculty across all departments of the University. As a result of the Vision 2020 reinvestment initiative, TLAC has hired fourteen (16) new clinical and tenure-track faculty members. As a result, class sizes have been reduced and new courses have been added. Additionally, all programs have been broadened and specializations have been enhanced by careful selection of faculty. A list of faculty hired with funds from the faculty reinvestment program is shown in the table below.

Faculty recruitment and retention during the past 5 years

Faculty hired with Reinvestment of Faculty funds from Vision 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edith Cassell</td>
<td>Clinical Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Graham</td>
<td>Clinical Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Rackley</td>
<td>Clinical Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersh Waxman</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance Lewis</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugrahan Yalvac</td>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quentin Dixon</td>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin McTigue</td>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Collins</td>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Jimarez</td>
<td>Clinical Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trina Davis</td>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeping Li</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 1/1/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanca Quiroz</td>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Slough</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Carpenter</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 1/1/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Hammer</td>
<td>Clinical Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty hired with University funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Margaret Capraro</td>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Wiese</td>
<td>Clinical Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Walters</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 11/1/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulmaris Diaz</td>
<td>Clinical Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Hill-Jackson</td>
<td>Clinical Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radhika Viruru</td>
<td>Clinical Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>Hired 9/1/2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty retired and resigned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diane Kaplan</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>Retired 1/31/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Foster</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>Retired 8/31/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Denton</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Retired 12/31/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulmaris Diaz</td>
<td>Clinical Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Resigned 7/15/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laverne Young-Hawkins</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>Retired 12/31/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Sloan</td>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Resigned 8/31/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Pryor</td>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>Retired 7/31/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Peters</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Retired 5/31/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert James</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Retired 9/30/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Norton</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Retired 7/15/2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6: Faculty Survey

TLAC Faculty Survey: Importance and Presence of Various Student Competencies in Bachelor’s, Master’s, and Doctoral Programs

Introduction

To meet the Departmental goals of preparing educators for teaching in the 21st Century, a committee was established during the summer of 2009 to develop a TLAC Faculty Survey. The charge to the committee was to create an instrument that would provide information about the current status as well as the vision for future goals regarding the review, revision, and delivery of programs and the courses residing within them. Committee members Carol Stuessy, Lynn Burlbaw, and Lori Graham used the Framework for 21st Century Learning (see http://www.21stcenturyskills.org) as a starting point for their deliberations about items to include in the survey. This framework was chosen because of the correspondence between the committee’s perceptions regarding the vision of the programs within the Department of TLAC with the stated goals of the Partnership for 21st Century Skills:

“to help practitioners integrate skills into the teaching of core academic subjects” … describing “the skills, knowledge and expertise students must master to succeed in work and life; it is a blend of content knowledge, specific skills, expertise and literacies.” (n.p.)

The Partnership describes 21st century outcomes as a “blending of specific skills, content knowledge, expertise and literacies with support systems to help students master the multi-dimensional abilities required of them in the 21st century” (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, Overview, p. 1). Student outcomes are distributed into four broad categories: Core Subjects and 21st Century Themes; Learning and Innovation Skills;
Information, Media and Technology Skills; and Life and Career Skills. Topics within each category offer explanations and elaboration of the outcome. These topics were discussed, adopted, and adapted for use in subsequent stem questions for the faculty survey. For example, within the category of Information, Media and Technology Skills, the Partnership explained,

Today we live in a technology and media-driven environment, marked by access to an abundance of information, rapid changes in technology tools and the ability to collaborate and make individual contributions at an unprecedented scale. Effective citizens and workers must be able to exhibit a range of functional and critical thinking skills, such as:

- Information Literacy
- Media Literacy
- ICT (Information, Communications and Technology) Literacy

Figure 1. Framework for 21st Century Learning reproduced from the website for the Partnership for 21st Century Skills (see http://www.21stcenturyskills.org).
Methods

In preparation for the current Program Evaluation, a twenty-item questionnaire was developed to examine perceptions of faculty teaching in the Bachelor of Science Programs, Master’s Programs, and Doctoral Programs within the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC). The items identified particular student learning objectives, or competencies, important to educators in the 21st Century (See Table 1). Twenty items for the survey were drafted by the committee members and reviewed by department administrators as a check for content validity. Survey item responses were based on a four point Likert scale to eliminate any neutral responses. A fifth choice of “Not Applicable” was scored zero, since ALL twenty competencies addressed in the survey have some place in ALL programs in the view of the Framework for 21st Century Learning.

The questionnaire was designed to address two areas of concern: “How important do you believe this item is in your program area?” and “How frequently do you address this particular item in the courses that you teach?” Therefore, the respondents answered all item prompts twice, each time from a different paradigm of thought. (See Table 2)

Table 1. Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Student Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students apply core content knowledge in a range of contexts to design age-appropriate curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students connect and integrate their knowledge of educational foundations (e.g., curriculum, philosophy, and history) to make decisions and solve problems in educational contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students solve problems and make decisions when using core knowledge and information such as global awareness, environmental problems, health issues, cloning, and stem-cell research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students express their philosophy of teaching and learning in their teaching and other interactions with others and with their instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Students communicate effectively in writing.
6. Students communicate effectively in their speech.
7. Students use leadership skills in successfully communicating their ideas and in respecting the ideas of others.
8. Students demonstrate their abilities to identify and articulate problems, design problem solutions, and apply methods to solve problems in educational contexts.
9. Students use critical thinking in formulating and responding to questions at all levels of complexity (i.e., yes/no, describe, infer, and evaluate).
10. Students collect data, analyze data, represent data visually, interpret data, and make conclusions on the basis of data.
11. Students use initiative, self-direction, and responsibility in completing tasks for which they are held accountable.
12. Flexibility is evident as students use self-assessment and other metacognitive strategies to adjust and adapt their learning.
13. Students evaluate different forms and sources of data to assess their value in making educational decisions.
14. Students use core content knowledge to design and deliver appropriate lessons.
15. Students respect the cultural diversity of their colleagues.
16. Students make decisions based on an ethical value system.
17. Students find and incorporate information from a variety of sources (e.g., print, digital, and video) in their lessons and classroom presentation.
18. Students assess the goodness of their conclusions about data by testing assumed inferences, predicting possible outcomes and interpretations, and relating the conclusions to the original question.
19. Students recognize and respect the cultural values of colleagues and students with whom they work.
20. Students use a variety of Learning communication, and production technologies to demonstrate their expertise in designing lessons and making classroom presentations.

Table 2. Prompts and Possible Responses for Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A</th>
<th>Question of Interest: How important do you believe this item is in your program area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prompt and Possible Responses for Part A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“My ranking of priority for students to demonstrate this competency in my program”:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4- very important  3-somewhat important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-not very important  1-not important at all  0- Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Part B | Question of Interest: How frequently do you address this item in the courses you teach? |
**Prompt and Possible Responses for Part B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities for students in my classes to demonstrate this competency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4- many opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- few opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty members were grouped by the degree program in which they taught (primarily). Those who primarily taught in the Bachelor of Science programs (n=17) were placed in the Baccalaureate Group. Those who primarily taught in the Master’s of Education or the Master’s of Science programs (n=10) were placed in the Master’s Group; and those who primarily taught in the PhD. and Ed.D. Programs (n=22) were placed in the Doctoral Group. Eight (8) faculty members desired to complete the survey twice for another program in which they were involved. The survey was administered to all full-time faculty members in the fall semester of 2009. Response rate was 100%. Results were analyzed within the different groups and comparisons were made between the first survey response addressing the importance of particular learning outcomes and the second survey response addressing the faculty’s perceptions of their own performance in teaching these learning outcomes. Factor analysis was employed as appropriate to reduce the data into components. The resulting categories are hierarchical in importance as the first category represents the greatest percentage of variance explained.

**Baccalaureate Group**

Seventeen faculty members (n=17) in TLAC teach primarily in the Bachelor of Science Programs and completed the questionnaire with the Baccalaureate Group. They first addressed the question “How important are these Student Learning Outcomes to your student’s success? Factor analysis of responses yielded four components accounting for 81% percent of survey variance. A review of questions associated with each
component produced a descriptive name for each component (See Table 3). Questions 1, 2, and 15 were not included in the factor analysis due to computational problems.

Thirteen of the questionnaire items grouped into factors, or components

**Table 3. Baccalaureate Group: Components of Student Competencies from Questionnaire Part A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Component name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4, 5, 12, 14, 16, 20</td>
<td>Development as an educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7, 19</td>
<td>Leadership and cultural awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6, 9</td>
<td>Personal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8, 11, 17</td>
<td>Professional communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, Part B of the questionnaire was analyzed to determine faculty perceptions of their own performance in teaching these particular competencies within their own classroom. Means and Standard Deviations were recorded for each item, and the responses were grouped by the competencies as determined by factor analysis of Part A. The means and standard deviations of those questions which did not group into factors are also reported. (See Table 4)

**Table 4. Mean and Standard Deviations from Part B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development as an Educator</th>
<th>Statement of Student Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students express their philosophy of teaching and learning in their teaching and other interactions with others and with their instructor.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Students use a variety of Learning communication, and production technologies to demonstrate their expertise in designing lessons and making classroom presentations.</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Students use core content knowledge to design and</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
deliver appropriate lessons.

| 16 | Students make decisions based on an ethical value system. | 3.53 | 0.624 |
| 5  | Students communicate effectively in writing.          | 3.35 | 0.786 |
| 12 | Flexibility is evident as students use self-assessment and other metacognitive strategies to adjust and adapt their learning. | 3.24 | 0.752 |

**Leadership and Cultural Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Statement of Student Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Students use leadership skills in successfully communicating their ideas and in respecting the ideas of others.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Students recognize and respect the cultural values of colleagues and students with whom they work.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Statement of Student Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Students communicate effectively in their speech.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Students use critical thinking in formulating and responding to questions at all levels of complexity (i.e., yes/no, describe, infer, and evaluate).</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Statement of Student Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Students demonstrate their abilities to identify and articulate problems, design problem solutions, and apply methods to solve problems in educational contexts.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Students use initiative, self-direction, and responsibility in completing tasks for which they are held accountable.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Students find and incorporate information from a variety of sources (e.g., print, digital, and video) in their lessons and classroom presentation.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions which did not cluster into factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Statement of Student Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Teaching, Learning and Culture*

*External Review*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students apply core content knowledge in a range of contexts to design age-appropriate curriculum.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students connect and integrate their knowledge of educational foundations (e.g., curriculum, philosophy, and history) to make decisions and solve problems in educational contexts.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Students solve problems and make decisions when using core knowledge and information such as global awareness, environmental problems, health issues, cloning, and stem-cell research.</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Students collect data, analyze data, represent data visually, interpret data, and make conclusions on the basis of data.</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Students evaluate different forms and sources of data to assess their value in making educational decisions.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Students respect the cultural diversity of their colleagues.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Students assess the goodness of their conclusions about data by testing assumed inferences, predicting possible outcomes and interpretations, and relating the conclusions to the original question.</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of TLAC Baccalaureate Faculty’s responses regarding opportunities for students to demonstrate competency in the 20 student-learning objectives within their own class was conducted using mean and SD values from Part B. The results are organized within the framework of factors, or components as formulated through factor analysis of Part A. These results indicate TLAC Faculty within the program strongly believe that Development as an Educator is the primary competency for students in the Bachelor of Science Program. Likewise, the faculty rate that they provide more opportunities for students to perform this competency in their classrooms. Other
important components including Leadership and Cultural Awareness, Personal Communication, and Professional Communication are primary competencies for students in the BS program. Note that a high mean indicates that students are provided more opportunities to exhibit their competency in the classroom (Part B). Likewise, a low standard deviation represents less variance which, in turn, indicates greater agreement among faculty concerning the ranking selection which was chosen. The highest mean (3.82) and the lowest standard deviation (0.393) both occurred on Item number 4, indicating that faculty have high agreement that students are given the most opportunities to exhibit this competency in the classroom. (Item 4: Students express their philosophy of teaching and learning in their teaching and other interactions with others and with their instructor.) Likewise, the lowest mean (2.12) and highest standard deviation (1.576) occurred on Item 3, indicating that, in general, faculty rated that students had the least opportunity to exhibit this competency in their classroom. (Item 3: Students solve problems and make decisions when using core knowledge and information such as global awareness, environmental problems, health issues, cloning, and stem-cell research). The high standard deviation also indicated great variance in the faculty’s perceptions of opportunities provided for students to exhibit this competency.

Cronbach’s Alpha is 0.871 for Questionnaire Part A and 0.865 for Questionnaire Part B, indicating favorable reliability.

Masters Group

As there were only ten faculty members who primarily taught in the Master’s Programs, factor analysis was not an appropriate statistical measure. Therefore Part A
was not analyzed to provide components of learning competencies for the Masters Group.

Means and Standard Deviations from Part 2 are presented. See Table 4.

**Table 4.** Master’s Group:
Means and Standard Deviations of Student Competencies from Questionnaire Part B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Competencies</th>
<th>Statement of Student Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Students apply core content knowledge in a range of contexts to design age-appropriate curriculum.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Students connect and integrate their knowledge of educational foundations (e.g., curriculum, philosophy, and history) to make decisions and solve problems in educational contexts.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>Students solve problems and make decisions when using core knowledge and information such as global awareness, environmental problems, health issues, cloning, and stem-cell research.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>Students express their philosophy of teaching and learning in their teaching and other interactions with others and with their instructor.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>Students communicate effectively in writing.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>Students communicate effectively in their speech.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>Students use leadership skills in successfully communicating their ideas and in respecting the ideas of others.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td>Students demonstrate their abilities to identify and articulate problems, design problem solutions, and apply methods to solve problems in educational contexts.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>Students use critical thinking in formulating and responding to questions at all levels of complexity (i.e., yes/no, describe, infer, and evaluate).</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>Students collect data, analyze data, represent data visually, interpret data, and make conclusions on the basis of data.</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td>Students use initiative, self-direction, and responsibility in completing tasks for which they are held accountable.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>Flexibility is evident as students use self-assessment and other metacognitive strategies to adjust and adapt their learning.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Students evaluate different forms and sources of data to assess their value in making educational decisions</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Students use core content knowledge to design and deliver appropriate lessons.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Students respect the cultural diversity of their colleagues</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Students make decisions based on an ethical value system.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Students find and incorporate information from a variety of sources (e.g., print, digital, and video) in their lessons and classroom presentation.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Students assess the goodness of their conclusions about data by testing assumed inferences, predicting possible outcomes and interpretations, and relating the conclusions to the original question.</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Students recognize and respect the cultural values of colleagues and students with whom they work.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Students use a variety of Learning communication, and production technologies to demonstrate their expertise in designing lessons and making classroom presentations.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that a high mean indicates that students are provided more opportunities to exhibit their competency in the classroom (Part B). Likewise, a low standard deviation represents less variance which, in turn, indicates greater agreement among faculty concerning the ranking selection which was chosen. The highest mean (3.70) and the lowest standard deviation (0.483) both occurred on Item number 5, indicating that faculty have high agreement that students are given the most opportunities to exhibit this competency in the classroom. (Item number 5: Students communicate effectively in writing). Likewise, the lowest mean (2.12) and highest standard deviation (2.0) occurred on Item 3, indicating that, in general, faculty rated that students had the least opportunity to exhibit this competency in their classroom. The high standard deviation also indicated great variance in the faculty’ perceptions of opportunities for students to exhibit this competency.(Item number 3: Students solve problems and make decisions when using
core knowledge and information such as global awareness, environmental problems, health issues, cloning, and stem-cell research.

Cronbach’s Alpha is 0.715 for Questionnaire Part B, indicating favorable reliability.

**Doctoral Group**

Twenty-two faculty members (n=22) in TLAC teach primarily in the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) and/or the Doctor of Education (Ed.D) programs and completed the questionnaire with the Doctoral Group. They first addressed the question “How important are these Student Learning Outcomes to your student’s success?” Factor analysis of responses yielded six components accounting for 82.637% percent of survey variance. A review of questions associated with each component produced a descriptive name for each component (See Table 5). All twenty questionnaire items grouped into factors, or components.

**Table 5. Doctoral Group:**
**Components of Student Competencies from Questionnaire Part A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Component name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11, 16, 17, 18</td>
<td>Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4, 5, 7, 9</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8, 10, 13, 20</td>
<td>Research Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2, 3, 2</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 14</td>
<td>Development of core content knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6, 15, 19</td>
<td>Cultural Awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, Part B of the questionnaire was analyzed to determine teacher perceptions of their own performance in teaching these particular competencies within their own
classroom. Means and Standard Deviations were recorded for each item, and the responses were grouped by the competencies as determined by factor analysis. (See Table 6)

Table 6. Doctoral Group:
Means and Standard Deviations from Part B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th>Statement of Student Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Students use initiative, self-direction, and responsibility in completing tasks for which they are held accountable.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Students make decisions based on an ethical value system.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Students find and incorporate information from a variety of sources (e.g., print, digital, and video) in their lessons and classroom presentation.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Students assess the goodness of their conclusions about data by testing assumed inferences, predicting possible outcomes and interpretations, and relating the conclusions to the original question.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Statement of Student Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students communicate effectively in writing.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Students use critical thinking in formulating and responding to questions at all levels of complexity (i.e., yes/no, describe, infer, and evaluate).</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Students use leadership skills in successfully communicating their ideas and in respecting the ideas of others.</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students express their philosophy of teaching and learning in their teaching and other interactions with others and with their instructor.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Research Skills |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Statement of Student Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Students demonstrate their abilities to identify and articulate problems, design problem solutions, and apply methods to solve problems in educational contexts.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Students collect data, analyze data, represent data visually, interpret data, and make conclusions on the basis of data.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Students evaluate different forms and sources of data to assess their value in making educational decisions.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Students use a variety of Learning communication, and production technologies to demonstrate their expertise in designing lessons and making classroom presentations.</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Solving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Statement of Student Competency</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>St. Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students connect and integrate their knowledge of educational foundations (e.g., curriculum, philosophy, and history) to make decisions and solve problems in educational contexts</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Flexibility is evident as students use self-assessment and other metacognitive strategies to adjust and adapt their learning.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Students solve problems and make decisions when using core knowledge and information such as global awareness, environmental problems, health issues, cloning, and stem-cell research.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Core Content Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Statement of Student Competency</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>St. Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students apply core content knowledge in a range of contexts to design age-appropriate curriculum.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Students use core content knowledge to design and deliver appropriate lessons.</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Statement of Student Competency</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>St. Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Students respect the cultural diversity of their colleagues.</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Students communicate effectively in their speech.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students recognize and respect the cultural values of colleagues and students with whom they work.

Results indicate that TLAC Faculty within the program strongly believe that Decision Making is the primary competency for students in the Doctoral Program. Likewise, the faculty rate that they provide more opportunities for students to perform this competency in their classrooms. Other important components are Communication, Research Skills, and Problem Solving. The two other components, Development of Core Content Knowledge and Cultural Awareness, are not rated as highly, as faculty provide less opportunity for students to perform these competencies in class.

The highest mean (3.86) and the lowest standard deviation (0.351) both occurred on Item 5: Students communicate effectively in writing. This indicates that the faculty has high agreement that students are given the most opportunities to exhibit this competency in the classroom. Ironically, Item 5 appeared in the secondary component rather than the primary component as determined by factor analysis. Two items, 9 and 11, share the second largest mean (3.77), indicating many opportunities to perform this competency in the classroom. The standard deviation is 0.429 for Item 11: Students use initiative, self-direction, and responsibility in completing tasks for which they are held accountable and 0.528 for Item 9: Students use critical thinking in formulating and responding to questions at all levels of complexity (i.e., yes/no, describe, infer, and evaluate).

Likewise, the lowest mean (2.12) and highest standard deviation (1.576) occurred on Item 3 competency, indicating that, in general, faculty rated that students had the least opportunity to exhibit this competency in their classroom. The high standard deviation
also indicated great variance in the faculty perceptions of opportunities for students to exhibit this competency. (Item 3: Students solve problems and make decisions when using core knowledge and information such as global awareness, environmental problems, health issues, cloning, and stem-cell research).

Cronbach’s Alpha is 0.871 for Questionnaire Part A and 0.865 for Questionnaire Part B, indicating favorable reliability.

**Table 7  **Comparisons Between Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Competencies</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>Statement of Student Competency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baccalaureate Group</strong></td>
<td><strong>Master’s Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students apply core content knowledge in a range of contexts to design age-appropriate curriculum.</td>
<td>$m=3.65$ $Sd=1.057$</td>
<td>$m=2.80$ $Sd=1.229$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students connect and integrate their knowledge of educational foundations (e.g., curriculum, philosophy, and history) to make decisions and solve problems in educational contexts.</td>
<td>$m=3.50$ $Sd=0.632$</td>
<td>$m=3.10$ $Sd=1.287$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Students solve problems and make decisions when using core knowledge and information such as global awareness, environmental problems, health issues, cloning, and stem-cell research.</td>
<td>$m=2.12$ $Sd=1.576$</td>
<td>$m=3.00$ $Sd=1.414$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students express their philosophy of teaching and learning in their teaching and other interactions with others and with their instructor.</td>
<td>$m=3.82$ $Sd=0.393$</td>
<td>$m=3.60$ $Sd=0.516$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students communicate effectively in writing.</td>
<td>$m=3.35$ $Sd=0.786$</td>
<td>$m=3.70$ $Sd=0.483$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Students communicate effectively in their speech.</td>
<td>$m=3.76$ $Sd=0.437$</td>
<td>$m=3.40$ $Sd=0.699$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Students use leadership skills in successfully communicating their ideas and in respecting the ideas of others.</td>
<td>$m=3.71$ $Sd=0.470$</td>
<td>$m=3.20$ $Sd=0.789$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Students demonstrate their abilities to</td>
<td>$m=3.47$</td>
<td>$m=2.70$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Identify and articulate problems, design problem solutions, and apply methods to solve problems in educational contexts.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=0.800</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=1.160</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Students use critical thinking in formulating and responding to questions at all levels of complexity (i.e., yes/no, describe, infer, and evaluate).</td>
<td><strong>m=3.69</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=0.479</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Students collect data, analyze data, represent data visually, interpret data, and make conclusions on the basis of data.</td>
<td><strong>m=2.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=1.455</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Students use initiative, self-direction, and responsibility in completing tasks for which they are held accountable.</td>
<td><strong>m=3.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=0.529</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Flexibility is evident as students use self-assessment and other metacognitive strategies to adjust and adapt their learning.</td>
<td><strong>m=3.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=0.752</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Students evaluate different forms and sources of data to assess their value in making educational decisions</td>
<td><strong>m=2.69</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=1.250</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Students use core content knowledge to design and deliver appropriate lessons.</td>
<td><strong>m=3.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=0.629</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Students respect the cultural diversity of their colleagues</td>
<td><strong>m=3.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=0.447</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Students make decisions based on an ethical value system.</td>
<td><strong>m=3.53</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=0.624</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Students find and incorporate information from a variety of sources (e.g., print, digital, and video) in their lessons and classroom presentation.</td>
<td><strong>m=3.88</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=0.332</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Students assess the goodness of their conclusions about data by testing assumed inferences, predicting possible outcomes and interpretations, and relating the conclusions to the original question.</td>
<td><strong>m=2.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=1.231</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Students recognize and respect the cultural values of colleagues and students with whom they work.</td>
<td><strong>m=3.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=.470</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Students use a variety of Learning communication, and production</td>
<td><strong>m=3.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sd=0.403</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When one compares data across the three degree programs, several competencies deserve special attention. Questions # 3, 10, 13, and 18 are four competencies related to handling data—from collecting to evaluating or interpreting data, as well as solving problems and making decisions. All seem to be related to the task of identifying problems and seeking solutions through careful gathering and interpreting of evidence. In some cases (#10, 13, and 18) the lowest mean and highest standard deviation occurs with faculty teaching in the Master’s program. This, however, must be tempered with the fact that, with a small n=10 versus n= 17 (bachelor’s) and n=22 (doctoral program) comparisons are tenuous.

Our hope is that faculty will find the results of this survey worth discussing—if only to be made aware of where we appear to have our greatest areas of agreement with the Framework for 21st Century Learning—and where we might wish to appraise and possibly refine our current emphases.
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Section I: Students

Student Enrollment

Student Enrollment in Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLAC Enrollment</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>13921</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Enrollment by Major

Graduate Enrollment in Educational Curriculum and Instruction (EDCI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCI Enrollment</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undergraduate Enrollment in Educational Instructional Strategies (EDIS)  
{Freshmen and Sophomores in Phase 1 of the INST Degree}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>1049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undergraduate Enrollment in Interdisciplinary Studies (INST)  
{Juniors and Seniors in Phase 2}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Enrollment by Major (TECR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Demographics

#### Undergraduate students

TExES Pass Rates for the College of Education and Human Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Taking Test</th>
<th># Passing Test</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
<th>Average Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELAR/Social Studies 4-8</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist EC4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle Schools Maths/ Science 4-8</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English as a Second Language Supplemental</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities 4-8</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate students

For more information on PhD GRE information, please see Appendix 8.

**PhD GRE Information used for US News and World Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAHR</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLKN</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLAC</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentile TLAC**

**Verbal Ranges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;580</td>
<td>80%-100%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460-579</td>
<td>50%-79%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-459</td>
<td>30%-49%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;400</td>
<td>0-29%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quantitative Ranges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 740</td>
<td>80%-100%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-739</td>
<td>50%-79%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520-599</td>
<td>30%-49%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;520</td>
<td>0-29%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 2: Outcomes and Assessment

**Certification Exam Passage Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Taking Test</th>
<th># Passing Test</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
<th>Average Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ELAR/Social Studies 4-8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Taking Test</th>
<th># Passing Test</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
<th>Average Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generalist EC4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Taking Test</th>
<th># Passing Test</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
<th>Average Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Middle Schools Maths/ Science 4-8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Taking Test</th>
<th># Passing Test</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
<th>Average Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**English as a Second Language Supplemental**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Taking Test</th>
<th># Passing Test</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
<th>Average Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weave-Online

The Office of Institutional Assessment (assessment.tamu.edu) is responsible for assuring that all courses taught at Texas A&M University meet certain requirements. One of those requirements is assuring that all courses are objective based and outcome oriented and that there is sufficient evidence to support assessment of the outcomes. The instrument which the university uses is Weave-Online. Each department provides documentation which is overseen by the Office of Institutional Assessment. Following are the TLAC weave on-line
reports for the undergraduate program and for the graduate program, which are continuing to be developed.

**Undergraduate Weave-Online Outcomes and Assessments**

**Assessment of Pre-Service Teachers**

In an effort to identify and define the actions that we expect our pre-service teachers to demonstrate in knowledge, skills, and attitudes upon the completion of our educational program, the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) developed seven student learning outcomes. It was also necessary to identify how this knowledge would be assessed. In response to this charge TLAC identified multiple assessments we use to determine if students have met these expectations. These student learner outcomes (listed below) and specific assessments are available through Weave online.

### Program Mission/Purpose

* "To prepare EC - 6 educators and researchers to build inclusive democratic learning communities in elementary schools and society through critical and reflective research, teaching and service."

### Student Learning Outcomes

**Student Learning Outcomes**: Use the fields below to enter student learning outcomes. An outcome is a specific, measurable, and/or identifiable learning goal focusing on the end result of Learning rather than the process. A student learning outcome is an identified action that a student is expected to demonstrate in terms of knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes upon the completion of an educational program. Outcomes should be measurable or observable, manageable, and meaningful. They are more easily formed when filling in this blank: “The successful student will be able to _______ (define, apply, analyze, etc.).” To see examples, use this link: [http://assessment.tamu.edu/asmt_help/writing_learning_outcomes.pdf](http://assessment.tamu.edu/asmt_help/writing_learning_outcomes.pdf)

**Assessment Methods**: There are direct and indirect, quantitative and qualitative assessment methods. Direct methods require students to produce work so that reviewers can assess how well students meet expectations. Indirect methods provide opportunities for students to reflect on their learning. Indirect methods are often helpful in interpreting the findings of direct methods. Use the fields below to describe the assessment methods for each student learning outcome. To see examples, use this link: [http://assessment.tamu.edu/asmt/methods.htm](http://assessment.tamu.edu/asmt/methods.htm)

**Student Learning Outcome #1:**

Demonstrates knowledge (conceptual, theoretical, and empirical) of content.
Assessment Methods for Outcome #1:
Content knowledge exams (RDNG 351, 361, 461, 467, 468; MASC 351, 450, 475; TEFB 412, 423;)
Position paper (MASC 351, 450; TEFB 412)
Presentation (MASC 351,450; TEFB 412;)
Lesson plan development (MASC 351, 450, 475; TEFB 410, 412, 413)
Design of an experiment (MASC 475, 351; TEFB 413)
Evidence of lesson plans in students' electronic portfolios
Certification Tests (TExES)

Student Learning Outcome #2:
Displays respect for others and creates a learner-centered environment; Aware of and provides for various background,
skills, interests, and learning needs through use of appropriate strategies, activities, materials, tools and resources.
Modifies and develops lessons to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students, including English
language learners.
Assessment Methods for Outcome #2:
Lesson plan modifications as evidenced in students' electronic portfolios.
Observations in senior field placements as evidenced in walk-through data (TEFB 412, TEFB 413, TEFB 410, TEFB 273)
Student teaching (EDFB 497, MEFB 497)

Student Learning Outcome #3:
Communicates effectively in written, oral and technological formats appropriate to content, learners, and environment
Assessment Methods for Outcome #3:
Classroom interactions as evidenced in walk-through data (MEFB 352, 450, RDNG 370, 390)
Writing samples as evidenced in writing intensive courses (RDNG 461, 371, 372, 472, TEFB 471)
Oral presentations as required in course work (RDNG 461)
Technology presentations as evidenced in course work (EDCI 365, MEFB 352, MEFB 450)
Students' electronic portfolios

Student Learning Outcome #4:
Develops and implements appropriate assessment strategies aimed at higher order thinking skills; Involves students in
inquiry activities
Assessment Methods for Outcome #4:
Lesson plans as evidenced in students' electronic portfolios. (INST 463)
Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT)
Student teaching (EDFB 497, MEFB 497)

Student Learning Outcome #5:
Models understanding of student learning and development through -content, -age, and level appropriate strategies, plans
and activities; recognizes and addresses all learners; models/applies research based learning and learning practices
Assessment Methods for Outcome #5:
Lesson plans as evidenced in students' electronic portfolios (RDNG 470, MEFB 450)
Demonstration of incorporating technology into teaching as evidenced in students' electronic portfolios (EDCI 365)
Student teaching (ECFB 497, MEFB 497)
Field placements as evidenced in walk-through data
Certification tests (ECFB 497, MEFB 497)

Student Learning Outcome #6:
 Displays the dispositions of a professional educator.
Assessment Methods for Outcome #6:
Field placements as evidenced in walk-through data (MEFB 352, MEFB 450, RDNG 370, 390)
Mentor observations and evaluations (MEFB 352, MEFB 450, RDNG 370, 390)

Student Learning Outcome #7:
Interacts with students, parents, and other educational personnel in an effective, professional manner
Encourages family and community involvement in the classroom/school

Assessment Methods for Outcome #7:
Student teaching (ECFB 497, MEFB 497)
Field-based experiences as evidenced in walk-through data (MEFB 352, MEFB 450, RDNG 370, 390)
Service project as evidenced in students’ electronic portfolios

Graduate Weave-Online Outcomes and Assessments

Detailed Assessment Report – Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Education in Curriculum and Instruction
Mission: To prepare educators and researchers to build inclusive democratic learning communities in schools and society through critical and reflective research, teaching, service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Revised Outcomes/Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measure</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1. Examine the impact of social, political, cultural, and economic issues that affect educational decisions.</td>
<td>Course content</td>
<td>Course evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class projects</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written and oral comprehensive exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conference presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2. Develop appropriate knowledge base content and research in respective discipline</td>
<td>Course content</td>
<td>Course evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class projects</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written and oral comprehensive exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conference presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3. Develop an understanding of appropriate research methodology (qualitative, quantitative or some combination).</td>
<td>Course content</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class projects</td>
<td>Dissertations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal submission s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>4. Analyze research reports</td>
<td>Course content</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research core</td>
<td>Dissertations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal submission s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5. Demonstrate research skills necessary to complete the dissertation (traditional or journal format)</td>
<td>Course content, Class projects</td>
<td>Journal articles, Journal submission s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>6. Analyze literature in their respective discipline.</td>
<td>Course content, Class projects</td>
<td>Journal articles, Journal submission s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching-Instruction</td>
<td>7. Examine the influence of social and cultural factors on the teaching and learning process.</td>
<td>Course content, Class projects</td>
<td>Portfolios, Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching-Instruction</td>
<td>8. Design instruction appropriate for understanding of relevant content and is based on continuous and appropriate assessment.</td>
<td>Course content, Class projects</td>
<td>Portfolios, Written and oral comprehensive exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>9. Encourage participation in their professional organizations.</td>
<td>Leadership in professional organizations</td>
<td>Leadership and Membership in organizations, Passing state requirements (criminal check, drug test)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>10. Fulfill professional roles and responsibilities as well as adhere to legal and ethical requirements of the profession.</td>
<td>Course content</td>
<td>Passing state requirements (criminal check, drug test)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Detailed Assessment Report – Master of Science in Curriculum and Instruction

### Mission:
To prepare educators and researchers to build inclusive democratic learning communities in schools and society through critical and reflective research, teaching, service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Revised Outcomes/Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measure</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1. Examine the impact of social, political, cultural, and economic issues that affect educational decisions.</td>
<td>Course content Class projects</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2. Develop an understanding of appropriate instructional practices (i.e., classroom, workplace).</td>
<td>Course content Class projects</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions Portfolios Written and oral comprehensive exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3. Analyze literature in their respective discipline.</td>
<td>Course content Class projects</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>4. Demonstrate research skills necessary to complete the thesis (MS).</td>
<td>Course content Research Core Class projects</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching-Instruction</td>
<td>5. Examine the influence of social and cultural factors on the teaching and learning process.</td>
<td>Course content Class projects</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions Portfolios Written and oral comprehensive exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching-Instruction</td>
<td>6. Design instruction appropriate for understanding of relevant content that is based on continuous and appropriate assessment.</td>
<td>Course content Class projects</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions Portfolios Written and oral comprehensive exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching-Instruction</td>
<td>7. Complete certification and licensure examinations (national or state) in respective fields (when appropriate).</td>
<td>Course content Class projects</td>
<td>Pass State Competency Exams Pass State Professional Exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>8. Encourage participation in their professional and community organizations.</td>
<td>Course content Class projects</td>
<td>Professional Organization Leadership and Membership Community leadership and membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>9. Fulfill professional roles and responsibilities as well as adhere to legal and ethical requirements of the profession.</td>
<td>Course content Class projects</td>
<td>Professional Organization Leadership and Membership Passing state requirements (criminal check, drug test)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Detailed Assessment Report – Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction**

Mission: To prepare educators and researchers to build inclusive democratic learning communities in schools and society through critical and reflective research, teaching, service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Revised Outcomes/Objectives</th>
<th>Related Measure</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1. Examine the impact of social, political, cultural, and economic issues that affect educational decisions.</td>
<td>Course content Class projects</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2. Develop an understanding of appropriate instructional practices (i.e., classroom, workplace).</td>
<td>Course content Class projects</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3. Analyze literature in their respective discipline.</td>
<td>Course content Class projects</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching-Instruction</td>
<td>4. Examine the influence of social and cultural factors on the teaching and learning process.</td>
<td>Course content Class projects</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching-Instruction</td>
<td>5. Design instruction appropriate for understanding of relevant content that is based on continuous and appropriate</td>
<td>Course content Class projects</td>
<td>Written &amp; e-learning assignments, papers, projects, exhibitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teaching-Instruction | 6. Complete certification and licensure examinations (national or state) in respective fields (when appropriate). | Course content | Pass State Competency Exams
| | | Class projects | Pass State Professional Exams |
| Service | 7. Encourage participation in their professional and community organizations. | Course content | Professional Organization Leadership and Membership Community leadership and membership |
| | | Class projects | |
| Service | 8. Fulfill professional roles and responsibilities as well as adhere to legal and ethical requirements of the profession. | Course content | Professional Organization Leadership and Membership Passing state requirements (criminal check, drug test) |
| | | Class projects | |
Comparison of Weave-Online, 21st Century, and Faculty Survey Outcomes

Comparison of Assessments

The following document compares the weave assessment from Texas A&M’s Office of Institutional Assessment with the results of the recent faculty survey, which is based on the framework of the 21st Century Student Outcomes (See Faculty Survey, Volume 2). This document compares the current state of TLAC’s weave online assessment framework for graduate students with the faculty survey on student competencies, which was based on the 21st Century framework.

COMPARISON OF THREE DOCUMENTS
21st Century Student Outcomes, Faculty Survey, And TLAC Graduate Weave Online Assessment Report

Carol Stuessy (11-16-09)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original 21st Century Skills Document</th>
<th>All-Faculty Survey (UG, Grad)</th>
<th>TLAC Assessment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Ed. Degree</td>
<td>M.S. Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE SUBJECTS AND 21ST CENTURY THEMES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core subjects mastery: English, reading, LA; world languages, arts, mathematics, economics, science, geography, history, government and civics [and create lessons for, as in PCK]</td>
<td>1,2,14</td>
<td>1,2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary themes mastery: global awareness; financial, economic, business literacy; civic literacy; health literacy [and create lessons for]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING AND INNOVATION SKILLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and innovation: think creatively; work creatively with others; implement innovations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking and problem solving: reason effectively, use systems thinking; make judgments and decisions; solve problems [and do research in]</td>
<td>3,8,9,10,18</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION AND COLLABORATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate clearly; collaborate with others</td>
<td>4,5,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION, MEDIA, AND TECHNOLOGY SKILLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information literacy: Access and evaluate information; Use and manage information</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media literacy: Analyze media; create media products</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, Communications and Technology (ICT) Literacy: Apply technology effectively</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching, Learning and Culture
External Review
### LIFE AND CAREER SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility and adaptability: Adapt to change, be flexible</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative and self-direction: Manage goals and time, work independently, be self-directed learners</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cross-cultural skills: interact effectively with others, work effectively in diverse teams</td>
<td>7,15, 5, 5, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRODUCTIVITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manage projects, produce results</td>
<td>11,14,17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEADERSHIP AND RESPONSIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guide and lead others; be responsible to others</td>
<td>7,16, 8,9, 8,9, 9,10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. "21st Century Skills document was developed by the Partnership for 21st Century Skills to "provide guidance to educators who are working to make sure the K-12 education system provides all students with rich core content and 21st century skills" (P21 document available on the web, 05/27/09)

2. All-Faculty survey was developed by Stuessy, Burbaw, and Graham in summer 2009 in response to the 21st Century Skills document, using the 21st Century Skills framework to develop individual items for all faculty (undergraduate through Ph.D.).

3. The TLAC Assessment Report was developed by Larke and Joshi in August 2009 to reflect lists of skills by graduate degree.

---

**Other Measures of Assessment and Outcomes**

**Internal Assessments to Assure Student Learning**

All students in senior methods are observed in their field placements 4 times each semester.

All observations are recorded by the field supervisor on the electronic walkthrough form the information is submitted to a database and should concern arise the information could be accessed during the student teaching semester. This data has also been used to study the experiences are students are receiving in their field placements.

A Walkthrough form has been developed for evaluation of students in the classroom. This is used as a formative assessment to make observations of their skills and assist in identifying student strengths and weaknesses.

Students also receive feedback from the mentor teacher and these evaluations are submitted to the field supervisors at midterm and at the end of the semester.

All students in senior methods are required to create an e-Folio which is a web based collection of authentic learner-specific artifacts that demonstrate growth and the development of
skills toward becoming an effective teacher. Each item placed in the e-Folio is chosen based upon the demonstration of a competency that correlates with an Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Standard.

**Purposes of the e-Folio:**

To provide evidence that pre-service teachers have met the competencies and requirements of the teacher education courses.

To inform prospective employers that pre-service teachers have met the competencies that are appropriate for beginning teachers.

All students in enrolled in the junior II semester are given the trial version of the TexEt exam (Exam for Texas State Teacher Certification) at the beginning and the end of the semester these scores are analyzed for the areas of strength and weaknesses and this guides the curriculum of the senior methods courses.

**Achieve technology expertise**

It was determined that while our undergraduate students were able to manipulate many of the current technologies they lacked knowledge of how to effectively integrate these technologies into the classroom. To address the integration of technology in the classroom, the course “Using Technology in Elementary Classrooms” was developed and implemented in the fall of 2009.

To address technology in all areas the National Educational Technology Standards and Performance Indicators for Teachers are addressed in every course taught by the department beginning with the fall 2009 semester.

Our goal is to celebrate the outstanding teaching and learning by Aggie Teachers. Effective and creative educational practices of Aggie Teachers serve as authentic learning ideas that have an impact on students and the community. The overall program will advance the "best practices" for all teachers through providing awards, scholarships, and recognition. Aggie Teachers may
receive recognition for their excellence in teaching and learning through telling and sharing their most compelling stories. The tradition and spirit prevails through Aggies helping other Aggies.

Two of our students have received monetary awards for the integration of technology into the classroom. Both of these students learned about the use of technology (ipods/flip cameras) during their methods course work they integrated these technologies into the classroom during their student teaching semester.

A student journal entry:

“For my last formal observation from my supervisor, my cooperating teacher and I decided to have the students perform a reader’s theatre. When I was thinking of how to make this observation my best one of the semester I remembered using Flip Cameras in my Methods reading class. I was in Methods during Fall 2008. During that semester we were able to get two flip cameras for the College of Education. I ran this idea of using the flip camera by my cooperating teacher and she had never heard of them. I showed her what is was online and she fell in love with it. She loved how you could video tape something and then automatically put it on the computer. Before my observation day, my teacher and I were able to buy a flip camera. We played around with it prior to the observation day. My teacher was hooked after getting to play with the camera. On my observation day we told the students that we were going to video tape them and then once they completed the assessment afterwards they would be able to watch their performance. My supervisor came to observe me and I video taped the students while they performed their reader’s theatre. The students really enjoyed being videotaped and loved being able to see
themselves up on the screen. My cooperating teacher and I also emailed the video to some of the parents of the students that were in the performance.

During my final evaluation, my supervisor brought up the flip camera idea and asked where I got that idea from. I told her about how during Methods we were able to get two flip cameras for the College of Education and how we got to play around with them. Then when I was thinking of this lesson I wanted to bring in the flip camera to introduce them to the students. I also explained to my cooperating teacher how they are easy enough for the students to operate. Then we talked about how that would get our students ahead in the technology that is out there than any of the other 4th graders in Ennis. We have been throwing around ideas about how else we might use the flip camera in the classroom.

Without having experienced the flip camera in my Methods class, I would not have been able to bring in more technology into my ST classroom. I daily use technology with PowerPoints but the flip camera brings in a whole different perspective on technology and the students enjoy being able to video tape something and automatically watch them from the projector.”

Kelly Little

“I was a student in the spring semester in your methods reading class, and I am currently completing my student teaching at Frisco ISD. I just wanted to let you know that I used the podcast assignment I completed for your class as an assignment for my students and they loved it, as well as my mentor teacher and the whole 3rd grade team of teachers! We were doing a week-long reading unit on Strega Nona and I mentioned to my mentor teacher that I had made a podcast and coordinating worksheet for an assignment in one of my past education classes on Strega Nona, so
she made me email it to her. She looked it over and we ended up using it in our classroom. She also emailed it to the other 3rd grade teachers who said they thought it was really neat. The students also loved it because they loved hearing the story in my voice over the podcast.

I thought I would email you to tell you that assignment was a big success and the teachers thought the technology was really great. Thanks for a great assignment! I hope your fall semester is going well."

Virginia Fellow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year retention rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TLAC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year Retention Rates</th>
<th>Retention(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003-Fall 2004</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004-Fall 2005</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005-Fall 2006</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006-Fall 2007</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007-Fall 2008</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003-Fall 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004-Fall 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005-Fall 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006-Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007-Fall 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLAC</th>
<th>Cohort Year-Graduation Year</th>
<th>Cohort #</th>
<th>Graduation #</th>
<th>Graduation %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 1998-Fall 2004</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 1999-Fall 2005</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2000-Fall 2006</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2001-Fall 2007</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2002-Fall 2008</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>INST</th>
<th>Cohort Year-Graduation Year</th>
<th>Cohort #</th>
<th>Graduation #</th>
<th>Graduation %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 1998-Fall 2004</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 1999-Fall 2005</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2000-Fall 2006</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2001-Fall 2007</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2002-Fall 2008</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Texas A&M University DISSENTATIONS AND THESES

Science Education Faculty – (2004-2009)

Carol Stuessy

**Toni Ivey.** (December, 2009). *High School Science Teacher Induction in Texas: Implications for Policy*. Ph.D. Dissertation. [Dr. Ivey is currently an assistant professor in science education at Oklahoma State University].


**Gerren, Sally Sue.** (August, 2008). *A Case Study: The Relationship Between the Use of*
Graphing Calculators and the Development of Classroom Norms in a College Algebra Course. Ph.D. Dissertation. [Dr. Gerren is currently a community college mathematics instructor; co-chaired with Dr. Gerald Kulm].

**Force, Crista.** (August, 2007). *Overcoming the Obstacles: Life Stories of Scientists With Learning Disabilities.* Ph.D. Dissertation. [Dr. Force is currently an assistant professor in secondary science education at Baylor University, Waco, TX].

**Metty, Jane.** (June, 2006). *A Comparative Study of Authentic Student Research Versus Guided Inquiry in Affecting Middle School Students’ Abilities to Know and Do Genetics.* M. S. Thesis. [Ms. Metty is currently pursuing a doctoral degree in science education at Texas A&M University, College Station].

**Jensen, Deborah.** (December, 2004). *Case Study of an Expert Mathematics Teacher’s Decision-making Behaviors Correlated with Physiological Response Rates.* Ph.D. Dissertation. [Dr. Jensen is currently Director of Programming and Implementation for the Southeast Regional T-STEM Center, Division of Community Outreach, at the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston].

Cathleen Loving

**Anderson, Amy.** (May, 2009) *Exploration of the Impact of the Same Developmental Mentor Training Within the Infrastructure of Two Different School Districts.* Ph.D. Dissertation. [Dr. Anderson continues in her leadership position in mentoring new teachers with the College Station I.S.D.].

**Seifert, Kathryn.** (August, 2008) *An Analysis of the Impact of a Reflection Component in a Problem-Based Learning Unit.* Ph.D. Dissertation. [Dr. Seifert is currently working in a leadership position at the Brenham State School, Brenham, TX; co-chaired with Dr. Susan Pedersen, Dept. of Educational Psychology].

**Schroeder, Carolyn.** (May, 2006) *Expert-Novice Interaction in Problematizing a Complex Environmental Science Issue Using Web-based Information and Analysis Tools.* Ph.D. Dissertation. [Dr. Schroeder is Program Coordinator, Aggie Teach Program in the Center for Mathematics and Science Education, College of Science, Texas A&M University].

**Ezrailson, Cathy Mariotti.** (December, 2004) *Explicit Modeling of Interactive-engagement Techniques for Physics Graduate Teaching Assistants and the Impact on Instruction and Student Performance in Calculus-based Physics.* Ph.D. Dissertation. [Dr. Ezrailson is an assistant professor of science education at the University of South Dakota in Vermillion, S.D.; co-chaired with Dr. Donald Allen, Dept. of Mathematics].

Scott Slough

**Gordon, Denise.** (December, 2009) *A Case Study of the Applied Learning Academy: Reconceptualized Quantum Design of Applied Learning.* Ph.D. Dissertation. [Dr. Gordon is
currently teaching science at the Applied Learning Academy in Ft. Worth ISD, Ft. Worth, TX.

Bugra Yalvac (assistant professor)

Richard, Shawn. (December, 2009). Non-thesis M.Ed. in Curriculum & Instruction. [Shawn is applying for doctoral programs in various technology fields/computer science; co-chaired with Dr. Cathleen Loving, TLAC]

Employment of Doctoral Graduates – Last Five Years (blanks simply are unknown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Graduation</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, Torrance Norval</td>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuthinger, Georgeanne</td>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>Director, Special Education- Laredo ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarpy-Simpson, Claudine Latreece</td>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasquez, Cherrye Shawn</td>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colvin, Alex Don</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contreras, Diana Linn</td>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>Asst Prof - Texas A&amp;M International, Laredo TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston-Cormier, Phyllis Ann</td>
<td>Summer 2006</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston-Cormier, Phyllis Ann</td>
<td>Summer 2006</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghong, Mary Njang</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingshead, Barbara Sue</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landeck, Edith S</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Grants Administrator, Director- United ISD, Laredo TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Xiaobao</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livengood, Kimberly Kay</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruiz, Elsa Cantu</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standish, Hilary Anne</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Judy</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Teresa Marie</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahn, Soo Jin</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone, Sonia Kay</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim, Eronif</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, Chia-Ning</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahin, Alpaslan</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickens, Corrine Marie</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Emily Ocker</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>Asst Prof., McMurray University, Abilene TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ding, Meixia</td>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
<td>Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force, Crista Marie</td>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
<td>Baylor University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia, Norma Garza</td>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham, Lori Lynn</td>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
<td>TAMU-TLAC, Clinical Asst Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kang, Rui</td>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
<td>Academia - Georgia College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matteson, Shirley Marie</td>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natesan, Prathiba</td>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
<td>Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittman, Ramona Trinette</td>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
<td>Florida State Univ – Asst Prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, Earnestyne Lashonne</td>
<td>Summer 2007</td>
<td>Asst Prof – Prairie View A&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayley Kazen</td>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>TAMU International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ates, Burcu</td>
<td>Summer 2008</td>
<td>Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavenall, Pamela Elaine Rogers</td>
<td>Summer 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Wen-Chun</td>
<td>Summer 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stake Holders

**Texas Education Agency (TEA)**

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) periodically reviews each program in the state which prepares students for teacher certification. The latest TEA review occurred in January 2008 and focused only on the undergraduate program.
Brazos Valley Cooperative Teacher Education Center (BVCTEC)

The Brazos Valley Cooperative Teacher Education Center (BVCTEC) is a long-standing advisory committee which helps shape the current status of teacher education at Texas A&M University. The BVCTEC is composed of TAMU faculty and staff, representatives from the Regional Education Services Centers, and faculty and administrators from many independent school districts from many areas of Texas. The collaborative committee meets each September, February, and June to develop and assess preservice candidate preparation.

Council on Teacher Education (CTE)

The Council on Teacher Education serves as an advisory body regarding all matters relating to teacher education. The CTE consists of twelve members of the general faculty, three students, and members from local school districts who are appointed by the president of the university. Members of the council meet monthly, with additional meeting scheduled when deemed necessary to discharge the business of the council. Members of the CTE board also attend relevant and appropriate teacher education meetings called by the Texas Education Agency and other regional and national accrediting bodies involved in the preparation of teachers. All correspondence from the Texas Education Agency concerning certification requirements and changes in the standards of teacher education programs is processed through the CTE. The Council on Teacher Education board is also responsible for keeping all essential records related to the approval status of the various teacher education programs and serves as an appeals board to hear petitions from students who have been denied admission to teacher education programs.

Bryan and College Station School Districts

Bryan and College Station School Districts are major share holders as they place many of the students teachers. In addition, many of TLAC student teachers are hired into these school districts and in school districts around the surrounding areas.
Section 4: Student Survey

Program Review Survey – Summary

Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture

College of Education and Human Development

Texas A&M University
Program Review Survey – Summary

As part of a program review, the Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture (TLAC) in the College of Education and Human Development at Texas A&M University (TAMU) invited current students and former students who graduated in the past five years to participate in an online survey. Students from all programs—Undergraduate, Secondary Graduate Certification, Master’s, and Doctoral—were sent emails that asked them to complete the online surveys. Response rates for the surveys were as follows: current undergraduate students = 34%; former undergraduate students = 15%; current Secondary Graduate Certification students = 52%; former Secondary Graduate Certification students = 21%; current Master’s students = 31%; former Master’s students = 26%; current doctoral students = 46%; and former doctoral students = 34%.

Items for the surveys were adapted from other similar surveys, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills, and widely-accepted “best practices” within the various concentration areas (Boyd, et al. 2008; Dean & Lauer, 2003; Dean, Lauer, & Urquhart, 2005; US Department of Ed., 1999). Prior to inviting participants to respond, doctoral students and faculty reviewed the surveys and provide feedback. Using a four-point Likert-type scale, participants indicated their levels of agreement with items related to program aspects (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree), as well as their confidence in various items related to professionalism and curriculum and instruction (1 = not at all confident, 2 = somewhat confident, 3 = confident, 4 = extremely confident). Furthermore, both current and former students were asked to provide open-ended responses concerning program strengths, challenges, and suggestions.
Separate analyses were conducted on survey data collected from current and former students in each program. The following is a brief summary of results. The complete report is available on the TLAC Program Review web site. Additionally, the descriptive survey results are provided in Tables 1-1 thru 8-2 (scale questions) and in Appendices A-1 thru H-3 (open-ended responses) within the comprehensive report. For purposes of confidentiality, faculty names and other identifying information were deleted from the open-ended responses.

*Summary of Undergraduate Program – current students*

Of the 464 participants who responded to the online survey of current undergraduate students, 96% were female and nearly 90% were white. Thirty-four percent of the respondents classified themselves as seniors, 28% juniors, 12% sophomores, 16% freshmen, and 10% fifth-year seniors. In terms of certification, 43% are 4 – 8; 38% are EC – 6; and 20% are EC – 4. Of the students who are pursuing 4 – 8 teacher certification, 55% have a math/science emphasis, and 45% are reading/language arts/social studies-focused.

On the whole, more students felt more confident teaching Reading/Language Arts and Early Childhood Education than Mathematics and Science. In both Mathematics and Science, mean scores for all indicators were less than 3.00 (on a four-point Likert-type scale). Students’ feelings about teaching Social Studies also indicated less confidence; although mean scores did indicate confidence with two indicators, assessing prior knowledge and making connections to events in students’ lives, current events, and other content areas. Conversely, mean scores for all Reading/Language Arts and Early Childhood Education indicators were higher than 3.00, providing evidence for students’ confidence in teaching these areas. Mean scores for ESL instruction split almost evenly, with about half of the students reflecting confidence teaching English language learners and half not feeling
confident. The findings pertaining to General Instruction revealed three issues where students felt less confident: teaching students with special needs, differentiating instruction, and conducting parent/teacher conferences.

While the majority of responses reflected positively on Texas A&M’s instructors in terms of knowledge, accessibility, and caring for students as individuals, an obvious area of weakness, as identified by the students, is the area of Professionalism. All indicators showed a mean score that fell below the confident level (Means < than 3.00). The concerns that students identified were: initiate a job search; conduct myself in an interview; identify and join professional organizations pertinent to my field; and read research-based articles related to my field.

Students were asked to reflect on the past as well as their future career aspirations. When asked whether or not they would once again choose Texas A&M University and the field of education should they have the opportunity to “start over,” most students generally responded that they would. The majority of students (90%) indicated that they planned to obtain a full-time teaching job immediately following graduation. Additionally, for the most part, students plan to still be teaching in the classroom three, five, and ten years following graduation. Finally, most students agreed or strongly agreed that they intend to pursue a graduate degree in education at some point in the future.

The open-ended responses reflected trends that were similar to the Likert-type scale indicators. By and large, five widespread themes emerged: (a) Advising, (b) Courses and Curriculum, (c) Instructors, (d) Field Experience, and (e) Professionalism/Job Preparation. Students are pleased with their advisors; however, they find registering for the classes they need, when they need them, to be challenging. Overall, they find their instructors to be
knowledgeable; but students report that taking courses from instructors who do not speak English as their native language can be difficult. Also, students enjoy the interdisciplinary nature of their coursework; however, on the whole, they believe far too much emphasis is placed on multicultural education, as opposed to classroom management—a topic of which many respondents suggested the department offer much more (but not online). In addition, practical field experiences emerged as a strength of the program; but students indicated that more effort should be made to meet their needs with regard to school/site placements. Lastly, across the board, the respondents want more instruction and guidance on the job-hunting process. Specifically, they want to learn how to identify good jobs, complete applications effectively, and make a good impression during interviews.

Summary of Undergraduate Program – former students

A total of 341 former undergraduate students completed the online survey. The response rate for this survey was particularly low (15%) due to the difficulty of obtaining accurate email addresses for these students. Of the respondents, 95% were female and nearly 91% were white. Seventy-three percent of the respondents are currently employed as teachers. In terms of certification, 37% are 4 – 8, and 63% are EC – 4. Of the former students who are 4 – 8 teacher certified, 42% have a math/science emphasis, and 58% are reading/language arts/social studies-focused. The distribution of grade-levels currently taught by the respondents was fairly even, ranging from 12 - 18% for kindergarten to eighth grade (8% teach Pre-K; 5% teach others). Thirty-eight percent of the former students reported that they currently serve as Team Leader, and 45% reported holding the role of student organization sponsor. With regard to the location of the schools where respondents are currently employed, 9% reported working in an inner city environment, 16% in an urban
school, 53% in a suburban setting, 13% in a small town, 7% in a rural environment, and 2% were “not sure” of their school’s location.

On the whole, more students felt more confident teaching Reading/Language Arts, Early Childhood Education, and Mathematics than Science and Social Studies. In both Science and Social Studies, three mean scores out of seven were less than 3.00 (on a four-point Likert-type scale). Of all areas of teaching, former students clearly felt less confident teaching ESL, as evidenced by all indicators having mean values below the confidence level of 3.00. On the other hand, mean scores for Reading/Language Arts, Early Childhood Education, and Mathematics provided evidence for former students’ confidence in teaching these areas.

Responses reflected positively on Texas A&M’s instructors in terms of knowledge, accessibility, and caring for students as individuals. Former students indicated that, 10 years from now, they were not confident that they would still be in the classroom. When asked, should they have the ability to “start over,” whether or not they would once again choose Texas A&M University for a degree in education, most students (92%) responded that they would.

The open-ended responses reflected trends that were similar to the Likert-type scale indicators. Overall, the former students felt well-prepared to enter their own classrooms and become effective teachers. As was the case with the current students, confidence in teaching mathematics and science, as well as ESL, were areas of weakness as compared to other content areas.

Summary of Secondary Graduate Certification Program – current students
Thirty-seven students responded to the online survey of current Secondary Graduate Certification students. Of the respondents, 81% were female and 81% were white. Seventy-eight percent of the students are currently employed as a teacher during the 2009-2010 school year. With regard to the location of the schools where respondents are currently employed, 50% reported working in a suburban school, 19% small town, 17% urban, 11% rural and 3% inner city. In terms of certification, 43% were Language Arts/Reading certified, 16% History, 16% Social Studies Composite, 11% Math, 8% Communication, 5% Life Sciences, 5% Science Composite, 2% Spanish, and 2% Theatre Arts. The majority of students in the program currently hold a leadership role in their school; 64% sponsor of a student organization, 27% other, 14% are coaches, and 9% are Team Leaders.

On the whole, students expressed confidence in their abilities to teach their chosen concentration areas. Mean scores for Mathematics and Social Studies were all higher than 3.00, providing evidence for students’ confidence in teaching these areas. Concerning Science, all mean scores were above 3.00 with the exception of designing and implementing student-led, inquiry activities. All but two mean scores for ESL (teach students to recognize and apply various strategies to interpret a writer’s purpose and provide opportunities for English Language Learners to listen, speak, read, and write at their current levels of English development, while gradually increasing the linguistic complexity of the English) were also above 3.0. Pertaining to General Instruction, three issues emerged with which students felt less confident: developing strategies for working with parents and families; conducting parent/teacher conferences; and employing effective instructional strategies for students with special needs.
The majority of responses reflected positively on the Undergraduate Prerequisite Courses/Field Experience, Application Process and Advising, Mentor Teacher/University Supervisor, Instructors, Job Search, and Current School Environment. All indicators showed a mean score either above or marginally below the confident level (M = 3.0). Professionalism was an area identified on which the program could improve. The issues identified as weaknesses were: writing academic papers and articles; identifying and joining professional organizations pertinent to my field; and presenting at professional conferences in my field.

When students were given the opportunity to reflect on their decision to choose teaching as a profession, overwhelmingly (94%), students agreed that they would do so again. In addition, almost all students agreed that Texas A&M would be their choice for obtaining their teacher certification. Also, the surveys revealed that 90% of students plan to continue teaching at their current school. Finally, most of the students indicated that they would remain teaching in the classroom three, five, and ten years from now.

The open-ended responses identified clear strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the Secondary Graduate Certification program. An identified strength was the quality of the instructors. Overall, respondents find their instructors to be knowledgeable, available, and caring with regard to students. Another strength to which the students referred was the cohort-nature of the program. Students reported that such a structure allows them to interact with others that are having similar experiences in their first year of teaching. A majority of students commented that the field experience component of the program is lacking. Students recognize the value of field experiences, and they believe that more opportunities for practical classroom experience should be included within the program. Lastly, some
respondents reported an ever-present feeling of favoritism within the program towards some content areas as opposed to others.

**Summary of Secondary Graduate Certification Program – former students**

Of the 53 participants who responded to the online survey of former Secondary Graduate Certification students, 83% were female and 87% were white. Seventy-eight percent are currently employed as teachers during the 2009-2010 school year. For those respondents who indicated they were not currently teaching, the primary explanation was the inability to find a job. With regard to the location of the schools where respondents are currently employed, 50% reported working in a suburban setting, 19% in a small town, 17% in an urban setting, 11% in a rural setting, and 3% in an inner city. In terms of certification, 40% are certified Language Arts/Reading, 26% Social Studies Composite, 22% History, 14% Life Sciences, 10% Spanish, 8% Physical Sciences, 8% Science Composite, 6% Chemistry, 4% Math, 4% Communication, and 2% Latin. The majority of respondents currently hold a leadership role in their school; 72% sponsor of a student organization, 23% are coaches, 21% are Team Leaders, 17% other, and 14% are Department Heads.

On the whole, former students expressed confidence in their abilities to teach their chosen content areas. Mean scores for Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts, and Social Studies were all higher than 3.00, providing evidence for former students’ confidence in teaching these areas. Concerning Science, all mean scores were above 3.00, with the exception of designing and implementing student-led, inquiry activities. Pertaining to General Instruction, three issues emerged with which former students felt less confident: differentiate instruction for all students; employing effective instructional strategies for students with special needs; and support older readers who are learning to read.
The majority of responses reflected positively on the Undergraduate Prerequisite Courses/Field Experience, Mentor Teacher/University Supervisor, Current School Environment, Instructors, TLAC Core Courses, and Job Search. All indicators showed a mean score above or the confident level. In the Action Research Project portion of the survey, a weakness that was identified was: The action research project changed my classroom teaching practices. Professionalism was another area identified that the program could improve upon. Other issues identified as weaknesses were: writing academic papers and articles and presenting at professional conferences in my field.

When former students were given the opportunity to reflect on their decision to attend Texas A&M University to obtain their teaching certification, overwhelmingly, former students (100%) agreed. In addition, almost all former students (87%) agreed that they would again choose teaching as their profession. In addition, the surveys revealed that only 67% of former students plan to continue teaching at their current school. Finally, most of the former students indicated that they would remain teaching in the classroom three, and five years from now; but they were less confident regarding whether they would still be in the classroom ten years from now.

The open-ended responses identified clear strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the Secondary Graduate Certification program. An identified strength was the quality of the instructors. Overall, respondents find their instructors to be caring with regard to former students and knowledgeable about the realities of the classroom. Another strength the former students referred to was the ability to complete a Master’s degree in Education upon completion of the program. Finally, former students commented on the cohort-nature of the program. The structure of the program allows former students to interact with others that are
having similar experiences in their first year of teaching. A majority of former students commented that the field experience component of the program is lacking. Former students feel as though the amount of field experience needs to be increased to better prepare future students in the program for the classroom. Another suggestion from former students was to increase the difficulty and rigor of the program. Lastly, some respondents suggested more marketing of the program to increase the number of people who are aware of its presence on campus.

Summary of Masters Program – current students

Thirty-two participants responded to the online survey of current Master’s students. Of the respondents, 81% were female and 26% were male. Seventy-five percent of the respondents classified themselves as White, 13% as Other, 6% as Asian or Pacific Islander, and 6% Latino(a). The respondents were asked to describe their current employment status and student status. Sixty-three percent of the students are employed full-time; 25% are not employed; and 12% are part-time employed. Of the current Master’s students, 56% are classified as part-time students and 44% are classified as full-time. The students’ proximity to Texas A&M University broke-down fairly evenly, with 55% living more than 50 miles from TAMU and 45% living within 50 miles of the university. In regard to previous work experience, 78% had previous experience in the field of education, 16% in another field of employment, and 6% have never been employed.

On the whole, students agreed that the TLAC core courses, concentration area courses, and online or hybrid courses were challenging and not repetitive. However, students disagreed that TLAC core courses and concentration area courses were offered during the semester(s) in which they needed them or whether or not seats were available in these
courses during registration. With regard to online or hybrid courses, students did not agree that instructors provided prompt feedback or were able to assist with technology issues when they arose.

The majority of responses reflected positively on Advising and Instructors. All indicators showed a mean score above the agree level. Professionalism was an area identified that the program could improve upon. The only indicators that demonstrated student confidence (M > 2.99) were Initiating a job search and Reading research-based articles related to my field. Three clear weaknesses (mean values < 3.00) were: writing academic papers and articles, professional activities (i.e. editing/reviewing for a journal) and presenting at professional conferences in my field.

Students were asked to reflect on their future career aspirations and overall experience with the program. Concerning future career aspirations, 93% agreed that after completing their degree they would seek a job in education and that their degree would lead to a professional career opportunity. When reflecting on the overall experience in the program, 93% agreed that the information they learned in graduate courses would be beneficial in their chosen career. Finally, most agreed that the graduate experience helped prepare them for a future job and provided networking opportunities.

The open-ended responses identified clear strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the Masters’ program. All students identified the quality of instructors and the flexibility of the program as strengths. Overall, respondents find their instructors to be caring with regard to students and knowledgeable current trends of the field. In addition, the program structure allows current students the flexibility to complete a Master’s degree at their own pace. In fact, many students commented that the flexibility allowed them to pursue a graduate degree
that they might not have been able to pursue otherwise. The responses pertaining to challenges and suggestions were clearly divided by those participating in the Online Master’s program and those who did not. Online Master’s students signified their biggest challenge as the number of online courses and the availability of classes that are online. These respondents suggested allowing students at a distance first choice at online classes before allowing other students to register for them. Other Master’s students’ challenges were more closely related to their own experiences in the program. Examples of these challenges include: not being able to find a job, not enough funding while in the program, and too much emphasis on pre-service educators as opposed to experienced educators.

Summary of Master’s Program – former students

Of the 49 participants who responded to the online survey of former Master’s students, 90% were female. Seventy-six percent of the respondents classified themselves as White, 4% as other, 4% African-American, 4% Latino(a), and 3% Asian or Pacific Islander. In regards to work experience since receiving their Master’s degree, 90% have worked in the field of education, 8% in another field of employment, and 2% have not been employed. If respondents indicated employment in the field of education, they were also asked to indicate the area of experience. Sixty-eight percent indicated experience as a classroom teacher, 23% other, and 9% administration.

General academic demographics were also collected on the survey. The percentages of former students identifying themselves in the various TLAC concentration areas broke-down as follows: 33% Culture and Curriculum; 21% Science Education; 15% Reading and Language Arts Education; 13% English as a Second Language (ESL); 6% Urban Education;
and 2% Early Childhood Education. Finally, of the former masters students, 27% are currently pursuing an additional degree.

On the whole, students agreed that the TLAC core courses, concentration area courses, and online or hybrid courses were challenging, not repetitive, were offered during the semester they needed them, and seats were available in these courses during registration. With regard to online or hybrid courses, students indicated they agreed that instructors provided prompt feedback or were able to assist with technology issues when they arose.

The majority of responses reflected positively on the Advising and Instructors. All indicators showed a mean score above or the agree level \((M = 3.00)\), except items that pertained to keeping in contact with professors or advisors once they finished their degree. Professionalism was an area identified that the program could improve upon. Three clear weaknesses (those with a mean value < 3.00) illustrated from responses were: writing academic papers and articles; professional activities (i.e. editing/reviewing for a journal); and presenting at professional conferences in my field.

Former students were asked to reflect on their future career aspirations and overall experience with the program. In regards to future career aspirations, 66% agreed that after completing their degree they did seek a job in education (54% in a public school district) and 70% indicated that their degree led to a professional career opportunity. In addition, only 40% have continued with graduate school after completing their Masters’ degree. When reflecting on the overall experience in the program, 91% agreed that the information they learned in graduate courses would be beneficial in their chosen career. Overwhelmingly, former students also agreed that the overall graduate experience helped prepare them for their
current job or a job in the future. Finally, most agreed that the graduate experience provided networking opportunities.

The former Master’s students identified clear strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the program in the open-ended responses. All students identified the quality of instructors and course content of the program as strengths. Overall, respondents find their instructors to be knowledgeable, and students appreciated their guidance throughout the program. In addition, the course content of the program provided foundational knowledge and allowed students to be confident discussing current educational issues. Former Master’s students’ challenges were more closely related to their own experiences in the program. Examples of these challenges included: finding time to coordinate a full time job with obtaining a graduate degree, commuting for classes, and not receiving feedback in online classes from professors.

**Summary of Doctoral Program – current students**

One-hundred current doctoral students responded to the survey. Of the respondents, 73% were female and 27% were male. Fifty-four percent of the respondents classified themselves as White, 19% as African-American, 14% as Asian or Pacific Islander, 8% as Latino(a), and 5% as other. Thirty-one percent of the current doctoral students reported that English is not their first language.

The percentages of students identifying themselves in the various TLAC concentration areas are categorized as follows: 22% Culture and Curriculum; 17% Reading and Language Arts; 16% Science Education; 13% Urban Education; 12% English as a Second Language (ESL); 12% Mathematics Education; and 6% Early Childhood Education. The current students are in various stages within the program: 25% have completed 0 - 1 year; 19% 1 - 2 years; 22% 2 - 3 years; 18% 3 - 4 years; 7% 4 - 5 years; and 8% 5+ years.
Current TLAC doctoral students represent a range of backgrounds and concentration areas. They hold various jobs, speak an assortment of languages, and come from (and currently live in) a mixture of communities. Their academic experiences and coursework have been both similar and different, and they are at varying stages in their doctoral studies.

As related to coursework, mean scores for two indicators (overall, the core courses were challenging, and the core courses were not repetitive of other doctoral courses I had already taken) were less than 3.00. The open-ended comments supported these lower scores, indicating that doctoral students desire increased academic rigor and less repetition in their core courses. They did, however, respond with higher levels of agreement to those items related to courses within their own concentration areas. Unlike the core courses, students do not find their concentration area courses to be “too easy,” nor do they consider them to be repetitive. Moreover, respondents indicated that their concentration area courses are taught by well-informed professors who are knowledgeable with regard to current issues in their areas of emphasis.

Doctoral students, in cooperation with their committee chair(s), select both a sequence of research coursework and additional advanced research courses. Almost one-third of the respondents have taken or plan to enroll in the TLAC research sequence (Sequence C); otherwise, students are distributed fairly evenly in their enrollment in the other research sequence options. The lowest area of agreement was there were open seats in the research courses when I needed to register for them. When combined with the open-ended comments on coursework, the overall sentiment appears to be that students appreciate the knowledge and competency levels of their professors; however, there exists concern that some professors are too narrow with their approaches to specific topics.
On the whole, respondents view both the TLAC Graduate Advising Office and their Dissertation Committee Chair in a positive light, reporting that both are helpful and treat them with respect; however, several students described problems related to communication with their chair. Some stated that their chair fails to respond in a timely manner and that logistical issues (often related to communication) have served as impediments to completing the doctoral program at an acceptable rate.

As evidenced by the open-ended comments, the areas of publications, presentations, and funding all tended to interconnect. Students indicated that they intend to publish papers and present at conferences during their academic program at TAMU; however, a multitude of respondents described funding options as a legitimate obstacle in accomplishing this and many of their goals. On the whole, students face challenges in meeting their day-to-day responsibilities while trying to finance their doctoral pursuits.

Finally, current doctoral students reported that they feel prepared and intend to secure a position in higher education and/or leadership. If they could start over, most (85%) agreed they would once again choose to attend Texas A&M University for a doctoral degree in education.

Summary of Doctoral Program – former students

Thirty former doctoral students responded to the online survey. Of the respondents, 90% were female and 59% white, 10% Asian or Pacific Islander, 10% Latino(a), 10% African American, and 10% responded as other. Of the former student respondents, 14% spoke a first language other than English. In terms of TLAC concentration area, 23% were Culture and Curriculum; 17% were Mathematics Education; 17% were Reading and Language Arts Education; 17% were Science Education; 13% were English as a Second
Language (ESL); and 13% were Urban Education. Currently, 70% of the former doctoral students are employed at a university, 27% are employed with a school district, and 3% are employed at a community college.

Former TLAC doctoral students represent a range of backgrounds and concentration areas, and the majority of them are currently employed at a university. During their time as TAMU students, the majority lived more than 50 miles from the campus, with less than 40% residing locally. They responded to a variety of questions on coursework and general experiences they had while attending Texas A&M for their Ph.D.

As related to the TLAC core and concentration area courses, mean scores for all items were above 3.20. The open-ended comments made by former doctoral students indicated that former doctoral students appreciated the high standards and rigor of their courses; however, it was noted that former doctoral students would like more available options for their elective courses. The survey items associated with Research Courses revealed two items where the mean scores fell below 3.00: *I feel like my advanced research courses further prepared me to complete my dissertation research* and *I feel like the research courses sufficiently prepared me to complete my dissertation research*. The lower scores were supported by the open-ended comments, where former doctoral students indicated that not enough advanced research courses were provided in certain areas of research.

Former students reflected favorably on both the TLAC Graduate Advising Office and their Dissertation Committee Chair. They indicated the Advising Office answered their questions and were accessible. The same sentiment was reflected in comments about Committee Chairs; however, respondents’ attitudes fell below the *agreement* level when asked about receiving specific instruction and guidance on writing their dissertations. Also,
some regretted that their Chair was seldom on campus or had too many doctoral students. Though not specific to Committee Chairs, former students had generally positive comments concerning their professors’ knowledge levels and demeanors; but some did comment on negative experiences relating to attitude and availability.

The Publications and Presentations segment of the survey showed a wide range of sentiment, based on the indicator. Former students demonstrated high levels of agreement with regard to attended conferences and submitted proposals for presentation. Conversely, a lower percentage said that they served as journal reviewers or that they knew how to apply for graduate student conference funding.

Lastly, former doctoral students reported that if they could start over, they would once again pursue a doctoral degree in education; and though slightly lower, mean values indicated that most would again attend Texas A&M University to do so. They appreciated the collegiality that emerged among their peers and believed the opportunities to interact were plentiful.

Conclusion

In summary, current and former students from all TLAC programs at Texas A&M University—Undergraduate, Secondary Graduate Certification, Master’s, and Doctoral—completed online surveys. For all program areas, respondents identified their instructors as a program strength, specifically citing their knowledge levels and caring demeanors. Additionally, program-specific trends emerged.

Specific to undergraduates, both current and former students’ responses overwhelmingly indicated that the field experiences component of the program is a strength; however, both undergraduate groups, as well as the Secondary Graduate Certification
program students, said that issues related to professionalism and job preparation were program challenges. In particular, students do not feel confident writing a résumé, interviewing, and the overall job-search process. Master’s students identified course availability as a challenge. Finally, doctoral students described collegiality among their peers as a strength. Also, most found their committee chair to be both motivational and supportive. Specific areas for improvement, as suggested by both current and former doctoral students, were: more TLAC departmental options for advanced research coursework, additional opportunities for funding, and fewer courses where professors offer a constricted viewpoint, based on their personal philosophies and research interests. This report represents a summary of the overall findings. A comprehensive description and analysis is available.

**Section IV: Student Survey**

Program Review Survey – Summary

Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture

College of Education and Human Development

Texas A&M University

As part of a program review, the Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture (TLAC) in the College of Education and Human Development at Texas A&M University (TAMU) invited current students and former students who graduated in the past five years to participate in an online survey. Students from all programs—Undergraduate, Secondary Graduate Certification, Master’s, and Doctoral—were sent emails that asked them to complete the online surveys. Response rates for the surveys were as follows: current undergraduate students = 34%; former undergraduate students = 15%; current Secondary
Graduate Certification students = 52%; former Secondary Graduate Certification students = 21%; current Master’s students = 31%; former Master’s students = 26%; current doctoral students = 46%; and former doctoral students = 34%.

Items for the surveys were adapted from other similar surveys, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills, and widely-accepted “best practices” within the various concentration areas (Boyd, et al. 2008; Dean & Lauer, 2003; Dean, Lauer, & Urquhart, 2005; US Department of Ed., 1999). Prior to inviting participants to respond, doctoral students and faculty reviewed the surveys and provide feedback. Using a four-point Likert-type scale, participants indicated their levels of agreement with items related to program aspects (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree), as well as their confidence in various items related to professionalism and curriculum and instruction (1 = not at all confident, 2 = somewhat confident, 3 = confident, 4 = extremely confident). Furthermore, both current and former students were asked to provide open-ended responses concerning program strengths, challenges, and suggestions.

Separate analyses were conducted on survey data collected from current and former students in each program. The following is a brief summary of results. The complete report is available on the TLAC Program Review web site. Additionally, the descriptive survey results are provided in Tables 1-1 thru 8-2 (scale questions) and in Appendices A-1 thru H-3 (open-ended responses) within the comprehensive report. For purposes of confidentiality, faculty names and other identifying information were deleted from the open-ended responses.

Summary of Undergraduate Program – current students

Of the 464 participants who responded to the online survey of current undergraduate students, 96% were female and nearly 90% were white. Thirty-four percent of the
respondents classified themselves as seniors, 28% juniors, 12% sophomores, 16% freshmen, and 10% fifth-year seniors. In terms of certification, 43% are 4 – 8; 38% are EC – 6; and 20% are EC – 4. Of the students who are pursuing 4 – 8 teacher certification, 55% have a math/science emphasis, and 45% are reading/language arts/social studies-focused.

On the whole, more students felt more confident teaching Reading/Language Arts and Early Childhood Education than Mathematics and Science. In both Mathematics and Science, mean scores for all indicators were less than 3.00 (on a four-point Likert-type scale). Students’ feelings about teaching Social Studies also indicated less confidence; although mean scores did indicate confidence with two indicators, assessing prior knowledge and making connections to events in students’ lives, current events, and other content areas. Conversely, mean scores for all Reading/Language Arts and Early Childhood Education indicators were higher than 3.00, providing evidence for students’ confidence in teaching these areas. Mean scores for ESL instruction split almost evenly, with about half of the students reflecting confidence teaching English language learners and half not feeling confident. The findings pertaining to General Instruction revealed three issues where students felt less confident: teaching students with special needs, differentiating instruction, and conducting parent/teacher conferences.

While the majority of responses reflected positively on Texas A&M’s instructors in terms of knowledge, accessibility, and caring for students as individuals, an obvious area of weakness, as identified by the students, is the area of Professionalism. All indicators showed a mean score that fell below the confident level (Means < than 3.00). The concerns that students identified were: initiate a job search; conduct myself in an interview; identify and
join professional organizations pertinent to my field; and read research-based articles related to my field.

Students were asked to reflect on the past as well as their future career aspirations. When asked whether or not they would once again choose Texas A&M University and the field of education should they have the opportunity to “start over,” most students generally responded that they would. The majority of students (90%) indicated that they planned to obtain a full-time teaching job immediately following graduation. Additionally, for the most part, students plan to still be teaching in the classroom three, five, and ten years following graduation. Finally, most students agreed or strongly agreed that they intend to pursue a graduate degree in education at some point in the future.

The open-ended responses reflected trends that were similar to the Likert-type scale indicators. By and large, five widespread themes emerged: (a) Advising, (b) Courses and Curriculum, (c) Instructors, (d) Field Experience, and (e) Professionalism/Job Preparation. Students are pleased with their advisors; however, they find registering for the classes they need, when they need them, to be challenging. Overall, they find their instructors to be knowledgeable; but students report that taking courses from instructors who do not speak English as their native language can be difficult. Also, students enjoy the interdisciplinary nature of their coursework; however, on the whole, they believe far too much emphasis is placed on multicultural education, as opposed to classroom management—a topic of which many respondents suggested the department offer much more (but not online). In addition, practical field experiences emerged as a strength of the program; but students indicated that more effort should be made to meet their needs with regard to school/site placements. Lastly, across the board, the respondents want more instruction and guidance on the job-hunting
process. Specifically, they want to learn how to identify good jobs, complete applications effectively, and make a good impression during interviews.

**Summary of Undergraduate Program – former students**

A total of 341 former undergraduate students completed the online survey. The response rate for this survey was particularly low (15%) due to the difficulty of obtaining accurate email addresses for these students. Of the respondents, 95% were female and nearly 91% were white. Seventy-three percent of the respondents are currently employed as teachers. In terms of certification, 37% are 4 – 8, and 63% are EC – 4. Of the former students who are 4 – 8 teacher certified, 42% have a math/science emphasis, and 58% are reading/language arts/social studies-focused. The distribution of grade-levels currently taught by the respondents was fairly even, ranging from 12 - 18% for kindergarten to eighth grade (8% teach Pre-K; 5% teach others). Thirty-eight percent of the former students reported that they currently serve as Team Leader, and 45% reported holding the role of student organization sponsor. With regard to the location of the schools where respondents are currently employed, 9% reported working in an inner city environment, 16% in an urban school, 53% in a suburban setting, 13% in a small town, 7% in a rural environment, and 2% were “not sure” of their school’s location.

On the whole, more students felt more confident teaching Reading/Language Arts, Early Childhood Education, and Mathematics than Science and Social Studies. In both Science and Social Studies, three mean scores out of seven were less than 3.00 (on a four-point Likert-type scale). Of all areas of teaching, former students clearly felt less confident teaching ESL, as evidenced by all indicators having mean values below the confidence level of 3.00. On the other hand, mean scores for Reading/Language Arts, Early Childhood
Education, and Mathematics provided evidence for former students’ confidence in teaching these areas.

Responses reflected positively on Texas A&M’s instructors in terms of knowledge, accessibility, and caring for students as individuals. Former students indicated that, 10 years from now, they were not confident that they would still be in the classroom. When asked, should they have the ability to “start over,” whether or not they would once again choose Texas A&M University for a degree in education, most students (92%) responded that they would.

The open-ended responses reflected trends that were similar to the Likert-type scale indicators. Overall, the former students felt well-prepared to enter their own classrooms and become effective teachers. As was the case with the current students, confidence in teaching mathematics and science, as well as ESL, were areas of weakness as compared to other content areas.

Summary of Secondary Graduate Certification Program – current students

Thirty-seven students responded to the online survey of current Secondary Graduate Certification students. Of the respondents, 81% were female and 81% were white. Seventy-eight percent of the students are currently employed as a teacher during the 2009-2010 school year. With regard to the location of the schools where respondents are currently employed, 50% reported working in a suburban school, 19% small town, 17% urban, 11% rural and 3% inner city. In terms of certification, 43% were Language Arts/Reading certified, 16% History, 16% Social Studies Composite, 11% Math, 8% Communication, 5% Life Sciences, 5% Science Composite, 2% Spanish, and 2% Theatre Arts. The majority of students in the
program currently hold a leadership role in their school; 64% sponsor of a student organization, 27% other, 14% are coaches, and 9% are Team Leaders.

On the whole, students expressed confidence in their abilities to teach their chosen concentration areas. Mean scores for Mathematics and Social Studies were all higher than 3.00, providing evidence for students’ confidence in teaching these areas. Concerning Science, all mean scores were above 3.00 with the exception of designing and implementing student-led, inquiry activities. All but two mean scores for ESL (teach students to recognize and apply various strategies to interpret a writer’s purpose and provide opportunities for English Language Learners to listen, speak, read, and write at their current levels of English development, while gradually increasing the linguistic complexity of the English) were also above 3.0. Pertaining to General Instruction, three issues emerged with which students felt less confident: developing strategies for working with parents and families; conducting parent/teacher conferences; and employing effective instructional strategies for students with special needs.

The majority of responses reflected positively on the Undergraduate Prerequisite Courses/Field Experience, Application Process and Advising, Mentor Teacher/University Supervisor, Instructors, Job Search, and Current School Environment. All indicators showed a mean score either above or marginally below the confident level ($M = 3.0$). Professionalism was an area identified on which the program could improve. The issues identified as weaknesses were: writing academic papers and articles; identifying and joining professional organizations pertinent to my field; and presenting at professional conferences in my field.

When students were given the opportunity to reflect on their decision to choose teaching as a profession, overwhelmingly (94%), students agreed that they would do so
again. In addition, almost all students agreed that Texas A&M would be their choice for obtaining their teacher certification. Also, the surveys revealed that 90% of students plan to continue teaching at their current school. Finally, most of the students indicated that they would remain teaching in the classroom three, five, and ten years from now.

The open-ended responses identified clear strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the Secondary Graduate Certification program. An identified strength was the quality of the instructors. Overall, respondents find their instructors to be knowledgeable, available, and caring with regard to students. Another strength to which the students referred was the cohort-nature of the program. Students reported that such a structure allows them to interact with others that are having similar experiences in their first year of teaching. A majority of students commented that the field experience component of the program is lacking. Students recognize the value of field experiences, and they believe that more opportunities for practical classroom experience should be included within the program. Lastly, some respondents reported an ever-present feeling of favoritism within the program towards some content areas as opposed to others.

Summary of Secondary Graduate Certification Program – former students

Of the 53 participants who responded to the online survey of former Secondary Graduate Certification students, 83% were female and 87% were white. Seventy-eight percent are currently employed as teachers during the 2009-2010 school year. For those respondents who indicated they were not currently teaching, the primary explanation was the inability to find a job. With regard to the location of the schools where respondents are currently employed, 50% reported working in a suburban setting, 19% in a small town, 17% in an urban setting, 11% in a rural setting, and 3% in an inner city. In terms of certification,
40% are certified Language Arts/Reading, 26% Social Studies Composite, 22% History, 14% Life Sciences, 10% Spanish, 8% Physical Sciences, 8% Science Composite, 6% Chemistry, 4% Math, 4% Communication, and 2% Latin. The majority of respondents currently hold a leadership role in their school; 72% sponsor of a student organization, 23% are coaches, 21% are Team Leaders, 17% other, and 14% are Department Heads.

On the whole, former students expressed confidence in their abilities to teach their chosen content areas. Mean scores for Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts, and Social Studies were all higher than 3.00, providing evidence for former students’ confidence in teaching these areas. Concerning Science, all mean scores were above 3.00, with the exception of designing and implementing student-led, inquiry activities. Pertaining to General Instruction, three issues emerged with which former students felt less confident: differentiate instruction for all students; employing effective instructional strategies for students with special needs; and support older readers who are learning to read.

The majority of responses reflected positively on the Undergraduate Prerequisite Courses/Field Experience, Mentor Teacher/University Supervisor, Current School Environment, Instructors, TLAC Core Courses, and Job Search. All indicators showed a mean score above or the confident level. In the Action Research Project portion of the survey, a weakness that was identified was: The action research project changed my classroom teaching practices. Professionalism was another area identified that the program could improve upon. Other issues identified as weaknesses were: writing academic papers and articles and presenting at professional conferences in my field.

When former students were given the opportunity to reflect on their decision to attend Texas A&M University to obtain their teaching certification, overwhelmingly, former
students (100%) agreed. In addition, almost all former students (87%) agreed that they would again choose teaching as their profession. In addition, the surveys revealed that only 67% of former students plan to continue teaching at their current school. Finally, most of the former students indicated that they would remain teaching in the classroom three, and five years from now; but they were less confident regarding whether they would still be in the classroom ten years from now.

The open-ended responses identified clear strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the Secondary Graduate Certification program. An identified strength was the quality of the instructors. Overall, respondents find their instructors to be caring with regard to former students and knowledgeable about the realities of the classroom. Another strength the former students referred to was the ability to complete a Master’s degree in Education upon completion of the program. Finally, former students commented on the cohort-nature of the program. The structure of the program allows former students to interact with others that are having similar experiences in their first year of teaching. A majority of former students commented that the field experience component of the program is lacking. Former students feel as though the amount of field experience needs to be increased to better prepare future students in the program for the classroom. Another suggestion from former students was to increase the difficulty and rigor of the program. Lastly, some respondents suggested more marketing of the program to increase the number of people who are aware of its presence on campus.

Summary of Masters Program – current students

Thirty-two participants responded to the online survey of current Master’s students. Of the respondents, 81% were female and 26% were male. Seventy-five percent of the
respondents classified themselves as White, 13% as Other, 6% as Asian or Pacific Islander, and 6% Latino(a). The respondents were asked to describe their current employment status and student status. Sixty-three percent of the students are employed full-time; 25% are not employed; and 12% are part-time employed. Of the current Master’s students, 56% are classified as part-time students and 44% are classified as full-time. The students’ proximity to Texas A&M University broke-down fairly evenly, with 55% living more than 50 miles from TAMU and 45% living within 50 miles of the university. In regard to previous work experience, 78% had previous experience in the field of education, 16% in another field of employment, and 6% have never been employed.

On the whole, students agreed that the TLAC core courses, concentration area courses, and online or hybrid courses were challenging and not repetitive. However, students disagreed that TLAC core courses and concentration area courses were offered during the semester(s) in which they needed them or whether or not seats were available in these courses during registration. With regard to online or hybrid courses, students did not agree that instructors provided prompt feedback or were able to assist with technology issues when they arose.

The majority of responses reflected positively on Advising and Instructors. All indicators showed a mean score above the agree level. Professionalism was an area identified that the program could improve upon. The only indicators that demonstrated student confidence (M > 2.99) were Initiating a job search and Reading research-based articles related to my field. Three clear weaknesses (mean values < 3.00) were: writing academic papers and articles, professional activities (i.e. editing/reviewing for a journal) and presenting at professional conferences in my field.
Students were asked to reflect on their future career aspirations and overall experience with the program. Concerning future career aspirations, 93% agreed that after completing their degree they would seek a job in education and that their degree would lead to a professional career opportunity. When reflecting on the overall experience in the program, 93% agreed that the information they learned in graduate courses would be beneficial in their chosen career. Finally, most agreed that the graduate experience helped prepare them for a future job and provided networking opportunities.

The open-ended responses identified clear strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the Masters’ program. All students identified the quality of instructors and the flexibility of the program as strengths. Overall, respondents find their instructors to be caring with regard to students and knowledgeable current trends of the field. In addition, the program structure allows current students the flexibility to complete a Master’s degree at their own pace. In fact, many students commented that the flexibility allowed them to pursue a graduate degree that they might not have been able to pursue otherwise. The responses pertaining to challenges and suggestions were clearly divided by those participating in the Online Master’s program and those who did not. Online Master’s students signified their biggest challenge as the number of online courses and the availability of classes that are online. These respondents suggested allowing students at a distance first choice at online classes before allowing other students to register for them. Other Master’s students’ challenges were more closely related to their own experiences in the program. Examples of these challenges include: not being able to find a job, not enough funding while in the program, and too much emphasis on pre-service educators as opposed to experienced educators.

Summary of Master’s Program – former students
Of the 49 participants who responded to the online survey of former Master’s students, 90% were female. Seventy-six percent of the respondents classified themselves as White, 4% as other, 4% African-American, 4% Latino(a), and 3% Asian or Pacific Islander. In regards to work experience since receiving their Master’s degree, 90% have worked in the field of education, 8% in another field of employment, and 2% have not been employed. If respondents indicated employment in the field of education, they were also asked to indicate the area of experience. Sixty-eight percent indicated experience as a classroom teacher, 23% other, and 9% administration.

General academic demographics were also collected on the survey. The percentages of former students identifying themselves in the various TLAC concentration areas broke-down as follows: 33% Culture and Curriculum; 21% Science Education; 15% Reading and Language Arts Education; 13% English as a Second Language (ESL); 6% Urban Education; and 2% Early Childhood Education. Finally, of the former masters students, 27% are currently pursuing an additional degree.

On the whole, students agreed that the TLAC core courses, concentration area courses, and online or hybrid courses were challenging, not repetitive, were offered during the semester they needed them, and seats were available in these courses during registration. With regard to online or hybrid courses, students indicated they agreed that instructors provided prompt feedback or were able to assist with technology issues when they arose.

The majority of responses reflected positively on the Advising and Instructors. All indicators showed a mean score above or the agree level ($M = 3.00$), except items that pertained to keeping in contact with professors or advisors once they finished their degree. Professionalism was an area identified that the program could improve upon. Three clear
weaknesses (those with a mean value < 3.00) illustrated from responses were: *writing academic papers and articles; professional activities (i.e. editing/reviewing for a journal)*; and *presenting at professional conferences in my field*.

Former students were asked to reflect on their future career aspirations and overall experience with the program. In regards to future career aspirations, 66% agreed that after completing their degree they did seek a job in education (54% in a public school district) and 70% indicated that their degree led to a professional career opportunity. In addition, only 40% have continued with graduate school after completing their Masters’ degree. When reflecting on the overall experience in the program, 91% agreed that the information they learned in graduate courses would be beneficial in their chosen career. Overwhelmingly, former students also agreed that the overall graduate experience helped prepare them for their current job or a job in the future. Finally, most agreed that the graduate experience provided networking opportunities.

The former Master’s students identified clear strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the program in the open-ended responses. All students identified the quality of instructors and course content of the program as strengths. Overall, respondents find their instructors to be knowledgeable, and students appreciated their guidance throughout the program. In addition, the course content of the program provided foundational knowledge and allowed students to be confident discussing current educational issues. Former Master’s students’ challenges were more closely related to their own experiences in the program. Examples of these challenges included: finding time to coordinate a full time job with obtaining a graduate degree, commuting for classes, and not receiving feedback in online classes from professors.

*Summary of Doctoral Program – current students*
One-hundred current doctoral students responded to the survey. Of the respondents, 73% were female and 27% were male. Fifty-four percent of the respondents classified themselves as White, 19% as African-American, 14% as Asian or Pacific Islander, 8% as Latino(a), and 5% as other. Thirty-one percent of the current doctoral students reported that English is not their first language.

The percentages of students identifying themselves in the various TLAC concentration areas are categorized as follows: 22% Culture and Curriculum; 17% Reading and Language Arts; 16% Science Education; 13% Urban Education; 12% English as a Second Language (ESL); 12% Mathematics Education; and 6% Early Childhood Education. The current students are in various stages within the program: 25% have completed 0 - 1 year; 19% 1 - 2 years; 22% 2 - 3 years; 18% 3 - 4 years; 7% 4 - 5 years; and 8% 5+ years.

Current TLAC doctoral students represent a range of backgrounds and concentration areas. They hold various jobs, speak an assortment of languages, and come from (and currently live in) a mixture of communities. Their academic experiences and coursework have been both similar and different, and they are at varying stages in their doctoral studies.

As related to coursework, mean scores for two indicators (overall, the core courses were challenging, and the core courses were not repetitive of other doctoral courses I had already taken) were less than 3.00. The open-ended comments supported these lower scores, indicating that doctoral students desire increased academic rigor and less repetition in their core courses. They did, however, respond with higher levels of agreement to those items related to courses within their own concentration areas. Unlike the core courses, students do not find their concentration area courses to be “too easy,” nor do they consider them to be repetitive. Moreover, respondents indicated that their concentration area courses are taught
by well-informed professors who are knowledgeable with regard to current issues in their areas of emphasis.

Doctoral students, in cooperation with their committee chair(s), select both a sequence of research coursework and additional advanced research courses. Almost one-third of the respondents have taken or plan to enroll in the TLAC research sequence (Sequence C); otherwise, students are distributed fairly evenly in their enrollment in the other research sequence options. The lowest area of agreement was *there were open seats in the research courses when I needed to register for them*. When combined with the open-ended comments on coursework, the overall sentiment appears to be that students appreciate the knowledge and competency levels of their professors; however, there exists concern that some professors are too narrow with their approaches to specific topics.

On the whole, respondents view both the TLAC Graduate Advising Office and their Dissertation Committee Chair in a positive light, reporting that both are helpful and treat them with respect; however, several students described problems related to communication with their chair. Some stated that their chair fails to respond in a timely manner and that logistical issues (often related to communication) have served as impediments to completing the doctoral program at an acceptable rate.

As evidenced by the open-ended comments, the areas of *publications, presentations,* and *funding* all tended to interconnect. Students indicated that they intend to publish papers and present at conferences during their academic program at TAMU; however, a multitude of respondents described funding options as a legitimate obstacle in accomplishing this and many of their goals. On the whole, students face challenges in meeting their day-to-day responsibilities while trying to finance their doctoral pursuits.
Finally, current doctoral students reported that they feel prepared and intend to secure a position in higher education and/or leadership. If they could start over, most (85%) agreed they would once again choose to attend Texas A&M University for a doctoral degree in education.

Summary of Doctoral Program – former students

Thirty former doctoral students responded to the online survey. Of the respondents, 90% were female and 59% white, 10% Asian or Pacific Islander, 10% Latino(a), 10% African American, and 10% responded as other. Of the former student respondents, 14% spoke a first language other than English. In terms of TLAC concentration area, 23% were Culture and Curriculum; 17% were Mathematics Education; 17% were Reading and Language Arts Education; 17% were Science Education; 13% were English as a Second Language (ESL); and 13% were Urban Education. Currently, 70% of the former doctoral students are employed at a university, 27% are employed with a school district, and 3% are employed at a community college.

Former TLAC doctoral students represent a range of backgrounds and concentration areas, and the majority of them are currently employed at a university. During their time as TAMU students, the majority lived more than 50 miles from the campus, with less than 40% residing locally. They responded to a variety of questions on coursework and general experiences they had while attending Texas A&M for their Ph.D.

As related to the TLAC core and concentration area courses, mean scores for all items were above 3.20. The open-ended comments made by former doctoral students indicated that former doctoral students appreciated the high standards and rigor of their courses; however, it was noted that former doctoral students would like more available options for their elective
courses. The survey items associated with Research Courses revealed two items where the mean scores fell below 3.00: *I feel like my advanced research courses further prepared me to complete my dissertation research* and *I feel like the research courses sufficiently prepared me to complete my dissertation research*. The lower scores were supported by the open-ended comments, where former doctoral students indicated that not enough advanced research courses were provided in certain areas of research.

Former students reflected favorably on both the TLAC Graduate Advising Office and their Dissertation Committee Chair. They indicated the Advising Office answered their questions and were accessible. The same sentiment was reflected in comments about Committee Chairs; however, respondents’ attitudes fell below the *agreement* level when asked about receiving specific instruction and guidance on writing their dissertations. Also, some regretted that their Chair was seldom on campus or had too many doctoral students. Though not specific to Committee Chairs, former students had generally positive comments concerning their professors’ knowledge levels and demeanors; but some did comment on negative experiences relating to attitude and availability.

The Publications and Presentations segment of the survey showed a wide range of sentiment, based on the indicator. Former students demonstrated high levels of agreement with regard to attended conferences and submitted proposals for presentation. Conversely, a lower percentage said that they served as journal reviewers or that they knew how to apply for graduate student conference funding.

Lastly, former doctoral students reported that if they could start over, they would once again pursue a doctoral degree in education; and though slightly lower, mean values indicated that most would again attend Texas A&M University to do so. They appreciated
the collegiality that emerged among their peers and believed the opportunities to interact were plentiful.

**Conclusion**

In summary, current and former students from all TLAC programs at Texas A&M University—Undergraduate, Secondary Graduate Certification, Master’s, and Doctoral—completed online surveys. For all program areas, respondents identified their instructors as a program strength, specifically citing their knowledge levels and caring demeanors. Additionally, program-specific trends emerged.

Specific to undergraduates, both current and former students’ responses overwhelmingly indicated that the *field experiences* component of the program is a strength; however, both undergraduate groups, as well as the Secondary Graduate Certification program students, said that issues related to *professionalism* and *job preparation* were program challenges. In particular, students do not feel confident writing a résumé, interviewing, and the overall job-search process. Master’s students identified *course availability* as a challenge. Finally, doctoral students described *collegiality* among their peers as a strength. Also, most found their committee chair to be both motivational and supportive. Specific areas for improvement, as suggested by both current and former doctoral students, were: more TLAC departmental options for advanced research coursework, additional opportunities for funding, and fewer courses where professors offer a constricted viewpoint, based on their personal philosophies and research interests. This report represents a summary of the overall findings. A comprehensive description and analysis is available.
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Section 1: Fiscal Information

Brief Fiscal Description

*Budget Information*

The department receives funds each year in state dollars and local dollars. Below is the information covering the past 3 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>Local Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>$3,778,590</td>
<td>$88,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>$4,251,835</td>
<td>$88,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$4,397,824</td>
<td>$88,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>$4,481,139</td>
<td>$88,993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Operating Funds*

The department receives the same amount each year in local funds. These funds are used to support supplies, equipment, travel, food, etc. The department allocates money each year to the faculty for professional development. These funds are to be used in support of travel to conferences where they present.

The department receives fee money from students who enroll in TLAC courses. Fees are attached to each course; the fees vary from $50 to $200. Online courses charge $300. The fee money collected is to be used in support of students and the classroom (such as grading, equipment, supplies and materials used in classes, and furniture for classrooms).
The Online Ed.D. Program is supported through fees collected from online courses in TLAC. This Program has a separate account, but funds are transferred from the Distance Fee account to support the Online Ed.D. Program.

Fees collected from students have increased each year since 2005. There are 2 types of fees collected: Instructional Enhancement and Distance Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Instructional Enhancement Fees</th>
<th>Distance Education Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$593,035</td>
<td>$216,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>$580,582</td>
<td>$286,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>$647,004</td>
<td>$252,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$689,560</td>
<td>$268,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The department also received Graduate Enhancement funds each year. These funds depend on the number of graduate students in the TLAC graduate program. The amount of funds the department receives varies each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Graduate Enhancement Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>$107,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>$121,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$141,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>$176,127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Graduate Enhancement funds are used to support graduate students working on journals with faculty, graduate students teaching and graduate student scholarships. The scholarships are awarded to graduate students presenting at conferences.

**Support Staff**

The department has seen some staff turnover in the past few years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total staff salaries are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>$415,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>$464,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$683,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>$19,711 - $93,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*3 positions were added in the budget for this year

* Staff salary range for the current year
**Funds Designated for Technology**

Over the past few years, TLAC has used funds in support of technology to be used in the classroom at TAMU and in the public schools. These funds have come from instructional enhancement fees and salary savings generated by faculty on research funds.

**Grant Funding**

Faculty have been awarded a number of grants over the past few years, these grants can bring supplemental funding to the department in the form of salary savings. When a faculty member puts themselves on the grant during the 9 month period (September through May), that creates a savings for the department. The college keeps 20% and transfers the remainder (80%) to the department. The faculty member then gets 33% of the remainder and the department receives 67%. The total grant expenditures for the past six years are listed below. *A complete summary of individual faculty grants is listed in Volume II.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,676,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1,868,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$3,083,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$2,055,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$7,536,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$1,947,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Salaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$64,933</td>
<td>$67,971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$72,131</td>
<td>$103,621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$92,223</td>
<td>$175,316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$52,470</td>
<td>$70,695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>$60,740</td>
<td>$72,393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>$74,770</td>
<td>$96,016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
<td>$12,011</td>
<td>$20,845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>$14,850</td>
<td>$41,315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Salaries by Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>College Mean</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$6,944</td>
<td>$7,061</td>
<td>$6,972</td>
<td>$7,093</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$7,403</td>
<td>$8,690</td>
<td>$8,016</td>
<td>$7,917</td>
<td>$8,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>$9,568</td>
<td>$13,473</td>
<td>$1,128</td>
<td>$10,801</td>
<td>$10,967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Student Funding

The TLAC department currently funds 3 graduate students (20 hours each) for each area (Reading, Math, Science, Early Childhood, ESL, Culture & Curriculum). Urban Education is a new area and right now it receives 1 graduate student (20 hours).

Graduate students allocated to the areas are funded by student fees. Graduate students who teach courses are funded by state dollars. In 2007-2008, the department started providing graduate student support to faculty that taught large enrollment courses, these students are funded by student fees. Priority is given to graduate students to teach courses in the department over part-time faculty. The number of courses available varies, but usually depends on if it is a base year. The number of graduate students assisting with large enrollment courses depends on student enrollment.

Ph.D. graduate students funded from department funds make $1,500 per month. Graduate students funded on research dollars can make higher salaries; it depends on the budget for the grant. Current graduate student salaries, funded on research dollars, range from $1,500 - $2,100.

From 2005 to the present, Dr. Carol Stuessy has been PI of the PRISE project, funded by NSF. In this project, graduate students are funded full time as Research Fellows, earning $30,000 per year. During 2005 and 2006 – 8 were funded; then in 2007 and 2008 – 6 were funded. In its fifth year, 3 doctoral students continue to be funded.

TLAC Graduate Tuition Utilization Funds

Fiscal Year 2009
Total Semester Hours Fall 2008, Spring 2009, Summer 2009 6,904
(This represents 32.08% of the College of Education credit hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Allocations for Fiscal Year 2010</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Departmental Allocations</td>
<td>$144,627.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Initiatives</td>
<td>$ 31,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Allocations FY 2010</td>
<td>$176,127.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Allocations FY2009  $114,750.00
Increase from 2009 to 2010  $ 35,114.09

***Special Initiatives to be funded from Grad. Enhancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLAC</th>
<th>Rupley GA .25/12 mo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 4,500.00</td>
<td>Kulm Ga .25/12 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 4,500.00</td>
<td>Joshi 2 Ga .25/12 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 9,000.00</td>
<td>Carpenter .25/12 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 4,500.00</td>
<td>GA Reads and Counts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$31,500.00
Grants and Contracts

State/University Department Funding Sources

1. State Academic Subvention. State subvention funding is determined by formula funding which is driven by two multipliers. The first multiplier is determined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board program area, level of the course (lower division, upper division, masters, doctoral, professional), student level (lower division, upper division, masters, doctoral, professional), and the funding code for each course (CIP code). The second multiplier is applied if the instructor of record for an undergraduate course is tenured or tenure track. At present, this multiplier has been set at 1.05, indicating that there is a 5% premium when tenured or tenure track faculty members teach an undergraduate course.

2. Instructional Enhancement/Equipment Access Fees (IEEF). IEEF fees are assessed on TLAC courses to provide for a learning-rich environment for students taking the class. Expenditures include salary support for graduate assistants and technical personnel supporting delivery of course instruction, the purchase and maintenance of equipment, instructional supplies, and their instructional support.

3. Graduate Enhancement Funding. The $50 incremental tuition that is charged for enrollment in graduate hours is allocated to academic departments based on student enrollment in graduate hours, and special funding initiatives to support enrollment growth or diversity. Funds are spent almost exclusively to fund graduate assistantships. Some increased funding is due to graduate assistant commitments to new faculty hires, and will cease upon faculty members achieving tenure.

4. Computer Access and Technology Fee. Students are charged per semester credit hour fee to support equipment and services for student access to computing, networking, student administrative computing and instructional technology at the University. TLAC submits proposals through the College of Education and Human Development to the
University for funding that will improve classroom instructional multimedia equipment near state-of-the-art and to support faculty in utilizing instructional technology. Annual awards have averaged between $20,000 and have been combined with instructional enhancement and equipment access fees, and other funding to improve student instructional facilities.

4. Faculty Workstation Program. The Faculty Workstation Program represents the commitment of the administration of Texas A&M University to replace computer workstations for faculty members at least every four years. Funds provided by the Vice President & Associate Provost for Information Technology require a minimum of 25% match by the college or the department. With the coordinated effort of TLAC and College of Education and Human Development, faculty workstations are replaced at least every 3 years.

5. Indirect Cost Return. IDC return is funding that is returned to the Department based on qualified sponsored research expenditures. In an effort to fund Startup commitments in the College of Education and Human Development, IDC return to the Department has been suspended. That practice is expected to change in FY 2010.

ENDOWMENT/GIFT FUNDING

TLAC is fortunate to be the recipient of several generous endowments that provide additional funding for support of special programs and projects.

Endowed Chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gerald Kulm</th>
<th>Curtis D. Robert Math /Ed Endowed Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to provide endowed professorship in math education and to support the academic endeavors of the recipient of the Robert Professorship. Donor is the Ed Rachal Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norvella Carter</td>
<td>Houston Endowment Endowed Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support of College of Education Faculty for a program to provide quality teachers for greater Houston area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance Lewis</td>
<td>Houston Endowment Endowed Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support of College of Education Faculty for a program to provide quality teachers for greater Houston area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennie Smith</td>
<td>Claude H Everett Jr. '47 Endowed Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chair holder from College of Education to broaden students' education

James Kracht
Byrnes Professor of Student Success

Chair holder from College of Education promoting academic success for all students

OTHER STUDENT SUPPORT

1. Graduate Diversity Fellowships. These Fellowships provide new doctoral students who demonstrate some aspect of diversity in their personal or professional work and who also demonstrate academic potential for graduate study a fellowship opportunity. Students who qualify are nominated by the TLAC Graduate Advisor. Students who are awarded this fellowship package receive:

   - Tuition exemption allowing them to pay Resident tuition and receive payment of $8,000 toward tuition/fees for three years
   - Departmental assistantship at $13,500 a year for three years (The total fellowship package to the student $40,500 over a three year period). The Department usually averages 1-2 Diversity Fellows annually.

2. Regent’s Fellowship Funding. The Regent’s Fellowship program provides first year academically excellent doctoral students with additional resources to support their initial year in a doctoral program. The award is designed to augment funding received from departmental sources. The amount varies based on the number of qualified students and averages $3000-$9500 per student. In 2009-2010 four TLAC students received a total of $19,000.

3. Graduate Assistantship Research (GAR) Sponsored Research. TLAC Faculty will also provide an estimated $172,166 ($147,150 salary + 17% benefits) in GAR salary/benefit support from their sponsored research in FY 2010.

4. Other Fellowships Available to TLAC and other CEHD doctoral students

   - Carolyn S. Lohman/Heep Fellowship. This fellowship recognizes an outstanding full-time doctoral student in the CEHD with demonstrated financial need. A total of $10,000 per year is awarded to one student.

   - Drs. Fred D. and Nancy Thornberry Endowed Fellowship. This fellowship recognizes one student in the CEHD (either in TLAC or EAHR) working towards a graduate degree with the aim of pursuing a career in the professoriate or as a
K-12 school administrator. The fellowship provides $500 a semester for the 2009-2010 academic year.

- Jane and Collie Conoley Fellowship. This fellowship recognizes an outstanding entry-level doctoral student in the CEHD with a demonstrated financial need. The fellowship provides $1000 per semester for 2009-2010.

**Graduate Assistant Funding, 50% time**

**Graduate Assistant Non-Teaching (GANT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Graduate Assistant Non-Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLAC</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAHR</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLKN</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLED</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduate Assistant Research (GAR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Graduate Assistant Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLAC</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAHR</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLKN</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLED</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduate Assistant Teaching (GAT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Graduate Assistant Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

Teaching, Learning and Culture
External Review
| Education | Masters | | Doctorate | | |
|-----------|---------|-------|-----------|-------|
|           | Min     | Max   | Min       | Max   |
| EPSY      | n/a     | n/a   | 1500.00   | 1500.00|
| TLAC      | 1000.00 | 1000.00| 1500.00   | 1500.00|
| EAHR      | n/a     | n/a   | n/a       | n/a   |
| HLKN      | 750.00  | 1875.00| 1250.00   | 2222.22|
| CLED      | 1500.00 |       |           |       |
Section 2: Resources to Enhance Learning

Student Advisers

Undergraduate Advisers are evaluated by students each year. The charts below indicate the improvement in student satisfaction since the annual survey began. To view the complete questionnaire and 2007 TLAC student responses see Volume 7, Appendix 7.

College of Education and Human Development Advisor Evaluation Summary 1997 - 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>69.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>67.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>78.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>86.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>86.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Skills</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>63.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>61.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>67.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>79.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>78.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>78.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Library Facilities

Texas A&M University Libraries serves both the research and study needs of students and faculty across campus. Online research collections and services include [Get it for me](#) and [Chat with Us](#), thousands of books and journals, subject guides and more. Study space and additional research help can be found in any of the libraries located across campus. The University Libraries encompasses five facilities plus the online library described below.

#### Sterling C. Evans Library and Library Annex

the main library facilities on Texas A&M's campus, offers the following features:

- Quiet and group study spaces
- Course reserves and textbooks
- General assistance and special expertise in library research for basic sciences, engineering, humanities, and social sciences
- General collections and state and federal depository for government documents
- [Map and GIS Collections and Services](#) with maps for check out, travel books and GIS services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>51.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>53.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>65.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>62.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>76.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>73.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Library Annex is open 24/5 with extensive spaces for general and group study throughout the building. It also houses Media and Reserves with access to movies, CDs, multimedia equipment, and a presentation practice room.

Additional features of the Evans Library and Library Annex include:

- Wireless Internet access for laptop users (Laptop computers can be checked out at the circulation desk for in library use.)
- Group study room reservations with on call pagers at circulation desk
- Poor Yorick’s Coffee House on the Evans Library concourse for quick meals and snacks.

**Undergraduate Student Organizations**

**Texas State Teachers Association - Student Program**

TLAC undergraduate students have organized a Texas A&M Chapter of Texas State Teacher’s Association – Student Program (TSTA – SP). The purpose of this organization is to provide up-to-date information about the world of education. TSTA – SP has various speakers ranging from current student teachers to professionals in the field of education. The organization also brings in many TAMU and TLAC faculty to provide information about the College of Education. TSTA – SP also works with the community of many different occasions, allowing for its members to gain more experience with children. The organization’s primary focus is on volunteer/community service and academics, and is targeted towards TLAC undergraduates (total annual membership dues are $34).
**Association for Childhood Education International - Texas A&M Bluebonnet**

TLAC undergraduates have formed a Texas A&M chapter of the Association for Childhood Education International. ACEI members are guided by a dynamic philosophy of effective education, a philosophy that is flexible and responsive to human needs in a changing society. ACEI's constitutionally defined purpose is to:

- Serve members and society through dissemination of authoritative information on education and child development;
- Promote a sensitive and comprehensive view of child development from birth through early adolescence;
- Facilitate continuous professional growth of educators; and
- Focus the attention of the public on the educational needs and inherent rights of children and programs for their well-being - in their school, community and home.

In addition to monthly meetings with informative guest speakers, ACEI members participate in many volunteer opportunities, including Big Event, Children's Museum, Ross Buddies, Helping One Student To Succeed (HOSTS), and many others throughout the semester.

**Graduate Student Organizations**

Within the College of Education and Human Development, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, is the Graduate Student Association (GSA). The GSA is a student-led organization founded to assist graduate
students as they matriculate through their master’s and doctoral programs. The organization offers monthly professional development by faculty members within and outside the college as well as opportunities to meet other graduate students and network beyond this experience. Funding to support the GSA comes from dues collected by student members. The GSA Officers are elected during the Spring semester and include the President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, Professional Development Coordinator, and Technology Coordinator. Other team members include one student representative from each of the program areas within the department. Faculty member Cathleen Loving serves as sponsor and as the liaison between the GSA and the department. For more information about the Graduate Student Association, visit our webpage: tlac-gsa.tamu.edu or Facebook page: http://tinyurl.com/tlac-gsa-facebook.

Peer Mentor Program

To contribute to the success of its students, the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) implemented the Undergraduate Peer Mentor (UPM) program to provide aid for undergraduate students struggling in writing-intensive (W) courses.

Through this program, students who excelled in their writing-intensive courses (W courses) are given the chance to serve as mentors to their undergraduate peers who are taking W courses.
Following a pilot semester this past spring, the fall semester marked the official opening and implementation of the UPM program. The mentors - 16 in all - provided services for 18 sections of W courses.

The program was created after Dennie Smith, TLAC department head, suggested the idea to faculty members. Patricia Wiese, clinical assistant professor and program coordinator of UPM, worked closely with TLAC administrators and W course instructors to perfect the program.

"All in all, we believe the program is a ‘win, win, win’ program that recognizes outstanding TLAC students as mentors and provides them meaningful opportunities for professional development," Wiese says. "The program helps all undergraduates with the challenges of their W courses and provides truly excellent course support to W instructors."

The mentors worked with individual W instructors to help with a variety of specific projects including evaluating online assignments and counseling peers on various assignment guidelines.

"Since this fall semester was the first semester for the full UPM project, the mentors have been instrumental in establishing the program for future semesters," Wiese says.

In order to strengthen the program, the mentors participated in a workshop on peer tutoring at the University Writing Center. They also met regularly as a group to brainstorm ways to improve the program and their teamwork skills.

In December, the mentors attended a reflective workshop and a celebratory luncheon to recognize their accomplishments during the semester.
Plans to continue the program include replacing the graduating mentors with students who are recognized in their W courses for exceptional work and conducting research to evaluate the program results.

**Education Career Fair**

The Education Career Fair is sponsored by the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture with major assistance provided by Career Fair Hostesses. The Career Fair is held each Fall and Spring Semester. There are over 100 school districts represented at the career fair each semester. For a list of school districts which participated in Fall 2009, please visit the following website.


**Classroom of the Future and Technology Equipment**

TLAC has a computer lab that was originally funded by a grant from Verizon. The main purpose of the lab was to create a space for our undergraduate students to have access to 35 Gateway Tablet laptops and 5 Dell desktop computers in order to complete many of their electronic course work assignments. At that time each undergraduate student was required to create and maintain a website that would be used as their electronic portfolio. This portfolio was used to provide a reference to
each undergraduate student’s coursework and accomplishments. However, all this has recently changed.

With Verizon no longer funding the classroom and the aging of the technology equipment, the time for change had arrived. A major change came about when the electronic portfolios were moved from the College of Education’s servers and transferred to University servers. The students were then able to maintain their portfolio through a content management system for more ease of use. Now the lab could be used for other initiatives with the biggest focus being on digital media as it pertains to classroom education. The goal is to create a “The Classroom of the Future and Learning Studio” where students can gain access to many of the newest technologies that are applicable to the elementary classroom. The previous technology has been replaced with (some of the listed items are owned in conjunction with the Dean’s office):

10 Apple Macbook Pro’s,

10 Macbooks,

10 Dell Mini’s,

10 iPod touches

30 Flip Mino flash cameras,

4 Sony Handycam HDD cameras,

and a Smartboard.

With the available technology, undergraduate students are able to work on projects such as audio and video podcasts, digital story books, and to create
Smartboard lessons. Additionally, Texas A&M participates in iTunes, and educational content is available in acceptable format for iPod’s.

Besides “The Classroom of the Future,” TLAC maintains 6 classrooms and 2 conference rooms. Most all of the rooms have a ceiling mounted projector, desktop computer, Smartboard, document camera, and Symposium.

**Committee of Online Learning and Evaluation (COLE)**

A committee was established to propose a management system for online courses which would give TLAC faculty better tools for making online courses more consistent. The faculty who served on the committee met with Technology Services to seek their assistance in designing the system to best serve faculty and students. For a complete report, see Volume 7, Appendix 11

**Lohman Learning Community**

The Lohman Learning Community is a First Year Experience program for students pursuing education majors. Funded through the generosity of Carolyn S. Lohman, the member students have a common first year experience through shared courses and activities. Students chosen to participate in the Learning Community have declared majors in TLAC, EPSY, EAHR, and General Studies, and are a diverse mix of interests and backgrounds.

Dr. Cynthia Boettcher, Assistant Department Head for Undergraduate Programs, leads the Learning Community. As part of the experience, students will take at least one class together per semester, which are specifically designed with this group in mind. Outside of class, the Learning Community members share fun activities that help them get to know each other. Activities include group dinners, movie nights, MSC OPAS performances, and field trips, such as the Holocaust Museum of Houston, TX.
The Marilyn Kent Byrne Student Success Center, operated by the College is dedicated to the enhancement and promotion of academic success for education majors at Texas A&M University. The center measures student success in terms of academic performance, retention through graduation, and career placement. To further promote student success, the center collaborates with key stakeholders, including students, faculty, advisors, student affairs professionals and academic departments.

Center for Urban School Partnerships (CUSP)

The Center for Collaborative Learning Communities in the College has a new face and a new name. Approved by the Texas A&M University Board of Regents, the center, which was originally established in 1995 under the leadership of then Dean Jane Stallings, will now operate under the name, Center for Urban School
Partnerships (CUSP). Urban education faculty Norvella Carter and Chance W. Lewis will serve as the center's new co-directors.

"We felt the time was right to put Texas A&M at the forefront of this global effort for large-scale change in urban education," Carter said. "We hope to lead this center in such a way that many students in urban educational environments can have a greater chance to improve their lives via education because of our work."

Under the leadership of Carter and Lewis, the center will continue to conduct research and offer support to a variety of externally funded research and service projects that focus on collaborative learning communities in urban education environments, such as mentoring veteran teachers through professional development.

Unlike the old center, CUSP will be involved in learning opportunities for the next generation of scholars; research/evaluation and dissemination; consulting; technical assistance to clients in education, community organizations, and businesses; and direct partnerships with national and international school districts.

"Our vision is to be the preeminent national and international research center in urban education," Lewis said. "CUSP also will provide opportunities for the next generation of scholars to be engaged in high-level scholarly investigations, external funding opportunities, and outreach in Texas, the nation and the global community."

**The State of Texas Education Research Center at Texas A&M University (ERC)**

In 2006, the 79th Legislature authorized the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to
Establish three centers for education research. One such center, the State of Texas Education Research Center at Texas A&M University (the ERC at TAMU), was established within the College of Education and Human Development. The ERC is responsible for conducting research on P-16 education issues for the benefit of education in Texas, disseminating results and findings, and providing access to student level education data for other researchers.

To facilitate the work of the center, the THECB—under an interagency contract with TEA—provides the ERC at TAMU with both P-12 and higher education data. This practice makes the ERC a primary source of access to student level education data for researchers across Texas. Student level data provided to the ERC, for example, includes attendance, achievement, disciplinary, and course completion records.

The ERC studies major issues in education reform and school governance in order to improve policy and decision-making in P-16 education. Researchers from TAMU’s College of Education and Human Development, Bush School of Government and Public Service, and College of Liberal Arts and from Texas A&M International University are involved in a number of projects investigating the nature and impact of school resources and educational practices on student learning and on gaps in achievement among diverse groups in Texas. Most of the studies take
advantage of the data warehouse the THECB and TEA have developed for the centers.

ERC STAFF

Hersh Waxman, Director
Jacqueline Stillisano, Associate Director
Amber Hopkins, Administrative Assistant
Yuan-Husan Lee (EPSY), Data Manager
Beverly Alford (TLAC), Research Associate
Danielle Brown (TLAC), Research Associate
Rhonda Goolsby (TLAC), Research Associate
Judy Hostrup (TLAC), Research Assistant
Kayla Rollins (TLAC), Research Assistant
Siwei Qi (TLAC), Research Assistant
Chyllis Scott (TLAC), Research Assistant

2010 ERC INTERNS

Allison Huie (TLAC)
Sencer Corlu (TLAC)
Melanie Woods (TLAC)
Roslinda Rosli (TLAC)

2010 UNDERGRADUATE ASSISTANTS

Tania Guajardo
John Goldgar

PROGRAM AREA LEADERS

Yolanda Padron, EPSY
Lori Taylor, Bush School of Government and Public Service
Chance Lewis, TLAC
Anthony Rolle, EAHR

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS AND OTHER RESEARCHERS

Nandita Chaudhuri, Public Policy Research Institute
Humberto Gonzalez, Texas A&M International University
Timothy Gronberg, Department of Economics
Dennis Jansen, Department of Economics
Miner P. Marchbanks III, Public Policy Research Institute
Dennie Smith, TLAC

THECB PROJECTS
Evaluation of Pathways Project ($30,000)
Evaluation of Houston ISD Gates GO Centers ($130,000)
Evaluation of Exemplary College-Going Centers in Texas ($95,000)
Evaluation of CCRI Faculty Collaboratives ($52,500)
Evaluation of Math, Science, and Technology Academies ($52,500)
Texas A&M University Educator Preparation Collaborative for Enhancing College and Career Readiness in Texas Schools ($499,738)

**TEA PROJECTS**

Evaluation of School Leadership Academies in Texas ($250,000)
Evaluation of Dual Credit Programs in Texas ($300,000)
Professional Development Activities for Teachers and Administrators: Mathematics College and Career Readiness Standards ($500,000)

**OTHERFUNDED PROJECTS**

Evaluation of Creative IT Program (NSF/A&M; ~$25,000)
Evaluation of IB Programs in TX (International Baccalaureate Organization; $75,000)
Evaluation of Region VI T3 Project (TEA/Region VI, $10,000)
What Works in Texas Schools (TEA/THECB; $75,220)
The Long-term effects of MTC (TEA/THECB; $52,265)

**SERVICE-RELATED PROJECTS**

Evaluation of Online EdD
Evaluation of Student Surveys for TLAC Program Review

**COMPLETED PROJECTS**

Evaluating Districts' Readiness for Online Testing (TEA/Pearson; $216,794)

**SUBMITTED GRANTS**

Evaluation of GEN Delta Project: Game Education Network for Change ($500,000; NSF/Austin CC; HW, DS, CL; JS)
Research on the Effectiveness of Alternative Pathways for the Development of Education Leaders in the Houston Metropolitan Area ($773,334; IES; HW, JS; LT)
State of Texas Educational Research Center at Texas A&M University Middle School Research Collaborative ($107,662; Houston Endowment; HW, CL, YP, JS)

See Volume 7, Appendices 12, 13, and 14 for recent newsletters from the Educational Research Center (ERC)
# Table of Contents

Section I: Undergraduate Programs .......................................................... 5

Early Childhood Education ........................................................................ 6
  Early Childhood Education Classes ....................................................... 6
  Early Childhood Education Field Based Classes ................................. 6
  Interdisciplinary Studies Classes .......................................................... 7
  Integrated Mathematics and Science (MASC) Classes .......................... 7
  Middle Grades Education Field Based (MEFB) Classes ....................... 8
  Reading Classes .................................................................................. 9
  Teacher Education Field Based Classes (TEFB) ..................................... 10

Section 2: Undergraduate Study Abroad Programs ................................. 12

Study Abroad Programs ........................................................................... 12
  Spring break study abroad programs: .................................................. 13
    Spring break (2008, 2009) ................................................................. 13
    Spring break (2009) ......................................................................... 13
    Spring break (2010) ......................................................................... 13
  Summer study abroad programs: ......................................................... 13
    Costa Rica (2009 – ongoing) .............................................................. 14
  Spring semester study abroad program: .............................................. 15

Review of study abroad experiences ....................................................... 16
  Education Students Take Study-Abroad Trip to New Costa Rica Center .................................................. 16
  Italian Study Abroad Provides Teaching Experience for Future Aggie Teachers .................................................. 19

Undergraduate Program Strengths and Challenges ............................... 21

Undergraduate Program Degree Plans ................................................... 22

Section 3: Graduate Programs ................................................................. 26

  Culture and Curriculum Courses ....................................................... 26
  Early Childhood Education ................................................................. 27
  English as a Second Language (ESL) ................................................... 30
  ESL Courses ....................................................................................... 30
Mathematics Education ................................................................. 31
  Mathematics Courses .................................................................. 32
Reading and Language Arts Education *........................................ 33
  Reading and Language Arts Courses ........................................... 33
Science Education ........................................................................ 35
  Science Education Courses ...................................................... 35
Urban Education .......................................................................... 36
  Urban Education Courses ......................................................... 37
On-line Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction ............. 39
Graduate Program Degree Plans .................................................... 39
  Master of Education (M.Ed.) in Curriculum and Instruction ........ 39
  Master of Science (M.S.) in Curriculum and Instruction .............. 40
  Standard Online Master of Education Degree Plan ..................... 41
  Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Curriculum and Instruction Degree Plan .......................................................... 42
  Online Executive Ed.D. Degree Plan ......................................... 45
Section 3: Secondary Graduate Certification .................................. 48
  Accelerate Online Program ........................................................ 48
  aggieTEACH Math and Science Program .................................... 49
  University Studies STEM Minor ................................................. 49
  University Studies Degree in Mathematics for Teaching Concentration .... 50
Agricultural Science .................................................................... 51
Section 4: Program Oversight ......................................................... 52
  Texas Education Agency (TEA) .................................................... 52
  National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) ... 54
Section 5: Admission Requirements ............................................... 56
  Graduate Admissions (additional information on websites below) .... 58
Section I: Undergraduate Programs

According the Texas State Certification Requirements, TLAC undergraduate students may select to certify in either a Pre-K Generalist program or a Middle Grades program. The PreK-6 generalist certification program leads to the Bachelor of Science degree (B.S.) with a major in Interdisciplinary Studies (INST) through the PK-6 Generalist Certification Program. It is a heavily field-based program, with students spending extensive time in early childhood and elementary classes. Credit hours required for graduation in the PK-6 Generalist total 122-124 credit hours. The middle grades certification program leads to the Bachelor of Science degree (B.S.) with a major in Interdisciplinary Studies (INST) through the Middle Grades Certification Program. The Middle Grades Program offers certification in two strands: Language Arts/Social Studies Specialist and Mathematics/Science Specialist. It is a field-based program, with students spending extensive time in middle schools. Credit hours required for graduation in the Language Arts/Social Studies Strand total 125 credit hours. Credit hours required for graduation in the Mathematics/Science Strand total 127 credit hours. To enter either of these programs, you must first be admitted to the Teacher Education Program. Within that framework of certification requirements, the TLAC program is divided into the following groupings of classes:
Early Childhood Education

The Early Childhood Education program offers students an opportunity to study in one of the following areas: Early Childhood Education (EDCI), Interdisciplinary Studies (INST), and Reading (RDNG).

Early Childhood Education Classes

- **EDCI 364: Creative Inquiry Through the Arts for the Young Child - Credit 3.** Explores the role of the arts in the education of young children; examines theoretical stages in children employing both graphic and musical expression; understanding Gardner's "Frames of Mind," the dynamics of creativity and its development in young children; explores strategies for enhancing creative development, inquiry, and expression of young children.

- **EDCI 365: Using Technology in Elementary Classrooms - Credit 3.** Overview of technology as it relates to the design of instruction and practices that support effective teaching and learning’ how learning theories are reflected in and supported by technology; current and emerging applications in technology delivered and supported learning environments. Prerequisite: Junior or Senior Status.

- **EDCI 453: The Young Child and Early Childhood Education - Credit 3.** Examines the world of the contemporary child, its demographics and diversity; explores the philosophical and historical foundation of early childhood education; examines early childhood programs and practices serving young children from birth through age nine; translates child development theory into developmentally appropriate practice.

- **EDCI 454: Planning and Curriculum Development for Early Childhood Education - Credit 3.** Addresses the assessment and application of curriculum models used in educational environments designed for young children; reviews state-adopted curriculum materials, their use and enhancement, and Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) for Grades EC-4.

- **EDCI 455: Home-School Involvement in Early Childhood Education - Credit 3.** The family unit, home-school relationships and strategies for building cooperative activities with parents in the education of their children; experience with the development of parent involvement materials. Prerequisite: EDCI 354 and 453; admission to teacher education.

Early Childhood Education Field Based Classes

- **TEFB 410: Social Studies Methods in Early Childhood Education - Credit 3.** Trends and procedures related to early childhood/elementary curriculum development and instruction in social studies and humanities; integration of content, planning, teaching/learning experiences and evaluation.
• **TEFB 413: Science Methods in Early Childhood Education - Credit 3.** Formatted as three problem-based learning (PBL) units integrating science content, scientific inquiry skills and field-based instruction in diverse elementary classrooms.

• **TEFB 471: Organization, Motivation and Management in Early Childhood Education - Credit 3.** Studies classroom management and the social, emotional and educational development of young children; discipline and organizational strategies that facilitate learning and motivation in young children; procedures for creating an effective learning community.

• **TEFB 412: Mathematics Methods in Early Childhood Education - Credit 3.** Analyzes contemporary curricula; implementation of methods relevant for active, authentic learning and age appropriate teaching of mathematics to young learners; considers state and national standards related to teaching and learning mathematics.

• **TEFB 426: Residency in Early Childhood Education - Credit 6.** Observation and participation in an accredited public school early childhood grades classroom; techniques of teaching and appropriate instructional strategies for assigned student population in fulfillment of certification requirements. May be taken two times.

**Interdisciplinary Studies Classes**

• **INST 322: Foundations of Education in a Multicultural Society - Credit 3.** Historical, philosophical and cultural foundations of education emphasizing education for a multicultural society.

• **INST 462: Second Language Instruction and Assessment - Credit 3.** Techniques and methods of intensive English instruction for Limited English Proficient students; lesson planning and instructional modification; use of instructional strategies and appropriate assessment practices.

• **INST 463: Assessment of English Language Learners - Credit 3.** Theoretical and practical aspects of ESL/EFL testing, including formal and informal assessment procedures and instruments, assessments and referral and processes of ESL with special needs, and gifted ESL learners.

**Integrated Mathematics and Science (MASC) Classes**

• **MASC 351- Problem Solving in Mathematics. Credit 3.** Problem solving strategies in math and science; evaluate conjectures and arguments; writing and collaborating on problem solutions; posing problems and conjectures; constructing knowledge from data; developing relationships from empirical evidence; connecting mathematics concepts; readings, discussions, and analyses will model and illustrate mathematics problem solving and proofs.

• **MASC 371- Inquiries in Life and Earth Sciences. Credit 3.** Integration and connections among topics in the life and earth sciences – diversity,
natural selection, ecosystem development, earth’s features, and weather systems; inquiry emphasizing experimental design, data analysis and collection; use of models in the life and earth sciences. Prerequisites: BIOL 111 or BIOL 113 and 123, CHEM 106 and 116, GEOL 101 or GEOG 203, ASTR 101 and 102, and PHYS 205; junior or senior classification; admission to teacher certification.

- **MASC 450- Integrated Mathematic. Credit 3.** Integration and connections among topics and ideas in mathematics and other disciplines; connections between algebra and geometry and statistics and probability; focus for integration with authentic problems requiring various branches of mathematics.

- **MASC 475- Inquiries in Physical Science. Credit 3.** Integration and connections among topics in physical sciences – matter, energy, force, motion, scientific cycles; focuses on inquiry emphasizing experimental design, data analysis and collection, and use of models in the physical sciences. Prerequisites: BIOL 111, BIOL 113 and 123, CHEM 106 and 116, GEOL 101 or GEOG 203, ASTR 101 and 102, and PHYS 205; junior or senior classification; admission to teacher certification.

**Middle Grades Education Field Based (MEFB) Classes**

- **MEFB 351- Introduction to Middle Grades: Adolescent Development, Philosophy and Organization. Credit 3.** Study of young adolescents in domains of physical, social, emotional, cognitive, interpersonal, moral growth and development; organizational structure of middle schools supporting development of young adolescents through teaming and interdisciplinary work; investigates roles and responsibilities of middle level teachers.

- **MEFB 352-Planning and Development for Middle Grades Curriculum. Credit 3.** Implementing instructional strategies appropriate to development of middle grades students; planning of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary curricula; student centered strategies related to inquiry and problem based learning.

- **MEFB 450- Social Studies Methods in the Middle Grades. Credit 3.** Trends and issues related to middle grades curriculum development and instruction in social studies and humanities; integration of content, planning, teaching-learning experiences; evaluation of teaching and learning in social studies. Prerequisites: MEFB 352; MIDG 352; admission to teacher education; senior classification.

- **MEFB 470- Science Methods in Middle Grades. Credit 3.** Problems-based-learning course integrating science content, scientific inquiry skills and field-based instruction; technology-mediated teaching, Learning and assessment.

- **MEFB 497- Residency in Middle Grades Education. Credit 6.** Observation and participation in an accredited public school middle grades classroom; techniques of teaching student’s teaching fields; appropriate instructional strategies for assigned student population.
Reading Classes

- **RDNG 351: Reading Acquisition in Early Childhood Education - Credit 3.** Focuses on competencies considered essential for effective Early Childhood reading instruction; studies recent research and instructional trends; reviews materials, procedures, and strategies deemed to be essential for effective teaching of reading.

- **RNDG 361: Assessment in Reading Instruction in Early Childhood Education - Credit 3.** Focuses on concepts underlying assessment and evaluation; appropriate procedures for studying and understanding the possible courses of literacy development in young readers; develops teacher's diagnostic skills and abilities to determine each student's literacy related skills, abilities and performance levels.

- **RDNG 371: Multicultural and Interdisciplinary Literature for Middle Grades - Credit 3.** Focuses on multicultural and interdisciplinary literature appropriate for middle grades students; implements and evaluates effective multicultural, interdisciplinary instruction through selection, use and development of literature in middle grades classroom.

- **RDNG 372: Reading and Writing across the Middle Grades Curriculum - Credit 3.** Acquaints middle-grade educators to reading and writing instruction in content area education; focuses on development of grade-appropriate reading/writing competencies and educational techniques appropriate to student development in various subjects.

- **RDNG 460: Language and Reading in Middle Grades - Credit 3.** Focuses on current views of the relationship between linguistics, psychology, sociolinguistics, and the development of reading and literacy; critical analysis of instructional and assessment practices.

- **RDNG 461: Teaching Reading through Children's Literature - Credit 3.** Prepares teachers in Early Childhood Education to teach critical reading and language arts while using children's literature in heterogeneous classroom; interrelates the teaching of four language processes: listening/viewing, speaking, reading and writing.

- **RDNG 468: Language and Reading - Credit 3.** Relationship between language, dialect, reading and linguistics; role of the child, community, school through stages of language and literacy development; relationship of linguistic, cultural and conceptual processes to second language learning.

- **RDNG 467: Reading/Language Arts methods in Early Childhood Education - Credit 3.** Investigate contemporary trends and issues in teaching listening, oral language, process writing, spelling, grammar and handwriting; explores relationships among the development of the language arts and the development of young children’s reading development; implementation of best instructional practices informed by research.

- **RDNG 470: Reading/Language Arts Methods in Middle Grades Education - Credit 3.** Investigate current trends and issues in teaching listening, oral language, process writing, spelling, grammar and handwriting; explores relationships among the development of various language arts and the
development of reading strategies and communicational competencies of middle school learners; application of best instructional practices informed by research.

- **RDNG 472: Teaching Reading in Elementary and Middle Grade Classrooms – Credit 3.** Focuses on effective methods of writing instruction and assessment for the middle grades; reviews and reinforces sound writing practices; exposes students to theory and research in the area of writing instruction. Prerequisite: Junior Classification.

- **RDNG 490: Assessment in Reading Instruction in Middle Grades - Credit 3.** Evaluation of middle grades students reading performance; selection, understanding, and implementation of formal and informal evaluation procedures in classroom reading assessment, diagnosis, and instruction.

**Teacher Education Field Based Classes (TEFB)**

- **TEFB 273: Introduction to Culture, Community, Society and Schools - Credit 3.** Analyzes school culture considering the perspectives of language; gender, race socio-economics, ethnicity, academic diversity, and educational equity; weekly field observations and participation in community-based settings; designed to analyze the learning environment, methodology, and the human experiences of teachers and learners.

- **TEFB 322- Teaching and Schooling in Modern Society. Credit 3.** Development, structure, management and finance of secondary schools; historical, philosophical, ethical and moral dimensions of teaching; role of school in a democratic society; teaching as a profession. Prerequisite: Junior or senior classification.

- **TEFB 324- Teaching Skills II. Credit 3.** Study and development of teaching skills necessary for applying instructional strategies; teaching general strategies, assessing student Learning and analyzing and synthesizing multiple source data; emphasis given to adolescent development and cultures and to teacher and child cultures. Prerequisites: Successful completion or concurrent enrollment in TEFB 322; junior or senior classification.

- **TEFB 410- Social Studies and the Humanities in the Elementary School. Credit 3.** Recent trends, issues and procedures related to curriculum development and instruction in the social studies and humanities; integration of content, planning, design of appropriate teaching/learning experiences and evaluation; preparation of prototype materials. Prerequisites: TEFB 271; admission to teacher education; concurrent enrollment in RDNG 467, TEFB 412 and 413 required.

- **TEFB 412- Mathematics in the Elementary School. Credit 3.** Introduction to understanding of modern mathematics; integration of content, history and application of discovering techniques using problem solving approach; developing an understanding of four fundamental procedures - structure, measurement, sets, fractions - and communication of important mathematical concepts to elementary children. Prerequisites: TEFB 271; MATH 365 and 366;
admission to teacher education; concurrent enrollment in RDNG 467, TEFB 410 and 413 required.

- **TEFB 413- Science in the Elementary School. Credit 3.** Designed to help elementary teachers understand basic concepts of science and scientific methods; content relates to natural phenomena involving physical, chemical and biological processes; elementary students appreciation and interest in science. Prerequisites: TEFB 271; admission to teacher education; concurrent enrollment in RDNG 467, TEFB 410 and 412 required.

- **TEFB 426- Supervised Student Teaching. Credit 6.** Observation and participation in an accredited public school classroom; techniques of teaching student’s teaching fields and appropriate instructional strategies for assigned student population. For students pursuing the baccalaureate option of the interdisciplinary studies program. Must be taken on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis. Prerequisites: Admission to teacher education program and to student teaching.

- **TEFB 471- Dynamics and Management in Multicultural/Inclusionary Learning Environments. Credit 3.** Field-based course focusing on communication, methodology and management perspectives that lead to democratic classrooms; organizational structures that focus on transformative, inclusionary learning; interventions for students with disabilities; analysis of systemic conditions placing children from diverse backgrounds and representing diverse abilities in positions of “risk” for incomplete success in school. Prerequisites: Senior classification; admission to teacher education; concurrent enrollment in TEFB 410, 412, 413 and RDNG 467.
Section 2: Undergraduate Study Abroad Programs

Study Abroad Programs

The rationale for offering students in our department the opportunity to study abroad is twofold.

1) The study abroad program embraces the spirit of Vision 2020 and Texas A&M University initiatives to, “Require value-added off-campus opportunities for all students, such as study abroad, internships, research experiences, and/or co-op work-study that expose students to international experiences and culturally diverse environments.”

2) The added component of living and learning in a foreign environment will give our pre-service teachers the first-hand experience to better understand and empathize with the diverse learners in today's classrooms.

Each year many of our pre-service teachers elect to participate in one or more of the study abroad programs.
**Spring break study abroad programs:**

**Spring break (2008, 2009)**

Students traveled to Poland and the Czech Republic in conjunction with a course on children’s Holocaust literature. Places visited included Auschwitz-Birkenau, Nazi Germany’s largest concentration and extermination camp facility in Poland and the Terezin Concentration Camp in the Czech Republic.

**Spring break (2009)**

Eighteen freshmen and sophomore pre-service teachers and faculty leaders stayed with Mexican families and visited two schools: Christel House, a nonprofit school, and Gama, a private institution. At Christel House, the students actually taught a lesson they developed on the commonalities of Texas and Mexico. They served as conversation partners with student English language learners through LaSalle University’s English Language Institute. Additionally, the group visited the Aztec pyramids of Teotihuacan and the Virgin of Guadalupe at the Basilica of Guadalupe, and saw a performance of the Ballet Folklorico de Mexico. They also attended lectures on Mexican history, culture and education.

**Spring break (2010)**

Students and faculty will travel to Denmark and the Netherlands in conjunction with a course on children’s Holocaust literature. Included in the study abroad experience will be visits to the Museum of Danish Resistance, the Jewish Historical Museum in Amsterdam as well as the Corrie Ten Boom and the Anne Frank Museums.

**Summer study abroad programs:**
Switzerland (2006-2009)

Students took children’s multicultural literature and ESL coursework while teaching under the supervision of mentor teachers in the International School of Zug and Luzern. Instructors and administrators of the two international school campuses provided valuable after-school workshops on the Primary Years Program curriculum, the International Baccalaureate Curriculum, and inquiry in the classroom. Cultural experiences for this study abroad included a visit to London and Oxford, England as well as an informative tour of the United Nations Building and historic Geneva, Switzerland.

Italy (2006-2009)

Students took children’s multicultural literature and ESL coursework while living in the Santa Chiara Study Center in Castiglion Fiorentino, Italy (a Texas A&M facility). Texas A&M pre-service teachers worked with local Italian teachers to provide an English language summer camp for local children. TLAC students took conversational Italian and Italian culture lessons at the center. Extensive student cultural experiences included visits to Rome and Florence, Italy.

Costa Rica (2009 – ongoing)

The Costa Rica Education program lasts five weeks and is based at the private language school, Centro Panericano de Idiomas (CPI). During the first two weeks, students live with homestay families and attend Spanish language classes four hours per day at the Monteverde campus, and the last two weeks they do the same at the school’s Heredia campus. In addition to intensive Spanish-language study, students
examine four different subcultures in Costa Rica (central valley, cloud forest, the Pacific Ocean and Caribbean Sea) through extensive travel and outdoor activities such as tropical rainforest hikes, volcano, and hot springs visits. Students also make observations at numerous public schools, work with a volunteer organization in an immigrant ghetto in the capitol city, visit an indigenous tribe living near the Caribbean coast, and travel up to the colonial city of Granada across the border in Nicaragua for several days. Arrangements have been made to expand the school observations in 2010 to include a week-long English language program in one of the public primary schools.

**Spring semester study abroad program:**

**Italy (2008, 2010)**

During the spring semester study abroad program, students take up to eighteen hours of course work in children’s literature, Italian culture and art, and English as a second language methodology and assessment while living at the Santa Chiara Study Center in Castiglion Fiorentino, Italy. Four days a week (Mondays-Thursdays) the pre-service teachers teach English in the local Dante Middle School, tutor Italian students in their preparation for the Trinity Exam in English after school, and work with Italian students in preparation for a bilingual stage production which is performed in the local historical theater. This intense semester is a true cultural immersion because TLAC students work on a daily basis with the local school children as well as take lessons in conversational Italian. In addition to the work with the school, TLAC students tour Venice, Rome, Florence, and Arezzo. Students also have the opportunity to travel to their selected destinations Friday through Sunday each week.
Review of study abroad experiences

Education Students Take Study-Abroad Trip to New Costa Rica Center

In January 2009, twenty first-year Lohman Learning Community students from TLAC embarked on a week-long study-abroad trip to the village of San Isidro de Peñas Blancas in the Casa Verde region of Costa Rica. The travelers were the first student group to visit the Texas A&M University Soltis Center for Research and Education (Costa Rica Center), a study-abroad facility near San Isidro. The trip, which was part of a multicultural education course, was designed to give pre-service teachers the opportunity to experience another culture and practice teaching English as a second language.
"I went on the trip to Costa Rica with the intention of teaching English to the kids and left having learned so much more from them than I ever expected," says Martha Kate Felts, freshman Interdisciplinary Studies major.

As part of a service-learning project, the students held English Camp for the Costa Rican children and parents of the local village school.

"The students, parents and teachers were so willing to learn and let us learn from them," says Erica De Luna, freshman special education major. "Teaching a language to a group of students that spoke hardly any English was a learning experience for future teachers. Alternative methods had to be used, such as hand motions and props, in order to communicate with the students." De Luna noted that many of the children were eager to learn English so they could go to college in Costa Rica.

In addition to teaching English, the 20 TLAC students held a drive to collect books for the school prior to the trip. They gathered children's books in English and Spanish from publishers, local teachers and churches, but their largest supplier was Half Price Books in College Station.

"We did a little research and discovered we each could take an extra suitcase of books," says Edie Cassell, trip leader and clinical assistant professor. "Some students put books in their first suitcase, so we all flew with two 50-pound suitcases. We ended up with over 1,000 pounds of books." Cassell says some students also carried school supplies, such as pens, pencils and paper, for the children.
"Someone brought the game Twister, which was a huge hit," she adds. "Twister is great for learning basic English—colors, body parts and directions. It’s great for all ages."

The students also visited several spectacular natural sites, including La Fortuna waterfall and Arenal, an active volcano. They had the opportunity to go on a canopy tour,
also known as zip-lining.

The Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Programs and Associate Provost for Academic Services at Texas A&M provided a $22,000 grant for the trip to encourage first-year students to engage in study abroad experiences.

"The culture, people and global issues I learned about helped me to realize the importance of traveling and the impact it can have on someone," said Meghan Brown, freshman education major. "I know my studies abroad will not end with Costa Rica, but will continue for many more trips."

**Italian Study Abroad Provides Teaching Experience for Future Aggie Teachers**

What started as a one-day visit to an Italian middle school has grown into an exciting opportunity for preservice Aggie teachers to teach English Language Learners.

In 2008, Janet Hammer and Patricia Wiese, clinical faculty members in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, journeyed with 14 Texas A&M University students to Castiglion Fiorentino, Italy, for a spring semester study abroad. The students stayed at the Santa Chiara Study Center in Castiglion Fiorentino and taught English to children at the Dante Scuola Media, a middle school near the center. In addition to teaching, they completed theoretical coursework and went on daylong field excursions.

"Our original goals were to pilot a program where our preservice teachers would have the experience of teaching English to English Language Learners," says Hammer, "and
since they were experiencing a true cultural immersion, they would develop empathy for the English learners they would have in their future classrooms in Texas."

Using PowerPoint, music and manipulatives, the education students developed and taught lessons for three levels of English learners. The English language instruction culminated in a special production at the local historic theater.

"Our students and the Italian children performed a bilingual production of Pinocchio, written and choreographed by Texas A&M students," Hammer says. "It was well attended by people from the local community."

Silena Faralli, lead English teacher and professional development coordinator at the Italian middle school, was impressed with the Aggie students' professionalism and hard work.

"They showed skills in managing class life and creating a positive learning environment, where all school children, including the weaker ones, were involved in the activities," she says. "By bringing their characteristic Texan flavor to our school life, these teachers were able to raise the enthusiasm in our middle school students."

This coming spring, Hammer and Wiese will return to Italy with 18 new preservice teachers to experience teaching English Language Learners yet again.
Undergraduate Program Strengths and Challenges

November, 2009 Undergraduate Committee Meeting
Strengths and Challenges in the INST program

Strengths:
1. Undergraduate teacher preparation has approximately 100 hours of Field-based experiences in their program
2. Curriculum infused with new technologies related to teaching and learning such as smart board, video and other web based programs.
3. Students have opportunities to participate in Study Abroad programs in Switzerland, Italy, Mexico, Germany, and China.
4. Undergraduate Peer Mentoring (UPM) provides support for students to enhance their writing skills courses
5. Undergraduate program enrollment has increased in Math/Science to serve shortage areas.
6. Teacher preparation curriculum includes extensive language arts courses and teaching of reading skills in all content areas
7. Teacher Consistency across program has been recently revised to provide a professional sequence and consistency across courses
8. Undergraduates have opportunities to access program through On-line courses
9. Students have access to mentoring and advising to ensure progress through their programs.
10. Students have various options to complete their certification through student teaching in local schools, at a distance and through internship models.
11. Approximately 225 recruiters participate in two Career Fairs to recruit Aggie teachers.
12. The professional placement of students for field experiences and student teacher
13. Classrooms are equipped with the latest technology for teaching and learning
14. Students and faculty have access to a Learning Studio to assist with technology projects
15. Highly qualified clinical faculty that takes pride in continuing to educate quality
teachers

16. Receptivity of schools in Brazos Valley in placing students for field services due to value added expectations

Challenges
1. The number of Classes over 30 has increased?

2. Classroom space is limited for large classes (over 40)

3. Only a few tenured faculty teach in the undergraduate program

4. More faculty needed in order to grow the program

5. Reading classes currently do not have a field-based component

6. More On-line courses need to be designed as blended courses to make learning more accessible for students.

7. Some coordination of assignments (such as technology) is needed among professors

8. Professors don’t always communicate explicit expectations (from the students on the committee) in courses

9. Middle School program does not have a field-based placement until junior II.

10. The placement of large numbers of students in the public school in Brazos Valley.

11. Replacement of faculty who retire or transfer due to financial conditions within the college and university.

Undergraduate Program Degree Plans

There are three different areas of certification within the TLAC program:

1. GRADES 4-8 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/SOCIAL STUDIES
2. GRADES 4-8 MATH AND SCIENCE
3. GRADES -6 GENERALIST

The degree plans for each program are outlined below.
### BASIC REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 104</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 203</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 105</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 106</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 206</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 207</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAR 101, MUSC 201</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Visual &amp; Performing Arts)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 322 **</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 111</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOL 101, GEOG 203</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 198 (Health &amp; Fitness)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 199</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 142, 131</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 141, 166</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 303, EPSY 435</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FOUNDATIONS COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST 332 **</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 351</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 334 **</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 470 *</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 273</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 352 *</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 450 *</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 490 *</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 497</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Hours Required for Graduation: 122**

Certifies to teach grades 4-8

* Methods Semester courses to be taken concurrently:
  MEFB 352, 450, 490 & RDNG 470, 490

** Courses leading to ESL Certification

---

### CONCENTRATIONS

#### LANGUAGE ARTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a ENGL 221, 222, 227, 228, 231, 232</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b ENGL 210, 241, 301, 203</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 323, 336, 339, 362</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 371</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 372</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 381 **</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 490 *</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SOCIAL STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 304, ECON 202, 203</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 201, 202</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 301, 305, 311, 320, 355</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 226, 416</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 314 -317, 319</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 329, 331, 347, 369, 415, 421</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFSC 335, WFSC 420/409, PHYS 205, ANTH 225, OCNG 251/252, ATMO 201/202</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- All coursework must be completed before the student teaching experience. Students may not take any regularly scheduled courses during the student teaching semester.
- All course work requires a grade of ‘C’ or higher.
- A 2.75 GPR is required for admission to Teacher Education.
- Degree plans are subject to change in order to meet state requirements. Students are responsible for adhering to course prerequisites and co-enrollments.

[Foreign Language Requirement]

2 years of the same foreign language in high school is required.
DEPARTMENT OF TEACHING, LEARNING & CULTURE  
INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAM - CATALOG #130  
GRADES 4-8 MATH/SCIENCE

### BASIC REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a COMM 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 105, 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 226, 416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAR 101, MUSC 201 (Visual &amp; Performing Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 361, ANTH 205, ARTS 149, 150 (Humanities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 322 (Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 142, 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 198 (Health &amp; Fitness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FOUNDATIONS COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 490 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 352 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 460 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 470 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 490 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c MEFB 497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONCENTRATIONS

#### MATHEMATICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAT 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 141, 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC 450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SCIENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 101 (prereq to CHEM 102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 106/116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 306/307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b CHEM 102, GEOG 203, ATMO 201/202, PHYS 201, OCNG 251/252, WFSC 335, ZOOL 319, ZOOL 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFSC 420/409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b GEO 101, GEOG 203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a** Must have a B/C combination with ENGL 104
- **b** GEOG 203 cannot double count on this plan
- **c** All coursework must be completed before the student teaching experience. Students may not take any regularly scheduled courses during the student teaching semester.

### Note:

- All coursework requires a grade of ‘C’ or higher.
- A 2.75 GPR is required for admission to Teacher Education.
- Degree plans are subject to change in order to meet state requirements.
- Students are responsible for adhering to course prerequisites and co-enrollments

- □ Foreign Language Requirement
  - 2 years of the same foreign language in high school is required.

---

**Total Hours Required for Graduation: 131**

**Certifies to teach grades 4-8**

* Methods Semester courses to be taken concurrently:  
  MEFB 352, 460, 470, 490 RDNG 490

---
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**BASIC REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 104</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 203, 210</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 141, 166</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 142, 131</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAR 101, MUSC 201, KINE 311 (Visual &amp; Performing Arts)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 322 (Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 301, 305, 202 (Humanities)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 105, 106</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 226</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 206</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS 207</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 198 (Health &amp; Fitness)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 199</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 273</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 203</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 351</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 361</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 461</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 468</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 303, EPSY 435</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 365</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 366</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 111, BIOL 113/123</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 106/116</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOL 101, GEOG 203</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 202, 203, GEOG 304</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development &amp; ESL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 453</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 462</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 463</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Emphasis Courses (choose one area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 364</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 365 (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 454</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 455</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 372</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 460</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 472 (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 371, ENGL 361</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 367</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 368</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC 351</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC 450</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 201, 202, ANTH 205</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 105, 106</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 361, 362, 363, 364</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 301, 305, 355</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC 371 (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC 475 (4)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 205</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTR 101/102, WFSC 420/409</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNDERGIRDING COURSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST 310</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 471</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROFESSIONAL STUDIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 467</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 410</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 412</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 413</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 426</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Hours Required for Graduation: 122 - 124**

Certifies to teach: PreK-6

---

Foreign Language Requirement

2 years of the same foreign language in high school is required.
Section 3: Graduate Programs

Graduate Programs are offered in Culture and Curriculum, Early Childhood Education, English as a Second Language (ESL), Mathematics Education, Reading and Language Arts Education, Science Education, On-line Executive Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction, On-line Master of Education, Secondary Graduate Certification Program, and Urban Education

Culture and Curriculum

The Culture and Curriculum program offers students an opportunity to study in one of the following areas: Multicultural Education, Foundations of Education, Curriculum Theory, Social Studies Education, and Art Education and Visual Culture.

Culture and Curriculum Courses

- EDCI 633. Educator as Learner. Designed to challenge the graduate learner as one who studies metacognition, working to understand how self and others process Learning maximize application of learning and evaluate the meaning of learning; for students working with others in a role of mentor, supervisor, administrator or coach in a PK-12 setting. Prerequisite: EDCI 631.

- EDCI 642. Multicultural Education: Theory, Research and Practice. Theory and research that undergirds the discipline of multicultural education by exploring the philosophical, anthropological and psychological theoretical frameworks. Prerequisite: Graduate classification.
• **EDCI 643. Teaching in Urban Environments.** Provide educators with historical perspectives, pedagogical knowledge and insights concerning educational experience of teachers and learners in urban environments. Will address cognitive, psychomotor and affective aspects of teaching and learning in urban environments. *Prerequisite: Graduate classification.*

• **EDCI 645. Society and Education in World Perspective.** Comparative education; interrelationships among societal institutions and particular roles that education plays in different cultures and political systems.

• **EDCI 658. History of Education.** The genesis of formal education in the Western world beginning with the ancient Greeks and working through the Enlightenment; tracing the idea that schooling is a fundamental part of human existence and therefore crucial to all questions concerning the human condition. *Prerequisite: Doctoral classification or approval of instructor.*

• **EDCI 659. History of American Education.** The social and institutional role of public education in the United States from 1789 to the present; including clarification of the political and economic underpinning that have worked catalytically to change the structure of public education in terms of philosophy, methods and curricula. *Prerequisite: Doctoral classification or approval of instructor.*

• **EDCI 662. Philosophical Theories of Education.** Selected historical theories of education from Plato to Skinner; evaluating educational ends and means; the nature of knowledge, its acquisition and transmission. *Doctoral level only.*

• **EDCI 670. Social Studies in Elementary and Secondary Education.** Methodology course focusing upon the implementation, both practical and theoretical, of the objectives of social studies: current trends, resource materials, demonstrations of teaching methods.

• **EDCI 677. Strategies for Teaching in a Culturally Pluralistic Society.** Research concerning the cognitive, psychomotor and affective aspects of learning and teaching among culturally diverse learners; practical applications to curriculum and instruction.

---

**Early Childhood Education**

The Early Childhood Education master's program requires 36 hours of course work and offers both a non-thesis and thesis option. A thesis is recommended for individuals interested in pursuing scholarly research or continuing on in a Ph.D. program. Flexibility within the program enables students to be creative in the development of their program to help them accomplish their professional goals. Students develop skills necessary for
working with diverse children and families, planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating programs for children and families, and conducting research. The program prepares students for a variety of careers in early childhood settings.

The Ph.D. program in Early Childhood Education emphasizes research and leadership in the areas of the interconnectedness of the social, emotional, moral and cognitive development of the child; as well as early child care practices in both national and international settings, second language acquisition and bilingualism; and family/community support including family studies and US policy issues. The PhD program in ECE requires 51 hours of doctoral course work and 13 hours of dissertation work. The program offers both a traditional dissertation and a three-article dissertation option.

Early Childhood Courses (* indicates newer courses seeking permanent numbers this year)

- **EDCI 640 Language/Literacy for Bilingual/Multicultural Young Learners.** Critical multicultural perspectives on the acquisition and development of communication skills by young children who represent bilingual and multicultural backgrounds; critique of language development practices as applied in education settings with young children.

- **EDCI 650 The Bilingual/Multicultural Young Child in Family and Culture.** Several theories of child development are examined and critiqued by exploring cross-cultural comparisons of western concepts of child, parenting, and what constitutes learning. Bilingual children’s language development is discussed, as are the implications of the evidence from different cultures for policy and practice in educating young children of diverse cultures.

- **EDCI 651 Bilingual/Multicultural Early Childhood Education.** Historical/current models of early childhood curriculum/methodology as a foundation for the more critical analysis of curriculum as social construction, grounded within values of a particular society or culture; bilingual/multicultural views of early childhood education, curriculum and teaching strategies requiring constant examination.

- **EDCI 652: Parental Involvement in Early Childhood Education.** This course will address theories as well as the historical and current beliefs regarding the influence of parental/ caregiver involvement in the school. Rights and responsibilities of parents and child advocacy policies will be discussed. The knowledge of family dynamics and community resources necessary to design an
effective home-school collaboration program will be examined. Techniques for
effective communication between school and the home and home and the school
will be taught. Methods for parental impact upon the school through volunteer
efforts and school based programs will be identified. Techniques through which
the school may assist parents in their academic role in the home will be
explored.

- **EDCI 689. *Cognitive Development in Young Children.* Addresses major
approaches to the study of cognitive development in the young child, including
constructivism, socioculturalism, informational processing, modularity, and
dynamic development.

- **EDCI 689. *Language Acquisition: Birth to Age 5.* This course discusses
both the theories of language acquisition and the empirical evidence for
developmental sequence that children (both monolingual and bilingual) follow in
learning to talk. This course will also introduce the most widely used methods in
child language research, in particular computerized methods for transcript
production and analysis. (Language acquisition of school-aged children is
included in EDCI 640.)

- **EDCI 689.*Learning Theories for Teachers of Young Children.* This
course focuses on understanding the varying nature of learners and the learning
process. Students will examine theory and research that has direct implications
for educational practice and analyze the educational applications that have
developed from this theory and research. Students will explore the processes of
Learning which include: (a) Learning from a Behavioral Perspective, (b) Learning
from a Cognitive Perspective (with emphasis on Information Processing Theory;
(c) learning from a constructivist perspective; (d) social cognitive theory.
Students will also study development as it relates to learning which includes
cognitive; social; emotional; and moral.

- **EDCI 689 *Education Policy for Language-Minority Children.* Language
planning, educational policies and instructional models in the US and
internationally for the education of young language-minority students, that is,
students who do not speak the majority language of the country at home, are
analyzed using evidence from psycholinguistic research on factors that influence
successful second language acquisition.

- **EDCI 689 *Development and Learning: Psychosocial Perspectives.* This
course focuses on constructivist-interactionist views of child development,
spanning the preschool through the early adolescent years. Topics include early
development, play, cognitive development and Learning family systems and
social Learning evaluation and assessment, gender difference, developmental
diversity among individuals and across cultures, including race, ethnicity,
linguistic background, and economic conditions.

- **EDCI 689 *What’s Happening with the Family?* This course’s aim is for
participants to become informed and familiar with major debates, methods of
assessment and findings that exist within the field of contemporary family
studies. The work of the course will provide opportunities to consider: How do
we understand the changes that characterize American family experience over
the last 3-4 decades? How do we assess the impact of different family characteristics on child and adolescent development? How do social and economic forces influence family functioning?

- **EDCI 689  Policy Issues of Early Childhood Education.** This course, focuses on federal and state policy in early childhood education, is designed to introduce students to early childhood education policy and some of the major issues and challenges confronting U.S. policymakers. A range of public policies will be examined, including some or all of the following: childcare, early-childhood education, parental employment, poverty reduction, immigration, and health. Information on U.S. policies as well as policies of other countries will be discussed.

**English as a Second Language (ESL)**

The ESL Education program is an interdisciplinary program designed for individuals with professional interest in the teaching and teacher education of English as a second or foreign language in national or international context. The program offers MS, MED, and Ph.D. degrees. In addition to taking a core curriculum shared with all students of Curriculum and Instruction, and some required ESL courses, students may choose to take some of their ESL electives from early childhood education, linguistics, and reading and literacy. The areas of emphasis in the ESL Education program include: ESL/Early Childhood Education, Teaching English in International Context, K-12 ESL Education, Adult ESL Education, and ESL/Multicultural Education.

**ESL Courses**

- **EDCI 610. Second Language Assessment and Development.** Second language assessment and development stressing classroom situations to teach second language acquisition. Prerequisite: Graduate classification.
- **EDCI 611. Teaching English as a Second Language.** Translation of theory into practice stressing various methods and techniques in ESL; relationship of language development, culture and conceptual processes to language teaching. Prerequisite: Graduate classification.
- **EDCI 612. Bilingual/ESL Content-Area Instruction.** Integrating English language instruction with content-based ESL instruction in science, mathematics and social sciences for non-English speaking students. Prerequisite: Graduate classification.
• **EDCI 613. Spanish/English Reading for Bilinguals.** Developmental processes in second language reading; nature of knowledge transfer and the application of second language principles in the classroom. Prerequisites: Graduate classification and Spanish proficiency.

• **EDCI 614. ESL for International and Intercultural Settings.** International and intercultural teaching practices with major emphasis on second language instruction in an international setting. Prerequisite: Graduate classification.

• **EDCI 615. Classroom Practice in Adult ESL.** Literacy practice issues in adult ESL literacy leading to assessment, instructional planning, curriculum development and program evaluation. Prerequisite: Graduate classification.

• **EDCI 616. Teaching in Spanish in the Bilingual Classroom.** Acquisition of Spanish in an elementary bilingual classroom and its relationship to instructional and curriculum issues. Prerequisites: Graduate classification and Spanish proficiency.

**Mathematics Education**

The graduate mathematics education program at Texas A&M represents an updated approach to preparing leaders for 21st century mathematics education. Today's elementary, middle, secondary, and university mathematics research, instruction and curriculum embrace a variety of strategies and technologies. The Texas A&M graduate program in mathematics education includes work with the latest research findings, curriculum developments, computer-based teaching tools, internet and web-based sources, and information technologies such as modeling, visualization, and data management. The program characteristics include:

- Research-based degree with an emphasis on mathematics learning with understanding and how to advance mathematics performance for all students.

- Opportunity for individualized projects that expand knowledge about teaching and learning with and through technology.

- Technology-rich environment, not only in terms of instructional tools, but also in the opportunity to employ technology in collecting data, modeling applied situations, and building representations of important mathematics concepts.
• Opportunity to study with a group of like-minded and motivated colleagues. Scheduled and available courses, making it possible to complete a degree within a well-defined time period.

• Course work and research available on-campus, as well as via the internet and through distance-Learning offering geographic and economic flexibility and accessibility.

• Students come from a variety of backgrounds, possess a wide array of experiences, and achieve national exposure before graduation. As a result of mentorship by mathematics education faculty and through participation in extant research projects, graduate students will present their work at local, regional, and national conferences as well as publish in relevant journals.

Mathematics Courses

• **EDCI 617. Early Childhood Mathematics.** Development of mathematical concepts in young children from developmental and mathematical perspectives. Prerequisite: Graduate classification.

• **EDCI 619. Teaching and Learning Number and Quantity Concepts.** Examination of the content, pedagogy, technology, and research on teaching and learning concepts on number and quantity concepts; discussion of contemporary issues in K-12, standards and assessment.

• **EDCI 621. Teaching and Learning Space, Dimension, and Measurement Concepts.** Examination of the content, pedagogy, technology, and research on teaching and learning concepts on space, dimension, and measurement concepts. Discussion of contemporary issues in K-12, standards and assessments.

• **EDCI 622. Theories of Learning and Teaching Mathematics.** Theoretical bases of the learning and teaching of mathematics, including an examination of the research which supports the theoretical bases.

• **EDCI 623. Teaching and Learning Pattern and Change Concepts.** Examination of the content, pedagogy, technology, and research on teaching and learning concepts on skills in algebra, functions and calculus. Discussion of contemporary issues in K-12, standards and assessment.

• **EDCI 624. Assessing Cognitive, Conceptual, and Fluency Structures Related to Learning and Teach Mathematics.** Examines diagnostic and
assessment procedures in mathematics and their potential for identifying problem areas related to children's acquisition of mathematical skills; number and quantity concepts. Prerequisite: Graduate classification.

- **EDCI 625. Teaching and Learning Mathematics with Diverse Learners.** Examining diagnostic and assessment procedures in mathematics and their potential for identifying problem areas related to children's acquisition of mathematical skills; number and quantity concepts. Prerequisite: EDCI 624.

- **EDCI 627. Teaching and Learning Data Analysis and Uncertainty Concepts.** Examination of the content, pedagogy, technology, and research on teaching and student learning of concepts and skills in probability, statistics, and discrete mathematics; discussion of contemporary issues and K-12 curriculum, standards and assessment. Prerequisite: Graduate classification.

- **EDCI 628. Analyzing and Reporting Field Based Research.** Analyze data from classroom observation, empirical tests and interviews; link theoretical and practical mathematics education to analysis of qualitative and quantitative data; equip teacher-leaders and researchers with the resources to interpret classroom phenomena from the research perspective using research-based theories of reaching and learning. Prerequisite: Graduate classification.

**Reading and Language Arts Education** *

The Reading and Language Arts offers both Master's and Doctorate degrees. Along with these degree options, students can also pursue Master Reading Teacher certification and Reading Specialist certification.

*See Volume 7, Appendix 15 to view peer reviewed journal article ranking this program.

**Reading and Language Arts Courses**

- **EDCI 672. Curriculum and Methodology of Language Arts.** Advanced methodology course for teachers of language arts courses and their supervisors; total curriculum development, attitudes and procedures for fostering developmental skills and creativity.

- **RDNG 604. Reading Diagnosis.** Appraisal and diagnosis of reading problems; practicum in administration and interpretation of individual reading inventories. Prerequisite: RDNG 649 or 674 recommended.

- **RDNG 612. Children's Literature and Literacy.** Critical selection and evaluation of various children's literature genres; comparative studies of children's literature; development, implementation and evaluation of research in
children's literature and literacy; integration of reading and response theory into the study of literature. **Prerequisite:** *Graduate classification.*

- **RDNG 613. Multicultural Children's Literature and Literacy.** Analysis and evaluation of Native American, Black and Hispanic children's literature; development, implementation and evaluation of research in multicultural literature and literacy; analysis of issues influencing multicultural literature and literacy. **Prerequisites:** RDNG 612; *Graduate classification.*

- **RDNG 614. Reading Research and Trends.** Exploration of recent research in reading; identification of trends and patterns in issues attached, research designs employed and consistent findings; generation of new research hypotheses and guidelines for improving current practice. *Doctoral level only.* **Prerequisites:** *Doctoral classification.*

- **RDNG 615. Theories of the Reading Process.** Seminar for doctoral students and advanced master's students to study and critique major theories of the reading process that have been influential in the fields of reading, language arts, educational psychology, and related fields. **Prerequisite:** *Doctoral status or approval of instructor.*

- **RDNG 616. Organization and Supervision of Reading Programs.** Organization of school reading programs; role of reading supervisor in program implementation, staff development, program evaluation. Coordination of reading services with total curriculum. **Prerequisites:** *Doctoral classification; approval of instructor.*

- **RDNG 620. Seminar** Seminar course for master's and doctoral students in reading, language arts, bilingual education, psychology, linguistics, and related fields as well as a required course for reading specialist certification. The main content of the course is to examine the nature of orthography of different languages and its relation to literacy acquisition and failure to acquire the basic literacy skills. Further, how the knowledge of written language can help in identifying and remediating reading, writing, and spelling problems will also be discussed. **Prerequisites:** *Graduate classification.*

- **RDNG 642. Clinic Teaching in Reading.** Practicum in recognition, diagnosis, remediation and corrective procedures of reading-study problems; demonstration and laboratory analysis of physiological and psychological factors related to reading disabilities. **Prerequisite:** RDNG 649 or 674.

- **RDNG 649. Reading Instruction in High School and College.** Basic principles of reading instruction; nature and scope of total reading program; methods, materials and organization of developmental, corrective and speed-reading programs in high school and college.

- **RDNG 650. Foundations of Reading Instruction.** Psychological, linguistic and physical factors related to reading performance; implications for content and teaching methods; appraisal of current research and related reading for teachers, supervisors and reading specialists. **Prerequisites:** RDNG 649 and 674 or **approval of instructor.**

- **RDNG 674. Developmental Reading in the Elementary School.** Methods and materials of reading instruction in the elementary grades; past, present and emerging programs; organization and administration of programs and classroom management; teaching reading to special groups; issues in reading.
Science Education

The Research in Science Teaching and Learning Program Area is a master's and doctoral program designed for individuals desiring to pursue advanced degrees with an emphasis in science education. Four strands of inquiry are woven into each graduate course. These strands emphasize faculty members' expertise and interests while reflecting the current research agenda of the program area. Strands include models of science teaching and Learning models of science learning environment design, models of teacher preparation and renewal, and models of engagement with scientists. Many of the science education courses use innovative technologies in their design, including web-based community portals, distance technologies, and hand-held data-collection devices. The program offers MS and MED degrees. PhD degrees are available for students seeking degrees with a research emphasis and Ed.D degree are available for students at a distance who seek advanced degrees emphasizing exemplary practice. Students work closely with their advisors to develop an individualized program of courses that best suits the graduate student's career goals while satisfying the core requirements of the Department. Funding opportunities exist to teach undergraduate teacher preparation courses, to do research with individual professors in shared areas of interest, and to work on sponsored projects offering professional development experiences to in-service teachers.

Science Education Courses

Courses which are marked with an asterisk (*) are new courses, and will be listed as EDCI 689 until the process which approves these courses is complete.
• **EDCI 656. *How People Learn Science.* Synthesize the scientific basis for learning science, with emphasis on memory and structure of knowledge, problem solving and reasoning, early foundations of Learning regulatory processes and how symbolic thinking emerges from the culture and community of the learner.

• **EDCI 657. *Exemplary Technology for Science Education.* Substantial emphasis for this course will be placed on identifying the common design principles of all exemplary technologies, investigation of current instruments for identifying exemplary technologies, and the design of novel exemplary technology.


• **EDCI 661. *Broader Impacts of Scientific Collaboration.* Explore the institutional contexts and social significance of broader impacts of scientific collaboration; design education and outreach projects and/or develop research studies for science education programs in collaborative, multidisciplinary outreach/research teams


• **EDCI 664. Advanced Methods of Secondary Science Education.** Strategies for teaching secondary school science; design and evaluation of secondary school science instruction; recent developments in secondary school science teaching.

• **EDCI 665. Science Curriculum.** Critical exploration of the trends and issues in school science programs; consideration of the foundations and strategies for the design, selection and evaluation of science curriculum.

• **EDCI 667. Research and Foundations of Science Education.** Analysis of research in science education which relates the historical and philosophical basis of science and science teaching; emphasis on implications for improved instruction, especially on the nature of science.

• **EDCI 668. *The History and Culture of Science Education – 1900 to the Present.* An analysis of the evolution of science education as a discipline, a profession, a culture and a component to the education of K-16 students during the last 100+ years in the U.S. and selected developed nations

• **EDCI 669. *Science Education in Sociological Context.* Explores science and its endeavors from a sociological perspective in order to make inferences on school science practice and science teaching.

Urban Education
The Urban Education Program at Texas A&M University is committed to urban school partnerships, teacher induction, equity and social justice, and advocacy of policies and programs across the nation. Two graduate programs are offered in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in Urban Education: a 36-hour Master of Education degree and a 64-hour Doctor of Philosophy degree. Our graduate program is currently one of the premier urban education programs in the nation.

The doctoral program emphasizes strong research and analytical skills, a broad knowledge base, and an individualized area of concentration focused on preparing the next generation of scholars and leaders. We also work to achieve national and international visibility for our Ph.D. candidates.

The master's program emphasizes the integration of theory and practice, a strong knowledge base in evaluation, practitioner action-based research, and community-based research.

*As Urban Education is a relatively new concentration area, the following courses are in the process of approval and a synopsis is not printed for each course. Some have been submitted with “real” numbers for approval; currently all are taught as EDCI 689s (Special Topics courses).

**Urban Education Courses**

- **EDCI 652* - Urban Schools and Communities** - Students explore the complex factors that influence urban schools and communities
- **EDCI 649* - Transformative School Contexts and Communities
- **EDCI 648* - Research in Urban Education** – Students interpret, analyze and make use of literature in urban education for literature reviews, proposals for dissertations.
• **EDCI 641*** - African American Learner in Urban Settings

• **EDCI 639*** - Benchmarks in Urban Education – *Students explore historical perspectives, pedagogical knowledge, and insights related to selected benchmarks in urban education*

• **EDCI 637*** - Urban Education: Policy and Analysis

• **EDCI 689** – The Hispanic Learner in Urban Settings

• **EDCI 689** – Urban Education

**On-line Executive Ed.D in Curriculum and Instructions**

The Executive Ed.D. in Curriculum & Instruction is a graduate degree offered by the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture. The program requires a minimum of 64 semester credit hours beyond the master's degree, all of which will be presented through a Web-based delivery system. In addition, the program requires that students participate in an annual 2-3 day on-campus experience involving faculty/student discussions and seminars. These campus experiences will typically occur during Summer Session I.

Students engaging in the program have the choice of two emphases to pursue: Educational Leadership or K-12 Administration. Those students interested in following the K-12 Administration emphasis will have the option of completing all requirements for Texas principal certification. Inclusion of elective hours provides students with an opportunity to further explore particular areas of interest. Currently there are ten students in the first cohort, admitted January, 2009 and fifteen students selected to begin January 2010. A detailed description of this new online program can be found at [http://tlac.tamu.edu/articles/executive_edd](http://tlac.tamu.edu/articles/executive_edd)
On-line Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction

The Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) at Texas A&M University offers an Online Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction. The Online Master of Education degree program can be earned through on-line distance education entirely or a combination of residential and distance courses.

This 36-semester hour Online Master of Education is designed to develop effective teaching and research tools that increase educational opportunity and workplace access. Currently about 100 students are enrolled in this degree program.

The Online Master of Education degree provides some flexibility within the program emphasis, as some prescribed courses may be substituted with committee approval, based on student experience and previous training.

Graduate Program Degree Plans

Master of Education (M.Ed.) in Curriculum and Instruction

Degree Plan: The Master of Education degree requires 36 credit hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Courses</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 602</td>
<td>Cultural Foundations of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 644</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 673</td>
<td>Analysis of Teaching Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest Area Required Electives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Master of Science (M.S.) in Curriculum and Instruction

#### Degree Plan: The Master of Science degree requires 32 credit hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 602</td>
<td>Cultural Foundations of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 644</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 673</td>
<td>Analysis of Teaching Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interest Area Required Electives***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students will consult with their advisory committee to determine what courses can be used as electives on their degree plan.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elective</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thesis Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 691</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total # of Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students will consult with their advisory committee to determine what courses can be used as electives on their degree plan.*

**Standard Online Master of Education Degree Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 602</td>
<td>Cultural Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 644</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 673</td>
<td>Analysis of Teaching Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 675</td>
<td>Teaching Strategies: Patterns of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 603</td>
<td>Professional Development Strategies for Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 676</td>
<td>Evaluation and Implementation of Electronic Learning Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 689</td>
<td>Advanced Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 636</td>
<td>Educator as Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 607</td>
<td>Programs and Procedures in Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 638</td>
<td>Trends in Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 677</td>
<td>Strategies for Teaching in a Culturally Pluralistic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 674</td>
<td>Developmental Reading in the Elementary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Curriculum and Instruction Degree Plan

For a student who has completed a master’s degree, a DVM or MD at a U.S. institution, a minimum of 64 hours is required on the degree plan for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. For a student who has completed a baccalaureate degree but not a master’s degree or a U.S. DVM or MD, a minimum of 96 hours is required on the degree plan for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Bolded courses are required.)

Minimum Total Hours: 64

Core Courses
12 hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 601</td>
<td>Disciplinary Knowledge &amp; Research in Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 of the following 5 courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 646</td>
<td>Instruction Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 647</td>
<td>Curriculum Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 658</td>
<td>History of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 662</td>
<td>Philosophical Theories of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 689</td>
<td>Cognition, Culture, &amp; Literacy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 12

* to be taken during the first or second semester of the program.

Research Core Courses
15 hours

Students and their advisors will choose one of the following four research sequences that is most appropriate for their needs. Any substitutions to these sequences will need to be approved by the student’s chair and dissertation/thesis committee.

Note: Adjustments may be made to the various research sequences due to course availability. Students should meet with their major advisors to make the necessary changes.

Sequence A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 689</td>
<td>Introduction to Qualitative Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| OR
| EHRD 655  | Qualitative Research      | 3            |
| EPSY 640  | Experimental Design in Education I | 3          |
| EPSY 641  | Experimental Design in Education II | 3          |

Total 9
### Sequence B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 689</td>
<td>Intro to Qualitative Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHRD 655</td>
<td>Qualitative Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 651</td>
<td>Statistics in Research I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 652</td>
<td>Statistics in Research II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sequence C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 689*</td>
<td>Research Methods in EDCI I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 689*</td>
<td>Research Methods in EDCI II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 689*</td>
<td>Advanced Research Methods in EDCI</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Permanent course numbers to be given in 2010

### Sequence D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 640</td>
<td>Experimental Design in Education I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 651</td>
<td>Statistics in Research I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 689</td>
<td>Introduction to Qualitative Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHRD 655</td>
<td>Qualitative Research Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 689</td>
<td>Advanced Research Methods in Qualitative Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining two research courses (6 hours) should come from this list of “advanced” research courses. Student, their advisors, and dissertation/thesis committee will choose the most appropriate “advanced” courses. The “advanced” research courses may be chosen from the following list:

**Qualitative Research Courses:**
- EDAD 623: Advanced Fieldwork Methods
- EHRD 651: Models of Epistemology and Inquiry in Human Resource Development
- EHRD 656: Narrative Analysis
- EHRD 657: Life History Research
- EDCI 634: Reflective Inquiry
EDCI 636: Educator as Researcher  
EDCI 689: Arts-Based Education Research  
**Mixed Methods Courses:**  
EDAD 620: Educational Program Evaluation  
EHRD 618: Evaluation Models in Human Resource Development  
EHRD 641: Evaluation of Adult Teaching and Learning  
EDCI 628: Analyzing and Reporting Field-Based Research  
EDCI 689: Standards and Models of Curriculum Evaluation  
EDCI 689: Mixed-Methods Research in Education  

**Quantitative Research Courses:**  
STAT 653: Statistics in Research III  
EPSY 622: Measurement and Evaluation in Education  
EPSY 630: Single-Case Research  
EPSY 636: Techniques of Research  
EPSY 642: Meta-Analysis of Behavioral Research  
EPSY 643: Applied Multivariate Research  
EDCI 627: Teaching and Learning Data Analysis and Uncertainty Concepts  
EPSY 689: Hierarchical Linear Modeling/Multi-level Modeling  
EPSY 689: Structural Equation Modeling  

**Advanced Research Seminar:**  
EDCI 690: Theory of Curriculum  

**Elective Courses***  
24 hours  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**  
24  

*Students will consult with their advisory committee to determine what courses can be used as electives on their degree plan.

**Dissertation Research**  
13 hours  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 691</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**  
13
Online Executive Ed.D. Degree Plan

- **Seminars (3 semester hours-required)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 682</td>
<td>Seminar in Content Domain of Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 682</td>
<td>Seminar in Reviewing for Qualifying Assessment or Developing Proposals for Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 682</td>
<td>Seminar in Assessing and Reporting Internship Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Content Specialization, advanced courses in Curriculum and Instruction (12 semester hours-required)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 646</td>
<td>Instruction Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 647</td>
<td>Curriculum Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 675</td>
<td>Teaching Strategies: Patterns of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 628 or EDCI 636</td>
<td>Analyzing and Reporting Field Based Research; or Educator as Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Methods of Research (9 semester hours-required) – Research Methods, Statistical Analyses, and Data Interpretation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 627</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Data Analysis and Uncertainty Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY 635</td>
<td>Educational Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 690</td>
<td>Research Design – Qualitative Methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Principal certification preparation courses (15 semester hours)** Five courses in Educational Administration are needed to prepare for principal certification examination. *These courses will be replaced with professional development concentration courses if principal certification is not among the professional goals of the student.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDAD 604/5</td>
<td>The Elementary School Principalship or The Secondary School Principalship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDAD 606</td>
<td>Instructional Leadership Development Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDAD 608</td>
<td>School Finance and Business Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDAD 609</td>
<td>Public School Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDAD 635</td>
<td>Administration of Auxiliary Services for Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Professional development concentration (15 semester hours)** Five courses in designing and providing professional development programs for students who already hold principal certification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 603</td>
<td>Professional Development Strategies for Teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 631</td>
<td>Mentoring the Novice Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 676</td>
<td>Evaluation and Implementation of Electronic Learning Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 689</td>
<td>Grant Writing for Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 689</td>
<td>Special Topics – Program Evaluation in Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Electives (6 semester hours)** – Two courses to be selected from the following areas that are offered online: professional development, educational technology, multicultural education, mentoring, reading, or social studies/language emphasis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concentration</th>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development emphasis*</td>
<td>EDCI 603 Professional Development Strategies for Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 676 Evaluation and Implementation of Electronic Learning Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 689 Special Topics: Advanced Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 689 Special Topics: Program Evaluation in Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 689 Special Topics: Grant Writing for Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 689 Special Topics: Public Relations for Schools and Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology Emphasis</td>
<td>EDTD 602 Educational Technology: field, theory, Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDTD 645 Instructional Applications of Computer Technologies I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDTD 654 Instructional Design: Techniques in Educational Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Emphasis</td>
<td>EDCI 642 Multicultural Education: Theory, Research and Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 643 Teaching in Urban Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 677 Strategies for Teaching in Culturally Pluralistic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 689 Special topics: Transformative School Contexts and Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Emphasis</td>
<td>EDCI 631 Mentoring the Novice Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 634 Reflective Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Emphasis</td>
<td>RDNG 612 Children’s Literature and Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RDNG 650 Foundations of Reading Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RDNG 674 Developmental Reading in the Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RDNG 689 Special Topics: Policy Issues in Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies/Language Emphasis</td>
<td>EDCI 645 Society and Education in World Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 659 History of American Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 689 Special Topics: Technology Applications in Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 611 Teaching English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDCI 689 Special Topics: Language Development During the Early Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Electives recommended for students selecting principal certification preparation

- **Professional Internship (6 semester hours-required)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 684</td>
<td>Professional Internship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Record of Study (13 semester hours-required)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 692</td>
<td>Professional Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See [http://tlac.tamu.edu/articles/graduate_programs](http://tlac.tamu.edu/articles/graduate_programs) for additional information on all graduate programs.
Section 3: Secondary Graduate Certification

The Secondary Post-Baccalaureate Certification Program (8-12) is designed for those candidates who have completed or will complete a baccalaureate degree and desire initial certification to teach in Texas public schools at the secondary level. Candidates are admitted upon recommendation of TLAC faculty and progress through the summer, fall, and spring semesters as a cohort.

The certification program requires the completion of twenty-one (21) graduate semester credit hours, the successful completion of the appropriate State examinations, and a full-year public school internship. Most candidates complete the internship requirement through a paid teaching position. Many go on to complete an M.Ed. degree.

Accelerate Online Program

The Texas A&M University Accelerate Online certification program is an innovative approach to preparing secondary teachers in the state of Texas. Certification may be obtained in Life Science 8-12, Physical Science 8-12, Science 8-12, Mathematics 8-12, History 8-12, Social Studies 8-12, or English Language Arts and Reading 8-12. The program is designed to provide graduates and professionals possessing a bachelor's degree, as well as students late in their undergraduate careers,
with an accelerated online program of educator preparation that can be completed in 12-18 months.

For more information, See Volume 7, Appendix 16: Questions and Answers about Accelerate Online with Director, Lynn Beason.

**aggieTEACH Math and Science Program**

Current estimates indicate that the numbers of mathematics and science teachers must increase by 22% by 2010 to meet the needs of the students and classrooms in today's public schools. Texas A&M University has developed the aggieTEACH Program in an effort to address this need and to positively affect the future of mathematics and science education in the state of Texas.

The aggieTEACH program, formerly known as Math and Science Scholars (MASS), is a collaborative effort of the College of Science and the College of Education and Human Development to recruit and prepare the best and brightest students at Texas A&M to become secondary teachers in math and science. Utilizing a field-based, hands-on, and mentored approach to teacher education, the aggieTEACH Program enables students to gain secondary teacher certification with no additional hours added to their degree plan. Students in the aggieTEACH Program gain experience in math and science classrooms with some of the area's best teachers as well as access to top scholarships.

**University Studies STEM Minor**

The Minor in Applied Learning in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) is a collaborative certification option between the College of Education & Human Development and the College of Science. It is a minor that can be
added to a University Studies Degree Program in the College of Science. The area of concentration for this certification is in the high need field of either Math or Science. A 2.5 overall GPR and a 2.5 GPR in the concentration area is required to pursue this program. To review the course requirements for this program, visit the University Studies Web site and review the degree requirements for University Studies in the College of Science.

**University Studies Degree in Mathematics for Teaching Concentration**

The Mathematics for Teaching area of concentration consists of courses that are designed to give students desiring a secondary-school teaching credential a solid foundation in mathematics. In particular, the courses chosen encompass the mathematical areas tested by the State of Texas on the TExES secondary mathematics examination. These are the courses currently required for the secondary mathematics teaching field at Texas A&M University.

There is a critical shortage of students certified to teach mathematics in secondary schools in Texas and the nation; this shortage is anticipated to grow worse in the coming years as long-time teachers retire. This degree option will provide an additional degree avenue to students desiring mathematics teaching careers, on with the flexibility of allowing them to take coursework in other areas of teaching interest simultaneously in the minor areas. For more information, visit the University Studies Web site and scroll down to the Mathematics for Teaching Concentration information.
Agricultural Science

The Agricultural Science major in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences works to prepare future Secondary Agricultural Science Teachers. This degree plan provides a broad and diverse background in agriculture through courses in animal science, plant and soil science, agricultural systems, and agricultural economics. The content in agriculture is paired with teacher education coursework in TLAC, thus preparing students for a career as an Agricultural Science teacher in public schools.
Section 4: Program Oversight

Texas Education Agency (TEA)

The teacher certification programs for undergraduate students are currently overseen by the Texas Education Agency (TEA), The latest review of the TLAC accreditation program occurred in February 2008. The program was commended in its performance in many areas. An excerpt is presented below:

The CEHD, with 4,158 undergraduate students, is the fourth largest college at TAMU. According to the college’s tracking system, it has achieved a 93% job placement rate for its graduates who serve in all 20 regions of the state, 207 counties, and 651 school districts.

The CEHD staff is to be commended for increasing the admission criteria to 2.75 in three of its undergraduate programs focused on teacher certification.

The CEHD is commended for its comprehensive course syllabi and offerings of intensive writing courses to improve the writing skills of its educator candidates.

Emphasis on the utilization of technology is demonstrated by the fact that 90% of the CEHD’s course offerings require some element of technology, with at least one course being offered 100% on-line. Plans are in place to expand the inclusion of technology through the college’s TAMU link site, which directly connects students not only to the registration process but also to all course syllabi.

Faculty selection reflects high standards and an intentional process by search committees as well as a strong commitment to diversity in the CEHD.

Interview of supervisors and administrators revealed that the addition of the position of Facilitator of Early Field Experience had increased coordination and effectiveness of the field-based and student teacher experiences.

Numerous administrators and cooperating teachers praised the CEHD for requiring student teachers to attend the beginning school year campus opening activities. This early placement has created the fostering of relationships, familiarity with campus procedures, and an overall awareness of the teaching process.

Administrators expressed recognition for the talent pool available through the university’s educator preparation program. One stated that he did not have to worry about second-rate teachers when he hired graduates from Texas A&M University.
because he was confident that, due to their instruction and experiences, they would make a positive impact on his campus.

Field experience opportunities were often referred to as win/win situations. Interviews of cooperating teachers indicated that by the time the educator candidates reached their student teacher semester, they had been exposed to diverse classroom settings and, thus, found them to be more effective and successful students. The process also provided opportunities for professional growth of cooperating teachers because the educator candidates introduced new strategies, innovative ideas, and integration of technology.

Furthermore, interviews revealed that when students stayed with the same teacher through one or more methods classes, and even into student teaching, there was a seamless transition because they knew the teacher, the students, and the classroom environment.

Student teachers expressed significant ongoing support from cooperating teachers and university supervisors.

Staff accessibility as well as a formal and intentional advising system is in place in a concerted effort to proved ongoing support and to retain educator candidates in the educator preparation program.

It was also noted that the CEHD is cognizant of the needs of first-generation college students and that retention is promoted through such efforts as the Lohman Learning Communities and the Byrne Center for Student Success.

As a college at a research-based university, the CEHD places emphasis on research and grant activities. Recognition of the Dean’s leadership is provided on the university’s website for the research activities that have brought nearly $19 million toward the preparation and training of leadership personnel in areas such as school psychology, special education, Hispanic children with disabilities, and special education for culturally diverse populations.

Program Recommendations:
- Ensure that the membership rosters of the advisory committees indicate the representation of the required groups designated in the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Rule 228.20 (b).
- Implement intentional and formal research-based training for the cooperating teachers to promote a clear understanding of expectations and mentoring techniques.
- Conduct supervision with the structured guidance and regular ongoing support of an experienced educator who has been trained as a mentor, as per TAC 228.30(c) (1) & (2).
- Designate clear guideline for university supervisors regarding frequency of feedback and visibility on campus.
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) previously was the authority overseeing the undergraduate accreditation programs for teacher education. However, the department opted not to continue the relationship with NCATE. The last NCATE review was held in 2002, and the program received many commendations at that time.

The NCATE review process involves two reports. One is an institutional report and the second is a board of examiners report. The institutional report provides an overview of the teacher education programs within the unit. The board of examiners report provides an assessment of the teacher education programs based on the findings of the NCATE Board of Examiners Review Team. The NCATE visit was held March 1-6, 2002. The College of Education and Human Development is no longer affiliated with NCATE.

Summary of findings from reports:

**NCATE Board of Examiners Report**

All of the six standards were met at the initial and advanced levels. However, there were three noted areas of improvement. Standard 1- The low scores on History and Social Studies the state’s licensure examination. Standard 2- Outcome data are not formally used for program improvement. Standard 6- Unit advising system at the initial level is not perceived to be of high quality.

TLAC was involved in programs at the initial level that included interdisciplinary studies teacher candidates and teacher candidates who seek initial certification through
the post-baccalaureate level. At the advanced program, TLAC provides an endorsement in reading.
Section 5: Admission Requirements

Admission requirements vary by program. The admission structures and policies are presented below for undergraduate and graduate students.

Interdisciplinary Degree Program in TLAC

Early Childhood/Elementary or Middle Grades Certification

Baccalaureate Degree Programs. Most students interested in early childhood/elementary (PreK-6) or middle school (4-8) certification pursue a program leading to the Bachelor of Science degree (B.S.) with a major in interdisciplinary studies (INST). The INST degree certification programs prepare students for the many diverse instructional roles assumed by public school teachers. A maximum of 126 credit hours is required for the INST degree. Within this program, students may focus on: (1) early childhood (PreK–grade 6); (2) language arts; (3) mathematics; (4) science; (5) social studies; (6) middle school (grades 4–8 math and science); and (7) middle school (grades 4–8 language arts and social studies). For complete information, see an advisor in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture's Office of Undergraduate Advising in Heaton Hall.

There is another baccalaureate elementary certification program available for students majoring in English. For information about this program, see an advisor in the College of Liberal Arts.

Eligibility. Students must meet the requirements for a bachelor's degree in the college and the department in which they are majoring. Further, they must meet specific admission and performance standards established by the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture as well as requirements for professional education and certification established by the State of Texas. These requirements include admission to teacher education, admission to student teaching and qualification for initial certification. It is the responsibility of the student to contact the
External Review

Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture's Office of Undergraduate Advising for specific information pertaining to program changes.

**Requirements for Admission to Teacher Education**
**Early Childhood/Elementary or Middle Grades Certification Programs**

Please see an advisor in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture’s Office of Undergraduate Advising for current information.

**Requirements for Admission to Teaching Education**
**Early Childhood/Elementary and Middle Grades Education Program**

1. Pass all sections of THEA or have state-authorized exemption.
2. Completion of a minimum 45 hours of pre-professional course work from degree program (includes University Core Curriculum courses).
3. Completion of a minimum of 32 hours of University Core Curriculum courses with no grade lower than a C.
4. Completion of TEBF 273 or INST 310 with a grade of B or higher (equivalent courses from a community college may be substituted).
5. Completion of English Proficiency grade requirement by earning a B/C grade combination in ENGL 104 and one of the following courses: 210, 235, 236, 241, or 301.
6. A GPR of 2.75 on all course work on a degree plan with no grade lower than a C.
7. Transcripts for all institutions of higher education on file in the Texas A&M University Office of Admissions and Records.
8. Approved and signed degree plan on file in the Advising Office of the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture.
9. Payment of a $200 non-refundable fee following acceptance into the Teacher Education Program-Professional Phase.

These requirements must be seen as minimum standards only. Successful fulfillment of all of the above requirements does not guarantee admission to the program. Admission also depends upon the number of places available and the number of applications received each year. If more qualified students apply than the available number of spaces, admission may be based on selection factors at the time of application, such as GPA in pre-professional courses, number of hours needed to complete the program, and enrollment in prerequisite courses.
Graduate Admissions (additional information on websites below)

PRE-ENROLLMENT / Structural & Policy Dimensions: Programs’ Mission/Purpose Statements

- TLAC –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>MISSION/ PURPOSE STATEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood/ESL</td>
<td>The Early Childhood Education program offers Masters and Doctoral degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://tlac.tamu.edu/articles/ECE">http://tlac.tamu.edu/articles/ECE</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Education</td>
<td>The graduate program in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in Urban Education is one of the premier “urban” programs in our nation. The doctoral level emphasizes strong research and analytical skills; a broad knowledge base; and an individualized area of concentration focused on preparing the next generation of scholars and leaders in this field. In addition, the doctoral level focuses on national and international visibility. The Urban Education Program also stresses a commitment to urban school partnerships, teacher induction, equity and social justice, and advocacy of policies and programs informed by this commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://tlac.tamu.edu/articles/urban_education">http://tlac.tamu.edu/articles/urban_education</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Education</td>
<td>The graduate mathematics education program at Texas A&amp;M represents an updated approach to preparing leaders for 21st century mathematics education. (…) The Texas A&amp;M graduate program in mathematics education includes work with the latest research findings, curriculum developments, computer-based teaching tools, internet and web-based sources, and information technologies such as modeling, visualization, and data management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://mathed.tamu.edu/background.htm">http://mathed.tamu.edu/background.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>The Reading and Language Arts offers both Master's and Doctorate degrees. Along with these degree options, students can also pursue Master Reading Teacher certification and Reading Specialist certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://tlac.tamu.edu/articles/RLA">http://tlac.tamu.edu/articles/RLA</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>The Research in Science Teaching and Learning Program Area is designed for individuals desiring to pursue advanced degrees with an emphasis in science education. (…) Ph.D. degrees are available for students seeking degrees with a research emphasis, and Ed.D. Degrees are available for students at a distance who seek advanced degrees emphasizing exemplary practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://tlac.tamu.edu/articles/scied">http://tlac.tamu.edu/articles/scied</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Curriculum</td>
<td>The Culture and Curriculum program offers students an opportunity to study in one of the following areas: Multicultural Education, Foundations of Education, Curriculum Theory, Social Studies Education, and Art Education and Visual Culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://cac.coe.tamu.edu/index.htm">http://cac.coe.tamu.edu/index.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Admissions Criteria – TLAC Ph.D. Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Education</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Early Childhood/ESL</th>
<th>Math Education</th>
<th>Science Education</th>
<th>Culture and Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Master’s</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance by Grad Fac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior GPR</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE (currently not using)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Rec.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical Profile / Vita</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life / Work Experiences</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Goals / Intent</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Community Service</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and Presentations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Cynthia Boettcher

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
Cynthia King Boettcher

POSITION TITLE
Clinical Professor
Associate Department Head
For Undergraduate Programs

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION | DEGREE (if applicable) | YEAR(s) | FIELD OF STUDY
--- | --- | --- | ---
Texas A&M University | Ph.D. | 1994-1998 | Curriculum & Instruction
Texas A&M University | M.Ed. | 1973-1976 | Educational Psychology
The University of Texas at Austin | B.S. | 1971-1973 | Elementary Education
The University of Hawaii |  | 1969-1971 | Courses in Elementary Education

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

May 2006 – present Texas A&M University
Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture
Associate Department Head
Clinical Professor
Director of Lohman Learning Community
Four Study Abroad Programs to England, Switzerland, France, Poland, and Czech Republic, Denmark and Holland.

Sept. 2002 –2005 Texas A&M University
Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture
Clinical Assistant Professor

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)
Academy Fellow, Regents’ Initiative Educator Development
Texas Classroom Teachers Association
Kappa Delta Pi Education Honor Society
Honorary Member of Golden Key Society
Texas A&M Mentor

Teaching, Learning and Culture
External Review
Lohman Learning Community Director 2002 – present
Member of International Reading Association
Member of American Educational Research Association
Member of International Dyslexia Association

**Honors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University Association of Former Students. Distinguished Teaching Award for the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University Association of Former Students. College of Education and Human Development Distinguished Achievement Award in Teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University. Fish Camp Namesake – Camp Boettcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University. T-Camp Namesake – Camp Boettcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University. Provost’s Multicultural and Diversity Group Award for Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University. College of Education &amp; Human Development. Dean’s Round Table, Outstanding Educator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)**

- ECFB 497: Student Teaching on-line seminar
- EDCI 489: Special Topics in Multicultural Children’s Literature
- EDCI 602: Cultural Foundations of Education
- EDCI 689: Special Topics in Multicultural Children’s Literature
- INST 322: Foundations of Education in a Multicultural Society
- RDNG 302: Teaching Reading through Children’s Literature
- RDNG 461: Teaching Reading through Children’s Literature
- RDNG 612: Children’s Literature and Literacy
- RDNG 649: Reading Instruction in High School and College
- TEFB 273: Children, School, and Society

**C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).**

**Books**


Articles

Presentations


them?” Presentation at the International Dyslexia Association Annual Conference, Indianapolis, IN.


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)

A&M Collaborative Advisory Board, "TAMU Educator Preparation Collaborative for Enhancing College and Career Readiness in Texas”, Co-PIs, Dennie Smith, Jackie Stillisano, & Larry Kelly. - $500,000 – Texas Education Agency.

Co-PI for “Teaching in Europe – European in Teaching “ - $13,139 - European Union Center of Excellence. Money used to bring European educators to Texas A&M University to present workshops to pre-service teachers and faculty members on European curriculum and teaching.
Lynn Burlbaw

Biographical Sketch

NAME
LYNN MATTHEW BURLBAW

POSITION TITLE
Associate Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Albuquerque, Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>History and Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern New Mexico University, Portales, NM</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction with emphasis in social studies and teacher education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment
1995 to present - Associate Professor, TLAC/CEHD, Texas A&M University
1989 to 1995, Assistant Professor, Texas A&M University

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

American Association for Teaching and Curriculum,
American Educational Research Association
National Council for History Education
Texas Council for History Education
Texas Oral History Association
Southwest Social Science Association, History and Geography Sections
National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), member of Assignments
Committee 1995-1998
College and University Faculty Assembly of NCSS
Society for the Study of Curriculum History, President 1990-1992, Executive Secretary 1992 to present; Curriculum History Editor, 1993 to present
Kappa Delta Pi, Phi Delta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, Delta Epsilon Sigma

Honors
Scholar in Residence, 2010-2011, CF&I Archives at the Bessemer Historical Society, Pueblo, Colorado
College Level Teaching Award, 2006, Association of Former Students, TAMU.

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
EDCI 670 – Social Studies in Elementary and Secondary Education
EDCI 658 – History of Education
EDCI 659 – History of American Education
EDCI 689 – Special Topics – Field Research in Social Studies
EDCI 689 – Special Topics – Principles and Application of Oral History Research
TEED 649 – Instructional Strategies in Academic Specialties in Middle and Senior High School: Principles and Applications

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Peer-Reviewed Articles


Presentations


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)

Fulbright-Hays Summer Seminar, Our MidEast Friends – Oman and Jordan, Summer, 2009, $21,000, PI.
The Melbern G. Glasscock Center for Humanities Research, Faculty Stipendiary Fellowships 2008-2009, $1500, PI.
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
Shannon Burnett

POSITION TITLE
Lecturer

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION
DEGREE (if applicable)
YEAR(s)
FIELD OF STUDY

William Carey College – Gulfport, MS
B.S.
1995-1997
Psychology/Business

Stephen F. Austin – Nacogdoches, TX
M.A.
2002-2003
Early Childhood Education

Texas A&M University – College Station, TX

2006 - 2009
Curriculum and Instruction

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

College of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M University  Fall 2005-present
Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture (TLAC)
Assistant Lecturer/Lecturer

James W. Fannin Elementary School, Bryan ISD, Bryan, TX  2002-2005
Kindergarten Classroom Teacher

Long-Term Substitute Elementary Teacher (K-5)

Bryan Coca-Cola, Bryan TX  1999-2001
Sr. Human Resources Representative

Twin City Mission, Bryan TX  1997-1999
Phoebe’s Home Volunteer Coordinator/Fundraiser
Services To At-Risk Youth (STAR) Counselor

Mississippi Gulf Coast YMCA, Ocean Springs, MS  1996-1997
Program Coordinator for Family Preservation Program (HUD/Region VIII Grant for 4 sites)
Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

Honors

Texas A&M Fish Camp Namesake, Camp Burnett  2008
Business and Professional Women’s Young Career Woman of the Year (Bryan/College Station  2000)
Juan de Cuevas Recognition Award  1996
Outstanding Psychology Intern  1996

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

RDNG 302/461 Teaching Reading Through Children’s Literature (Writing-Intensive)
Fall 2009 ( 2 sections), Spring 2009 (2 sections), Fall 2008 (2 sections), Spring 2008 (2 sections), Fall 2008 (2 sections), Fall 2007 (2 sections), Summer 2007 (1 section), Spring 2007 (2 sections)

TEFB 273  Introduction to Culture, Communities, Society, and Schools
Summer 2008 (1 section – online), Summer 2007 (1 section – online), Fall 2006 (2 sections), Spring 2006 (2 Sections), Fall 2005 (2 sections)

TEFB 471  Dynamics and Management in Multicultural/Inclusionary Learning Environment (Writing-Intensive)
Fall 2009 (2 sections – online)

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Presentations


Hunter, F. & Burnett, S. (2007, June). *Calibrated Peer Review (CPR) in Teacher Education Language Arts and Writing Courses: Experiences and Implications*. Calibrated Peer Review Symposium, College Station, TX.

K-12 Teacher Workshops:


**D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)**

**Member of the Clinical Reading Faculty Search Committee**

2006-2008
Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, College of Education and Human Development
Texas A&M University
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
Mary Margaret Capraro

PROFILE
Assistant Professor

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barry University</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>1967 - 71</td>
<td>English with Elementary Education Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>1973 - 75</td>
<td>Administration and Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>EdS.</td>
<td>1991 - 93</td>
<td>Mathematics and Science Curriculum and Instruction (Mathematics Education/Research Methods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>PhD.</td>
<td>1997 - 00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

- 2007 - present **Assistant Professor**, Texas A & M University
- 2006 – 2007 **Clinical Associate Professor**, Texas A & M University
- 2000 – 2006 **Clinical Assistant Professor**, Texas A & M University
- 1999 - 2000 **Graduate Assistant/Hall Director**, U. of So. Miss.
- 1994 - 1997 **Adjunct Professor**, Florida International University, Miami, FL
- 1986 – 1999 **Assistant Principal**, Miami-Dade County Public Schools, FL
- 1972 - 1986 **Teacher**, Miami-Dade County Public Schools, FL

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

- Texas Council of Teachers of Mathematics
- Kappa Delta Pi Educational Honor Society
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
- School Science and Mathematics Association, Associate Editor of Journal
- Southwest Educational Research Association, President
- American Educational Research Association

Honors

- Montague-CTE Scholar: Teaching Award for College of Education, 2008-09
- President, Southwest Educational Research Association. 2007-08
- Appointed to Full Graduate Faculty Status, Texas A & M, 2004

**B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECFB 420</td>
<td>Elementary Science Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC 351</td>
<td>Problem Solving in Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 351</td>
<td>Introduction to Middle School and the Adolescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECFB 440</td>
<td>Elementary Mathematics Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 673</td>
<td>Analysis of Teaching Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 623</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Pattern and Change Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 624</td>
<td>Assessing Cognitive Structures Related to Learning and Teaching Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 460</td>
<td>Middle School Mathematics Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEED 649</td>
<td>Post Baccalaureate Secondary Mathematics Methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).**

**Books**

**Book Chapters**

**Peer-Reviewed Articles**


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)

- Texas Education Agency - M-STAR- Curriculum Focal Points - CoPI 01/06/09 - 12/31/09 (Awarded December, 2008 for $900,000)
- College of Education & Human Development- CEHD Research Grant for Preparing Elementary Mathematics Specialists (PEMS) Through an Online Graduate Program (Awarded May, 2008 for $5000)
- Regent’s Initiative: Longitudinal Influences of Conceptual Mathematics on Teacher Classroom Enactments, awarded March, 2004 for $18,60
Robert M. Capraro

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert M. Capraro</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>Ph. D.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Research Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattiesburg, Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>Ed. S.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Mathematics and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Gables, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>M. S.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Reading and Computer Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral Gables, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Thomas University</td>
<td>B. S. Ed.</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

- December 2007-2008 Assistant Department Head, Research Mentoring. Teaching Learning and Culture
- August 2006 – Present Associate Professor of Mathematics Education. Texas A&M University
- August 2000 - 2006 Assistant Professor of Mathematics Education. Texas A&M University
- Sept. 1999-2000 Graduate Teaching Assistant. University of Southern Mississippi
- Jan.-1996- 1999 Region I Operations Technology & Curriculum, Miami-Dade County Public Schools
- 1994-1997 Adjunct Professor, Mathematics Education, Florida International University

Honors, Titles and Memberships

- 2008 Nominee for the Presidential Award of Excellence for Faculty Service to International Students Texas A&M University
- 2007 Joann Treat Research Award Winner for the College of Education and Human Development Texas A&M University
- 2007 Educational Testing Service- Visiting Scholar, Princeton NJ
2006-07 President- Southwest Educational Research Association
2006-09 Research Advisory Committee- National Middle School Association
2004-05 Elected Member at Large- Conference Committee Research Council for Mathematics Learning
2002 CTE-Montague Scholar Texas A&M University
2001 Appointed to the Regents' Initiative for Excellence in Education’s Academy for Educator Development; Regents' Fellow
2001 Appointed to Full Graduate Faculty Status

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
EDCI 623 Teaching and Learning Pattern and Change Concepts
EDCI 628 Analyzing and Reporting Field-Based Research
EDCI 627 Teaching and Learning Data Analysis and Uncertainty Concepts
EDCI 625 Teaching and Learning Mathematics with Special Learners
MASC 450 Integrated Mathematics
TEFB 407 Teaching Field Based Secondary Mathematics Methods
EDCI 685 Special Topics
EDCI 624 Assessing Cognitive Structures Related to Learning and Teaching Mathematics
EDCI 450 Integrated Mathematics
EDCI 621 Teaching and Learning Space, Dimension, and Measurement Concepts
EDCI 690 Theory of Curriculum and Instruction Research
EDCI 690 Theory of Curriculum and Instruction Research
EDCI 622 Theories of Learning and Teaching Mathematics

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Books

Book Chapters - selected


**Peer-Reviewed Articles**


**Presentations – recent selections**


**D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-10 years)**

2009 International Research Travel Assistance Grant. Algebraic Equivalence in Italy & Turkey: Building Bridges Through Research to Improve Early Algebraic Teaching and Learning in the U.S. PI Awarded $1,700 Local Funded

2008-10 Texas Education Agency, M-STAR, Awarded $900,000 State Funded

2007 Researched-based Inquiry in Elementary Teacher Preparation Quality Enhancement. Co-PI Awarded $10,000 State Funded

2007-10 New Traditions. Co-PI with Drs. Lewis and Carpenter, Davis, Collins, Quiroz Awarded $349,000

2006-08 Texas Education Agency. Texas- Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Center. Suplemental grant. Co-PI with Drs. Scheurich and Slough Awarded $200,000

2006 Texas Education Agency. Texas- Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Center. Co-PI Awarded $ 1,000,000
B. Stephen Carpenter, II

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
B. Stephen Carpenter, II

POSITION TITLE
Associate Professor

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slippery Rock University</td>
<td>B.F.A.</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

2005-         Associate Professor of Art Education and Visual Culture (tenured), Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture, Texas A&M University

2005, 2006    Visiting Associate Professor, Summer Leadership Academy, Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, North Adams, MA

2002-2004    Associate Professor of Art Education (tenured) and Interim Department Chair (Fall 2004), Department of Art Education, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA

2001 (Fall)  Associate Professor of Art (tenured) and Art Education Program Director, Department of Art, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA

1995-2001    Assistant Professor of Art and Art Education Program Director, Department of Art, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

2010-         Co-Editor, Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy

2009-2011    Co-Director, Governor’s School in Arts and Humanities for Urban Leadership, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX


2007-2009    President, Seminar for Research in Art Education, National Art Education Association

2007-2009    Associate Editor, Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy

2005-2007    Assistant Editor, Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy
2004-2006  Editor, *Art Education* (The Journal of the National Art Education Association)

**Honors**

2008  CHUD Faculty Fellow, Center for Housing and Urban Development, Texas A&M University
2008  J. Eugene Grigsby, Jr. Award, Committee On Multiethnic Concerns (COMC), National Art Education Association
2007  Ivy Laurel Award, Texas Art Education Association
2007  Fellow, Mexican American and U.S. Latino Research Center, Texas A&M University
2006  Keynote Speaker, Virginia Art Education Association Annual Conference, Roanoke, VA
2004  Dorothy Liskey Wampler Distinguished Professorship, Department of Art + Art History, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA

**B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)**

EDCI 331: Creative Inquiry through the Arts  EDCI 602: Cultural Foundations of Education
EDCI 644: Curriculum Development  EDCI 647: Curriculum Theory
EDCI 655: Contemporary Visual Culture  EDCI 689: Special Topics: Interdisciplinary Arts Education
EDCI 689: Special Topics: Arts Education Research

**C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).**

**Books**


**Book Chapters**


**Peer-Reviewed Articles**


**Conference Presentations** (47 total conference presentations between 2005 and 2009)

**D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)**

- **2009-2010** *Undergraduate Research Assistant Program*. College of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M University. Co-PIs: Patrick Slattery and B. Stephen Carpenter, II.

- **2009-2011** *Governor’s School in Arts and Humanities for Urban Leadership*. Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. PI: Patrick Slattery; CoPIs: B. Stephen Carpenter, II, Chance W. Lewis, Norvella Carter. ($750,000)

- **2009** *Raising Awareness of the Global Potable Water Crisis by Teaching the Chemistry of Water Treatment in Secondary Schools*. The Camile and Henry Dreyfus Foundation, Inc. Project PI: Bryan Boulanger, Texas A&M University. ($30,000 [overall]; $4,500 [individual]).

- **2008-2011** *Collaborative Project: Ensemble: Enriching Communities and Collections to Support Education in Computing*. National Science Foundation. Pls: Lillian N. Cassell and Christine Stephenson, Villanova University. Participating institutions include: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Drexel University, Portland State University, University of Pittsburgh, and Texas A&M University. (Overall project amount: $902,108). TAMU PI: Richard Furuta; Co-PIs: Frank Shipman and B. Stephen Carpenter, II. National Science Foundation (#0840713). TAMU/Texas Engineering Experimentation Station. (individual project amount: $35,270.00) (#0840715; September 15, 2008 and expires August 31, 2011).


- **2007** *Affordable Water Filter Production Facility Prototype: Artists as Change Agents in the Colonias and Beyond*. Mexican American and U. S. Latino Research Center, Texas A&M University. Co-PIs: B. Stephen Carpenter, II and Oscar Muñoz ($10,000).

- **2007** *Visiting Artists as Social and Educational Change Agents: Step Two of the TAMU Interdisciplinary Ceramic Water Filter Project*. Academy of Visual and Performing Arts, Texas A&M University CoPIs: B. Stephen Carpenter, II and Oscar Muñoz. ($5,000)
2006-2007  *Undergraduate Research Assistant Program*. College of Education and Human Development. PI: B. Stephen Carpenter, II.

**Norvella P. Carter**

---

**Biographical Sketch**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norvella P. Carter</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>Master of Ed</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University Chicago</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. Positions and Honors.**

**Positions and Employment**

**Professor, Endowed Chair in Urban Education**, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, College of Education, Texas A&M University College Station, Texas (2001-Present).

**Distinguished Professor and Endowed Chair in Urban Education**, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, Texas Southern University, Houston, Texas (2006-2007).

**Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)**

**Co-Director**, Center for Urban School Partnerships, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, College of Education, Texas A&M University College Station, Texas (2009-Present).

**Vice-Chair, Multicultural Education Committee**, Association of Teacher Educators, 2006-present.

**Co-Chair, Commission**, Preparing and Supporting Teachers in Diverse Communities 2005-2009.


**Honors**

**Slate Award** for Teaching, 2009, Texas A&M University
Research Assistant Fellowship Award, Pathways to the Doctorate 2009
Diversity Research Fellowship Award, (Recipient, Yetunde Zannou) 2008
National Teaching Award in Higher Education, National Alliance of Black School Educators, 2007
Dissertation of the Year Award, Co-Chair of Doctoral student, 2007

B. Courses Taught (Last 5 Years)

EDCI 643, Teaching in Urban Environments
EDCI 673 Analysis of Teaching Behavior
EDCI 690 Research
EDCI 691 Dissertation Research
EDCI 689 Advance Research in Urban Education
EDCI 689 Urban Education
EDCI 689 Benchmarks in Urban Education
EDCI 689 Teaching African American Students
EDCI 645 Society and World Perspectives
EDCI 658 History of Education.

C. Graduate Student Advising (Last 5 Years)
Chair or Co-Chair, past 5 years = 35 students

D. Selected peer-reviewed publications and presentations (Selected from last 5 years).

Books

Book Chapters

Peer-Reviewed Articles


**Presentations**


**Carter, N.P.** (2008). *The Preparation and Support of Teachers in Diverse Communities.* The Association of Teacher Educators, New Orleans, LA.


**E. Grants/Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5 Years)**

Slattery, Carpenter, Lewis, **Carter,** Co-PI’s, (2009-2012). *The Governor’s School.* The Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB), ($750K).

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
Edith C. Cassell

POSITION TITLE
Clinical Assistant Professor

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION
Degree
( applicable)
YEAR(s)
FIELD OF STUDY
Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN
PhD
2001-2007
English Language & Linguistics
University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
MEd
1991-1994
English as a Second Language
Butler University
BA
1982-1986
International Studies

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment
Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, College of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M University, August 2007 to present
INST 334: Assessment of English Language Learners
Prepare undergraduate education majors (pre-service teachers) in the principles and methods of performance-based instructional assessment activities for second language learners (multiple sections).

INST 322: Foundations of Multicultural Education
Prepare undergraduate education majors (pre-service teachers) to adopt a multicultural perspective of education in order to work successfully with diverse populations in American schools.

EDCI 489/689: Multicultural Language Arts and Children’s Literature
Prepare education majors to teach language arts and children’s literature in heterogeneous classrooms.

Oral English Proficiency Program, Department of English, Purdue University, 2001-2006
ENGL 001T: Professional Development for International Graduate Students (ESL)
Designed curriculum and taught new oral communication course for improving interpersonal, group, and formal presentation skills of advanced ESL students preparing for the job market (4 semesters).

ENGL 001T: Classroom Communication for International Teaching Assistants (ESL)
Developed new materials and taught a course preparing teaching assistants to communicate effectively, emphasizing oral presentation, classroom norms, and teaching skills (6 semesters).

ENGL 002: Academic Writing for International Graduate Students (ESL)
Designed and taught a course for developing advanced second language writing proficiency, focusing on rhetorical analysis and peer review for a variety of academic/professional genres (2 semesters).

**Department of English, Purdue University**, 2001  
LING 227: *Elements of Linguistics*  
Lectured undergraduate language education majors in a survey course introducing language acquisition, syntax, semantics, morphology, phonology and sociolinguistics (1 semester).

**Department of Education, University of New Hampshire**, 2002  
LING 591: *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*  
Designed curriculum and instructed a 3-credit, intensive summer course for elementary and secondary education teachers in continuing education as part of an MA-TESL program.

**American Language Academy, Butler University** (Indianapolis, IN), 1994-1997  
*Grammar, Writing, Reading, Listening and Speaking, TOEFL Preparation* (Intensive ESL)  
Taught content-based, integrated skills for international students preparing to attend American universities in a private academic intensive English program for pre-beginner to advanced levels.

**Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis** (IN), 1994  
G010: *ESL Intermediate Grammar and Writing*  
Assisted adult immigrants prepare for academic courses through the development of individual writing portfolios and collaborative activities such as self-assessment coupled with peer review.

**Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)**

**Study Abroad Program Development & Leadership**  
Costa Rica Education Program (July-Aug 2009) Texas A&M University  
*Course: EDCI 489: Multicultural Literature and Language Arts*  
Coordinated excursions and observations at multiple public elementary schools and excursions for 8 students. Also attended intensive Spanish language courses through Centro Panamericano de Idiomas.

Costa Rica Education Program (January 2009) Texas A&M University  
*Course: INST 322 Foundations of Education in a Multicultural Society*  
Coordinated student teaching of 20 students at a village school near the TAMU Study Center.

**Italy Education Program (June 2008)** Texas A&M University  
*Course: EDCI 489/689 Multicultural Children’s Literature*  
Coordinated observations and excursions for 20 students at an Italian Middle School & Study Center.
Switzerland Education Program (May 2008) Texas A&M University
Course: EDCI 489/689 Special Topics in Reading and Language Arts
Coordinated observations and student teaching of 26 students at an International Elementary School.

Affiliations & Academic Service
American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL)

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)

Linguapax: International Organization of Language Planners

International Association of World Englishes, Purdue University, 2005
Committee Member: Assisted with preparation and coordination of annual conference.

Midwest Association of Language Testers, Purdue University, 2003
Assistant to Coordinator: Assisted with preparation and coordination of annual conference.

Purdue University Lilly Retention Initiatives Committee (West Lafayette, IN), 1998-1999
Committee Representative: Represented International Students and Scholars at monthly meetings.

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
Texas A&M University 2007-2009
INST 463 English as a Second Language (ESL) Assessment
EDCI 489/689 Multicultural Literature and Language Arts
EDCI 602 Cultural Foundations of Education
INST 334 Assessment of English Language Learners
INST 322 Foundations of Education in a Multicultural Society
EDCI 489/689 Reading and Language Arts: EC-4th Grade
EDCI 489/689 Multicultural Children’s Literature

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Presentations
Promoting Internationalization Through Education Study Abroad Programs: Using Technology to Prepare for Departure and Enhance Learning Outcomes. Association of Teacher Educators, Chicago, IL, February 2010 (with Karla Eidson).

YOU be the student: Learn Spanish in Costa Rica. Texas Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TexTESOL), El Paso, TX, October 2009 (with Marla Rae).

Ecological Language Planning for International Graduate Students. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), New York, NY, April 2008.

Using Online Assessment of Student Learning and Development to Facilitate an Effective Study Abroad Program. 8th Annual Assessment Conference, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, Feb. 2008 (with Karla Eidson).

Language use patterns of international teaching assistants outside the classroom. Symposium entitled, "Toward an ecological approach to international teaching assistant preparation" with A. Ginther (Chair), S. Dimova, C. Blake, N. Kauper, and J. Haan, all of Purdue University, at the World Congress of Applied Linguistics (AILA), University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, July 2005.

Knowledge-construction through the use of EIL in U.S. academic and corporate research institutions. Colloquium entitled "Constructing knowledge within the inner circle: Attitudes and practices of international users of English" with C. Tardy, Purdue University and C. Feak, University of Michigan, at the International Association of World Englishes (IAWE), Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, IL, October 2002.

D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)

Grand Alternative Grant Award secured for La Milonguera Argentinean Tango Club, 2006
Purdue University, funded at $1000 for a substance-free workshop/multicultural event.

FSBIT Grant Award secured for the Friends of Europe Student Organization, 2005
Dean of Students, Purdue University, funded at $600 to host a multicultural performance.

Cecilia Zissis Graduate Student Grant Award, Dean of Students, Purdue University, 2004
Funded at $500 to conduct dissertation research.

Purdue Research Foundation Summer Research Grant, Department of English, 2003 and 2004
Funded at $2,000 each year to conduct dissertation research.
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
Francis Eugene Clark

POSITION TITLE
Professor

EDUCATION/TRAINING (Begin with baccalaureate or other initial professional education, such as nursing, and include postdoctoral training.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg State University</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Industrial Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Industrial Education, Administration and Supervision, Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions

Professor, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, College of Education, Texas A&M University (IX, 2000 to present)

Professor, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, Texas A&M University (1999 to 2000)

Interim Head and Professor, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, Texas A&M University (VIII, 1997 to VIII, 1999)

Assistant Head, Coordinator of Graduate Programs and Professor, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, Texas A&M University (VIII, 1995 to VII, 1997)

Professor, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, Texas A&M University (I, 1991 to VII, 1995)

Professor, Department of Interdisciplinary Education, College of Education, Texas A&M University (IX, 1987 to XII, 1990)

Associate Dean, The Graduate College; Professor, Department of Interdisciplinary Education, College of Education, Texas A&M University (VI, 1986 to VIII, 1987)

Associate Dean, The Graduate College; Professor, Department of Industrial, Vocational and Technical Education, College of Education, Texas A&M University (IX, 1984 to V, 1986)

Assistant Dean, The Graduate College; Professor, Department of Industrial, Vocational and Technical Education, College of Education, Texas A&M University (I - VIII, 1984)

Honors

Phi Kappa Phi (PKP)
Phi Delta Kappa (PDK)
Kappa Delta Pi (KDP)
Iota Lambda Sigma (ILS)
Epsilon Pi Tau (EPT)
Invited delegate to the "New Spirit in Leadership Conference," Lakeside Laboratory, Okoboji, Iowa, 1980
Texas Delegate to the "Lake Okoboji Educational Media Leadership Conference,"
Lakeside Laboratory, Okoboji, Iowa, 1979

Other Selected Experiences

State and National Professional and Honorary Societies

Paper and Symposia Reviewer, AERA Instructional Technology Special Interest Group (SIG/IT), 1993 to present
Consulting Editor, Educational Technology Research and Development, 1989 to present
Paper and Symposia Reviewer, AECT Research and Theory Division, 1980 to present
PKP Past President, TAMU Chapter, 1989 to 1990; Chair, Outstanding Juniors Committee, 1989 to 1992;
President, 1988 to 1989; Vice President, 1987 to 1988; Treasurer, 1985 to 1987; Chair, Initiation Banquet Committee, 1984; Banquet Committee, XXXI Triennial Convention, College Station, Texas, 1980
Editorial Board, Educational Communication and Technology Journal, 1980 to 1983; Consulting Editor, 1983 to present
President, 1978 to 1979; Second Vice President, 1977 to 1978; Secretary, 1976 to 1977; Awards Committee, 1975 to 1976
TAET/NAVA Spring Leadership Conference Coordinator, Dallas, Texas 1981
TAET Chair, Leadership Development Committee, 1978 to 1980
TAET Chair, State Conference, Dallas, Texas, 1980
Conference Coordinator, "TAET Constitutional Revision Workshop," Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, 1978
TAET Area VI Affiliate President, 1977 to 1978
TAET Area VI Leadership Conference Coordinator, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, 1978
TAET Membership Committee, 1976 to 1978; Chair, 1977 to 1978

Texas A&M University

Graduate Faculty, Texas A&M University, 1974 to present
Chair, University Placement Committee for International Students, 1984 to 2002
Chair, Departmental Focus Group on Technology, 2000 to 2002
Chair, Departmental Committee on Equipment Access, 1999 to 2002
College Strategic Planning Committee for Technology and Distance Learning 1999 to 2002
Rewarding Teaching/Enhancing Student Learning 1998 to 2001
Transition Committee for the College of Education, 1999 to 2001
Dean's Council, College of Education, 1997 to 1999
Graduate Instruction Committee, College of Education, 1995 to 1997
Chair, Graduate Faculty, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction, 1995 to 1997
Faculty Development Leave Committee, Texas A&M University, 1994 to 1997
Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion, Texas A&M University, 1989 to 1992 and 1994 to 1997
Faculty Advisory Council, College of Education, 1994 to 1997; Chair, 1976 to 1978; Vice Chair, 1975 to 1976
Chair, Tenure and Promotion Committee, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction, 1995 to 1997
Faculty Representative Council, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction, 1994 to 1995
ad hoc Faculty Evaluation Advisory Committee, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction, 1993, 1994, and 1995
Committee on Teacher Preparation for the Middle Grades, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction, 1993 to 1995
Committee on the Mission/Philosophy of Teacher Preparation, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction, 1993 to 1995
Teacher Preparation Task Force, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction, 1993 to 1995
College Representative, Committee on University Electronic Information Resource Planning, Texas A&M University, 1993 to 1995
College Representative, ad hoc Program Planning Committee for the Second Annual Symposium for the Texas A&M University System, 1984

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

TEFB 401 Lang Arts in Mddl&Sr Sc; TEED 649 Inst Strat Mid & High Sc; TEED 684 Internshi;
EDCI 673 Anlys of TchngBehavr; EDCI 685 Directed Studies

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances.

Book Chapters


Station, Texas: Instructional Research Laboratory, College of Education, Texas A&M University.

Peer-Reviewed Articles


Presentations


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)


Biographical Sketch

NAME
Tracy E. Collins

POSITION TITLE
Assistant Professor

Harvard University, Graduate School of Education
Harvard University, Graduate School of Education
Wheelock College
Linfield College

NAME
Tracy E. Collins

POSITION TITLE
Assistant Professor

Harvard University, Graduate School of Education
Harvard University, Graduate School of Education
Wheelock College
Linfield College

A. Positions and Honors

Positions and Employment

2006 – Present
Assistant Professor, Teaching, Learning & Culture College of Human Development & Psychology Texas A&M University

2005 – 2006
Adjunct Faculty, School of Education Lesley University, Cambridge, MA

2004
Adjunct Faculty, Off Campus Graduate School Programs Wheelock College, Boston, MA

2005 – 2006
Research Assistant, NICHD Study of Early Child Care & Youth Development Wellesley Centers for Women, Wellesley, MA.

2005 – 2006
Project Coordinator, Early Childhood Study of Language & Literacy Development of Spanish-Speaking Children Harvard University, Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA

1995 - 2002
Research Assistant, Developmental Pathways Pilot Study; Child Family Coordinator, Harvard Graduate School of Education-Windham County, Vt., Early Head Start Research Partnership.

Spring 2000
Research Assistant, Family Child Care Project, Children’s Television Workshop, Boston, MA.

**Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)**

Member, American Educational Research Association  
Member, Society for Research in Child Development  
Member, National Association for the Education of Young Children  
Member, Texas A&M University Women Faculty Network, Mentoring Program  
Member, Texas A&M University African-American Professional Organization

**Honors**

2007-2010 Mexican-American Latino Research Center Fellow  
2002 Summer Foundation for Child Development Fellow  
2000-2001 James N. Snitzler Scholarship  
1997-1998 Elisabeth A. and John H. Hobbs Fellow  
1996-1997 Dana M. Cotton Fellow

**B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)**

EDCI 689 What’s Happening with the Family? (2007, 2008)  
EDCI 322 Curriculum & Planning for Early Childhood Educators (2009)  
EDCI 689 Early Childhood Education Policy Issues (2009)

**C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).**

**Peer-Reviewed Articles**


Presentations


*presentations by graduate students

D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)

2009-2010  Member, Children’s Museum of Brazos Valley Operations Committee
           Member, TLAC Departmental Review Committee
           Member, Early Childhood Education Specialization Committee

2008-2009  TLAC Department Representative, Summer Commencement
           Poster Judge, Texas A&M Student/Faculty Research Conference
           TLAC Department Spring Career Fair, Reed Arena
           Book Reviewer, McGraw-Hill
           Book Reviewer, Pearson
           Reviewer, The National Journal of Urban Education and Practice
           Member, Children’s Museum of Brazos Valley Operations Committee
           Member, Early Childhood Education Doctoral Program Committee
           Member, Early Childhood Education Doctoral Admissions Committee
           Member, Early Childhood Education Specialization Committee

2007-2008  Reviewer, Early Childhood Research Quarterly
           Texas A&M University Freshman Convocation
           TLAC Department Representative, Spring Commencement
           College of Education Outcome and Assessment Project
           Member, Diversity Training Institute, Multicultural Services
           Member, Early Childhood Education Specialization Committee
           Member, Early Childhood Education Doctoral Program Committee
           Member, Early Childhood Education Doctoral Admissions Committee
Member, TLAC Department Graduate Committee

2006-2007
Poster Judge, Texas A&M Student/Faculty Research Conference
Poster Reviewer, Texas A&M Student/Faculty Research Conference
Member, Hiring Committee Clinical Early Childhood Education Faculty
Member, Early Childhood Education Specialization Committee
Member, Early Childhood Education Doctoral Program Committee
Member, Early Childhood Education Doctoral Admissions Committee

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

2006-2009
Writing Workshop, College of Education Texas A&M University
TLAC Departmental Peer Review Committee
Diversity Training Institute
QPR Suicide Prevention Gatekeeper Training
Teaching for Excellence: Syllabus Writing Workshop
Teaching for Excellence: Mentoring Workshop
Office of Proposal Development: Grant Writing Seminar
# BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

## NAME

Trina J. Davis

## POSITION TITLE

Assistant Professor

## EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA.</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Mathematical Sciences, Emphasis: Applied Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics, Research Emphasis: Nonparametric Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M University</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Educational Curriculum and Instruction, Program Area: Educational Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## A. Positions and Honors.

### Positions and Employment

Assistant Professor, Texas A&M University, College of Education and Human Development, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, 2006-Present.

Director, eEducation, Texas A&M University, College of Education and Human Development, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, 2000-2007.

Lecturer, Texas A&M University, College of Education and Human Development, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, 2005-2006.

Director, Middle School Aerospace Scholars Program Web Development and Online Delivery. Contract with NASA Johnson Space Center. Texas A&M University, 2001-2006.

Director, Partnership for Environmental Education and Rural Health (PEER), Texas A&M University, College of Education and CERH, 1999-2002.

Director, Ocean Drilling Distance Learning Program, Texas A&M University, Colleges of Education and Geosciences, 1999-2001.

Program Coordinator, South Central Regional Technology in Education Consortium (SCR*TEC-TX), Texas A&M University, College of Education, Office of the Dean, 1997-2000.


Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)
Past President, International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), 2009-2010.
Associate Editor, School Science and Mathematics Journal 2007-2011.
Chair, ISTE Board Committees (President’s Council, Finance Committee, Nominations and Appointments Committee, Policy and Procedures Committee), 2003-2009.

Honors
President’s National Volunteer Service Award (Gold Level). Presented by the President’s Council on Service and Civic Participation, 2009.

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
Courses Developed/Taught
EDCI 675 (2008C, 2009A, 2009C)
EDCI 619 Teaching Strategies: Patterns of Learning
EDCI 619 Teaching and Learning Number and Quantity
EDCI 603 [formerly 689] Professional Development Strategies for Teachers (2008A, 2009C)
EDCI 644 Curriculum Development (2007A, 2008A)
EDCI 602 Cultural Foundations in Education (2007A)

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).
Commissioned Reports

**Peer-Reviewed Articles**


**Presentations**


Davis T. (2007, June). *Making a difference: Three critical challenges in educational technology.* Invited president’s address at the National Educational Computing Conference, Atlanta, GA.


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)


2008 – 2010 Carpenter, S., & Davis, T. Establishing the TAMU-Digital Humanities and Visual Culture Education and Research Island in Second Life. Melbern G. Glasscock Center for Humanities Research and Sterling C. Evans Chair. ($10,000/2 years), (05/12/08 – 05/10). Role: Co-Principal Investigator (Research Grant).


L. Quentin Dixon

Biographical Sketch

NAME
L. Quentin Dixon

POSITION TITLE
Assistant Professor

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION
DEGREE
YEAR(s)
FIELD
Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA
A.B.
1992
Anthropology
Harvard University Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA
Ed. M.
2000
Human Development and Psychology
Harvard University Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA
Ed.D.
2004
Human Development and Psychology

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

2006 – present  Assistant Professor, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX
2004-2006  Senior Analyst, Abt Associates, Cambridge, MA
2001-2004  Spencer Research Training Grantee, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA
2000-2003  Teaching Fellow, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA
2000-2002  Research Assistant, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

American Educational Research Association
International Reading Association
Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness
Society for the Scientific Study of Reading
Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

Honors

2007-2010  Mexican-American Latino Research Center Fellow
2007 Institute for Education Sciences (IES) Training Institute Fellow
2006-2009 Mexican-American Latino Research Center Fellow
2001-2004 Spencer Foundation Research Training Grant
2001 Model Qualifying Paper Proposal
2000-2001 Alternate, U. S. Department of Education Graduate Bilingual Fellowship
1999-2000 Roy E. Larsen Fellowship
1987-1991 Marie L. Rose Huguenot Scholarship
1990 Ford Foundation Summer Linguistic Research Grant

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

EDCI 650: The Bilingual/Multicultural Child in Family and Culture (Fall 2006, 2007, 2009)
EDCI 689: Education Policy for Language-Minority Students (Spring 2007, Fall 2008)
EDCI 614: ESL in International and Intercultural Contexts (Fall 2007, 2009)
EDCI 689: Cognitive Development in Young Learners (Spring 2008)
EDCI 602: Cultural Foundations of Education (Spring 2009)
INST 332: Second Language Instruction and Assessment (Spring 2009)

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Peer-Reviewed Articles (*denotes graduate students)


Presentations (*denotes graduate students)

International


National


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)

# Karla Eidson

## Biographical Sketch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION TITLE</th>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karla Eidson</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University, College Station, TX</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Dec. 2009</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University, College Station, TX</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University, College Station, TX</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. Positions and Honors.

#### Positions and Employment

- Lecturer, Texas A&M University –College Station, Texas
  
  2002-present

- Therapist, Language Learning Center, Inc. Scottish Rite Division, College Station, Texas
  
  2005-2008

- Private Tutor for Special Needs Students, College Station, Texas
  
  1994-1998

- Classroom Teacher, College Station Independent School District, College Station, Texas
  
  1991-1994

- Classroom Teacher, North East Independent School District, San Antonio, Texas
  
  1989-1991
Grant Writer, City of San Antonio, Texas
1989

**Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)**

Summer 2010- Study Abroad Faculty Costa Rica
Summer 2008 – Study Abroad Faculty Santa Chiara Study Center

2009 - Co- Principal Investigator: Director of the Center for International Outreach and the European Union Center for Excellence Getting to Know Europe Grant: Collaboration between EUC and the Teaching Learning and Culture Department.

Course Development Grant: Information Network for the Alternative Certification of Teachers (INACT)

Selected to participate in the INACT grant writing online courses for Texas A&M University at Tarleton (Stephenville) and Corsicana.

**Honors**


EXPLORE Conference Panel Member, Texas A&M University: Address Incoming Freshman Class in Keynote Presentation (2006)
Fish Camp Namesake – Camp Eidson 2002 – Texas A&M University

**B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)**

Social Studies Methods in the Middle Grades

Organization, Motivation, and Management in Middle Grades Classrooms

Curriculum and Instruction for Middle Grades Curriculum

Social Studies and the Humanities in the Elementary School

Organization, Motivation and Management in Early Childhood Education

Assessment in Reading Instruction in Early Childhood Education

Reading and Writing across the Middle Grades Curriculum

Reading/Language Arts Methods in Middle Grades Education
Assessment in Reading Instruction in Middle Grades

Teaching Reading Through Children's Literature

Multicultural and Interdisciplinary Literature for Middle Grades

Reading/Language Arts Methods in Early Childhood Education

Content Reading in the Middle Grades

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Presentations

Eidson, K. (March 2009). “Using online assessment of student learning and development to facilitate an effective study abroad program: A Reflection of the Results.” College Station, TX: Annual Assessment Conference (AAC).

Eidson, K. and Cassell, E. (February 2008). “Using online assessment of student learning and development to facilitate an effective study abroad program.” College Station, TX: Annual Assessment Conference (AAC).


“Making History Come Alive: Telling Stories and Developing Documentaries.” (September 2008). Eidson, K., Social Studies Specialist: Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture, TAMU (Keynote at Elementary Level Master Teacher Series sponsored by the Office of International Outreach, Texas A&M University, George Bush School, College Station, TX)

“Unpacking the Past: Using Artifact Trunks and Ethnographies to Make History Real.” (July 2008). Eidson, K., Social Studies Specialist: Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture, TAMU (Keynote at Middle School Level Master Teacher Series sponsored by the Office of International Outreach, Texas A&M University, George Bush School, College Station, TX)

D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)
Brazos Valley Arts Council Committee Co-Chair – Special Olympics Art Exhibit – “Reflections of A Special Olympics Athlete” – 2007, 2008, 2009

Vice-President of Communications/Executive Board of Directors /Junior League of Bryan-College Station. Member 11 years:  8 years as Active Member,  3 years as Elected Officer.  Sustaining Member currently.

Parent Teacher Organization Board Member: Oakwood Intermediate School

Parent Teacher Organization Board Member: College Hills Elementary

Volunteers In Public Schools: A&M Consolidated High School

Parent Teacher Organization Board Member: A&M Consolidated Middle School

Habitat for Humanity:  Project Build leader

Habitat for Humanity:  Women’s Build Chairperson

Family Promise Network:  Overnight host coordinator for homeless family outreach
Barbara Erwin

Biographical Sketch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Erwin</td>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Elementary Education Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education, Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Reading, Language Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment
- Clinical Professor of Reading and Early Childhood Education, Texas A&M University (2006-present)
- Assistant Department Head for Undergraduate Programs, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, Texas A&M University (2001-2006)
- Founding Chair and Professor of Education, Department of Urban Education, University of Houston-Downtown (1995-2000)
- Executive Director of Teacher Education and Professor of English, College of Social Sciences, University of Houston-Downtown (1994-1995)
- Assistant and Associate Professor, University of Houston-Victoria (1989-1994)
- Assistant Professor of Education, Department of Education, Angelo State University (1985-1989)
- Supervisor of Language Arts, Kindergarten, and Bilingual Programs, Bryan Independent School District, (1979-1985)

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

Honors

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
• RDNG 351 (302), Reading in the Elementary School
• RDNG 467 (440), Language Arts Methods

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

**Presentations**


2008 Self, N. & Erwin, B.K. (2008 March). *Integrating creative instructional strategies and materials with standards in order to reach every child’s potential*. Session presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Childhood Education International, Atlanta, Georgia.


**D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)**

**PROPOSALS FOR EXTERNAL FUNDING**

2006 Verizon Early Literacy On-line Project, Verizon Foundation, to develop five on-line, early literacy modules for children in grades Pre-K through grade three, $94,340, Barbara Erwin and Trina Davis, Co-PIs.

2005 Bridges to Literacy, Verizon Foundation, to review, modify and implement appropriate reading materials in day care center in the Verizon service area, $29,150, William Rupley, PI, proposal written by Barbara Erwin.

2005 Literacy Modules for English Language Learners, to develop four on-line...
literacy models for middle-school age English Language Learners, $72,030, Zorah Eslami, Janet Hammer, Zamaris Diaz, Malt Joshi, Barbara Erwin, Co-PIs.

2004  Brighter Horizons in Early Literacy, to develop and implement a parent involvement program for parents of students in day care centers in the Verizon service area, $40,000. William Rupley, PI, proposal written by Barbara Erwin.

2003  TAMU Signature Program Initiative, Signature Program Classification – TLAC Undergraduate Program ($650,000), proposal written by Barbara Erwin.

2003  Verizon Scholars, to provide MRT training for teachers in the Verizon service area, $100,000, Malt Joshi, Mark Sadowski, Co-PIs, proposal written by Barbara Erwin.

2003  Brighter Horizons in Early Literacy, to provide training for day-care teachers in the Verizon service area in literacy instruction, $100,000 (second year funding), William Rupley, PI, proposal written by Barbara Erwin and William Rupley.

2002  Verizon Interactive Classroom, to provide infrastructure support, materials and equipment; $100,000, Jack Helfeldt, PI, proposal written by Barbara Erwin and Ben Smith.

2002  Brighter Horizons in Early Literacy, to provide training for day-care teachers in the Verizon service area in literacy instruction, $100,000 (first year funding), William Rupley, PI, proposal written by Barbara Erwin and William Rupley.
Zohreh R. Eslami

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
Zohreh R. Eslami

POSITION TITLE
Associate Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1987-1992</td>
<td>Second Language Acquisition and Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Columbia, Missouri-Columbia</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>1985-1987</td>
<td>English Language &amp; Lit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Columbia, Missouri-Columbia</td>
<td>B.E.S.</td>
<td>1979-1985</td>
<td>English Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

2008-Current  Associate Professor. Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture. Texas A&M University. College Station, Texas. Joint appointment in Liberal Arts Program at Texas A&M at Qatar.

2002-2008  Assistant Professor. Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture. Texas A&M University. College Station, Texas.

2007-2008  Coordinator, University of Qatar / TAMU Teacher Preparation Program

University of Qatar: Doha, Qatar

2006-2009  University of Qatar / TAMU Teacher Preparation Program

Courses Taught: ESL Methods: Primary Level
University of Qatar: Doha, Qatar

2000-2002  Assistant Professor. Department of English Language. Iran University of Science and Technology, Tehran, Iran
1997-1998  Executive Member for developing a Ph.D. Program in TESOL, Isfahan University, Isfahan, Iran

1994-2000  Assistant Professor. Faculty of Foreign Languages. Isfahan University, Isfahan, Iran


**Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)**

**Honors**

Member, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (2001-present)
Member, American Educational Research Association (2003-present)
Member, American Association of Applied Linguistics (2001-present)
Board Member, TEXTESOLIII (Region 3 of Texas TESOL) (2002-2005)
Member, TESOL Arabia (2004-present)
Historian, Phi Beta Delta Honor Society for International Scholars (2004-present)
Treasurer, Phi Delta Kappa International (2004-present)

**Honors/Awards**

Nominated for the Best Mentor Award Competition (2006), Texas A&M University
Nominated for Presidents’ Award for Service to International Students (2005), Texas A&M University
Appointed to Full Graduate Faculty Status (2004), Texas A&M University
Appointed to the Regents’ Initiative for Excellence in Education (2002), Texas A&M University
Academy for Educator Development; Regents’ Fellow, Texas A&M University
Appointed to Associate Graduate Faculty Status (2002), Texas A&M University

**B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)**

*Graduate*

EDCI 611 Teaching English as a Second Language
EDCI 614 ESL in International and Intercultural Context
EDCI 610 Second Language Assessment and Development
EDCI 645 Society and Education in World Perspective

*Undergraduate*

INST 332 Second Language Instruction and Assessment
C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).


**Book Chapters**


Dianne S. Goldsby

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
Dianne S. Goldsby

POSITION TITLE
Clinical Professor

NAME
Dianne S. Goldsby

POSITION TITLE
Clinical Professor

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION
Louisiana Tech University Ruston, LA
Louisiana State University Baton Rouge, LA
University of New Orleans New Orleans, LA

DEGREE (if applicable)

YEAR(s)

FIELD
1969
1974
1994
Mathematics Education
Mathematics Education
Curriculum and Instruction

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment
Clinical Assistant/Associate/Full Professor of Education Texas A&M
Assistant Professor/Associate Professor Iona College New Rochelle, NY
• Mathematics Consultant Rye Neck Free Union School District Mamaroneck, NY
Adjunct Instructor Manhattanville College Purchase, NY
• Adjunct Instructor Western Connecticut State University Danbury, CT
• Teacher/Mathematics Coordinator Ridgewood Preparatory School Metairie, LA

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)
Associate Editor, School Science and Math Journal (2006 – present)
Associate Editor, Focus on Mathematics Pedagogy and Content (2008-present) (A new online newsletter for teachers)
Reviewer for the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics journals, Teaching Children mathematics and Mathematics Teaching in the Middle School (2002 – present)
Member of the Van de Walle Advisory Council for Pearson Education to review the 7th edition of the Van de Walle Teaching Mathematics in the Elementary and Middle Schools. Indepth-review of chapter 2 of the new edition. (Fall 2007 – 2008)

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Associate Member)
Association of Teacher Educators Leadership Academy
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
Phi Delta Kappa
Kappa Delta Pi
School Math and Science Association
Southwest Educational Research Association

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
ECFB 420                  Elementary Science Methods
ECFB 440                  Elementary Mathematics Methods
EFB 412                     Elementary Mathematics Methods
MEFB 460                  Middle School Mathematics Methods
MASC 450                  Integrated Mathematics and Science
MEFB 351                  Introduction to the Middle School
EDCI 633                   Educator as Learner
EDCI 646                   Instructional Theory
EDCI 689                   Using Manipulatives for Performance Task Assessment in Mathematics

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Peer-Reviewed Articles

Presentations
Goldsby, D., Allen, D., Parker, D., & Kelly, L. (February 2004). Pre-service teacher perceptions of mathematics and science preparation, SERA Annual Conference, Dallas, TX \n
Goldsby, D. (March 23, 2004). Using manipulatives for effective instruction, Texas A&M University Bluebonnet Chapter ACEI meeting
Goldsby, D., Allen, D., Parker D., & Kelly, L. (May 2004). Educator perceptions of mathematics and science preparation, Academy of Educator Development Second Annual Conference, College Station, T
Goldsby, D. (November 2004). *Enhancing geometry communication skills through geometry draw*, NCTM Annual Southern Regional Conference, New Orleans, LA


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)

Grants

*Pre-calculus – Practices of Good Teaching through Content, Technology and Interaction*, $295,000 Teacher Quality Grant, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. Co-Director with Dr. G. Donald Allen. (2003-2004)

*Assuring Excellence in Pre-Calculus Instruction*, $79,993 amendment to the Pre-calculus – Practices of Good Teaching through Content, Technology and Interaction Teacher Quality Grant, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. Co-investigator with Dr. G. Donald Allen. (2004-2006)

*Assuring Excellence in Middle School Mathematics I Instruction*, Teacher Quality Grant from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board for $81,875, Co-Director and co-principal investigator with G. Donald Allen (2005-2006)

*Assuring Excellence in Algebra II Instruction*, Teacher Quality Grant from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board for $81,997, co-principal investigator with G. Donald Allen (2005-2006)

*Assuring Quality in Algebra II Instruction*, Teacher Quality Grant from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board for $84,990 co-principal investigator with G. Donald Allen (2006-2007)


*Undergraduates in Research Initiative*. (2006-2007). Awarded funds for an undergraduate research student. (was not able to find a student.)


Lori Graham

Biographical Sketch

NAME
Lori Graham

POSITION TITLE
Clinical Assistant Professor

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION | DEGREE (if applicable) | YEAR(s) | FIELD OF STUDY
---|---|---|---
Lamar University, Beaumont, Texas | B.S. | 1992 | Interdisciplinary Studies
Lamar University, Beaumont, Texas | M.Ed. | 1999 | Educational Administration
Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas | Ph.D. | 2007 | Curriculum & Instruction

A. Positions and Honors

Positions and Employment

August 2008-present
Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas
Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture
Clinical Assistant Professor

July 2006-May 2008
Lamar University, Beaumont, Texas
Instructor (July 2006 – August 2007)
Assistant Professor (August 2007-May 2008)
Graduate Faculty
CSP Coordinator: Collaborative School Partnership, Cardinal Buddies
Post-Baccalaureate Mentor for first-year teacher (PEDG 5383)
A&M Supervisor for eEducation Program-Vidor I.S.D.

June 2004-May 2006
Texas A&M University, College of Education
Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture
Harrington Tower MS 4232 College Station, TX 77843-4232
Graduate Research/Teaching Assistant/Instructor
Graduate Assistant: Lohman Learning Community for Dr. Cindy K. Boettcher (Spring 2006)
Instructor of undergraduate reading courses
Research Assistant-Teacher Quality Grant (Fall 2005)
P.I.’s: Dr. Deborah Simmons, Dr. William Rupley: A&M
Dr. Sharon Vaughn: University of Texas
Research Assistant & Coordinator for A&M:
(Spring & Summer 2005)
What Works and Why: University of Illinois, Chicago
P.I.’s Dr. Jim Pelligrino & Dr. Susan Goldman
Project Director: Dr. Bob Plants
Graduate Assistant: Lohman Learning Community-Dr. Cindy K. Boettcher (Fall 2004-Spring 2005)
Adjunct Instructor, Lamar University, Beaumont, TX (Fall 2004)
Supervision of student teachers: Lamar University and East Texas Baptist University; Mentoring of first year teacher: Stephen F. Austin State University, (Fall 2004-Spring 2005)

July 2001-May 2004  Lamar University, Beaumont, Texas
Director, Master Supervising Teacher Program
Instructor, Professional Pedagogy
Campus Coordinator, Novice Teacher Induction Program (NTIP, 2002-2003)

Director, Superkids, Lamar University (summer program);
Supervisor, Student Teachers (Spring 2000)

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

Texas A&M University Health Science Center
Office of Academic Affairs, College of Medicine, College Station, TX
June 2009-August 2009, Created Faculty Development Plan for the COM Round Rock Campus

Higher Education Collaborative, Presenter for Texas Reading First Institutes, June 2009, Houston, TX

Texas Reading First Higher Education Collaborative Peer Advisor, Fall 2009

Professional Memberships:
American Educational Research Association
Charter Member, Kappa Delta Pi, Lamar University; Mu Chi Chapter-Texas A&M University
International Dyslexia Association
International Reading Association
National Council of Teachers of English
Society for the Scientific Studies of Reading

Offices Held:
Texas A&M Representative for the College and Career Readiness Initiative (CCRI), 2009
Member, Advisory Council CCRI, 2009; Interview Committee, CCRI, 2009

Member, Advisory Board –International Reading Association Brazos River Chapter Council, 2008-2009

Board Member, Ubi Caritas, Beaumont, TX, 2007

Secretary, Brazos Valley International Dyslexia Association, Spring 2006 and Publicity Co-Chair, Fall 2006 & Spring 2007

Honors
2009  Received Student Led Award for Teaching Excellence (SLATE), Texas A&M University, Spring 2009
2009  Nominated to serve on Proclamation 2010 Textbook Review Panels
2008  Nominated for Outstanding Dissertation Award – College of Education, Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture
2007  Educational Research Exchange, Texas A&M University
      College Station, Texas
Outstanding Faculty-Student Poster, January 26, 2007

2006 Nominated for Graduate Student Teaching in Excellence Award by the College of Education and Human Development, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture

2006 SERA Travel Award

2005 Student Research Association, Texas A&M University

2nd place in student research:
“The root of literacy problems in elementary schools: Teachers' knowledge and textbook information”

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

2008-present: Texas A&M
RDNG 361 Reading Assessment; RDNG 411 Language and Literacy

2004-2008: Texas A&M
TEFB 273 Schools & Society; RDNG 302 Children’s Literature; RDNG 411 Language and Literacy

Lamar University
READ 3390 Reading in the Elementary School; READ 3393 Emergent Literacy; READ 4310 Diagnostic/Prescriptive Procedures for Teaching Reading; PEDG 4340 Classroom Management

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Books:

Book Chapters


Peer-Reviewed Articles


Presentations
Graham, L., Washburn, E., Boulware-Gooden, R., Joshi, R., & Binks, E. (accepted for presentation November 12, 2009). The Essential Components of Reading Instruction: If Teachers Knew,
Orlando, Florida.

Hairrell, A., Simmons, D., Rupley, W., & Graham, L. (2009, April). The State of Vocabulary
Association. San Diego, California.

Acquisition and Maintenance of Vocabulary: Exploring Content Areas for All Learners.

Graham, L. & Hairrell, A. (2008, April-Invited presentation) Strategies to Enhance Acquisition and
Maintenance of Vocabulary in the Content Areas. Presentation for the International
Dyslexia Association-Houston Branch 2008 Annual Conference.

Words: Volumes of Vocabulary in Social Studies and Science. Poster presented at the
International Dyslexia Association Conference, Dallas, Texas.

Vocabulary Learning in the Content Areas. Presentation at the International Dyslexia
Association Conference, Dallas, Texas.

Graham, L. (2007, February) From Research to Practice: Make It STICK-Strategies To Implement
Content Knowledge. Paper presented at the Southwest Educational Research Association
Conference, San Antonio, Texas.

Roadblocks to Reading Acquisition: Is Teacher Knowledge One of Them? Paper
presented at the Society of the Scientific Study of Reading, Vancouver, British Columbia.

Success. Poster presentation at the American Educational Research Association, San
Francisco, California.

Teachers’ Knowledge of Basic Language Constructs: Where Does It Come From? Paper
presented at the International Dyslexia Association Conference, Denver, Colorado.

D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)
Library Volunteer, Round Rock Elementary School for the school year 2009-2010; 2 hours per
week
Study Abroad program-met with school officials in England, September 2008 for Texas A&M
University
Presentation for Junior II and Senior Methods on Professionalism, December 2008, May 2009 &
scheduled for December 2009, Texas A&M University
Served with a committee preparing curriculum for prisoners in the prison system in Jefferson
County, TX; used literature and generated test questions for specific books, Spring 2008,
Lamar University
Mentored professors taking over the Collaborative School Partnership at Lamar University, Spring
and Fall, 2008
Janet Hammer

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
Janet Hammer

POSITION TITLE
Clinical Associate Professor

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION
The University of North Texas
Texas Woman’s University
University or St. Thomas
The University of Texas at Austin

DEGREE
BS
M.Ed.
Ph.D.

YEAR(s)
1984
1988
1993
2003

FIELD OF STUDY
Elementary education & History
Gifted education
English as a Second Language
Curriculum & Instruction

A. Positions and Employment

Texas A&M University College Station, TX
Clinical Assistant Professor, September 2004-August 2009
Clinical Associate Professor, September 2009 – present

Coordinator of TLAC Middle Grades Program

Professional Memberships

Kappa Delta Pi
Phi Delta Kappa
Delta Kappa Gamma
TESOL – Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages
National Council for the Social Studies
Texas Council for the Social Studies
American Educational Research Association

Honors

Association of Former Students College-Level Distinguished Achievement Award for Teaching, 2009
B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

MEFB 450 - Social Studies Methods for the Middle Grades
MEFB 352 - Curriculum and Instruction for the Middle Grades
INST 463 (334) – Second Language Methodology: ESL/Bilingual
INST 462 (332) – Language Acquisition and Development
EDCI 611 – Teaching English as a Second Language
ECFB 430 – Organization, Motivation, and Management in Early Childhood Education
INST 322 – Foundations of Education in a Multicultural Society
EDCI 489 – Special Topics in Multicultural Children’s Literature
EDCI 485 – Independent Study (conducted in conjunction with active field experiences at Dante Middle School in Castiglion Fiorentino, Italy)
TEED 302 – Teaching / Learning Processes: Psychological Perspectives on Education
EDCI 689 – Classroom Management
RDNG 491 – Research Field-based Study Abroad
EDCI 646 – Instructional Theory

Study Abroad Experience:

Spring, 2008 - taught and co-supervised per-service teachers during a study-abroad semester in Castiglion Fiorentino, Italy. The program included a substantial field experience where the pre-service teachers taught 6th through 8th grade English as foreign language (EFL) students in Dante Scuola Media.

Spring, 2009 – co-led pre-service teachers during a study abroad field trip in Poland and the Czech Republic in conjunction with a study of Holocaust literature.

Summer, 2009 – taught and co-e-supervised pre-service teachers during a study abroad in England and Switzerland. The program included field experience where the pre-service teachers taught pre-k through 8th grade students in the International Schools of Zug and Luzern.

C. Selected publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Articles

**Presentations**


Hammer, J. “The Effects of Immigration on Education” Wiley Lecture Series, Memorial Students Center, Texas A&M University, College Station, February 4, 2009


Hammer, J. “Population Connection” Texas Middle School Association, Ft. Worth, TX, 2007.


Hammer, J. “Methods and Tools for Assessing English Language Learners in the Main Stream Classroom” Texas Middle School Association, Corpus Christi, TX, 2005.

D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)

A&M Collaborative Advisory Board, ”TAMU Educator Preparation Collaborative for Enhancing College and Career Readiness in Texas”, Co-PIs, Dennie Smith, Jackie Stillisano, & Larry Kelly. - $500,000 – Texas Education Agency.

Co-PI for China: The Place and the People” - $83,000 – Fulbright Hay Group Projects Abroad. This grant will fund social studies teachers and Chinese language teachers on a trip to China.

Co-PI for “Teaching in Europe – European in Teaching “ - $13,139 - European Union Center of Excellence. Money used to bring European educators to Texas A&M University to present workshops to pre-service teachers and faculty members on European curriculum and teaching.

PI for “An Italian Experience” an International Curriculum Development Grant - $1,500 - Office for Research and International Programs Office. Materials to support pre-service teachers when teaching English as Foreign Language students in Dante Middle School in Castigleon Fiorentino, Italy.

Co-PI for “Interactive Science for the English Language Learner” -$ 10,000 - MALRC. Teaching math and science content to diminish the gap between mainstream students and English language learners on high stakes tests.

Co-PI for “Verizon Bridge to Literacy” -$100,000 - Verizon. On-line modules for teaching English literacy to English Language Learners.
Jack Helfeldt

Biographical Sketch

NAME
John P. Helfeldt

POSITION TITLE
Professor

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUNY College at Fredonia</td>
<td>B. A.</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY College at Fredonia</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Reading/Elem. Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>Ph. D.</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Reading Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Childhood Ed. Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Positions and Honors.

**Positions and Employment (last 20 yrs)**

**Director**, Teacher Internship & Induction Program, 2003 - present
College of Education, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX

**Department Head**, Professor, Teaching, Learning And Culture, 1999-2003
College of Education, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR

**Area Head**, Professor, Curriculum and Instruction, 1988-1992
College of Education, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL

**Program Chair**, Elementary & Early Childhood Education, 1990-1992

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

Honors
E. Courses Taught (Last 5 Years)
EDCI 638 Trends in Curriculum & Instruction – PICA Evaluations - 4.84/5.0
EDCI 673 Analysis of Teaching - PICA Evaluations – 4.77/5.0, 4.62/5.0
EDCI 684 Professional Internship - PICA Evaluations - 4.67/5.0, 4.39/5.0, 4.73/5.0, & N/A – small N
EDCI 689 Disciplinary Knowledge & Research in C&I – PICA Evaluation 4.74/5.0
EDCI 690 Theory of C&I Research PICA Evaluation – 4.84/5.0
RDNG 616 Organizing and Administering Reading Programs - PICA Evaluations - 4.86/5.00,4.91/5.0, 4.5/5.0, 4.95/5.0, 4.99/5.0
RDNG 649 Reading in High School & College - PICA Evaluations - 4.78/5.00, 4.13/5.0, 2.1/5.0, 4.19/5.0, 4.23/5.0
RDNG 465 Reading in Middle & Secondary Grades – PICA Evaluations – 4.23/5.0, 4.19/5.0, 4.66/5.0

F. Graduate Student Advising (Last 5 Years)
Chair: 2 Ph.D. Students who graduated
Committee Member: 8 Ph.D. Students who graduated
Chair: 2 M. Ed. Students who graduated
Committee Member: 9 Students who graduated

G. Selected peer-reviewed publications and presentations (Selected from last 5 years).

Book Chapters

Peer-Reviewed Articles


**Presentations**


**Helfeldt, J.,** & Helfeldt B. (May, 2005) *Adapting Research-Based Strategies and Applying Assistive Technology: Direct Pathways for Teaching Literacy to English Language Learners.* Poster co-presented at IRA Annual Convention, San Antonio, TX.

**H. Grants/Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5 Years)**

**Out Reach Grants**
P I - International Reading Association – Start Up Grant to establish the Brazos River Reading Council (local affiliate reading council) 2009.

Co P I – Texas A&M University System – Intra system Cooperation Contract between TAMU and TAMIU (Laredo) to provide support and coordination for doctoral cohort planning and implementation, 2006 – 2010, Dennie Smith P I.
Valerie Hill-Jackson

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Clinical Associate Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valerie Hill-Jackson</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rowan University</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Conservation and Environmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph’s University Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Doctor of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. Positions and Honors.**

- **2004 - Present**  Clinical Associate Professor of Teacher Education Department of Teaching Learning and Culture, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX
- **2003-2004**  Adjunct Professor, Science Department, Gloucester County College, Sewell, NJ
- **2001-2002**  Program Director / P.I. Math / Science Upward Bound Program Temple University, Philadelphia, PA
- **1999-2000**  Project Coordinator Psychology Dept. Rutgers University Camden, NJ
- **1996-1999**  Science Teacher and Department Chair Camden Board of Education, Camden, NJ
- **1993-1994**  Environmental Chemist, Remtech Environmental Group Camden, NJ

**Honors**

- Texas A&M University College-Level Association of Former Students Distinguished Achievement Award for Teaching  2008
- Texas A&M University Transfer Camp (T-Camp) Namesake  2008
- Time Inc. / Maybelline *Women Who Empower Through Education* Service / Teaching Award  2007
- Texas A&M University / College of Education and Human Development Research Grant  $4,754  2009
External Review

Time Inc. Empowerment Through Education National Award & Grant for Mentoring Pre-service Teachers & Creating College Readiness Programs

$10k 2007

HUD / Lead Poisoning Community Outreach Grant Evaluator

$2 mil '04 – '06

Math & Science Upward Bound TRIO Grant PI & Director

$1 mil '00 – '02

AERA/Spencer Fellowship

$20 k '01 – ‘02

Geraldine R. Dodge Outstanding New Teacher Award & Fellowship

‘97

Mc Donald’s Classroom Grant

‘99

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

INST 322  Multicultural Education

TEED302  The Teaching & Learning Process

EDCI 644  Curriculum Development

EDCI 643  Teaching in Urban Environments

EDCI 689  Transformative School Contexts & Communities

EDCI 646  Instructional Theory

EDCI 602  Cultural Foundations

EDCI 689  Urban Schools & Communities

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Books


Book Chapters


Peer-Reviewed Articles


Bonner, F., Lewis, C., Bowman-Perrott, L., Hill-Jackson, V. & *James, M. (in press). Definition, identification, identity and culture: A unique alchemy impacting the


**Presentations - International and National**


* = With students

**D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)**

- Chair of Committee for Online Learning and Evaluation; TLAC/TAMU
- 2006-2009 *Co-founder of the Barnabas Outreach Foundation – A college readiness and scholarship organization*
- *Scholarly Partnerships Edu* - Editorial Reviewer
- Coalition for Environmentally Safe Communities – Advisory Board
- Association for Teacher Educators (ATE) – National Commission Member for Preparing Teachers for Diverse Communities
- Evaluator for pending HUD Education and Outreach Project: HUD-424-CBW
CURRICULUM VITAE

TERESA JIMAREZ

Business Address: Teaching, Learning and Culture 348 Harrington Tower; College of Education & Human Development TX. A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-4232 (979) 862-3579 (Office); (979) 845-9663 (FAX); (915) 241-2159 (Cell)

E-Mail: t-jimarez@tamu.edu

Ph.D. Curriculum & Instruction in Science Education, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM
M.Ed. Science Education, Gannon University, Erie, PA.
B.S Science, University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX.

Texas. Mid-management Certification in School Administration, 1994
Texas Endorsement in English as a Second Language Instruction, 1992
Texas Secondary Science Composite Certification, 6-12, 1984

EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES

Texas A&M University
2006 – Present Clinical Assistant Professor, Middle Childhood Education Program. Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, College of Education, College Station, TX.

University of Arkansas
2005-2006 Assistant Professor, Field placement & Assessment Coordinator, Teacher Education, Little Rock AR.

University of Texas at El Paso
2001-2005 Lecturer and Advisor, College of Science-College of Education, University College, Circles program & Teacher education program, El Paso, TX.
Harvard University
1999-2000 Physical Science Curriculum Specialist --Sabbatical, Science Education Department, Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics,
http://www.project2061.org/meetings/technology/tech2/schwartz-sadler Cambridge, MA.
1996-1999 Science Educator-Project DESIGNS, Doable Engineering Science Investigations
Geared for Non-science Students, Summer Institutes, Science Education Department, Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Cambridge, MA.

2009 Co-Pilot study abroad-Mexico City. Sponsored by the Undergraduate Experience Office, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas.
2007-2008 Pilot Instructor for the Video cases for Science Teaching Analysis, Lesson Lab Research Institute, Santa Monica, California
2007-2008 Co-PI of the “Interactive Science for English Language Learners Grant. Develop an interactive
metric system kit for Middle School ELL students. Mexican-American and U.S. Latino Research Center, MARLAC grant. Texas A & M University, College Station, TX.
Science Education Department, Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

2007-2010 Seed Grant from the Mexican-American and U.S. Latino Research Center, MARLAC. Texas A & M University, College Station, TX.

Memberships
Member, American Educational Research Association (AERA), 2006-present
Member, National Association of Research in Science Teaching (NARST), 2006-present

PROFESSIONAL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Member, Committee on Equity & Ethics, National Association in Research in Science Teaching (NARST), 2009
Member, Committee on Research in Science Education for the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA), 2005-2007
Point of Contact, National Science Teacher Association (NSTA), Coronado High School, El Paso Independent
School District, 1997-1999

PUBLICATIONS

REFEREED ARTICLES/ REFEREED CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

National


BOOK/BOOK CHAPTERS


PAPERS AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS (Submitted)

National


Jimarez, T. (March, 2007). Enhance Reflective Journaling Practices of Pre-service Teachers” paper presented at the National Science Teachers Association Conference, St. Louis, MO.

State

Teaching, Learning and Culture
External Review

Local
Jimarez, (October, 2007). Does alignment of Constructivist Teaching, Curriculum, and Assessment Strategies promote meaningful learning? Paper presented at the science education group, Texas A & M University, College Station, TX.
Jimarez, (January, 2007). Does alignment of Constructivist Teaching, Curriculum, and Assessment Strategies promote meaningful learning? Poster presented at the Educational Research Conference, Texas A & M University, College Station, TX.

SCIENCE EDUCATION PRESENTATIONS
Jimarez, T. (March, 2007). Use Student Discourse and Writing Samples to Assess Student Learning of Physical Science Concepts. Workshop presentation, National Science Teachers Association, St. Louis, MO.

AWARDS
Outstanding faculty poster, Educational Research Exchange, January 2007
MALRC Fellow, Mexican-American and U.S. Latino Research Center, TX. A & M University, 2007-2010
Conference for the Advancement of Science Teaching, CAST 2002
Outstanding Teacher, Tandy Technology Scholars, TX. Christian University, 1997-1998
## R. Malatesha Joshi

### BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>POSITION TITLE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Malatesha Joshi</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mysore University, India</td>
<td>B. Sc.</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Chemistry, minor in Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana St. University</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>Ph. D.</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Reading Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minors: Psychology and Educational Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. Positions and Honors.

#### Positions and Employment
- **2000-present**, Professor of Reading/Language Arts Education, ESL, and Educational Psychology, Texas A&M University
- **1990-2000**, Associate Professor, Professor of Curriculum & Instruction, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma
- **1983-1990**, Associate Professor of Reading, Fayetteville State University, North Carolina
- **1978-82**, Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations & Reading, Oregon State University, Corvallis
- **1976-78**, Assistant Professor of Education and Special Education, Idaho State University, Pocatello

#### Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)
- Director of Reading Program, 1993-95, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma
- Co-Coordinator, Reading Program, Texas A & M University, 2008-
- Member, *Scientific Committee, World Congress on Dyslexia, Greece, Sept. 1997; August 2004*
- Director-at-large, International Dyslexia Association, 2001-present; Secretary, 2003-2006; Conference co-chair, 2004-2006
- Member, *Organizing Committee, Multilingualism & Dyslexia Conference, Cyprus, July 2005*
- Member, Expert Panel on Early Grade Reading Assessment, World Bank, USAID, RTI, 2006, 2008
- Program Evaluator, Ph.D. in Literacy Studies, Tennessee Board of Regents, Fall 2006
- Member, International Organizing Committee, International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development, Zambia, 2010

### Professional Memberships:

*Teaching, Learning and Culture*
Teaching, Learning and Culture

External Review

Fellow, International Academy for Research in Learning Disabilities
Fellow, Academia Rodimensis Pro Remediatione
Society for the Scientific Study of Reading
International Reading Association
National Reading Conference
International Dyslexia Association
American Educational Research Association

Honors
Outstanding University Professor, International Multisensory Language Education Council, 2004
Mexican American and U.S. Latino Research Center (MALRC) Fellow, 2005-
Erasmus Mundus Visiting Scholar European Masters in Clinical Linguistics, Universiteit
Potsdam, 2009 (only 3 candidates were selected from non-EU nations)

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
RDNG 411: Language and Reading
RDNG 674: Developmental Reading
RDNG 614: Reading Research and Trends
RDNG 620: Literacy and Language (also taught as EDCI 689 for three years)
RDNG 642: Clinic Teaching in Reading
EDCI 610: Second Language Assessment and Development
EDCI 611: Teaching English as a Second Language
EDCI 690: Proposal Writing
EDCI 689: Culture, Cognition, and Literacy

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Books

Book Chapters


**Peer-Reviewed Articles**


Joshi, R.M., Binks, E., Graham, L., Dean, E., Smith, D., Boulware-Gooden, R. (2009). Do textbooks used in university reading education courses conform to the instructional


**Presentations – last three years**


Joshi, R.M. (2009, September). *Language and Literacy: The Obligation of the Schools of Education (with apologies to Isabelle Liberman).* Haskins Laboratories, Yale University, New Haven, CT.


**D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)**

Co-Principal Investigator, MRT Program, Verizon, 2005-2007, ($100,000.00)

Glasscock Center for Humanities Research (7,500.00), 2004-present

Mexican American and U.S. Latino Research Center (MALRC), (12,000.00) 2005-2006

Key Investigator, Investigation and impact of education for a new era classroom and school: Processes on Student Outcomes, Qatar National Priorities Research Program, 2008-2010, ($750,000.00 – direct costs).
Larry Kelly

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
Larry Joe Kelly

POSITION TITLE
Clinical Associate Professor

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION | DEGREE (if applicable) | YEAR(s) | FIELD OF STUDY
---|---|---|---
Abilene Christian College, Abilene, TX | B.S. | 1968 | Agriculture Business
Sul Ross State University, Alpine, TX | M.Ed. | 1997 | C&I Secondary Education
The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX | Ph.D. | 2002 | C&I

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

Director Secondary Graduate Certification Program, Texas A&M University
Director M.Ed. On-Line Program, Texas A&M University
Director Accelerate On-Line Secondary Certification
Clinical Associate Professor, Texas A&M 2007 - Present
Clinical Assistant Professor, Texas A&M, 2002 –2007

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum History</td>
<td>Associate Editor</td>
<td>Spring 08-present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>Fall 06 - present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate By-Laws Committee</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Fall 08 - present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Council</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Fall 08 - present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans Library Council</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Fall 07 - present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University EIS Portal Committee</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Fall 07 - present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Scholarship Committee: Dependent Children of Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Fall 06 - present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad Fellowship Scholarship Application Reviewer</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Fall 08 - present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University AFS Distinguished Achievement Awards</td>
<td>Chair Sub-Committee</td>
<td>Spring 08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Scholarship Committee</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Spring 08 - present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kappa Delta Pi International Honor Society Mu Chi Chapter  
Associate Counselor  
Fall 08 - present

Honors

2003  Goldsby, Diane; Kelly, Larry; Parker, Dawn; Allen, Donald; and Dewald, Dawn: Regent’s Initiative Fellowship and Collaborative Award, An In-Depth Look at Pre-Service Teachers’ and Administrators’ Perception of Teacher Preparation.

2003  Fellow, Texas A&M Regents System Academy for Educator Development.

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

EDCI 638: Trends in Curriculum and Instruction
TEED 602: Contemporary Perspectives on Education
TEED 649: Instructional Methods
TEED 682: Seminar
TEED 684: Professional Internship
TEED 302: Teaching/Learning Processes: Psychological Perspectives

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Presentations


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)

2009-Present  Co-Principal Investigator, TAMU Educator Preparation Collaborative for Enhancing College and Career Readiness in Texas Schools, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, $499,738.00.

2004-2007  Principal Investigator, Transition to Teaching Program, Department of Education, $70,600.00.
Douglas A. Koebernick

Biographical Sketch

NAME
Douglas A. Koebernick

POSITION TITLE
Assistant Lecturer

EDUCATION/TRAINING (Begin with baccalaureate or other initial professional education)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, Texas</td>
<td>BBA</td>
<td>May 1969</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas Pan American</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>May 1975</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

2004-Present - Assistant Lecturer
Texas A&M University, Department of Teaching Learning and Culture,
College Station, Texas

1994-2001 - Superintendent of Schools
Cameron Independent School District
Jasper Independent School District
Odem-Edroy Independent School District

1984-1992 - Assistant Superintendent of Schools
Magnolia Independent School District

1977-1984 - Principal
Robstown Independent School District
Weslaco Independent School District

1969-1974 - Teacher - Mathematics
Weslaco Independent School District

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

2009 - Faculty advisor, Texas State Teachers Association-Student Program
Honors

I. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
   TEFB 273: Introduction to Culture, Community, Society and Schools

J. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Books

Book Chapters

Peer-Reviewed Articles

Presentations

K. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)
Gerald Kulm

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION | DEGREE | YEAR(s) | FIELD OF STUDY
--- | --- | --- | ---
Washington State University | BA | 1963 | Mathematics
Cornell University | MAT | 1967 | Mathematics
Columbia University Teachers College | MAT | 1971 | Mathematics Education

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment
Curtis D. Robert Professor, Mathematics Education, 1999 - present
Texas A&M University, College Station, TX
Program Director, Mathematics Education, 1996 - 1999
Project 2061-American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, DC
Professor, Mathematics Education, 1990 – 1994
Texas A&M University, College Station, TX
Associate Program Director, 1986 - 1988
American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, DC
Associate Professor, 1982-84
University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY
Assistant Professor, 1971-1976; Associate Professor, 1977-1982
Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN
Mathematics Teacher
Horace Greeley High School, Chappaqua, New York, 1968 - 1970
Sheldon High School, Eugene, Oregon, 1964 - 1966
Boise High School, Boise, Idaho, 1963 - 1964
Guided Missile Petty Officer 2nd Class
United States Navy, 1956 – 1959

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)
Editor, School Science and Mathematics journal, 2006-present
Member
Mathematics Technical Advisory Committee, National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2005-present.
Member, National Advisory Committee for the National Voluntary 8th Grade Mathematics Test, 1997.


Series Editor, Assessment and Evaluation, AAAS Press, American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1991-93.


Member, National Advisory Board, Bell Atlantic-AAAS Institute, American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1991-93

Member, State Textbook Subject Area Committee for Mathematics, Texas Education Agency, 1991.

Member, Board of Directors, Trinity-Brazos River Valley Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1992-94.

**Honors**

Curtis D. Robert Endowed Chair Professorship in Mathematics Education, Texas A&M University.

Outstanding Teacher, Department of Education, Purdue University, 1982.

Alexander von Humboldt Fellow, University of Bielefeld, West Germany, 1977-1978.


NSF Academic Year Institute Fellow, Cornell University, 1966-1967.

**E. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)**

EDCI 691 Research

EDCI 689 Mathematics Knowledge for Teaching

EDCI 622 Theories of Teaching and Learning in Mathematics

MASC 351 Problem Solving

**F. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).**

*With Students

**Books**


**Book Chapters**


**Peer-Reviewed Articles**


**Presentations**


**G. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)**


Pathways Fellowship. Texas A&M University, (G. Kulm, Advisor; Leslie Woodard, Student). $25,000, 2004-08.

Improving Mathematics Teaching and Achievement through Professional Development, NSF-IERI, (G. Nelson, G. Kulm, J. Manon, Co-PIs), $5,823,988, 2001-200
Patricia J. Larke

Biographical Sketch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION TITLE/ FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia J. Larke</td>
<td>Professor - Multicultural Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina State University, Orangeburg, SC</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina State University, Orangeburg, SC</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri –Columbia, Columbia, MO</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Education Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

2004 – Present Professor, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture
1999-2003 Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction (tenured 1992)
1998-1999 Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction
1992-1999 Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction
1986-1992 Lecturer, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction
1985-1986 Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction
1984-1985 Lecturer, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

President, Texas National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME) Chapter, 2005-2006
President Elect, Texas NAME Chapter, 2004-2005
Member, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education Board of Examiners, 1997-2008
Institutional Representative, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1994-2006
Board Member, National Association for Multicultural Education, 2000-2003; Regional Director for Region Six, 2000-2003
Co-Editor, Journal of Texas Alliance of Black School Educators, 2007-2010
Editorial Board, Urban Education, 2003-present

Honors

Fulbright-Hayes Scholar, China, June 1-30, 2005
G. Pritch Smith Multicultural Educator Award, National Association for Multicultural Education, October 2004
Multicultural Award, National Association for Multicultural Education, November 2003
Extraordinary Service Award, College of Education Development Council. Texas A&M University, September 1997

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
   Graduate:
   EDCI 602 - Cultural Foundations
   EDCI 642 - Multicultural Education: Research, Theory and Practice
   EDCI 677- Strategies for Teaching in a Culturally Pluralistic Society
   EDCI 647 - Curriculum Theory
   EDCI 689 - Disciplinary Knowledge and Research in Curriculum and Instruction

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Books

Book Chapters

Peer-Reviewed Articles


http://www.hiceducation.org/proceedings_edu.htm


**Presentations**


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)
Reviewer, Educational Administration Quarterly, 2009
Culturally Responsive Teaching in Higher Education. Texas State University’s Multicultural Curriculum Institute. San Marcos, TX., 2005-Present

Women Empowerment Workshops for Washington County Community


Biographical Sketch

**NAME**

Chance W. Lewis

**POSITION TITLE**

Associate Professor and Endowed Chair in Urban Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Business Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Education Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Education Leadership/Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

**Positions and Employment**

2006 – Present  
Associate Professor of Urban Education, Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture, College of Education, Texas A&M University

2001 – 2006  
Assistant Professor of Teacher Education, School of Education, Colorado State University

**Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)**

2009 – Present  
Co-Director, Center for Urban School Partnerships, College of Education, Texas A&M University

2006 – Present  
Deputy Director of Research, Center for African American Research & Policy, University of Wisconsin-Madison

**Honors**

2009 – Present  
Houston Endowment Inc., Endowed Chair in Urban Education, College of Education, Texas A&M University

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

EDCI646 – Instructional Theory
EDCI643 – Strategies for Teaching in Urban Environments
EDCI689 – Urban Education: Policy & Analysis

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).
**Books**


**Book Chapters**

**Lewis, C.** & Hill-Jackson, V. (in press). This is our moment: Contemplating the urgency of now for the future of teacher education. In V. Hill-Jackson & C. Lewis (Eds.), *Transforming teacher education: What went wrong and how we can fix teacher education.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.


**Peer-Reviewed Articles**


**Presentations**


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)


Yeping Li

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME

Yeping Li

POSITION TITLE

Associate Professor

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION

DEGREE (if applicable)

YEAR(s)

FIELD OF STUDY

University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

Ph.D.

1999

Cognitive Studies in Education

Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China

M.S.

1991

Mathematics Education

Hangzhou Normal University, Hangzhou, China

B.S.

1984

Mathematics

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

2006 -    Associate Professor, Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture, Texas

A&M University, College Station, TX

1999 – 2005  Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics & Statistics, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH

1994 – 1999  Research Assistant, Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA

1992 – 1994  Graduate Assistant, College of Education, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI

1991 – 1992  Assistant Department Head for Teaching, Department of Mathematics, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China

1991 – 1992  Assistant Professor, Department of Mathematics, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China

1984 – 1988  Mathematics Teacher, YanZhou Secondary School, Zhejiang, China

Other Experience (selected)

Member, American Educational Research Association (AERA)

Member, Special Interest Group for Research in Mathematics Education (SIG/RME, AERA)

Member, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)

Member, School Science and Mathematics Association (SSMA)

Member, International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education (PME)

Member, North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education (PME-NA)
Member, GK-12 program grant review panel, National Science Foundation, 2007
Associate Editor, School Science and Mathematics, School Science and Mathematics Association, USA, June 2006-present
Member, Steering Committee, International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education-North American Chapter, 07/2008 – present

Honors (selected recently)
Invited Speaker at The Teacher Development Continuum in the United States and China, invited by U.S. National Commission on Mathematics Instruction, Newport Beach, CA. 2009.
Co-Chair, the Organization Team for Discussion Group 4 (DG4: Reconceptualizing the mathematics curriculum) at the 11th International Congress on Mathematical Education, Monterrey, Mexico, January – July 2008.

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
MASC 450 Integrated Mathematics
EDCI 621 Teaching and Learning Space, Dimension and Measure Concepts
EDCI 622 Theories of Learning and Teaching in Mathematics
EDCI 627 Teaching and Learning Statistics and Uncertainty Concepts
EDCI 685 Directed studies
EDCI 689 Culture and Cognition
EDCI 689 Curriculum Research in Mathematics Education
EDCI 690 Theory of Curriculum and Instruction Research
EDCI 691 Research

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).
Books (since 2009)

Book Chapters (selected since 2008)


**Peer-Reviewed Articles (just 2009)**


Support (since coming to TAMU in 2006)

Spencer Foundation: Role: PI 12/05 – 11/07
Investigating U.S. and Chinese Mathematics Teacher Planning, Teaching Performance, and Student Achievement: The Case of Division of Fractions. (Total direct cost: $39,965);
Texas Education Agency Role: Content Consultant and Faculty Researcher
08/05 – 07/07 Mathematics TEKS Awareness Professional Development Pro (PI: Dennie Smith, Texas A&M University) (Total award amount: $4,694,55
Cathleen C. Loving

Biographical Sketch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cathleen C. Loving</td>
<td>Associate Professor &amp; Associate Department Head for Graduate Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>B. S.</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Biology/Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>M.A.T.</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Employment

- Associate Department Head for Graduate Programs (Fall, 2009 to present)
- Assistant Department Head for Graduate Programs (Spring, 2009 – Fall, 2009)
- Associate Professor, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, Texas A&M University (Fall, 2001–)

- Assistant Professor, Department of Teaching Learning and Culture, Texas A&M University (1994-2001)

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

- Associate Editor, School Science and Mathematics (2006 to the present)
- Editorial Board, Science and Education (2003 to the present)
- Membership: AERA, NARST, ASTE, AAAS, IHPST (Intl. Hist. & Phil. in Sci. Teaching)

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

- EDCI 667 Research and Foundations of Science Education (course I revised and regularly teach)
- EDCI 647 Curriculum Theory (one of 5 foundation courses from which all TLAC doc. students choose 3)
- EDCI 689 History and Culture of Science Education: 1900 to the Present (newly developed in Fall, 08)
- EDCI 682 Science Education Seminar (one credit rotating among science ed. faculty)
EDCI 689 Disciplinary Knowledge and Research in C &I – (all doc students entry-level core requirement)

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and presentations

**Book**


**Chapter In Refereed Book (most recent)**


**Peer-Reviewed Articles (selected)**


Refereed Conference Papers/Posters (recent)
*Singleton, J., Loving, C. C., Jeong-Kim, H., Herbert, B. Pedersen, S. (2010, April) Adapting to a high-stakes testing environment within a professional science learning community. Poster to be presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Denver, CO.


*doctoral student researcher

D. Grants/Support (Last 5-Years)
Herbert, B. E., Dept of Geology and Geophysics (PI)
Co-PI(s Loving, C. C. (TAMU), Crow, L. & Loiacano, M. (Lone Star College), & Sconzo, G. (Humble ISD). Professional Learning Community Model for Entry into Teaching Science (PLC-METS) 9/01/04 to 9/1/10 – extended. Total Award: $3,076,978 --- CEHD @ $238,000/year

E. Doctoral Student Committees Chaired: (10 since 2004)
Cathy Ezrailson, co-chair, Ph.D. graduated
Kathryn Seifert, co-chair, Ph.D. graduated
Carolyn Schroeder, chair, graduated
Amy Anderson, co-chair, Ph.D. graduated
Moira Baldwin, co-chair, Ph.D. (2006 --)
Christine Shimek, co-chair, Ph.D. (2006 --)
Valerie Reiss, chair, Ph.D. (2009 --)
Mehmet Ayar, co-chair, Ph.D. (2008--)
Vishal Arghode, co-chair, Ph.D. (2009 --)
Julie Singleton, chair, Ph.D. (2009 --)
Erin M. McTigue

Biographical Sketch

NAME
Erin M. McTigue

POSITION TITLE
Assistant Professor

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION
DEGREE
YEAR(S)
FIELD
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA
Ph.D.
2006
C&I: Literacy
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA
M.Ed.
2003
C&I: Literacy
Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA
(post bac)
1998
Teacher Certification
Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA
B.A.
1997
Psychology

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment
Assistant Professor, TLAC, Texas A&M, (2006-2009)
Adjunct Faculty, School for Continuing and Professional Studies, University of Virginia, (2004-2005)
Grade 2 Classroom Teacher, City of Charlottesville, Charlottesville, VA, (2002-2003)
Grade 6 Reading and Language Arts Teacher, Albemarle County, Albemarle, VA (2000-2002)
Grade 3 Classroom Teacher, Scituate Public Schools, Scituate, MA (1998-2000)

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)
Director of the TAMU Reading Clinic (2006 – 2009)
Study Abroad Leader for TLAC students (Summer 2008, Switzerland)
Reading Teacher Certification – Commonwealth of Virginia

Honors
Outstanding New Faculty Award, College of Education and Human Development, TAMU 2009
George Graham Scholarship Award for Academic Excellence, University of Virginia 2006
Phi Delta Kappa, University of Virginia 2005
Graduated cum laude – Wellesley College

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years))
RDNG 649 – Reading in High School and College
RDNG 604 – Reading Diagnosis
RDNG 642 – Clinical Teaching in Reading
EDCI 489 – Special Topics in Reading (study abroad)
RDNG 381 – Language Arts in the Middle Grades
C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Book Chapters


Peer-Reviewed Articles (** = undergraduate student * = graduate student)


Presentations

National Presentations


sixth grade science texts. Presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Teacher Educators (ATE), Dallas, TX.


McTigue, E. & Yeh, Y.* (2008, December) Diagrammatic literacy skills required for state science tests. Presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference (NRC), Orlando, FL.


Smolkin, L., McTigue, E., Donovan, C. & Yeh, Y.* (2008, December) Examining outstanding science trade books: What can we learn from Coh-Metrix?. To present at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference (NRC), Orlando, FL.


Invited Presentations/Local Presentations


McTigue, E. (2009). The role of images in the comprehension of science texts. LearningResearch and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.


McTigue, E. (2004). *Comprehension strategies for non-fiction texts.* Workshop presented to educators at Bluefield County Schools, Bluefield, VA.


**D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)**

**Awarded Grants**


Increasing the extent of multicultural literature integration within Content Area Literacy. Awarded $800 from *Center for Teaching Excellence Incentive Grant Program* for the purchase of materials for class-research project in RDNG 649, Spring 2009. (Awarded October 2008)

**Instructional Development**

Erwin, B. & Davis, T., & McTigue, E. (2008). Designed and co-developed two of five online reading modules for the *Verizon Early Literacy Program*, Texas A&M University.
Dawn R. Parker

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
Dawn R. Parker

POSITION TITLE
Clinical Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howard Payne University, Brownwood, Texas</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1985-1989</td>
<td>Secondary Education- Mathematics and Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University, College Station, Texas</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1989-1991</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University, College Station, Texas</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1994-1997</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction Science and Mathematics Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Collaborative Projects

Jan 2008 – Present
Investigation and Impact of *Education for a New Era* in Qatar: Classroom and School Processes on Student Outcomes
Qatar National Research Fund (QNRF); Collaborative Research Project of Faculty from Qatar University and Texas A&M Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture

May 2004 – Present
Texas A&M University - University of Qatar Teacher Preparation Project: Planning and Implementation of a one-year Post-Bacc Teacher Preparation Program for Primary Education

May 2006 – May 2007
Mathematics TEKS Connections (MTC) Project: Development of Preservice Teacher Education Modules for Mathematics Teaching

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

Sept 2004 – Present
(TLAC Courses)
Mathematics Methods in the Middle School;
Science Methods in the Middle School
Science Methods for Elementary Education
Introduction to Middle Grades Education
Curriculum in the Middle School
Graduate Courses: Educator as Learner (Online)
Curriculum Development (Online)
Supervisor for Elementary and Middle School Mathematics and Science
Senior
Methods Interns

Spring 2006, Spring 2007, Primary Educator Preparation Program (PEPP)

Spring 2008, Spring 2009 Courses Taught: Mathematics and Science Methods for Primary Education, Qatar University: Doha, Qatar

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).


Professional Presentations


**Professional Organizations**

- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)
- School Science and Mathematics Association (SSMA)
- National Science Teachers Association (NSTA)
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)

**Service Activities**
Jan 2008 – Present  Mediator, Texas A&M University
*40 hours* Basic Mediation Training, TAMU
The Center for Change and Conflict Resolution

May 2006 – Present  Associate Editor School Science and Mathematics Journal

Sept 2005 – Present  Member Clinical Professor Review Committee (CPRC)

Sept 1999 – May 2009  Middle Grades Program Leadership; work with preservice teachers, mentors and principals through TAMU field-based teacher preparation program


Sept 2007 – Dec 2007  Chair, Clinical Professor Review Committee

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION TITLE</th>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blanca Quiroz</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Harvard Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Human Development and Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge, MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harvard Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge, MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. Teaching Positions

- Sep. 2005 – May 2010 Assistant Professor Texas A & M University
- Sep. 2004 - June 2005 Full Time Faculty, Wheelock College
- Sep. 2003 - Jan. 2004 Lecturer, Simmons College
- Sep. 2001 - June 2002 Teaching Fellow, Harvard Graduate School of Education
- Sep. 2000 - June 2001 Teaching Fellow, Harvard Faculty of Arts and Science

### Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held) Honors

- Faculty Training Fellowship (January, 2010). Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-B cohort (ECLS-B). Washington, DC.
- Barbara Bush Fellow award a student Jee-Young Shin Texas Center for the Advancement of Literacy and Learning (TCALL), Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy $ 25,000.00
- Big XII Faculty Fellowship Award (2006-2007). Research collaboration with the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Texas, Austin.
- Faculty Training Fellowship (June, 2006). National Assessment of Educational Progress data analysis training (NAEP). Washington, DC.
- Harvard Civil Rights Project (Fall, 2004). Group coordinator (Organized by Gary Orfield), Cambridge, MA.
Advanced Doctoral Grant (2003). Harvard Graduate School of Education. Cambridge MA
Harvard Graduate School of Education Student Research Conference (2003).
Co-chair of the Recruitment Committee. Cambridge, Latinos Remaking America (Fall, 2002).
Coordinator (organized by Marcelo Suárez-Orozco). National conference on educational issues for
Latinos in the U. S. Cambridge, MA. Harvard Graduate School of Education Student Research
Conference (2002).
Co-chair of the Recruitment Committee, Cambridge, MA.
Bilingual Education., Washington, DC.
Harvard Educational Review (1999–2001). Member of the Editorial Board at Harvard University,
Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA.

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

2009-2010 Level
Spring 10 Teaching English as a Second Language Graduate
Language/Literacy for Bilingual/Multicultural Young Learners
Fall 09 Hispanics in Urban Schooling Graduate

2008-2009
Spring 09 ESL Methods (INST 332-605) Undergraduate
Teaching English as a Second Language Graduate
Fall 08 ESL Methods (INST 332-603) Undergraduate

2007-2008
Spring 08 Language and Literacy for Bilingual/Multicultural Young Learners Graduate
Research Group Dissertation Methodology Consultation Doctoral Student
Fall 07 Teaching English as a Second Language Graduate

2006-2007
Spring 07 Language and Literacy for Bilingual/Multicultural Young Learners Graduate
Research Group Dissertation Methodology Consultation Doctoral Student
Fall 06 Curriculum Theory Section 600 in person Graduate
Fall 06 Curriculum Theory Section 700 long distance delivery Graduate

2005-2006
Spring 06 Language/Literacy for Bilingual/Multicultural Young Learners Graduate
Fall 05 English Language Learners Methods Graduate

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances

Books & Book Chapters

Rothstein-Fisch, C., Greenfield, P. M. Trumbull, E., Keller, Heidi, & Quiroz, B. (2010). Discovering
culture in Learning development, and education. In D. Preiss& R. J. Sternberg (Eds.).
Towards an integrative, developmental, and contextual science of education.**(I will look for this
and send it to you.)
Cultural conceptions of learning and development. In P.A. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.),
Handbook of Educational Psychology (pp.675-692) (special edition APA division 15).


**Peer-Reviewed Article**

**D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)**

2009 Texas Center for the Advancement of Literacy and Learning (TCALL), Barbara Bush Foundation for Family: Literacy Barbara Bush Fellow. Project title: Intergenerational Literacy within Language Minority Families: Focus on Their Strengths. Supervisor: Blanca Quiroz; Student Fellow: Jee-Young Shin.

$25,000

2007-2010 *New Traditions*. PI Robert Capraro, Co-PIs with Drs. Quiroz, Lewis, Carpenter, Davis, and Collins. $349,000

2007 MALRC: Building Language and Pre-literacy Skills in the Classroom: A Professional Development Program for Preschool Teachers of Spanish-speaking Children Co PI with Dr. Dixon as PI $5,000

2006 MALRC: Home-Learning Supporting Reading Skills: Building Language Together for Spanish-speaking Families. PI with Dr. Dixon as CoPI. $10,000

Robin Rackley

Biographical Sketch

**NAME**
Robin A. Rackley

**POSITION TITLE**
Clinical Assistant Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University, College Station, TX</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University, College Station, TX</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University, College Station, TX</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

**Positions and Employment**

2008- Present  *Early Childhood Coordinator*, Department of Teaching Learning and Culture, College of Education, Texas A&M University
2007-Present  *Clinical Assistant Professor*, Department of Teaching Learning and Culture, College of Education, Texas A&M University
2005 -2007    *Lecturer*, Department of Teaching Learning and Culture, College of Education, Texas A&M University
2005-2006     *Visiting Assistant Professor*, Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education, Texas A&M University
2000-2005     *Teaching Assistant*, Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education, Texas A&M University
2000-2001     *Research Team Member*
               Innovative Alternatives, Inc. Peer Mediation Program Evaluation for Alvin and Pasadena Independent School District
               Center for Collaborative Learning Communities, Texas A&M University
2000-2001     *Teaching Assistant*, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, Texas A&M University

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

Texas State Teacher Certifications:
Elementary (Grades 1-8)
Elementary Reading Specialist (Grades 1-8)
Early Childhood Education (Grades PK-KG)
Gifted and Talented (Grades PK–8)

Honors
B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

INST 301 - Educational Psychology
EPSY 320 - Child Development for Educator
EPSY 321 - Adolescent Development for Educators
TEFB 273 - Introduction to Culture, Community, Society and Schools
ECHE 321 - The Young Child and Early Childhood Education
ECHE 332 - Planning and Curriculum Development for Early Childhood Education
ECFB 420 - Science Methods for Early Childhood Educators
ECFB 440 - Math Methods for Early Childhood Educators
EPSY 648 - Creativity and Intelligence
EPSY 636 - Techniques of Research
EDCI 644 - Curriculum Development
EDCI 689 - Classroom Management
RDNG 440 - Reading and Language Arts Methods in Early Childhood Education
EDCI 689 – Learning Theories for Educators
EDCI 646 – Instructional Theory
EDCI 675 – Teaching Strategies Patterns of Learning
EDCI 365 - Using Technology in Elementary Classroom

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Books


Book Chapters


Presentations


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)


**Professional Service**

2000  
Group Facilitator, Participatory Campus Leadership Conference.  
Sponsored by the Center for Collaborative Learning  
Communities/Principals Center, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

2002 -2003  
Mentor/Facilitator, Graduate Teaching Assistant Orientation Program.  
Sponsored by the Center for Teaching Excellence, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.
William H. Rupley

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
William H. Rupley

POSITION TITLE
Professor

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University, Bloomington, IN</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis College, Ft. Wayne, IN</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois, Urbana, IL</td>
<td>Ph. D.</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment
Professor and Distinguished Research Fellow, Teaching, Learning and Culture, Texas A&M University, 1999 to present
Professor, Educational Curriculum and Instruction, Texas A&M University, 1985 to present
Associate Professor, Educational Curriculum and Instruction, Texas A&M University, 1979-1984
Assistant Professor, Educational Curriculum and Instruction, Texas A&M University, 1975-1979
Abstractor, annotator, and subject specialist (reading), ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, IL, 1972-1975
Teaching Assistant - Reading, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL, 1972-1975
Nongraded elementary teacher, Fort Wayne Community Schools, Fort Wayne, IN, 1971-1972
Instructor - Reading, St. Francis College, Fort Wayne, IN, 1970-1971
Sixth grade teacher, Fort Wayne Community Schools, Fort Wayne, IN, 1969-1971
Fourth grade teacher, South Whittier School District, South Whittier, CA, 1968-196

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)
Member of the National Advisory Committee for Fourth Grade Reading Academies, Texas Education Agency Office of Statewide Initiatives (2003-04)
Member Higher Education Collaborative, University of Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts (2003-04)
Member Texas Reading First Initiative Review Panel, Texas Education Agency, (2004)
Executive Editor, Reading Psychology: An International Quarterly, 1989-present
**Honors**
University Regents Scholar, Initiative for Excellence in Education’s Academy for Educator Development (2001 present)
Distinguished Research Fellow, College of Education, TAMU, 1999 - present.

**B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)**
RDNG 301: Principles and practices of reading instruction
RDNG 351: Reading in the elementary school
RDNG 674: Developmental reading in the elementary school

**C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).**

**Books**

**Book Chapters**
In Handbook of Reading Disabilities Research General Editors: Richard Allington & Anne McGill-Franzen, University of Tennessee


**Peer-Reviewed Articles**


**Presentations**


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)

Co-Principal Investigator (2005-2008). Enhancing the Quality of Expository Text Instruction and Comprehension Through Content and Case Situated Professional Development. Institute of Education Sciences. 1,500,000.00 Funded.


Co-Principal Investigator. (2004-2005). Texas High School Success and Completion. Calvert, Texas ISD. $80,000.00 (Funded)


**Mark C. Sadoski**

**BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

**NAME**  
Mark C. Sadoski

**POSITION TITLE**  
Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Connecticut State University, New Haven, CT</td>
<td>B.S., M.S.</td>
<td>1968, 1973</td>
<td>English, Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EDUCATION/TRAINING**

**A. Positions and Honors.**

**Positions and Employment**

- Texas A&M University  
  1991-present  
  Full Professor (with tenure)
- Texas A&M Health Science Center, Development College of Medicine  
  2004-present  
  Office of Educational Development  
  (presently 75% time)
- Texas A&M University  
  1986-91  
  Associate Professor (with tenure)
- Texas A&M University  
  1981-86  
  Assistant Professor
- Southern Connecticut State University  
  1978-81  
  Associate Member, Graduate Faculty, Reading Department
- Milford, Connecticut Public Schools  
  1968-81  
  Reading Consultant, K-12; Classroom Teacher of Reading and Language Arts, 7-8

**Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)**

- Policy & Legislative Committee, National Reading Conference, 1998-2002

Editorial review boards: Reading Research Quarterly, Journal of Literacy Research, Reading Psychology, Reading and Writing (various years, 1989-present)

Honors
Distinguished Research Fellow, Texas A&M University College of Education and Human Development, 1991-2001; reviewed and re-awarded, 2001-2011. (Externally reviewed award; top 10% of scholars in field).

Distinguished Alumnus Award, Southern Connecticut State University, 1994
Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi, inducted 1988.

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
RDNG 650 Foundations of Reading Instruction
RDNG 615 Theoretical Models of the Reading Process
RDNG 604 Reading Diagnosis
RDNG 649 Reading Instruction in High School and College

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Books

Book Chapters

**Peer-Reviewed Articles**


**Presentations – recent**


**D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)**


Director (2006) and Co-director (2003-2005,) of the Reading Clinic, a diagnostic and remedial facility for children and adults with serious reading problems. Outreach project of the Dept.of TLAC, Texas A&M University. Partially funded by the Verizon Corporation (see above).
NAME
Nancy S. Self

POSITION TITLE
Clinical Assistant Professor

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furman University, Greenville S.C.</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman University, Greenville S.C.</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

2003-present  Clinical Assistant Professor, Texas A&M University
2002-2006      Coordinator of Early Childhood Program
1998-2001      Director of Undergraduate Advising and Student Teaching, Texas A&M University
1997-1998      Interim Director of Student Teaching, TAMU
1995 (summer)  Instructor at Blinn Community College
1994-2003      Senior Lecturer, TAMU
1987-1993      Lecturer, Texas A&M University: instructor and supervisor of student teachers
1986-1987      Kindergarten teacher, Gause, Texas
1985-1986      Lecturer, Texas A&M University
1984-1985      Teacher of Toddlers, Child Development Center, First Baptist Church, Bryan, Texas
1982-1983      Private tutor, elementary students, Portsmouth, Virginia
1970-1972      Supervisor of Student Teachers, Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
1967-1970      Fourth Grade Teacher, Carrboro, N.C.
1966-1967      Fourth Grade Teacher, Greenville, S.C.
1965-1966      Third Grade Teacher, Rock Hill, S.

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

Current Professional and Academic Association Memberships

- National Association of Education for the Young Child (NAEYC)
- Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI)
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Instruction (ASCD)
- National Storytelling Network (NSN)
- Tejas State Storytelling Association
- Aggie Storytelling association
Current Professional Assignments and Activities

Advisor for Bluebonnet Branch of ACEI (1990 – present)
President of Phi Delta Kappa (2008-2009)
Advisor for Aggie Storytelling Association

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
EDCI 364: Creativity and the Young Child
EDCI 469: Inter/Intrapersonal Communication Skill in the Early Childhood Classroom
EDCI 453: Early Childhood Education
EDCI 455: Home-School Involvement in Early Childhood Education
EDCI 454: Curriculum for Young Children
ECHE 430: Classroom Management in early Childhood Classroom
ECHE 331: Creative inquiry Through the Arts for the Young Child
ECHE 244: School, Family, and Community Dynamics in Early Childhood Education
ECHE 332: Curriculum and Instruction in the Early Childhood Classroom
ECHE 321: Early Childhood Development
EDCI 652: Parental Involvement in Early Childhood Education
UPAS 181: The Power of Story

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Peer-Reviewed Articles


Presentations

• “Integrating Creative Instructional Strategies and Materials with Standards in Order to Reach Every Child’s Potential,” presented at the ACEI International Conference in Atlanta, GA on March 28, 2008. (Assisted by Dr. Barbara Erwin)
• “Using Storytelling to Celebrate Each Child’s Heritage and Culture While Enhancing Literacy,” presented at the ACEI International Conference in Tampa, Florida, May 2-5, 2007 (assisted by Dr. Barbara Erwin)
• “Brighter Horizons in Early Literacy: Transforming Early Literacy Instruction for At-Risk Children,” Assisted Dr. Barbara Erwin in presenting this at the ACEI International Conference in Tampa, Florida on May 2-5, 2007.
• “Engaging Pre-K-4 Children in Storytelling to Enhance Cultural Awareness and Literacy,” workshop presented at the 2007 International Conference on Education in Honolulu,
George Patrick Slattery

NAME

POSITION TITLE

Biographical Sketch

NAME

George Patrick Slattery

POSITION TITLE

Professor and Regents Scholar

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Curriculum Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s College of California</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Santa Fe (Summa Cum Laude)</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>English/Math</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

1. Distinguished Visiting Professor. University of South Africa (September, 2009); Universidad Alberto Hurtado, la Universidad Jesuita de Chile (Summer, 2008); York University, CA (May, 2008); University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee (January, 2008); Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts (Summers, 2002-2009); Ursuline College of Ohio (Summer, 2001); University of Manitoba, CA (Summer, 2000); University of Alberta, CA (Summer, 1998); The University of St. Thomas (1994)


5. Diversity Award for Individual Achievement. Texas A&M University. Presented by the Executive Vice-President and Provost. May 5, 2004

Positions and Employment

Professor. Texas A&M University. Tenured and Graduate Faculty. (1998 - Present)


Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)
President, American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (2007-2010)
Chair, Arts-Based Educational Research Special Interest Group (SIG) of AERA, 2003-2005.

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

Doctoral Courses: Philosophical Theories of Education (EDCI 662); History of Education (EDCI 658); Issues in Curriculum and Instruction (EDCI 638); Curriculum Theory (EDCI 647); Analysis of Teaching Behavior (EDCI 673); Curriculum Development in Foundations of Education (EDCI 644); Qualitative Research Methodologies (EAHR 600); Reflective Inquiry (EDCI 634)

Undergraduate and Post-Baccalaureate Courses: Teaching and Schooling in the Modern Society (TEFB 322 / EDCI 489); Contemporary Perspectives on Educ (TEED 602)

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Books


**Presentations**


"Reflections on a Curriculum of Place." Presidential address with Susan Edgerton to the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies. Teachers College, Columbia University. March 21, 2008

Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)

PI, Summer Arts and Humanities Institute for Urban Leadership
2009-02-15 - 2011-08-31
$750,000 - Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
Scott Wayne Slough

POSITION TITLE
Associate Professor of Science Education
and ODASES Science Education Specialist

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen F. Austin State University</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td>1978-1982</td>
<td>Forest Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Houston State University</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>1989-1992</td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Houston State University</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1992-1994</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>1994-1998</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

2005 – present Associate Professor of Science Education Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.
2000 – 2005 Assistant/Associate Professor of Chemistry University of Houston-Downtown, Houston, TX.
1998 – 2000 Assistant Professor of Science Education Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA.
1993 – 1998 Lecturer of Chemistry Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, TX.
1989 – 1992 Middle School Science Teacher (Texas) Humble ISD (Humble, TX) & Cleveland ISD (Cleveland, TX).

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)

MEFB 460 – Mathematics Methods in the Middle School
MEFB 470 – Science Methods in the Middle School
MASC 475 – Inquiries in Physical Science
EDCI 601 – PhD Studies in TLAC
EDCI 664 – Ad. Methods of Sec. Science Education
EDCI 665 – Science Curriculum
EDCI 676 – Eval. and Implem. of e-Learning Materials
EDCI 682 – Seminar in Science Education
EDCI 689 – Broader Impacts of Sci. Collaborations
C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

**Books**

**Book Chapters**

**Peer-Reviewed Articles**


**D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)**

Co-PI for *Engaging Middle School Students in Student-directed Inquiry Through Virtual Environments for Learning*. NSF-IMB (0628264) with Susan Pederson (PI). Janie Schielack (co-PI), and Douglas Johnson (co-PI ULL) ($1,685,499 TDC) 2006 - 2010.

Co-PI for *North Texas STEM Center (NTSTEM Center)*. TEA-T-STEM with Jim Scheurich (PI) and Robert Capraro (Co-PI) ($400,000 TDC) 2006-2007.+ supplemental grant of $200,000 TDC 2006-2007

Co-PI for *Bioscience Inspiration and Opportunities for Students*. National Institutes of Health (1R25HL075747-01) with Baylor College of Medicine, Nancy Moreno (PI-Baylor College of Medicine). ($1,250,000) 2003-2008.

Co-PI for *Expanding Pathways to Success in Science at UHD and SJCN*. NSF-Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Talent Expansion Program (STEP) (0333312) with Larry Spears (PI), Sarah Janes (Co-PI - SJCN), Suzette Mouchaty (Co-PI), and Akif Uzman (Co-PI). ($3,632,024 TC) 2003-2009.

Co-PI for *UHD Urban Center for Student Success in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (UCSS/STEM)*. DOD ARO with Larry Spears (PI), Albert-Gomez Rivas, (Co-PI), Suzette Mouchaty (Co-PI), Kenneth Oberhoff (Co-PI), and Akif Uzman (Co-PI). ($6,757,755 TC) 2003-2009.

Co-Director (PI) for a series of 30 contact hour workshops. HU-LINC (Houston ISD’s USI grant) ($244,345 TDC - combined amount from 10 funded projects) 2000 – 2005.

Co-PI (University Professional Development Coordinator) for *Houston TARGETS Mathematics and Science*. Texas Education Agency (263000221400833) with Ricki Price-Baugh (PI), Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Houston Independent School District. ($2,025,000 TDC) 2003-2006.

*Teaching, Learning and Culture*  
*External Review*
NAME
Dennie L. Smith

POSITION TITLE
Professor & Department Head

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marshall University, Huntington, WV</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall University, Huntington, WV</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

2003 to present- Professor, Department Head, and Claude H. Everett, Jr. Endowed Chair, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, College of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX
1997-2003- Department Chair, Instruction & Curriculum Leadership Department, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN
1984-2003- Professor, Instruction and Curriculum Leadership Department, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN
1995-1997- Professor and Director of Family Business Center, College of Business, University of Memphis (dual appointment)
1971-1984- Associate Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, Memphis, TN
1969-1971- Assistant Professor, Department of Elementary Education, College of Education, Auburn University
1967-1969- Instructor, Learning Media Center, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

AERA (American Educational Research Association
ASCD (Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development

Honors
Claude H. Everett, Jr. Endowed Chair for Leadership

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
EDCI 646  Instructional Theory
EDCI 604  Classroom Management
C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

**Book Chapters**


**Peer-Reviewed Articles**


**Presentations**


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)

-Professional Development Activities for Teachers and Administrators: Mathematics College and Career Readiness Standards (PI), Texas Education Association, 2009-2010, $500,000

-TAMU Collaborative for CCRS Demonstration Centers (C0 PI), Texas Education Association, 2009-2010, $500,000

-Developing Proof of Concept Teacher Training Animated Vignettes (Co PI), Texas A&M University, Office of Research, 2009-2010, $130,000

-Laredo Cohort Ed.D. Development, Texas A&M International (Co PI), 2005-2010, $107,000

-Math TEKS Awareness (MTA): Professional Development Project (PI), Texas Education Agency, 2005-2007, $6,500,000

-Learning Community Education: Teacher Education (PI), Texas A&M University, 2003-2006, $50,000

-Evaluation of Texas’ High School Drop Out and Completion Grants (PI), Texas Education Agency, 2004-2006, $1,200,000

-PEICS (P-16 Educational Improvement Consortia) (PI), Texas Education Association, 2004-2006, $479,500
Carol L. Stuessy

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
Carol L. Stuessy

POSITION TITLE
Associate Professor

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University, Columbus</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University, Columbus</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Teaching Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. POSITIONS AND HONORS

Positions and Employment

1992 - Associate Professor, Texas A&M University, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture
1992- Co-Director, Center for Science and Mathematics Education, Colleges of Science and Education, 2001 – present; Assistant Department Head, 1998-1999
1989- Assistant Professor, Texas A&M University, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction
1988- Assistant Professor, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Department of Instructional Leadership and Academic Curriculum
1985- Assistant Professor, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, Department of Curriculum and Instruction
1983- Gifted and Talented Coordinator, Perry Middle School, Worthington, OH
1982- Science Teacher, Perry Middle School, Worthington, OH
1983
1976- Science Teacher, Perry Middle School, Worthington, OH
1976
1971- Assistant to Dr. Otto Solbrig, Gray Herbarium, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
1972
1969- Biology Teacher, Worthington High School, Worthington, OH
1972

Other Experience

Editorships

2005- Associate Editor, School Science and Mathematics Journal
2009
2003-
2005  Co-Editor, Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, Science Section

Leadership in Professional Organizations (last 5 years)

2005-
2009  School Science and Mathematics Association; Past President and Chair, Finance Committee (2007-2007); President (2004-2006); Board of Directors (elected 2002-2005)
2003-
2005  Southwest Association for Science Teacher Education; President (2003-2005); Board of Directors (2005-2007)
2007  National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Conference Proposal Reviewer
2006-2008  Sigma Xi, Outstanding Educator Nomination Committee

Honors

2000  Outstanding Research Paper Award (with Kim Dooley and Jane Magill), Regional Agricultural Education Conference, Las Cruces, NM, 2000
1998-1999  Texas A&M University ACE Fellowship Nominee
1992  Outstanding New Faculty Member, College Development Council, Texas A&M University

B. COURSES TAUGHT (LAST 5 YEARS)

Integrated Methods in Middle School Mathematics and Science Teaching (Undergraduate, Spring 2004)
Research in the Secondary Science Teacher Professional Continuum (Graduate, Fall 2008)
Scientific Inquiry in K-16 Settings (Graduate, Spring 2008)
Introduction to Mixed Methods Research (Graduate, Spring 2006, Fall 2007, Spring 2009)
Data Collection and Analysis in Field-Based Settings (Graduate, Summer 2007)
Instruction Theory (Graduate, Fall 2006)
Issues in Curriculum: Modeling in Science and Mathematics Education (Graduate, Spring 2004)

C. SELECTED PUBLICATIONS AND PERFORMANCES (LAST 5 YEARS)

Refereed Journal Articles

Yoo, D, & Stuessy C. L. (in press). Education graduate students' orientations toward research: An analysis through impressionist tale. *Journal of Ethographic & Qualitative Research* (Accepted November 2008).


### Peer-Reviewed Conference Proceedings


### Peer-Reviewed Presentations at National Conferences (* denotes co-presentation with graduate students)


*Stuessy, C., McNamara, J., & the PRISE Research Group. (2007, September). Mapping the research terrain of the high school science TPC: Domain, geography, and method. Research*
External Review

poster presented at the Invited National Symposium for Principal Investigators, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC.


D. SUPPORT (LAST 5 YEARS)

2009
Fry, G., & Stuessy, C.L. NEES Research, Multi-Scale, Mechanistic Fracture Prediction and Optimal Panel Zone Participation in Steel Moment Frame Buildings, National Science Foundation (2009-2012), $1,218,000. [GRA Support: 1.]

2008
Guidry, J., & Stuessy, C. A comprehensive approach for addressing science education in underrepresented populations. K-12 supplement to a grant awarded to Dr. Lovell A. Jones, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, from the National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities. (2008-2009), $70,000. [GRA Support: 1; UG Support: 1]

2007
Hemingway, C., Stuessy, C., & Stanley, E. Plant IT Careers, Cases, and Collaborations, Division of Research on Learning in Formal and Informal Settings (DRL), Information Technology Experiences for Students and Teachers (ITEST). National Research Foundation (2007-2010), $998,133. [GRA Support: 2]

2007

2006

2005
Rebecca Thomas

Biographical Sketch

NAME
Rebecca Thomas

POSITION TITLE
Lecturer

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M, College Station, Texas</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Elementary Education, Reading Specialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early Childhood Directors Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinn College, Bryan Texas</td>
<td>Director's Certificate</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M, College Station, Texas</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Educational Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

2005-present Lecturer, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, Texas A & M, College Station, Texas 77843
2001-2005 Assistant Lecturer, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, Texas A & M, College Station, Texas 7843
1999-1999 Teacher, First Presbyterian Children’s Center, 1100 Carter Creek Pkwy., Bryan, Texas 77802 Supervisor Ms. Debbie Almand
1997 – 1998 Graduate Assistant, Department Educational Curriculum and Instruction, Texas A & M, College Station, Texas 77843 Supervisor: Dr. Doug Godwin
1993 – 1997 Childcare Teacher, First Baptist Church of Bryan, Child Development Center, 200 S. Texas Ave., Bryan, Texas 77803 Supervisor: Mrs. Debbie Burch

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)
Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI)
Honors

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
ECHE 321 – The Young Child and Early Childhood Education
ECHE 331 – Creative Inquiry through the Arts for the Young Child
ECHE 332 – Planning and Curriculum Development for Early Childhood Education
EDCI 364 – Integrating the Expressive Arts in the Elementary Classroom
TEFB 273 – Introduction to Culture, Community, Society and Schools
Biographical Sketch

NAME
Radhika Viruru

POSITION TITLE
Clinical Associate Professor

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banaras Hindu University, India</td>
<td>B.A. (Hons).</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University, College Station, Texas</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University, College Station, Texas</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

2009-2010 Coordinator, B. Ed Program, Qatar University

2008-2009 Coordinator, Early Childhood Programs, Qatar University.

2006-2008 Coordinator, Early Childhood Programs, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, Texas A&M University.

2005- Clinical Associate Professor, Department of Teaching Learning and Culture, Texas A&M University (on leave 2008-2010)

2003-2005 Clinical Assistant Professor, Department of Teaching Learning and Culture, Texas A&M University.

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

Member, American Educational Research Association (AERA) since 1994.
Member, Curriculum Theory and Classroom Practice (Bergamo) 1998-2003

L. Courses Taught (Last 5 Years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 690</td>
<td>Introduction to Qualitative Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHE 332</td>
<td>Planning and Curriculum Development for Young Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 602</td>
<td>Cultural Foundations of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 322</td>
<td>Foundations of Education in a Multicultural Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 644</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 101</td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M. Graduate Student Advising (Last 5 Years)**

**Doctoral committees chaired:**

Co-Chair, Soo Young Ahn (graduated, Summer 2008)
Co-Chair, Ellen Demas
Co-chair Cinthya Saavedra (graduated, Fall 2005)

**Doctoral committee memberships:**

- Michelle Lopez (EAHR)
- Rosalind Alderman (EAHR)
- Becky Spurlock (EAHR)
- Burcu Ates (TLAC)
- Patricia Henry (TLAC)
- Alicia Kerr (TLAC)
- Jee Young Shin (TLAC)
- Kylah Clark-Goff (TLAC)
- Meixia Ding (TLAC)
- Gina Chen (TLAC)
- Michael Muzheve (TLAC)
- Xi Chen (TLAC)

**N. Selected peer-reviewed publications and presentations (Selected from last 5 years).**

**Book Chapters**


External Review

Grieshaber (Eds.). Practical transformations and transformational practices. Greenwich, CT: Jai Press.

Peer-Reviewed Articles


Presentations


O. Grants/Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5 Years)

Viruru, R. (2008). Developmentally appropriate curriculum in Qatar Independent Schools for Young Children. Start up grant, Qatar University, QR 50,000.

Biographical Sketch

NAME: Lynne Masel Walters

POSITION TITLE: Associate Professor

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University, Bloomington</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Radio-television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University, University Park</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Mass Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

**Positions and Employment**

- Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, Texas A&M University
  - Associate professor, 2004-present

- International Studies Degree Program, Texas A&M University, 2000-2004
  - Director

- Journalism Department Study Abroad Program (Mexico City), Texas A&M University
  - Associate professor, Summers, 1997-2000

- Semester at Sea, University of Pittsburgh
  - Professor, Spring, 1998; Summer, 2000; Fall, 2004; Fall, 2007

- Senior Fulbright Fellow, Budapest, Hungary, 1994-1995
  - Assistant director for curriculum and program development, American Journalism Center
  - Professor, Etovos Lorand University

- Department of Journalism, Texas A&M University
  - Director, Graduate Studies, 1999-2000
  - Tenured associate professor, 1993-2004
  - Visiting assistant professor, 1989-1992

- School of Communication, University of Houston
  - Assistant professor, 1981-1988

- School of Communication, University of Alabama
  - Assistant professor, 1978-1981

- Department of Journalism, Central Michigan University
Assistant professor, 1975-1978

Honors
2007 Mexican-American and Latino Research Center Fellow
2003 Texas A&M University Fish Camp namesake
1996 Texas A&M University Fulbright Host
1994-5 Senior Fulbright fellowship, Budapest, Hungary

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
Educator as Researcher
Educator as Learner
Foundations of Education in a Multicultural Society
Teaching Writing for Elementary and Middle School
Language Acquisition and Development
Second Language Methodology
Cultural Foundations of Education

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Books


Book Chapters


Peer-Reviewed Articles
Walters, L., Garii, B. & Walters, T., (in press). Incorporating International Exchange and Intercultural Learning into Pre-service Teacher Training, published on line via the “Moving Beyond Mobility” website, and accepted for publication in a special issue of the Journal of Intercultural Education.

The Intercultural Communication Motivation Scale – An Instrument to Assess Motivational Training Needs of Candidates for International Assignments, accepted by the Journal of Human Resource Management.


**Presentations**


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)
2009 Fulbright Hays Group Projects Abroad Grant for China Seminar ($83,000)
2008 Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies study abroad grant for Foundations of Education in a Multicultural Society students in Mexico ($20,000)
2007 MALRC grant for work with English Language Learners, ($10,000)
2006 Honors College Grant for Intercultural Development Inventory ($1,000)
2005 Center for Teaching Excellence Grant for Intercultural Development Inventory ($1,000)
2004-5 consultant, Undergraduate International Studies Minor and Foreign Language Initiative, Texas A&M University –Texarkana, funded by the U.S. Department of Education ($4,000)
Hersh C. Waxman

Biographical Sketch

NAME
Hersh C. Waxman

POSITION TITLE
Professor and Director, State of Texas Education Research Center at Texas A&M University

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Postdoc</td>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>Adaptive Instruction &amp; Learning Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Educational Evaluation and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>M.E.</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Educational Evaluation and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment
Professor, Teaching, Learning and Culture Department, Texas A&M University
2006-present

Director, State of Texas Education Research Center at Texas A&M University
2007-present

Professor, Educational Leadership and Cultural Studies Department and Curriculum & Instruction Department, University of Houston
1996-2006

Principal Investigator, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Laboratory for Student Success, The Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory.
2001-2005

Principal Researcher, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence
1996-2004

Senior Research Associate, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Research Center on Education in the Inner Cities
1996-2004

Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction Department, University of Houston
1989-1996

Associate Dean for Research, College of Education, University of Houston
1989-1994

Director, Educational Research Center, College of Education, University of Houston
1983-1989

Assistant Professor, Curriculum and Instruction Department, University
1983-1989
Other Experience
President, AERA Special Interest Group on Classroom Observation Research
2003-2005
Co-organizer & Chair, National Invited Conference on Improving Teacher Quality for ELLs
2003
North America Regional Editor, Learning Environments Research: An International Journal. 2000-present
Chair, American Educational Research Association Committee on SIGs
1995-97
President, American Educational Research Association SIG on The Study of Learning Environments.
1993-1995

Honors
University of Houston, College of Education Alumni Faculty Service Award --2006
Hall of Honor, College of Education, University of Houston - 1999
Outstanding Paper Award, American Educational Research Association Special Interest Group on the Study of Learning Environments. - 1997
Career Contribution to Quantitative Research in Technology and Teacher Education Award, Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education. - 1997
Senior Research Excellence Award, College of Education, University of Houston - 1997
Distinguished Alumni Award, College of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago- - 1989
Outstanding Research Paper Award, Southwest Educational Research Association - 1989
University of Houston Teaching Excellence Award. - 1988

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
EDCI 689: Research Methods in EDCI, Part 1
EDCI 689: Research Methods in EDCI, Part 2
EDCI 689: Research Methods in EDCI, Part 3
EDCI 689: Standards and Models of Curriculum Evaluation
EDCI 691: Theory of Curriculum and Instruction Research

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications (Selected from last 5 years).
Books

Book Chapters
Teaching, Learning and Culture

External Review


Waxman, H. C., & Padrón, Y. N. (2004). The uses of the Classroom Observation Schedule to

**Peer-Reviewed Articles**


**D. Recent Grants**


Biographical Sketch

NAME
Patricia P. Wiese

POSITION TITLE
Assistant Clinical Professor

EDUCATION/TRAINING (Begin with baccalaureate or other initial professional education)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University, College Station, Texas</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Dec., 2001</td>
<td>Educational Curriculum and Instruction - Emphasis: Language Arts/Reading; (Also completed 21 post-master’s work in English/Humanities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas</td>
<td>BA in Teaching</td>
<td>May, 1972</td>
<td>English/History; secondary education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

September 2005 to present:
Clinical Assistant Professor in Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) Department, College of Education, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas
Courses: Designated Writing Intensive Courses: Teaching Reading through Children’s Literature, Multicultural and Interdisciplinary Literature for the Middle Grades, and Language and Reading in the Middle Grades; Teaching Writing in the certification areas of early childhood-fourth grade and fourth grade-eighth grade, and special topic courses connected with study abroad programs. Designed and proposed all TLAC writing-intensive (W) courses and serve as member of university-wide W Course Faculty Committee. Proposed, designed and conducted Study Abroad programs in England, Switzerland, Italy, Poland, and Czech Republic and lead (with Dr. Hammer) a continuing partnership with TAMU’s Santa Chiara Study Center and Dante Middle School in Castiglion Fiorentino, Italy. Coordinate a program of sixteen Undergraduate Peer Mentors who mentor and assist with TLAC’s writing-intensive courses.

August 2003 to August 2005:
Full-time Lecturer, Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) Department, College of Education, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas
Courses: Teaching Reading through Children’s Literature, Multicultural and Interdisciplinary Literature for the Middle Grades, and Language and Reading in the Middle Grades. Also taught single semester of ‘Teaching Reading in the Content Areas for Middle Grades and Assessment in Reading Instruction (Early Childhood).

February 2002 to July 2003 (days):

May 2002 to June 2003 (evenings):
Adjunct Faculty, International University in Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland.
Courses: Introduction to Management, English Composition (for international students)

**August 2002 to December 2002 (evening):**
Adjunct Faculty, Webster University – Geneva, Bellevue, Switzerland
Course: Basic Composition (for international students)

**January 2001 to May 2001 (and continued adjunct):**
Visiting Assistant Professor, University of Houston – Victoria, Victoria, Texas
Courses: Children’s Literature, Adolescent/Young Adult Literature, Teaching Language Arts, and Teaching Fundamentals of Reading.

**September 1997 to January 2001 (various teaching/research positions while completing doctoral studies):**
Adjunct Faculty, University of Houston-Victoria, Victoria, Texas
Courses: Children’s Literature and Multicultural Children’s Literature (all-day Saturday classes at Sugar Land campus)

Research/Teaching Assistant to Dr. Donna E. Norton, College of Education, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas. Named to TAMU Evans Library Advisory Board for Multicultural Storytelling Project.

Part-time Instructor, English/Humanities, Blinn College, Brenham, Texas
Courses: Developmental Writing, Rhetoric and Composition, American Literature, Creative Writing (latter two courses taught at the Navasota Luther Unit-men’s prison); also assisted in the management of the Writing Lab.

Final title: Senior Vice President for Marketing and Production

1990-1993: Burke Daniels, Inc., Houston, Texas
Vice President

Final title: Vice President and National Energy Director (one of 10-12 Directors across the U.S., the only woman director)

Final title: Assistant Director in the Marine and Energy Division (first woman officer in Marine/Energy).

Final title: Senior Insurance Administrator

Congressional Caseworker

1972-1974: Abernathy ISD, Abernathy, Texas
English and Social Studies Teacher in 7th & 8th grades (days)
Adult Education (including English as a Second Language and GED classes); (evenings)

**Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)**
Member of Assembly on Literature for Adolescents of the National Council of Teachers of English, Texas Council of Teachers of English Language Arts, National Council of Teachers of English, International Reading Association, Brazos River Reading Council, Phi Kappa Phi

**Honors**
Recipient of the Texas A&M University 2007 International Excellence Award in recognition of work developing the TLAC Study Abroad Programs in Switzerland and Italy and for committee work with the European Center for Excellence at TAMU.
B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
“Teaching Reading through Children’s Literature,” “Multicultural and Interdisciplinary Literature for the Middle Grades,” “Language and Reading in the Middle Grades,” “Teaching Writing” in the certification areas of early childhood-fourth grade and fourth grade-eighth grade,” Teaching Reading in the Content Areas for Middle Grades,” “Assessment in Reading Instruction (Early Childhood),” and several different special topic courses connected with study abroad programs; currently teaching a graduate-level Children’s Literature course online.

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Peer Reviewed Articles:

“Authenticating Children’s Literature: Raising Cultural Awareness with an Inquiry-Based Project in a Teacher Education Course,” (co-authored with Jane Smith, with authors listed alphabetically). *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Spring 2006.

Presentations

January 7-10, 2010: (accepted for presentation with peers) “Implicational of a Cross-Cultural Partnership between Preservice English as a Second Language (ESL) Teachers and an Italian Middle School” at the Hawaii International Conference on Education in Honolulu, Hawaii.

September 17, 2009: (presented with peer) “Celebrating Latino Heritage in Education through Children’s Literature” at the Brazos River Reading Council in Bryan, Texas.

March 26-28, 2009: Presented (with peer) “An Italian Experience for American Preservice Teachers” at the 43rd Annual TESOL Convention and Exhibit in Denver, Colorado.

January, 2009: Presented with Ph.D. Student and teaching assistant “Connecting with Literature and Writing About It: Using Reading-Writing Workshops and Calibrated Peer Review (CPR) to Improve Student Writing and Assessment” at the 2009 Annual Texas Council of Teachers of English Language Arts 44th Annual Conference in Fort Worth, Texas.

July 30, 2008: Presented (with peers) “Becoming and Nurturing Inquirers: How Texas A&M University and the Internatioanal Schools of Zug and Luzern are Working Together to Prepare Preservice Teachers with an Inquiring, Global Vision” at the 22nd World Congress on Reading in San Jose, Costa Rica.

February, 2007: Presented “Using Peer Tutoring in Writing-Intensive University Teacher Preparation Courses” to TAMU’s Teaching with Technology conference (with Fran Hunter, CEHD Distance Learning Coordinator).


November 17, 2004: “Authenticating Folktales: Inquiry-Based Projects to Increase Cultural Awareness and Nurture Intellectual Curiosity” presented with Assistant Professor Jane Smith to the TAMU Literacy Studies Group (LSG), College Station, Texas.

June 1, 2004: “Nurturing Intellectual Curiosity: Student-Directed Research Using Children’s Literature,” three-hour workshop presented with Assistant Professor Jane Smith, Educational
Reference Librarian at TAMU to teachers at faculty professional development meeting of the International School of Geneva (three campuses), Geneva, Switzerland. 

**March 2003:** “From Folktales to Fiction: Teaching Diversity and Multicultural Awareness through Literature” Presented in Basel, Switzerland at the Annual Conference of the Swiss Group of International Schools.

**D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)**

In 2007 and again in 2009, worked with European Union Center of Excellence to secure grant funding to bring international educators to Texas A&M University Campus to meet with preservice teachers and area K-12 teachers to discuss international teaching opportunities and developing a global vision in our classrooms.
Bugrahan Yalvac

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME

Bugrahan Yalvac

POSITION TITLE
Assistant Professor

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE (if applicable)</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Technical University</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Technical University</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Physics Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Technical University</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>C&amp;I, Science Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>Post-doc.</td>
<td>2003-2006</td>
<td>Learning Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors.

Positions and Employment

2006–current Assistant Professor of Science Education, Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, Texas A&M University, TX.
2003–2006 Research Associate/Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the VaNTH Engineering Research Center (a collaboration of Vanderbilt, Northwestern, Texas at Austin, Harvard, and MIT), Learning Sciences, Northwestern University, IL.
2001–2003 Teaching/Research Assistant at the Pennsylvania State University, Colleges of Engineering and Education, Curriculum and Instruction Department, PA.
1996–1999 Instructor, teaching assistant, and supervisor at the Middle East Technical University, Faculty of Education, Science Education Department, Ankara.

Other Experience (Titles, Professional Memberships, and Offices Held)

European Science Education Research Association (Since 2008)
National Association of Research in Science Teaching (Since 2002)
American Educational Research Association (Since 2002)
American Society for Engineering Education (Since 2004)
Editorial Board Member- Science Education Review (Since 2002)

Honors

Best Physics Senior Lab Project Award, Middle East Technical University, 1996.
Turkish Ministry of Education, Graduate Education Scholarship, 1999, ($120,000).

B. Courses Taught (Last 5-Years)
EDCI 690: Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods (Three semesters)
EDCI 690: Theory of Curriculum and Instruction (a proposal/dissertation writing course) (Two semesters)
EDCI 644: Curriculum Development (Two semesters)
EDCI 665: Science Curriculum (One semester)
EDCI 689: Science Education in Sociological Context (One semester)
EDCI 689: How People Learn Science (One semester)
EDCI 689: Cognitive Foundations of Knowing and Learning in Science and Mathematics (One semester)

C. Selected peer-reviewed publications and performances (Selected from last 5 years).

Peer-Reviewed Articles


Peer-Reviewed Proceedings

American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference and Exposition, Pittsburgh: June, 2008.


Presentations


D. Support (List Research and/or Community Outreach Support for Last 5-Years)

National Science Foundation: $149,330 (Co-PI) Reading, Writing-Energy, with Christine Ehlig-Economides (PI), Nancy Simpson (Co-PI), and Ramesh Talreja (Co-PI). March 01, 2007-February 28, 2009. Completed.

Hewlett Funding and Writing Program at Northwestern: $6750 (Co-PI) awarded for exploring the school-wide standards for science writing at Northwestern University, 2006. Completed.

Murphy Society: $45,550 (Co-PI) awarded for developing communication standards for undergraduate students of the McCormick School of Engineering, Northwestern University, 2005, http://www2.writing.northwestern.edu/standards/. Completed.
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Appendix 1:

Dr. Smiths’ response to the 2002 Graduate Program Review
To: David Pryor, Provost

Through: John Giardino, Dean of Graduate Studies

Through: Douglas Palmer, Dean
College of Education and Human Development

From: Dennie Smith, Professor
Department Head
Teaching, Learning and Culture

Re: Graduate Review Mid-Term Response

Date: May 12, 2006

Cc Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) Faculty

Doctoral Program Review Letter
May 2006

The external review of the Doctoral Program in the Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) department was completed in 2002. This memorandum addresses issues and concerns noted by the review committee and reports plans and progress of the department in addressing these issues. All faculty members have had opportunity to review the committee's report. The following information represents their input to the TLAC Graduate Committee responsible for responding to the report of the external review.
The concerns identified in the 2002 report have been listed in bold print below and are followed with a response noting the progress and actions related to resolving the issues.

**Concern 1: Large Undergraduate Enrollments in Field Based Courses**

**Strategies to manage growth in undergraduate enrollments.** The undergraduate enrollment has increased from approximately 500 graduates in 2002 to 700 graduates in 2005. The current program (2005-2006) is functioning at capacity with large enrollments (30-40 students per section) in the methods and field-based courses and is served mostly by 12 clinical and 23 part-time faculty. Two certification programs are offered in the department, Early Childhood – Grade 4 (EC-4) and Middle Grades (5-8). Of concern to both programs, which have significant field-based components, has been the placement of students in classrooms to work with elementary and middle grade teachers and their students. Nine strategies have been developed to manage the growing numbers of prospective teachers of our programs while increasing the diversity and assuring the quality of the classroom placements. These strategies are listed below.

1. Place most of our students in College Station and Bryan school districts, which are in close proximity to the Texas A&M University campus. The College of Education and Human Development has had long term and positive relationships with the schools.
2. Choose school districts within a 20 mile (round trip) radius to serve as locations for field courses and increase the opportunities for more diverse classrooms and environments.
3. Place students in pairs to maximize the availability of classroom locations, provide students opportunities to reduce travel expenses, and to establish a more collaborative learning environment for students.
4. Integrate opportunities for prospective teachers to individualize their work with special-needs students. School districts have provided feedback to the Department indicating the perception of the added value in having additional adults (A&M students) in classrooms to assist with learning, especially for students needing individual attention.
5. Develop and implement an innovative "walkthrough" observation electronic data system that provides more efficient and systematic feedback for monitoring quality of student and intern teaching.
6. Manage enrollment by encouraging students to pursue middle school (high need) certification.
7. Eliminate travel time and reduce costs in the alternative certification program by providing online monitoring of field components.
8. Provide PhD students opportunities to teach in the undergraduate program as part of their preparation and mentoring.
9. Phase out the Undergraduate Secondary Program (2005) due to low enrollments and overall operating expenses and establishment of a Graduate Secondary Certification program (established in 2000) has increased enrollment and provided additional tuition and fees to operate this successful program.

**Alternative methods to fulfill teaching requirements.** The following alternative methods are now available for students to fulfill their clinical teaching requirements prior to certification:
a. Traditional University-School Cooperating Teacher Model;
b. Mentor-School Model in Team Situation;
c. District-School Model (District pays for Mentor);
d. Intern Model (District hires student for a year);
e. District Hires (2 Year Certification)

Although we have put creative and unique programs such as those described above into place, student teaching supervision continues to challenge our human and financial resources.

Strategies to alleviate the tension between undergraduate teacher preparation and research productivity. The perceived tension between undergraduate teacher preparation and research productivity required of faculty has been reduced through several strategies implemented by the Department:.

- Hire clinical faculty in the Department’s signature undergraduate program. The reinvestment program has enabled the department to hire four (4) new clinical faculty members over the past three years for the following: English as a Second Language (2), Cultural Foundations (1), and Science Education (1).

- Involve tenure-track faculty in the undergraduate program. Twelve of the Department’s 23 tenure line faculty also teach in the undergraduate program on a regular basis. They provide additional resources and research knowledge for the undergraduate program and provide undergraduates with more contact with research faculty.

- Hire tenure-track faculty in the graduate program. The department has hired six additional tenure line and one clinical faculty members to provide more resources for the PhD program in Early Childhood (2), English as a Second Language (1), Science Education (2), Literacy (1), and Research Methodology (1).

Comparisons of number of faculty members in different categories appear in the table below. Two tenure-line faculty members have negotiated additional teaching assignments as part of their overall responsibilities, as recommended by the report. These appear in the table below as Tenure Line Faculty (60-20-20). Differentiated assignments have been accomplished by changing faculty effort ratios from 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service to 60% teaching, 20% research, and 20% service. Other faculty members who have not been active in research, grants, and refereed publications or who choose to do more teaching have the same option.
Table 1
Numbers of faculty members in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006 (Projected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Line Faculty (40-40-20)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Line Faculty (60-20-20)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Instructors</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concern 2: Research activities and notable scholarly efforts often go unrecognized and unrewarded. There is a lack of resources to support noteworthy research efforts. Without additional resources from the University, it will be very difficult for the TLAC Department to mount a research redirection on its own.

Increase external funding through grants and contracts. The evaluation system provides a consistent measure of research activities and scholarly efforts. Various types of scholarship are rewarded in the evaluation process. Publications in peer reviewed journals are not only rewarded at the department level, but are recognized at the college level for the universities reinvestment program. The department recognizes all scholarly work through the TLAC TIMES (Department Newsletter) and through display cases located in the department office. A proposal is now being discussed by one of the department’s cognate groups to reward and recognize faculty for quality research productivity that is not necessarily funded by external sources to provide additional avenues for encouraging scholarship among faculty and students.

Although funds allocated by the state remain stable, there has not been an increase in operating funds over the past three years with university allocations. Additional resources continue to be sought by the department and faculty through grant and other external sources especially in areas where grants are more readily available, such as mathematics, science, literacy, and early childhood education. The department currently has 3 National Science Foundation (NSF) grants. Furthermore, TLAC faculty are involved in another NSF grant and IES Institute for Educational Sciences grant in other departments. At the state level, the Texas Education Agency has funded projects in High School Evaluation, School Improvement, and Professional Development in Math Education.

Reallocate faculty time and make new tenure -line hires. The faculty evaluation system has been modified to give faculty the opportunity to reallocate time to support research productivity through a salary savings model. For example, faculty can buy out teaching responsibilities with external funding. In addition, faculty have been hired for programs that possess the greatest potential for national visibility, external support, and impact on
research capacity and productivity. Six tenure line faculty have been hired (2004-06) in Science Education (2); Mathematics Education (1); English as Second Language (1); and Early Childhood (2 for 2006). Newly hired tenure faculty will have a reduced teaching load in order to support their efforts in securing external funds and pursuing their research. Currently, the department is seeking to hire a senior faculty member to support junior faculty in their research efforts.

**Offer seminar series and research group activities.** The Literacy Group has established a popular seminar series featuring high-end research by bringing in outside and inside speakers. Also, as part of a recent NSF grant, a group of PRISE (Policy Research Initiatives in Science Education) scholars hosted a research seminar series in the fall of 2005 and a research group in the spring of 2006, both of which meet weekly with graduate students in the Science, Society, and Technology Cognate Group to discuss and plan high level research projects. Graduate students in the Mathematics Education Cognate Group also have met weekly during the past year to initiate and complete collaborative research projects.

**Focus graduate activities on research-based scholarship.** The department is also working on interdisciplinary networking through an active TLAC Graduate Student Association. Graduate students and faculty have become more focused on research-based scholarship as a result of the university, college, and department collaborative research and grant development goals. The University and College have increased internal support for assisting faculty in the development and automated submission of grants. Graduate students are encouraged to participate in grant writing seminars and to work collaboratively with faculty to secure external research funds. Graduate Students are encouraged through departmental financial support to submit proposals to national conferences as a means of learning more about their specialty areas by participating in inquiry. For example, 14 students made presentations and were supported by the department with travel funds for the AERA conference (2006).

**Secure and support national editorships.** Eleven (11) peer-reviewed national editorships are housed in the department and these editors are being encouraged and supported to establish a seminar series next academic year (2006-07) for faculty and graduate students.

**Increase Ph.D. productivity.** In the past three years, numbers of students awarded advanced degrees have increased dramatically. In 2003, 3 students were awarded the Ph.D., increasing to 10 students in 2004, and 16 students in 2005 (see Table 2 attached). The number of MED and MAT’s are noted in Tables 3 and 4 attached to this document with respect to the cognate groups and individual faculty members. Tenure line faculty have a minimum expectation of graduating at least one PhD student every three years.

**Concern 4. Financial Resources for graduate students are inadequate.**

**Majority of doctoral students are part time-a condition that undermines the quality of the program the TLAC faculty can deliver**
Off campus doctoral program courses take time away from faculty research and mentoring of doctoral students' research.

Provide financial resources for graduate students. Financial resources from state funds and the department to support graduate students continue to be somewhat limited. Graduate students are supported at approximately $1,000 per month, along with additional tuition funds from the College and University. Graduate stipends are very low with respect to university standards and with peer institutions. Future grant applications will include support for graduate students at a higher monthly rate and tuition funds. External funds, such as the NSF funded Science PRISE Scholars, support students at approximately $27,000 per year for their studies. The Department has also been awarded funds for Pathways Scholars (4 students from other A&M Universities) and Minority Fellowships (2) and could access this program with additional proposals. Graduate Enhancement funds in 2001 were $107,415 and have been increased only slightly in 2005-06 to $107,962. The funds currently support 3 Graduate Students for the Cognate areas. Additional graduate students are supported through externally funded grants and contracts.

Streamline the admissions process. The admissions process has been streamlined to include a formal interview process for all students. International students and some students disadvantaged by their distance from campus are interviewed via telephone or video conference. Three graduate faculty must agree to admit a PhD student with respect to the current standards. Students who appear marginal with any of the admission criteria are reviewed by the full cognate group and send a recommendation to the Department Head. PhD candidates will have an option to take the MAT or the GRE entrance exams beginning Fall 2006. The admissions process is further augmented by a full time graduate advisor and an up-to-date web page related to administrative and academic processes. The graduate advising office functions as a hub for facilitating students through all phases of the PhD program.

Enhance technology resources. Although a concern was present in 2002 regarding faculty teaching off-campus courses, primarily because of demands of travel time and time away from campus activities, this problem has been greatly impacted by advances in technology. TLAC has undertaken a major effort through the support of the college to develop web based and web assisted courses. Faculty receive $3000-$4000 for participating in training and developing such courses. Also, consultative services through the college to support web based teaching have been made widely available. The department now offers 14 web based courses for students. An increase in the number of weekend courses has also been appealing to students and faculty and computer/camera real time access has ameliorated the concern regarding distance from campus. An Online Masters has also been developed and implemented to better serve students at a distance as well as assisted the department in becoming competitive with other university programs. To strengthen professor/student interactions and support, the cohort model has been used successfully in the Houston area (4 years) and a newly developed cohort program was
implemented in January 2006 in Laredo (TAMIU) through joint institutional financial support.

**Expand the EdD.** One of the concerns of the external review team (2002) was that expansion of the EdD had not been a viable alternative due to lack of faculty and student interest and greater appeal of the PhD degree. TLAC is currently seeking financial support to develop and deliver an innovative EdD program that will prepare students for leadership roles in public education and in state, regional, and national education agencies. Faculty are currently having discussions concerning the Departmental and Research Core requirements in order to provide students with courses that better align with diverse career objectives delivered via an EdD or PhD.

**Concerns**

**Concern 5a.** Given the complex administrative demands and the large student enrollments in the Houston Endowment's Center for Urban Education, we are concerned that the center will not survive without additional human and fiscal support from both the College and University.

**Concern 5b.** The Houston Endowment Center for Urban Education is understaffed. We believe the Center has the potential to gain national visibility in ways that would reflect favorably on the department, the College of Education, and the University.

**Recruit more faculty for urban education.** The external review noted that TLAC faculty and administration should take a closer look at providing additional resources to expand the Houston Endowment's Center for Urban Education. Currently, an endowed professor of urban education continues to recruit, teach, and mentor student cohorts from the Houston area. This program is especially important in providing students of color an opportunity to pursue graduate degrees while at the same time dealing with significant urban school problems. TLAC tried unsuccessfully to recruit a nationally known urban educator last year as the review recommended. However, a successful associate professor has been recruited for next year (06-07) to support urban and teacher education. Proposals to further fund urban programs have not been successful.

**Concern 6.** The review team expressed concerns associated with elements of the doctoral curriculum and coursework, student research experiences and preparation, and the support and mentoring of doctoral students. The recommendations included:

**Recommendation 1. Expand research opportunities for graduate students.**

The main avenue for providing opportunities to expand research for graduate students is through securing grants and contracts. The department has been very successful in Mathematics and Science Education in providing financial support for graduate students along with related research in these respective areas. Texas Education Agency grants have also provided additional funding for graduate students. Faculty teaching TLAC core
courses and required electives in cognate areas emphasize the importance of interpreting and conducting research. Faculty have involved students in unfunded research projects that have resulted in increased numbers of presentations at national conferences and publications.

Recommendation 2. Offer required research seminars that consider both qualitative and quantitative research, and afford the opportunity for student collaboration across the cognates.

Seminars reflecting both qualitative and quantitative research for graduate students are now being offered on a systematic basis by the Reading and Science, Society and Technology Cognate groups. Future plans include building seminars around the various journal editors (11) in the department (2006-07) to foster collaboration across the cognate groups.

Recommendation 3. Examine courses within each cognate area to insure that they foster both depth and breadth of intellectual development.

A graduate faculty meeting (2005) reviewed the department's core courses and examined their continued relevance to student needs and program requirements. Faculty responsible for teaching these courses presented the content and requirements of all the core courses. This discussion is currently ongoing and faculty have submitted various alternatives for the core requirements. A standardized course syllabus outline was developed and insures that faculty have covered the major components of all courses. In addition, the faculty university evaluation process is used to identify specific strengths and weaknesses of courses and faculty. Formal faculty improvement plans seriously address any individual issues. A departmental peer review program has also been developed and provides faculty with an opportunity to observe and provide feedback for each other in the area of teaching.

Recommendation 4. Require doctoral students to write at least one publishable research paper before they graduate.

Although not required currently, it is highly advised that PhD students publish during their program to enable them to become more marketable in research and other institutions. There has been some preliminary discussion by the Science, Society and Technology Cognate Group to require students to present a draft of an article as part of the preliminary examination. In addition, a committee proposal is forthcoming that will review and make recommendations to improve the preliminary exam. The department has had one example of a PhD student who was allowed to meet alternative dissertation requirements (publishable articles vs. classical dissertation format). This alternative is used in the Department of Health and Kinesiology in the College of Education and in several science departments across the campus of Texas A&M University. The three-article dissertation is quickly becoming a viable alternative for TLAC's PhD students, especially for those desiring placements in Research I universities.
Faculty may be considered for merit pay for coauthoring a peer reviewed publication with a student. Laptop computers have been provided by the department (or by a grant) for all full time graduate students to encourage publishing and accessing the internet in the department's wireless educational environment.

Recommendation 5: Require doctoral students to teach or co-teach at least one undergraduate course and provide the support and mentoring necessary.

The formal Graduate Student Review process has been implemented (Spring 2006) to mentor and guide doctoral students. The process clearly identifies that PhD students are expected to teach and/or coteach an undergraduate course before completing their programs. This review will assist faculty as they mentor and guide students through their programs. Students who are not making adequate progress must meet with the cognate group before they are allowed to continue through the program. The department is developing a plan to ensure that undergraduate courses are scheduled and taught by graduate students. One faculty member in Reading, one in ESL and two in Mathematics provide mentoring support for PhD students who are presently teaching courses (Spring, 2006). The goal of the department is to have all PhD students teach or co-teach a course before graduation.

Recommendation 6. Formalize support for international students to insure integration in the department and community culture

The international students were highly involved and instrumental in organizing a strong graduate student association (2004-2005). The elected presidents of this group, both in 2005 and 2006, were international students. Social gatherings and receptions have been held on campus and at professors' homes to help students begin to form networks for study as well as work. In addition, a series of international receptions have been held (2005-06) through special funding from the dean's office. TLAC students have been active participants in these events. Several international days and special events where students share cultural traditions, practices, and arts with other graduate students and faculty are held each semester. Presently there appears to be ample integration of international students with other students and the community and the Department intends to continue to fully support these efforts.

Recommendation 7. Continue to work with doctoral students after they graduate—in ways that promote research productivity of both faculty and students.

Faculty are continuing to publish and make presentations with doctoral students after they graduate. The department is currently working on establishing a database to maintain contact with PhD students to encourage networking for research and securing positions in various universities and educational enterprises. A survey will assess students' views of the graduate programs and provide information about their current research programs. This information will be shared to encourage collaborative efforts among faculty and other students.
Recommendation 8. Design formalized, developmental sequences to involve doctoral students in research in a more continuous manner throughout the program. Consider the implementation of credit bearing research internships and required research seminars.

Discussions have occurred in the department relative to beginning the research component at the very beginning of a student's program. A Mixed Methods Research Course was developed and offered to 26 PhD students (Spring, 2006) as a substitution for one of the Department's core courses. Faculty are presently reviewing the core in light of student interest in obtaining more research oriented courses. EPSY has developed a research sequence and course requirements to enable students to self evaluate their research competencies and TLAC is participating in discussions related to this concept for use in the department.

Attachments

Table 2
Ph.D. Productivity by Cognate Group ($\#$ $\&$ Graduates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognate</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Committee Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>N. Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z. Eslami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Lara-Alecio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Lara-Aleco/D. Seaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P. Larke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P. Slattery/M. Sadoski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Young-Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.M. Capraro/G. Kulm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Capraro/G. Kulm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Kulm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Kulm/V. Schielack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Language Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Joshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Sadoski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Society/Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Burlbaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Burlbaw/Z. Eslami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Clark/L. Cifuentes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Loving/G. Allen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Stuessy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increase productivity in Masters' Degrees. The Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture offers two masters' degrees: the M.Ed., which is a non-thesis degree requiring a final oral examination; and the M.S., the thesis-requiring degree. There have been increases in numbers of students receiving these degrees (see Tables 3 and 4 below).

Table 3
Numbers of Students Receiving the M.Ed. since 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognate</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Committee Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N. Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z. Eslamii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Z. Eslamii/J. Helfeldt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Z. Eslamii/P. Larke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E. Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P. Larke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P. Larke/G. Cannella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L. Young-Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>M.M. Capraro/G. Kulm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.M. Capraro/R. Capraro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.M. Capraro/L. Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Capraro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L. Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Kulm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Language Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>F. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>F. Clark/L. Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F. Clark/M. Joshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Joshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Norton/M. Sadoski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Parrish/C. Pryor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>W. Peters/L. Burbaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M. Sadoski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Society/Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>L. Burbaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Burbaw/N. Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Burbaw/R. James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Burbaw/L. Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Burlbaw/C. Pryor</td>
<td>F. Clark</td>
<td>L. Kelly/C. Stuessy</td>
<td>C. Loving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1
Numbers of Students Receiving the M.S. since 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognate</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Committee Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N. Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z. Esfahani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.M. Capraro/G. Kulm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Capraro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Lamb/R. Capraro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Kulm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Language Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Society/Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Burbaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2:

Teaching, Learning and Culture Goals 07-08
Teaching, Learning and Culture
Goals 07-08
Draft: 5/3/07; Revised 6/4/07; 8/10/07; 8/20/07

College/Department Goals

1. **Establish and promote a diverse academic community**
   1.1 Increase number of diverse faculty
   **Data Source:** College (2003-2008)
   1.2 Increase higher percentage of diverse students
   **Data Source:** College (2003-2008)
   1.3 Graduate a higher percentage of diverse students
   **Data Source:** College (2003-2008)

   Other Indicators:

2. **Recruit and develop faculty to foster the college’s research, teaching and service missions**
   2.1 Recruit faculty to complete the reinvestment program
   **Data Source:** College (2003-2008)
   2.2 Recruit faculty in high need areas (Mathematics, ESL, Science)
   **Data Source:** College (2003-2008)
   2.3 Provide systemic mentoring and mentoring of non tenured and clinical faculty
   **Data Source:** Departmental Records (2003-2008)

   Other Indicators:

3. **Strengthen graduate education**
   3.1 Incorporate teaching, research and service skills throughout graduate programs to enable students to build competitive resumes
   **Data Source:** Graduate Student Records Annual Review
   3.2 Establish and monitor research sequence (qualitative and quantitative) to ensure that students develop competencies
   **Data Source:** Graduate Student Records Annual Review
   3.3 Increase the funding and overall number of graduate student stipends
   **Data Source:** Departmental Records Annual Review
   3.4 Implement annual review system for all graduate students
   **Data Source:** Departmental Records Annual Review

   Other Indicators:

4. **Meeting the commitment to Texas and the nation through preparation of quality practitioners**
   4.1 Prepare highly qualified practitioners for all grade levels and subject areas
   **Data Source:** Dean’s Office # pass in respective areas
   4.2 Increase opportunities for students to complete internships and student teaching with school systems throughout Texas
   **Data Source:** Departmental Records
   4.3 Recruit a higher percentage of students to middle grades certification with an emphasis on science and math
   **Data Source:** Departmental Records
4.4 Implement Applied Minor in Mathematics and Science with other colleges by developing an “Applied Learning” Minor  
Data Source: Departmental Records (08)  
4.5 Develop increased emphasis on teacher education in urban schools  
Data Source: Departmental Records Program Development and Student Enrollment  
4.6 Continue to establish increased accessibility to courses and programs through online and distance courses  
Data Source: Departmental Records # of online courses and respective enrollments  

Other Indicators:  

5. Research to eliminate achievement and health disparities  
5.1 Attain an average of at least two publications per tenure line faculty  
Data Source: Dean’s office  
5.2 Conduct research related to impact on achievement  
Data Source: Dean’s office
Teaching, Learning and Culture

Rank the following goals:

(1) Top Priority  (2) Medium Priority  (3) Low Priority

Department Goals

6. Attain national ranking to top 10 by 2012  
   Data Source: US News and World Report and other ranking systems
7. Collaborative effort to develop EdD with TAMUI by 2010  
   Data Source: Dean’s office
8. Develop collaborative M Ed with Qatar University by 2010  
   Data Source: Dean’s office
9. Communicate our work to both internal and external audiences  
   Data Source: Departmental Records (Brochures, News Flashes, Newsletters…)
10. Continue to implement shared leadership model for departmental operations with leaders 1 2 3  
    Data Source: Departmental Records noting various leaders and responsibilities
11. Continue to align faculty and staff evaluation with University, College and Department goals  
    Data Source: Auditing assessments with university goals  
    Evaluation Committee Steve Carpenter
12. Incorporate outcome assessment strategies to assess and evaluate programs (Determined by the degrees)  
    Data Source: Program area documentation  
    Outcome Assessment Committee Pat Larke, Janet Hammer, Diane Goldsby, Malt Joshi, Larry Kelly
13. Continue to celebrate faculty, student and staff achievements  
    Data Source: TLAC FLASH
14. Implement and evaluate the use of technology for instruction  
    WebCT courses or blended models  
    Pod Casting
15. Implement Executive online Ed D program 08  
    Data Source: Department

Undergraduate Education

16. Review and implement changes in the UG Curriculum (Specifically reduce the duplication of curriculum in early education and emphasize math/science methodology)  
    Data Source: Departmental records  
    Undergraduate Committee Diane Goldsby
17. Evaluate the various components (field experiences, course work, etc.) of teacher education  
    Data Source: Student, supervisor, professor evaluation
18. Continue to collect and process electronic data related to the classroom learning practices of student teachers, interns and other field experiences and compare to teacher preparation courses  
    Data Source: Departmental data base
19. Increase the opportunities for international experiences for students to strengthen educational experience  
   Data Source: Departmental Records of # of students participating

20. Increase opportunities for students to complete student teaching in school systems of their choice  
   Data Source: Departmental Records

Graduate Education
21. Prepare PhD students for research extensive universities and leadership positions.  
    Data Source: Department Graduate Advising Office Documentation

22. Implement change in PhD/EdD curriculum to meet diverse needs of students  
    Data Source: Department Graduate Advising Office Documentation

23. Incorporate publication and grant writing skills in courses  
    Data Source: Department Graduate Advising Office Documentation

24. Provide opportunities for graduate students to participate in national conferences (AERA)  
    Data Source: Dean’s office publications and departmental records

25. Develop and implement Executive EdD 07-10 for educational leaders to develop curriculum and leadership skills  
    Data Source: Departmental and Institutional records

26. Establish Clinical Professor role for chairing professional practice masters and doctorate (EdD) committees  
    Data Source: Departmental and Institutional records

Grants/External Funds
27. Increase external funding for research, service and teaching  
    Data Source: Dean’s office data

Other Goals

Opportunities
28. Study feasibility of developing online M Ed with Saudi Ramco (Planning Stages)  
    Data Source: Department Records
Department Head

- Implement the policies, procedures and responsibilities of DH
- Coordinator of Texas A&M Department Head Council
- Provide internal and external opportunities for faculty to conduct their work
- Encourage creative practices and innovative thinking
- Coordinate “Always Expect More of Aggie Teachers” Program
- Partner with University of Illinois Technology Teacher Training Project
- Reads and Counts (Tina Shannon)
- Recruit under represented students for the Reads and Counts program in high need areas
Appendix 3:

Number of Credit Hours produced From Undergraduate Courses for 2009 - 2010 Academic Year
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Number enrolled</th>
<th>Weighted Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 364</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 365</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 453</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 454</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 322</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>2163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 462</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>1668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 463</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC 351</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC 450</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC 475</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 351</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 352</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 450</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 460</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 470</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFB 497</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG351</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 361</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 371</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 372</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 460</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 461</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 465</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 467</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 468</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 470</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDNG 490</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEED 302</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 273</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>1401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 322</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 323</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 410</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 412</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 413</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 426</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 429</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFB 471</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**27321**
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Chart titles in red are U.S. News and World Report measures
Faculty Excellence

Publishing
- Increase overall publishing productivity
- Collaborating with departmental colleagues
- Increase peer reviewed journal articles
- Publishing with graduate students
- International and National Level Presentations
- PI or Co-PI appointment
- New Awards

Research Dollars
- Grant Expenditures increase by 5% each year
- Increase total number of memberships among faculty members who's research appointment is at least 40%
- Chair and Co-Chair on graduate committees
- Teach undergraduate courses

Teaching
- Mentor students and improve average graduation completion times
## Faculty Excellence

### Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>EAHR</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
<th>HLKN</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All journal articles, books and book chapters are counted by faculty member.

### Faculty Publications

All journal articles, books and book chapters are counted by faculty member.
Faculty Excellence

Peer Reviewed Journal Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>EAHR</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
<th>HLKN</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Publications are counted by faculty member. Deans are assigned to home department.

50 Faculty members have published with a graduate student in 2007.
Faculty Excellence

Percent of Faculty Published

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>EAHR</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Res Fac</td>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>PerCnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>HLKN</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Res Fac</td>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>PerCnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Count Fac</th>
<th>Res Fac</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Count Fac</td>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80% of CEHD Tenure/Tenure Track faculty (with at least 40% research appointment) will publish two or more, peer reviewed journal articles (3 year rolling avg).
## Faculty Excellence

### Research Grant EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>EAHR (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>EPSY (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>HLKN (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>TLAC (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>DEAN (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>Total (in 1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>2114</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2432</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>3915</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>5063</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research Grant EXPENDITURES by Department

- **EAHR**
- **EPSY**
- **HLKN**
- **TLAC**
- **DEAN**
- **Total**

![Graph showing Research Grant EXPENDITURES by Department from 2001 to 2008](image)
## Faculty Excellence

### New Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>EAHR (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>EPSY (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>HLKN (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>TLAC (in 1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3947</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>3425</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4994</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>2128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>7390</td>
<td>3169</td>
<td>1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>4471</td>
<td>2620</td>
<td>3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2633</td>
<td>7423</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>2364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>8575</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>1458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not shown on Graph**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Dean (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>COLR (in 1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5462</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty Productivity

- **Number of New Awards:** 10/8/2008
- **Faculty Excellence:** 7 of 25
### Total Grant EXPENDITURES

#### Fiscal Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EAHR (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>EPSY (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>HLKN (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>TLAC (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>Total (in 1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>6124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>2764</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>7800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>3454</td>
<td>2376</td>
<td>2136</td>
<td>9308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2566</td>
<td>3583</td>
<td>2704</td>
<td>2297</td>
<td>11150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2148</td>
<td>4663</td>
<td>2420</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>11233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2298</td>
<td>5866</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>7447</td>
<td>17192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7062</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>12595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Not shown on Graph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dean (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>COLR (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>Grand Total (in 1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>8767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>10897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>12356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>13298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>13826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3761</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>21534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3062</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>15935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Excellence

### PI or Co-PI on External Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EAHR</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
<th>HLKN</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>PerCnt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Excellence

Editorial Board Memberships

### EAHR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>T/TT</th>
<th># on</th>
<th>PerCnt</th>
<th>T/TT</th>
<th># on</th>
<th>PerCnt</th>
<th>Ed/Co-Ed</th>
<th>Assoc. Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EPSY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>T/TT</th>
<th># on</th>
<th>PerCnt</th>
<th>T/TT</th>
<th># on</th>
<th>PerCnt</th>
<th>Ed/Co-Ed</th>
<th>Assoc. Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Productivity
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Faculty Excellence

Editorial Board Memberships

HLKN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research T/TT</th>
<th>All T/TT</th>
<th>Ed/Co-Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># on</td>
<td># on</td>
<td>PerCnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TLAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Research T/TT</th>
<th>All T/TT</th>
<th>Ed/Co-Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># on</td>
<td># on</td>
<td>PerCnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Af Am</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Ind</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ttl Fac</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ttl M/F</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Div</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Div</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Af Am</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Ind</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ttl Fac</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ttl M/F</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Div</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Div</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Female (% Div) in Fall:
- 2003: 108/18% = 60.5%
- 2004: 113/18% = 62.8%
- 2005: 116/22% = 62.2%
- 2006: 123/27% = 68.8%
- 2007: 126/33% = 77.4%
- 2008: 122/34% = 76.9%

### Faculty Excellence

- Faculty Diversity
- Faculty Productivity
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Graduate Student Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EAHR</th>
<th>EAHR</th>
<th>EAHR</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Div #</td>
<td>% Div</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Div #</td>
<td>% Div</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HLKN</th>
<th>HLKN</th>
<th>HLKN</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Div #</td>
<td>% Div</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Div #</td>
<td>% Div</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CEHD</th>
<th>CEHD</th>
<th>CEHD</th>
<th>TAMU</th>
<th>TAMU</th>
<th>TAMU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Div #</td>
<td>% Div</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Div #</td>
<td>% Div</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7291</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7518</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7815</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8243</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8703</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8512</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8291</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8680</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9106</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Doctoral Student Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CEHD</th>
<th>CEHD</th>
<th>TAMU</th>
<th>TAMU</th>
<th>TAMU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2940</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2901</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2993</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>3229</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3303</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>3329</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3451</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>3364</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3308</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UT</th>
<th>UT</th>
<th>UT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hispanic, Black, Asian-Pacific Islander and American Indian are counted as diverse.
### Undergraduate Student Diversity

#### Fall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EAH</th>
<th>Ugrad</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>% Div</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
<th>Ugrad</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>% Div</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EAH</th>
<th>Ugrad</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>% Div</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
<th>Ugrad</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>% Div</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1562</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>EAH</th>
<th>Ugrad</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>% Div</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
<th>Ugrad</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>% Div</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3622</td>
<td>5580</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3089</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36603</td>
<td>5562</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3411</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36775</td>
<td>5551</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3681</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36066</td>
<td>5523</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3868</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35732</td>
<td>5798</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4116</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36066</td>
<td>6413</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4112</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36580</td>
<td>7028</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4158</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37557</td>
<td>7592</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4070</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38430</td>
<td>8384</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OISP Student Enrollment Profile

- Hispanic, Black, Asian-Pacific Islander and American Indian are counted as diverse.
### Average Lower and Upper Division Class Size

### Average Graduate Class Size

### Student to Faculty Ratio (Undergraduate)

#### Undergraduate Student Full Time Equivalent (UG Stu FTE): Undergraduate Faculty Full Time (UG Fac FTE) Equivalent

#### STAR Report. Fall 2002 is an estimated calculation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Lower Division UG Stu FTE</th>
<th>Upper Division UG Stu FTE</th>
<th>Graduate UG Stu FTE</th>
<th>Overall CEHD UG Stu FTE</th>
<th>Overall UG Stu FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Upper Division and Lower Division average class sizes decreased in Fall 2006 from Fall 2005.
Four and Six Year Graduation Rate by Department by Cohort Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>HLKN</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
<th>TAMU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Yr</td>
<td>4 Yr</td>
<td>6 Yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EPSY and EAHR have not had a graduating cohort yet.

Cohort is defined as a student who enters a CEHD department as a freshman and graduates within same dept.
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### Five Year Teacher Retention Rates

**Public Schools in Texas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PerCnt</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PerCnt</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PerCnt</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cohort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PerCnt</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PerCnt</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PerCnt</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1st five consecutive year retention has decreased, but is rising. Most teachers in population teach at least one year.*
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### Employment or Graduate School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grad Year</th>
<th># Students Work/Sch</th>
<th>Graduated</th>
<th>PerCnt</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **# Graduated** - Number of undergraduates who finished degree during academic year. (uncertified)

- **# Students Work/School** - Number of students in proceeding year TEA file plus the number of non-cert students who answered “yes” to being employed. Added this to survey of all students who stated the intent to continue education.

- **Graduation Year** - Academic year assigned to degree date. For example, December 2005, May and August 2006 = Grad Year 2006.
### Teacher Preparation

#### TExES Pass Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Completion Year</th>
<th>Actual Pass #</th>
<th>Passing Percent</th>
<th>Total Attempts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/1/1999</td>
<td>12/31/2001</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2000</td>
<td>12/31/2002</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2001</td>
<td>12/31/2003</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2002</td>
<td>12/31/2004</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2003</td>
<td>12/31/2005</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2004</td>
<td>12/31/2006</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2005</td>
<td>12/31/2007</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Period** - Student is allowed 2 1/2 years following graduation to pass TExES test

**Completion Year** - end of eligible calendar year

**Actual Pass #** - Number of students eligible for certification

---

Increase the Pass Rate for the TExES to 98% or more by 2008

Our goal is 915 certified teachers each year
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Bridges to Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sem</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase the number of students in the BRIDGES TO SUCCESS programs to 900 Students. Includes HRD, Tech Mgmt & Sports Mgmt.
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Table: Percent of Undergraduate Semester Credit Hours taught by Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EAHR</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
<th>HLKN</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heather Turner: OISP doing research on this. No T/TT teaching these courses.

OISP Who's Teaching Whom
### Meeting the Needs of the State and the Nation

#### Endowment Dollars
**Undergraduate, Graduate and College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>GR (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>UG (in 1,000s)</th>
<th>CEHD (in 1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>12,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>12,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>15,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>19,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>22,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>23,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>28,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increase the undergraduate (UG) scholarship endowment to $8 million, or more, by 2008**

**Have $1 million, or more, total graduate (GR) fellowship endowment, or more, by 2008**
### Endowed Chairs and Professors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Number Endowed</th>
<th>Endowed $ (in 1000s)</th>
<th>Count Prof</th>
<th>Dist. Prof</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8,631</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9,849</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10,346</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12,487</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram:**

- **Y-axis (Dollars):** Endowed $ (in 1000s)
- **X-axis (Number Endowed):** Year

**Legend:**
- Red line with markers: Endowed $ (in 1000s)
- Blue line with markers: Number Endowed
Appendix 5:

Performance Evaluation Guide for Tenure / Tenure-Track Faculty
Approved 2009
The model of Engaged Scholarship is a central theme to the College of Education and Human Development. The faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) is a learning community committed to scholarship that creates and disseminates new knowledge; improves teaching practices; and serves the department, college, university, profession, and community.

The faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture recognize that within the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, it is important to comply with the University goals of achieving a culture that supports multidisciplinary collaboration, developing a climate and providing experiences that enhance diversity and internationalization, and requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance with university guidelines and regulations.

Approvals:
INTRODUCTION

This document is a guide to enable faculty members and administrators in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture to identify, cite, and evaluate the annual performance of individual tenure-track faculty members in the traditional areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The document identifies categories of performance and ranks their importance, within each of these three areas. Points are assigned to each activity according to its ranked importance within the category. Throughout this Guide, the term “faculty” is used to refer to “tenure-track faculty.”

A. General Assumptions
   • While the document describes several categories of performance within each area, it does not attempt to list all possible activities within these categories. Faculty members are responsible for clarifying or justifying the reason for placement of an outlying activity within the appropriate category.
   • Value Added points are available for most performance activities. These Value Added points are intended to reflect activities that are valued and important to the department, college, and/or university and are intended to reward faculty members who focus their efforts on activities that benefit or advance the larger academic community.
   • The ranking of categories and the assignment of both points and Value Added points are intended to align with the advancement toward tenure and promotion of junior faculty. Generally, active and consistent engagement and productivity in the higher-ranked categories, with special attention given to the area of scholarship, should support promotion and tenure. However, simply attaining the threshold number of points for merit in each area would not be deemed sufficient for either promotion or tenure.

B. Expected and Merit Performance
   • Points are awarded to faculty members within each of the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. Expected performance is identified for each area, according to a specified number of points earned (12 points for Scholarship, 12 points for Teaching, and 6 points for Service).
   • Points earned above Expected performance levels are Merit points. There is no upper limit to the number of Merit points that can be earned within each of the three areas.

C. Implementation
   • Merit need not be requested; it is awarded upon exceeding the threshold number of points for Expected performance. Merit can be earned independently in each of the three areas (Scholarship, Teaching, Service).
   • The annual Merit raise pool for tenure-track faculty in the department will be allotted to each of the areas: Scholarship (40%), Teaching (40%) and Service (20%). Each faculty member will receive a share of the merit raise pool, proportional to the number of merit points he/she earned in each area and relative to the total points earned by all TLAC tenure-track faculty members within each of the three areas.
   • The Department Head will report to the faculty a summary of the A-1 results, including the frequency distributions, means, and total number of merit points for each of the three areas. These data will allow individual faculty members to calculate their share of the merit raise pools for each area.
FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: TRAINING and SAFETY

Faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) realize the importance of maintaining their own level of awareness and expertise in basic competencies related to ethical, safety, and personnel concerns of the university. Each faculty member must attest to the following statements before the annual A-1 evaluation can be considered.

1. Faculty members should complete all training activities that are required by the university, college, or department.
   ___ I have completed all currently required training requirements.

2. Faculty members should consider the teaching environments they were responsible for and list any safety concerns.
   ___ After consideration of the teaching environments where I was the instructor of record, I believe that all safety concerns that I could mitigate would tend to be of low impact and low frequency.

3. Faculty members should consider the research environments they were responsible for and list any safety concerns.
   ___ After consideration of the research environments where I was the principal or lead investigator for the environment, I believe that all safety concerns that I could mitigate would tend to be of low impact and low frequency.
FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: SCHOLARSHIP (Research and Funding)

The Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture recognizes its status as an integral member of a top-tier research institution where research is defined as the construction, discovery, or integration of knowledge and the communication of this knowledge to an audience of critical peers. Contributing to the professional research literature is acknowledged as an academic priority in the Department. Consistent with College of Education and Human Development and University guidelines, faculty research accomplishments are demonstrated by the generation of products that are: part of a sustained, focused program; conceptual rather than merely technical; significant in their effects on thought and practice; and significant contributions by the individual (where he or she is part of a multidisciplinary activity).

Faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) realize the importance of external support for their research efforts. Faculty members who seek appropriate funding in any of the three major domains of evaluation (research, teaching and service) will be awarded performance points toward fulfillment of expected or meritorious performance. While it is acknowledged that all fields in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture do not have equal access to external funding opportunities, efforts to make the most of available opportunities are required of all faculty members.

Performance evaluation in the area of Scholarship includes both Research and Funding. The evaluation of performance for Scholarship will consist of the combined total productivity for each of these areas. To be considered for merit, the threshold level is 12 points, including at least one publication in Category 1 and participation* in at least one funding activity.

*Participation may include being a PI, Co-PI, or Member of (1) a project that is currently funded, or (2) a group that submits a proposal in any of the six categories for funding. A project must receive approval of funding or approval for continuation in the year of evaluation; a proposal must be submitted in the year of evaluation.
Performance Categories for Research

For the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, six categories of research will be used for faculty evaluation. The guidelines in this document reflect performance in these categories that have been sequenced by level of importance. For evaluation of performance in the area of research as a scholarly activity, authorship with students or by senior faculty with non-tenured colleagues should be considered. “Top-tier” journals are national or international in scope, and are listed in SSCI, ERIC, or Education Index and are recognized as influential in one’s field, with other factors taken into account as defined by the Department. Exhibitions of creative scholarship (artworks and arts-based performances) can be substituted for publications at the appropriate level in any of the categories.

Category 1 - Publications in peer-reviewed professional journals, including on-line journals and other professional formats, at the national or international level. Author of scholarly professional books at the national or international level. Publications contain original findings, reviews, syntheses, and critiques, and the creative application of existing knowledge to educational problems.

Category 2 - Publication of chapters in scholarly professional books at the national and international level. Publication in peer-reviewed conference proceedings at the national or international level. Editor or co-Editor of scholarly professional books at the national or international level. Publications contain original findings, reviews, syntheses, and critiques, and the creative application of existing knowledge to educational problems.

Category 3 - Publications in peer-reviewed professional journals, including on-line and other professional formats; publications in peer-reviewed conference proceedings; author or editor of scholarly professional books; at the regional level or state level. Publications contain original findings, reviews, syntheses, and critiques, and the creative application of existing knowledge to educational problems.

Category 4 - Presentation of research papers at professional conferences at the national or international level. Presentations that result from peer-reviewed proposals, membership presentations, invited addresses, and discussant/discussion panel membership. Presentations must be completed during the evaluation period.

Category 5 - Presentation of research papers at professional conferences at the regional, state, and local level. These presentations should result from peer-reviewed proposals, membership presentations, invited addresses, and discussant/discussion panel membership. Presentations must be completed during the evaluation period.

Category 6 - Articles in non peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings, editorial columns or book reviews in journals, local presentations, and opinion-editorial pieces for newspapers or magazines. These presentations and publications must be in print or completed during the evaluation period.
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Research

The following table outlines the performance points to be awarded for each Research activity. Points are awarded for each article or presentation. Meritorious consideration will be determined by the cumulative number of points. College or University level Research Awards receive Value Added points to be negotiated with the Department Head. The evaluation of performance for Scholarship will consist of the combined total productivity for Research and Funding. To be considered for merit, the threshold level is 12 points, including at least one publication in Category 1 and participation in at least one funding activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value Added Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Publications must be in press, in print, on-line, or on display (arts-based) during the A-1 evaluation period and may be listed only one time. Presentations must be completed during the evaluation period.</em></td>
<td>Published in press</td>
<td>With student(s), AND/OR non-tenured TLAC faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1 - Publications in peer-reviewed professional journals, including on-line journals and other professional formats, at the national or international level. Author of scholarly professional books at the national or international level.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2 - Publication of chapters in scholarly professional books at the national and international level. Publication in peer-reviewed conference proceedings at the national or international level. Editor or co-Editor of scholarly professional books at the national or international level.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3 - Publications in peer-reviewed professional journals, including on-line and other professional formats; publications in peer-reviewed conference proceedings; author or editor of scholarly professional books; at the regional level or state level.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4 - Presentation of research papers at professional conferences at the national or international level that result from peer-reviewed proposals, membership presentations, invited addresses, and discussant/discussion panel membership.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5 - Presentation of research papers at professional conferences at the regional, state, and local level. These presentations should result from peer-reviewed proposals, membership presentations, invited addresses, and discussant/discussion panel membership.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6 - Articles in non peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings, editorial columns or book reviews in journals, local presentations, and opinion-editorial pieces for newspapers or magazines.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Three Value Added points are awarded for publication in a “top-tier” journal. This should be justified by faculty member using indicators such as citation rating, acceptance rate under 25%, significance, impact, or degree of extending knowledge. +See University guidelines for definitions and sample activities*
Performance Categories for Funding

The guidelines in this document reflect fund-seeking efforts from the categories below that are listed by type of funding source. While not exhaustive, these six categories represent primary funding sources. In evaluating any fund-seeking effort, the primary indicators are the source, the potential impact of the funding, and the dollar amount.

Category 1 – Federal grants and contracts obtained through a multi-tiered peer review system. These competitive grants support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

Category 2 – State grants and contracts obtained through a multi-tiered peer review system. These competitive grants support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

Category 3 – Foundation grants or contracts that are either peer reviewed or reviewed by the Board of Directors of the Foundation. These grants are competitive and support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

Category 4 – Federal grants and contracts that are reviewed by agency staff. These grants or contracts are reviewed internally by agency staff and support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

Category 5 – State grants and contracts that are reviewed by agency staff. These grants or contracts are reviewed internally by agency staff and support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

Category 6 – Local (system, university, college, and departmental) grants or contracts. These grants are based on peer reviews and support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Funding

The following table outlines the performance points to be awarded for each Funding activity. Points are earned in the year funding is sought, the year funding is granted, and each year of continuing funding. For funded proposals, additional points can be awarded for generating salary savings, as negotiated with the Department Head.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Funded Proposals* (year funded)</th>
<th>Submitted Proposals/Continuing Grants</th>
<th>Value added Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI or Co-PI</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1. – Federal grants and contracts obtained through a multi-tiered peer review system.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2 – State grants and contracts obtained through a multi-tiered peer review system.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3 – Foundation grants and contracts that are either peer reviewed or reviewed by the Board of Directors of the Foundation.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4 – Federal grants and contracts that are reviewed by agency staff.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5 – State grants and contracts that are reviewed by agency staff.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6 – Local (system, university, college and departmental) grants and contracts.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For funded proposals, additional Value Added points are awarded to the PI and Co-PIs each year for grant amounts as follows: Up to $49K – 1 point, $50K to $99K – 2 points, $100 to $149K – 3 points, $150K to $199K – 4 points, $200K to $249K - 5 points, over $250K – 6 points. Additional points are awarded to the PI, Co-PIs, or Members for each TLAC student supported by external grant funds: 4 points for each full-time (20 hours per week) student, and 2 points for each half-time student for each academic year of support. Projects will decide who will receive points for each student.

+See University guidelines for definitions and sample activities
FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: **TEACHING** (Instruction and Advising)

The Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture fully accepts its valuable role in the preparation of pre-service teachers and graduate students for the enhancement of teaching and learning. Each faculty member is expected to make significant contributions in areas such as quality classroom instruction, mentorship, effective instructional program development, and outreach and partnership initiatives. The Department recognizes that the scholarship of teaching takes many forms and includes classroom-based teaching, supervising field-based experiences, working with students on their individual projects, advising and mentoring students, developing learning materials (textbooks, computer programs, web-based courses), providing continuing education experiences for professional educators or other professional audiences, and developing new courses and programs.

For the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, six categories of teaching will be used for faculty evaluation. The guidelines in this document reflect performance in these categories, with Category 1 being most fundamental and advising graduate students also of high importance (see the separate table for this category).

**Meritorious consideration will be determined by the cumulative number of points for Teaching and for Advising Graduate Students. To be considered for merit, the threshold level is 12 points, including at least 6 points in Category 1.**

**Performance Categories for Instruction**

**Category 1 - Quality and effectiveness of teaching:** Delivery and impact of classroom, laboratory, and field-based instruction. Teaching should be evaluated using the PICA student evaluation system. In addition, evaluation can include one or more of: (1) Peer review of classroom teaching and instructional innovations, using a valid and reliable measure, (2) Preparation of a teaching portfolio, or (3) Self-evaluation and development of an improvement plan.

**Category 2 - Contribution to the development of the curriculum:** Development and implementation of new courses or appropriate and substantial revisions of existing courses

**Category 3 - Scholarship within the broader context of instruction:** Writing textbooks and developing instructional materials: enhancement of instruction in the faculty member’s field of study through production of various teaching publications.

**Category 4 - Use of appropriate technologies in instruction and curriculum development:** Demonstrate sound, effective, and creative uses of technology.

**Category 5 - Work in a mentoring role with individual students:** Direct work with students, mentoring undergraduate and graduate students.

**Category 6 - Provision of continuing education experiences for professional educators or other professional audiences:** Contributing to the improvement of comprehensive educational programs through workshops and presentations for inservice teachers.
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Instruction

The following table outlines the performance points to be awarded for each Teaching activity. College or University level Teaching Awards receive Value added points to be negotiated with the Department Head. **Meritorious consideration will be determined by the cumulative number of points for Teaching and for Advising Graduate Students. To be considered for merit, the threshold level is 12 points, including at least 6 points in Category 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value added Points#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1: Quality and effectiveness of teaching. Delivery and impact of</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom, laboratory, and field-based instruction as indicated by average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICA student rating at or above 4.0 for undergraduate courses or 4.5 for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate courses.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2: Contribution to the development of the curriculum itself.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and implementation of new courses or appropriate and substantial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revisions of existing courses, including extending the course for Web or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online enrollment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3: Scholarship within the broader context of instruction.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement of instruction in the faculty member’s field of study through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of various teaching publications; writing textbooks and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing instructional materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4: Use of appropriate technologies in instruction and curriculum</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development. Sound, effective, and creative uses of technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5: Work in a mentoring role with individual students. Work with</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual undergraduate or graduate students. (See the following table for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>points awarded for chairing and membership on graduate committees.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6: Provision of professional development experiences for professional</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educators or other professional audiences. Contributing to the improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of comprehensive educational programs through workshops and presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for inservice teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PICA average ratings must include at least 50% of the students enrolled. **Points are awarded for each course meeting the criterion.** Additional points can be used to meet the 6 point Category 1 requirement by completing a Peer Review, Teaching Portfolio, or Self-Evaluation (3 points per course).

#Value added points are awarded for participation in professional development activities to improve teaching effectiveness or for teaching large sections of 40 or more undergraduate or 20 or more graduate students (3 points per activity).

+See **University guidelines for definitions and sample activities**
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Advising Graduate Students

The following table summarizes merit performance points for advising graduate students. **Points are awarded for each student and added to the merit points for Teaching.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories#</th>
<th>Points per Student Graduated*</th>
<th>Points per Student Continuing+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1 – PhD Dissertation/EdD Record of Study committee Chair or Co-chair</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2 – MS Thesis committee Chair or Co-chair</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3 – PhD Dissertation/EdD Record of Study committee Member</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4 – M Ed committee Chair</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5 – MS Thesis committee Member</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6 – M Ed committee Member</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Student must have an approved degree plan and be currently enrolled for at least one semester or summer session during the year. Points are awarded both for committees inside and outside the TLAC department.

*Value Added points are awarded for students who are placed in a position at a Research I university upon graduation (3 points per student).

+ Points can only be awarded for a maximum of three continuing years before graduating.
FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: SERVICE

For the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, five categories of service for organizational citizenship and scholarship and application are addressed in these guidelines. With regard to service, a claim for higher ranking in any category must be justified in terms of significance, time commitment, and degree of importance. **To be considered for merit, the threshold level is 6 points.**

Performance Categories for Service

Category 1: **Service to the profession at the national or international level** - At the national or international level, serving as: an officer of an organization; chair or committee member of a prominent committee; Editor or co-Editor of a journal, special issue, or proceedings; presenter of a service-related talk or paper; grant or conference paper reviewer; newsletter editor; or mentor a student receiving an award.

Category 2: **Service to the Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture** - Developing new programs, serving as chair or member of standing and ad-hoc committees; serving as advisor of student organizations; mentoring new faculty. Organizing or presenting at department or program area seminars.

Category 3: **Service to the College of Education and Human Development or Texas A&M University** - Serving as a chair or member of college or university committee; organizing or presenting at seminars sponsored by the university or college. Service related presentation at a college or university-wide meeting; writing an article in a university or college publication.

Category 4: **Service to the profession at the regional or state level** – At the regional or state level, serving as: an officer of an organization; chair or committee member of a prominent committee; Editor or co-Editor of a journal, book, special issue or proceedings; presenter of a service-related talk or paper; grant or conference paper reviewer; newsletter editor; or mentor of a student receiving an award.

Category 5: **Service to the community through efforts to support children and families** - Lecturing to non-professional groups; serving as a committee or board member for district or community agencies; serving on school-based committees; providing professional development in-services for school personnel; or providing classroom presentations or model teaching lessons to school-age children. Editing community newsletters; providing support for community grant writing projects; applying for seed grants related to community issues; creating web page for community agency.
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Service

The following table outlines the performance points to be awarded for each Service activity. Points are awarded for each activity. College or University level Service Awards receive Value added points to be negotiated with the Department Head. **To be considered for merit, the threshold level is 6 points.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value added Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1: Service to the profession at the national or international level</strong> - At the national or international level, serving as: an officer of an organization; chair or committee member of a prominent committee; Editor or co-Editor of a journal, special journal issue, or proceedings; presenter of a service-related talk or paper; grant or conference paper reviewer or newsletter editor; or mentor of a student receiving an award.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 2: Service to the Department of Teaching, Learning &amp; Culture</strong> - Developing new programs, serving as chair or member of standing or ad-hoc committee; serving as advisor of student organization; mentoring new faculty; organizing or presenting at department or program area seminars.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 3: Service to the College of Education and Human Development or Texas A&amp;M University</strong> - Serving as a chair or member of college or university committee; organizing or presenting at seminars sponsored by the university or college. Service-related presentation at a college or university-wide meeting; writing an article in a university or college publication.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 4: Service to the profession at the regional or state level</strong> - At the regional or state level, serving as: an officer of an organization; chair or committee member of a prominent committee; Editor or co-Editor of a journal, special issue, or proceedings; presenter of a service-related talk or paper; grant or conference paper reviewer; newsletter editor; or mentor of a student receiving an award.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 5: Service to the community through efforts to support children and families</strong> - Lecturing to non-professional groups; serving as a committee or board member for district or community agencies; serving on school-based committees; providing professional development in-services for school personnel; or providing classroom presentations or model teaching lessons to school school-age children. Editing community newsletters; providing support for community grant writing projects; applying for seed grants related to community issues; creating web page for community agency.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+See [University guidelines for definitions and sample activities](#)
Appendix 6:

Student Enrollment for Fall 2009 by Classification Level by Demographics
## Student Enrollment for Fall 2009 by Classification Level by Demographics

**Fall 2009 numbers based on Preliminary 20th Class Day Data (Unofficial)**

**Classification Level:** Undergraduate, Masters, Doctoral  
**Student College:** Education and Human Development  
**Student Department:** TLAC

### Fall 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Headcount</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>U2</td>
<td>U3</td>
<td>U4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student College

#### Education and Human Development

- **Total:** 1,807

### Student Department

#### TLAC

- **Total:** 1,807

### Major

#### EDCI

- **Total:** 414

#### EDIS

- **Total:** 674

#### INST

- **Total:** 694

#### TECR

- **Total:** 25

### Sex

#### Female

- **Total:** 1,645

#### Male

- **Total:** 50

### Ethnic Origin

#### White-Non-Hispanic

- **Total:** 1,456

#### Black-Non-Hispanic

- **Total:** 89

#### Hispanic

- **Total:** 51

#### Asian or Pacific Islander

- **Total:** 30

#### American Indian or Alaskan Native

- **Total:** 18

#### International

- **Total:** 5

#### Unknown or Not Reported

- **Total:** 6

### Top 10 Percent Flag

#### Top 10

- **Total:** 568

#### Not Top 10

- **Total:** 1,239
## Student Enrollment for Fall 2009 by Classification Level by Demographics

**Fall 2009 numbers based on Preliminary 20th Class Day Data (Unofficial)**

**Classification Level:** Undergraduate, Masters, Doctoral  
**Student College:** Education and Human Development  
**Student Department:** TLAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Headcount</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>U2</td>
<td>U3</td>
<td>U4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Generation Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not First Generation</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Time In College</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Non-Degree Undergraduate (UD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Transfer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Non-Degree Graduate (PB)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmitted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 21</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 to 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blinn TEAM Flag</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Tuition (Regular)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Tuition (Regular)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Exemption for Texas Resident</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Tuition (HB1403/SB1528)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Tuition (CB Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State Waiver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCH Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 6 SCH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-08 SCH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-11 SCH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14 SCH</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17 SCH</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18+ SCH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIMS Full-Time Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Half-Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Quarter Time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Student Enrollment for Fall 2009 by Classification Level by Demographics

**Fall 2009 numbers based on Preliminary 20th Class Day Data (Unofficial)**

**Classification Level:** Undergraduate, Masters, Doctoral  
**Student College:** Education and Human Development  
**Student Department:** TLAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Headcount</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U1</td>
<td>U2</td>
<td>U3</td>
<td>U4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Term Residency Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>HB1403 Residency Status</th>
<th>RS Not State Funded</th>
<th>RS Not State Funded - 7 Yr Exclusion</th>
<th>Non-Resident</th>
<th>NR Not State Funded - 7 Yr Exclusion</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>344</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>566</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                | 23          | 161                     | 184                 | 162                                 | 162          | 162                                 | 1,716         |

|                                | 1           | 1                       | 6                   | 6                                   | 6            | 6                                   | 6             |
|                                | 2           | 1                       | 3                   | 9                                   | 9            | 9                                   | 29            |
|                                | 2           | 1                       | 3                   | 9                                   | 9            | 9                                   | 29            |
|                                | 2           | 1                       | 4                   | 12                                  | 2            | 14                                  | 32            |
|                                | 3           | 1                       | 3                   | 12                                  | 2            | 14                                  | 32            |
|                                | 4           | 12                      | 2                   | 14                                  | 32           | 32                                  | 50            |

## Co-op

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Co-op</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>578</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall 2009 numbers based on Preliminary 20th Class Day Data (Unofficial)**

/content/folder[@name='OISP Historical Reports and Queries']/folder[@name='Student']/report[@name='Enrollment Profile (Interactive - Demographics)']

Provided by Office of Institutional Studies and Planning, Texas A&M University  
Nov 5, 2009 -  3  -

oisp.tamu.edu/cognos8  
11:53:25 AM
Appendix 7:

A Review of Undergraduate Academic Advising
A Review
of Undergraduate Academic Advising

Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Fall 2006
This survey is for evaluating College of Education and Human Development advisors only. Your reply will be confidential. The opinions and experiences will be very helpful in improving our academic advising services. Please give a few minutes of your best thinking to help shape our future advising.

**Directions:** Mark your answer on your scantron. Please use the following scale for questions 1-22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - Strongly Agree</td>
<td>B - Agree</td>
<td>C - Disagree</td>
<td>D - Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>E - No Opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My academic advisor has an adequate knowledge of the University.
2. My academic advisor has an adequate knowledge of my department.
3. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about my degree requirements.
4. Faculty members in my department are knowledgeable about degree requirements.
5. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about opportunities in my field/specialization.
6. Faculty members in my department are knowledgeable about opportunities in my field/specialization.
7. My academic advisor is accessible to me.
8. My academic advisor made me feel comfortable during my advising session.
9. My academic advisor shows a personal interest in me.
10. My academic advisor is a good listener.
11. My academic advisor is resourceful.
12. My academic advisor can refer me to resources on campus and within the community (ex: fiscal matters).
13. Scheduling appointments with my academic advisor is convenient.
14. I usually do not have too long of a wait for my advising appointment.
15. I am informed about changes in policy that affect me in the College of Education and Human Development.
16. I am informed about changes in policy that affect me in my department.
17. I am aware of the course and GPA requirements for my degree.
18. I know the course prerequisites on my degree plan.
19. I have taken responsibility for my degree plan.
20. Scheduling appointments with advisors is better than having appointments on a walk-in basis.
21. I am aware of the COE Student Advisory Board and its function.
22. There seems to be little concern for undergraduate students in the development of semester course offerings.
Directions: Please use the following scale to answer questions 23 - 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A - Frequently</th>
<th>B - Sometimes</th>
<th>C - Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 4 times per year</td>
<td>1 - 2 times per year</td>
<td>Less than 1 times per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. I visit my academic advisor in my department in the College of Education and Human Development.

24. I visit with other academic advisors in the College of Education and Human Development.

25. I get advising information from my peers or friends in my department.

26. I utilize MyRecord for information (ex: course offerings, times, etc.).

27. When I visit my advisor, I have a tentative schedule planned.

28. I am on time for my appointment with my academic advisor.

29. If my advisor is not available, I leave a message.

30. I use e-mail to communicate with my academic advisor.

31. I ask my academic advisor to accommodate my schedule.

32. I do not keep appointments with my academic advisor.

What department are you in?

33. Department:  
   a. TLAC  
   b. HLKN  
   c. EAHR  
   d. AGED  
   e. EPSY

Select only one major/program for questions 34 - 36.

34. Major/Program:  
   a. TLAC: EC – 4th  
   b. TLAC: 4th–8th Math/Science  
   c. TLAC: 4th–8th Language Arts/Social Studies  
   d. EPSY: Special Education; Bilingual/ESL  
   e. TLAC: Secondary teacher certification (math, biology, etc.)

35. Major/Program:  
   a. EAHR: Technology Management  
   b. EAHR: Human Resource Development  
   c. HLTH: School Health (teacher certification)  
   d. HLTH: Community Health (non-certification)  
   e. AGED: Ag. Sciences & Technology

36. Major/Program:  
   a. KINE: Kinesiology (teacher certification)  
   b. KINE: Exercise Technology  
   c. KINE: Sport Management

37. Classification:  
   a. Freshman  
   b. Sophomore  
   c. Junior  
   d. Senior  
   e. TECR

38. Gender:  
   a. Male  
   b. Female
## College of Education and Human Development Advisor Evaluation Summary 1997 - 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>69.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>67.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>78.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>86.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>86.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Skills</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>63.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>61.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>67.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>79.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>78.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>78.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>51.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>53.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>65.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>62.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>76.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>73.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please respond to the following questions on the back of the scantron:**

a. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the advising program?

b. How can we better distribute information to students?

c. What are some recommendations for improvement of the advising system?

**Thank you for taking the time to fill out this survey**
TLAC Undergraduate Advising Evaluation- Open-ended Questions - 2007

Please respond to the following questions on the back of the scantron:

a. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the advising program?

b. How can we better distribute information to students?

c. What are some recommendations for improvement of the advising system?

Responses:

1. a. We have personable people who are very knowledgable. However, some advisors tell students different things which could be helpful to other students.
   b. Maybe a TLAC newsletter for our specific certification.

2. a. Great advising
   b. Email

3. a. The advisors are friendly and helpful during session. Always easy to see an advisor even if it may not be the one you ask for.
   b. Make more than one day for walk-ins

4. a. I’ve always had a pretty good experience with advising program. Sometimes I would like though to discuss some future options with one gut we pretty much just work on my schedule and that’s it.
   b. I’ve also been frustrated with Education’s advising ability to work with other colleges.
      I changed from Business to Education and have had so much trouble getting things substituted.

5. a. The advisors are very helpful & always have suggestions and ways to help get you the best possible schedule. I don’t see any real weaknesses.
   b. Send out information a/b meetings or advising appointments in more than 1 email.
   c. Make people aware of how helpful you really are.

6. a. I really like that it is required to go to advising appointments.
   b. I would say email, but y’all have started that this year
   c. None.

7. a. I like that they are really good at getting back with me whether via email or whatever. I also like having required visits. It helps remind me I need to go.

8. a. strengths – Avery!
   weaknesses – Vince & some other girl who is new.
   There is a difference between acting with tact & being rude and making people cry. I don’t like that you are blocked from registration if you don’t meet with an advisor. We are of age to make decisions on our own. This shouldn’t be a requirement.
   b. Email is great!
   c. Be knowledgeable! I don’t like it when the person I’m talking to has to leave the office with every question I ask. What makes you think I want to take advice from that person??

9. a. The advising program is just great!

10. a. I really like that it is mandatory to visit with our advisors. It has always been very helpful & I wouldn’t have gone on my own.
11. a. ________ is my advisor. I love her! She is sweet and helpful.
   b. Y’all do a great job.

12. a. strengths – always friendly and helpful.
   b. have advisor give you a reminder notice before you leave you advising meeting.

13. a. They know what you need to accomplish and what courses to take. Not much personal interest, my advising takes maybe 5 minutes.
   b. Inform them when they come to advising
   c. Don’t make people come to advising if they don’t want to

14. a. strengths – everyone in the office is friendly and willing to help you, even if they don’t know you are not your advisor.
   b. E-mail reminders are great, and you already do that a lot.

15. a. I love _______. He is beyond friendly & makes you feel very welcomed. He has really helped me through my college experience. I appreciate his knowledge on my degree. I have heard of several advisors who have messed up people’s schedules & requirements. Making advisors informed, friendly, & knowledgable is a major plus.

16. a. I find the scheduling & organization of the appointment times very helpful.
   - some advisors are unfair between students (forcing one student into a class and not another who has the same circumstances & even asked first)
   b. Have it sent through personal advisor. Mass emails from dept are often deleted.
   c. None other than above mentioned.

17. a. Always helpful – no weaknesses
   b. Email, phone
   c. None

18. a. The main strength is the sincerity with which we are advised. I have always felt like my advisor is truly concerned w/my needs. I’m not just 1 of the thousands of education majors.
   I also like the informative emails that get sent out about dates to remember.
   b. I think the email system is an adequate way of distributing info.
   c. I really haven’t ever had a situation that I thought needed improvement.

19. a. I really feel comfortable and confident about my degree plan after my advising session. I believe my advisor wants the best for me, and is willing to help in any way possible.
   b. I believe the best way is through emails because I check mine daily.
   c. It would be great to be able to set up an appointment to meet with an advisor using the Internet.

20. a. The advising program is well informed. If there is ever a question of concern, I know that it will be answer

21. a. strengths are everything already rated. One weakness is that I am sometimes confused about requirements that have a multitude of classes that would fulfill the requirement; I am usually only made aware of one option.
   b. Email is great!

22. a. strengths: welcoming, they truly help me form my classes schedule (types of classes I need to take), they give me direction & encouragement.
   weaknesses: sometimes it is hard trying to meet with my advisors because our schedules conflict
   b. Emails

23. a. strengths – The advisors are extremely knowledgable in knowing what all students need to take and the best ways about going about taking specific courses.
b. More information can be distributed by having more informational mandatory advising sessions

c. I have no recommendations.

24. a. strengths include that meeting with advisors is a good time to get questions answered, and it was very helpful in the beginning to have someone help plan my schedule. Weaknesses include that many students only meet with advisor twice a year as required.
   b. Have the advisors update students on important developments during their advising sessions. I often ignore Emails that don’t seem relevant to me (from TLAC)
   c. For this survey, it would be better if individual advisors were listed. This survey won’t let anyone know which advisors are doing a good job and which ones are not.

25. a. strengths – gives you great info. about your advising plan and helps you to be organized
   weakness – sometimes we have to take a class that the advisors need to force us into & they end up just not letting us in.
   b. Monthly emails about any changes that may take place would be nice.
   c. Monthly emails, more friendly environment.

26. a. I think its great
   b. Maybe have a flyer

27. a. Right now there are great advisors, a few years ago, there were not
   b. Emails
   c. Have none – Great job.

28. a. strengths: easy to make an appt. on my time. Advisors do what they can to get me into the classes I want.
   weaknesses: haven’t really had any.
   b. More emails/mailings or even phone calls

29. a. strengths – always helpful
   weaknesses – none
   b. doing a great job already
   c. none

30. b. I love the emails we get each month. They keep me up to date on what’s going on.
   I think our advisors are doing a great job!

31. a. Advisors are very helpful in course scheduling
   b. Email is the best way or through professors.

32. a. n/a
   b. Doing fine
   c. None

33. a. strengths – always very helpful and I feel I can depend on my advisor for help
   weakness – diff. advisors sa diff. things on same subject
   b. n/a
   c. I think it’s fine the way it is.

34. a. Very interested on student issues
   b. Emails

35. a. They know their stuff about advising you in you schedule and degree plan, but not in extra programs or benefits you can be involved in around the campus community. And offer different routes to take in our educ. Process.
   b. I like the emails, maybe a write up to give to use w/explanations of the different prof. mtg. orgs. or programs.
   c. What I said above
36. a. strengths – friendly, easy to make appts.  
   weaknesses – sometimes do not give best info and classes  
   b. Email is best  
   c. Always give students best way to graduate on time (most advisors already do this)  
     - don’t rush advising appts. & answer all questions to best of your ability (you’re paid to do this)

37. b. Newsletter  
   c. More walk-in days

38. a. Some of the advisors seem to not know our alternatives. I had been seeing one advisor and switched, and my second advisor told me that a class I thought couldn’t be in my degree could actually substitute for another. He found a place for all of my credits that my other advisor didn’t see.  
   b. the emails I get work for me.  
   c. I haven’t had any real problems yet.

39. a. I love my advisor. I always feel he helps me whenever I may need assistance.

40. a. I do not feel they take a personal interest in me  
   b. More emails  
   c. be more into what students are doing and offer more advice

41. a. The walk-in advising is frustrating when you are interested in the College of Education and not yet a member.  
   b. I think you do a good job with the emails, but possibly a mail-out would serve as additional reminders.  
   c. I like the advising system. I am happy with how it works.

42. a. strengths – know material, prompt  
   weaknesses – listening to, confusion over classes/schedules  
   b. Continue using email  
   c. Not so rushed.

43. a. strengths: very helpful and informative when looking to fill out the next year’s schedule.  
   weaknesses: sometimes it is very hard to get a hold of an advisor  
   b. Email always works great!  
   c. Can’t improve much more!

44. a. I feel like there are too many students and not enough advisors. All of the advisors are very nice but just too busy.  
   b. I get all the information fine through email.  
   c. Have them prepare us better for transition out of school.

45. a. strengths – organized, timely  
   b. I can’t think of any ways to improve

46. a. Certain advisors need to be specifically looked at. The one I was assigned to when I transferred gave me inaccurate information including the # of hours I had. I had to switch to advisors who knew the program and gave me accurate information

47. a. there isn’t a problem with it  
   b. Emails work fine  
   c. I have nothing, everything seems to be running smoothly.

48. a. strengths – ____ awesome  
   weaknesses not every advisor is ____  
   b. None
49. a. strengths – one on one time with advisor is great. Advisors listen and help efficiently every time. 1 yr in I have never left an appointment unhappy.
   b. I think the mandatory advising sessions are enough.

50. a. They don't really care about me they are just in & out.

51. a. very knowledgeable about our department but extremely unresourceful & helpful when talking about other departments.
   b. Do a good job- emails great
   c. None it’s good!

52. a. The advisors are always super friendly
   c. I think more one on one sessions would be helpful

53. a. They could have more mandatory meetings
   b. Email

54. a. strengths – very informative on courses weak – summer course knowledge
   b. Easier access website, kind of confusing
   c. Same

55. a. strengths – know what they are talking about
   b. Handouts
   c. Doing good

56. _____ is absolutely wonderful and so helpful. The advisor I met with while _____ was out was not very helpful and recommended classes I already had credit for.

   If all advisors are prepared before their appointments it will really help because students will feel more important.

57. a. strengths – organized, personable and professional
   b. Email more often
   c. None

58. a. Very involved with students
   b. Brochures/emails
   c. I think the program is fine.

59. a. Knowledgeable about college – strength

60. a. Better schedule
   b. Email & education classes

61. a. Advisor’s generally stick to the plan laid out for everyone and usually only recommend those classes
   b. List all information on the website – update regularly

62. a. I really do not think there is any weaknesses
   b. Email
   c. None

63. b. Email is the best way for me. I always check it and read the advising office emails.

64. a. They answer your questions and concerns. They make you feel very comfortable.
   b. Maybe a website
65. a. The advisors are well informed of all the degree programs available and they are able to substitute a lot of my classes.
   b. Email works well
   c. Can’t think of any.

66. a. The advising program is very helpful & do try to make sure that students have the resources they need to be successful at TAMU. A weakness is that the requirements for class, etc. are not clear.
   b. By having a audio CD/DVD/video with the information on it, but it shouldn’t be just information it should contain footage of things within the Dept such as Lohman or methods.

67. a. strengths – very helpful with skeleton of how classes pan out for the next semesters
   Weakness – sometimes very snappy when I ask questions, seem rushed.
   b. Emailing and maybe handouts through education courses.
   c. Making advisors more readily available & nicer scheduling people.

68. a. strengths – the division of advising
   - 1 week for freshmen, 1 for soph…etc
   - the appointment system
   weaknesses –
   b. Email is the best way.
   c. None that I can think of

69. a. The strengths are that the advisors are always willing to help. Anytime I email them they have a good response immediately.
   No weaknesses so far.
   b. I wouldn’t mind receiving a reminder about my advising meeting needing to be scheduled through my PO Box.
   c. None

70. a. strengths – very helpful in scheduling class and requirements
   Weaknesses – I have not found any yet
   b. Emails
   c. Some advisors are more friendly.

71. a. strengths – available most of the time, very accommodating
   weaknesses – maybe they could check the progress of the student more
   b. Emails
   c. There needs to be more meetings w/the students
Appendix 8:

PhD GRE Information used for US News and World Report
# PhD GRE Information used for US News and World Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAHR</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLKN</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLAC</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Verbal Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>EAHR</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
<th>HLKN</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;580</td>
<td>80%-100%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460-579</td>
<td>50%-79%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-459</td>
<td>30%-49%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;400</td>
<td>0-29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quantitative Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>EAHR</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
<th>HLKN</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 740</td>
<td>80%-100%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-739</td>
<td>50%-79%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520-599</td>
<td>30%-49%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;520</td>
<td>0-29%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>EAHR</th>
<th>EPSY</th>
<th>HLKN</th>
<th>TLAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both scores</td>
<td>80%-100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed top two</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% top scores</td>
<td>18.52%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>35.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both scores</td>
<td>50%-79%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed top &amp; low middle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed two middle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both scores</td>
<td>30%-49%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Top and low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed low % high middle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Middle scores</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% middle scores</td>
<td>70.37%</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed two low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both scores</td>
<td>0-29%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal low scores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% low scores</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

As part of a program review, the Department of Teaching, Learning, & Culture (TLAC) in the College of Education and Human Development at Texas A&M University (TAMU) invited current students and former students who graduated in the past five years to participate in an online survey. All programs—Undergraduate, Secondary Graduate Certification, Master’s, and Doctoral—participated. Evaluators created surveys measuring various aspects of the programs, and participants answered questions using a Likert-type scale, as well as provided open-ended responses regarding program strengths, challenges, and suggestions. Separate analyses were conducted on survey data collected from current and former students in each program area. The following is a comprehensive description and analysis. All survey results are provided in Tables 1-1 thru 8-2 (scale questions) and Appendices A-1 thru H-3 (open-ended responses).
Comprehensive Description

and Analysis
Undergraduate Summary – current students

Summary of scale-item responses

Table 1-1 reports the characteristics of the 464 participants who responded to the online survey of current undergraduate students. Of the respondents, 96% were female and nearly 90% were white. Thirty-four percent of the respondents classified themselves as seniors, 28% juniors, 12% sophomores, 16% freshmen, and 10% fifth-year seniors. Thirty percent of the students transferred to Texas A&M from another institution. In terms of certification, 43% are 4-8; 38% are EC-6; and 20% are EC-4. Of the students who are pursuing 4-8 teacher certification, 55% have a math/science emphasis, and 45% are reading/language arts/social studies-focused. Seventy-four percent of the students indicated that they have taken online/hybrid courses.

Students responded to items in four categories (Registration and Advising, Field Experience, Instructors, and Reflections and Future Aspirations) using a four-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree), as reported in Table 1-2. In the area of Registration and Advising, 459 students responded to the five items. The mean values ranged from 3.07 to 3.44, indicating that most of the students agreed that their advisors and registration procedures were accessible. The standard deviations ranged from .75 to .80, indicating that there was some variance among respondents in their attitudes toward these items. The item with the highest mean value was Undergraduate advisors treated me with respect (M = 3.44), and the lowest was Education courses required by my degree plan were offered when needed (M = 3.07).

For the Field Experience section of the survey, 52% (n = 199) of the respondents indicated they had reached the point in the program where they had completed a field experience. Students responded to five items with means ranging from 3.35 to 3.57 indicating that nearly all
of the students agreed or strongly agreed that their field experiences were beneficial and increased their knowledge.

Students \((n = 378)\) responded to three items related to their Instructors. The mean values ranged from 3.34 to 3.45, indicating that most students agreed or strongly agreed that their instructors were knowledgeable and accessible.

Finally, students \((n = 378)\) responded to seven items concerning Reflections and Future Aspirations. The mean values ranged from 3.13 to 3.62. The standard deviations ranged from .63 to .84, indicating that there was some variation in the way students reflected on their future. The items with the highest values were: If I could start over, I would again choose to attend Texas A&M University for a degree in education \((M = 3.62)\); Three years after graduation, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching \((M = 3.55)\); and If I could start over, I would again choose education as my program of study \((M = 3.54)\). The lowest items were: Ten years after graduation, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching \((M = 3.20)\); and At some point in the future I plan to attend graduate school for an advanced degree in education \((M = 3.13)\).

Students also responded to items in eight categories (Mathematics, Science, Reading/Language Arts, Social Studies, Early Childhood Education, English as a Second Language, General Instruction, and Professionalism) using a slightly different, four-point Likert-type scale that examined their confidence in teaching these areas \((1 = \text{not at all confident}, 2 = \text{somewhat confident}, 3 = \text{confident}, 4 = \text{extremely confident})\), as shown in Table 1-3. There were seven items that examined students’ perceptions about their ability to teach Mathematics \((n = 287)\). The mean values for mathematics ranged from 2.77 to 2.99, which indicate that most respondents were somewhat confident to confident in their ability to teach mathematics. The standard deviations ranged from .71 to .81, indicating that there was some variance among
respondents in their confidence levels. The items with the highest mean values were: *Explore various ways to incorporate the use of math manipulatives in the curriculum* \((M = 2.99)\); *Facilitate opportunities for math learning in small groups* \((M = 2.99)\); and *Provide instruction that meets math content standards (district, state, or national)* \((M = 2.96)\). The item with the lowest mean value \((M = 2.77)\) was *Design student-initiated math lessons*.

Seven items pertained to the 229 students who responded about their perceptions of teaching *Science*. The mean values ranged from 2.74 to 2.95, and the standard deviations ranged from .74 to .85. The item with the highest mean value was *Apply science concepts to real and authentic life scenarios* \((M = 2.95)\), and the item with the lowest mean value was *When planning, consider students’ prior conceptions about natural phenomena* \((M = 2.74)\).

Seven items examined 252 students’ perceptions about their ability to teach *Reading/Language Arts*. The mean values for language arts/reading ranged from 3.12 to 3.31, which indicate that most respondents are confident in their ability to teach reading/language arts. The standard deviations ranged from .65 to .75. The items with the highest mean values were: *Build student interest and motivation to read* \((M = 3.31)\); *Use a variety of instructional strategy to facilitate reading comprehension* \((M = 3.27)\); and *Use a variety of appropriate reading and language arts assessment strategies* \((M = 3.27)\). The item with the lowest mean value \((M = 3.12)\) was *Recognize the various stages and characteristics of emergent readers*.

Seven items gauged 237 students’ perceptions about their ability to teach *Social Studies*. The mean values for social studies ranged from 2.93 to 3.11. The standard deviations ranged from .70 to .78. The item with the highest mean value was: *Make connections to events in students’ lives, current events, and other content areas* \((M = 3.11)\). The items with the lowest mean values were: *Provide opportunities for students to support or defend a position, analyze*
information and draw conclusions, create and carry-out an action plan, etc. \((M = 2.93)\); Plan opportunities for students to investigate topics in-depth \((M = 2.95)\); and Use a variety of appropriate social studies strategies \((M = 2.95)\).

Eight items related to the 211 undergraduate students who described their perceptions of teaching in an Early Childhood Education learning environment. The means ranged from 3.22 to 3.48 indicating that these students were confident or very confident teaching in an early childhood education environment. The standard deviations ranged from .62 to .69. The item with the highest mean value was Plan classroom activities based on a variety of learning areas (i.e., dramatic play, construction, art, music, science experience, etc.) \((M = 3.48)\), and the item with the lowest mean value, though still indicating confidence, was Understand the stages of child development and plan learning experiences using developmentally appropriate practices \((M = 3.22)\).

Three items related to the 366 students who indicated their perceptions of teaching English as a Second Language. The means ranged from 2.61 to 2.69, indicating the students feel between not confident and somewhat confident teaching ESL learners. The standard deviations ranged from .85 to .89, indicating some variation in the way students responded to these items. The three items were: Provide opportunities for English Language Learners to listen, speak, read, and write at their current levels of English development, while gradually increasing the linguistic complexity of the English \((M = 2.69)\); Plan instruction that recognizes different proficiency levels within the language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing \((M = 2.63)\); and Integrate social language instruction with content and academic language instruction \((M = 2.61)\).
Students ($n = 383$) responded to 15 items related to their confidence levels in **General Instruction**. The means ranged from 2.80 to 3.41. The standard deviations ranged from .65 to .91, indicating a wide range of responses for some items. The items with the highest mean values were: *Recognize and respect individual family differences* ($M = 3.41$) and *Recognize diverse learning styles* ($M = 3.32$). The items with the lowest mean values were: *Employ effective instructional strategies for students with special needs* ($M = 2.80$) and *Conduct parent-teacher conferences* ($M = 2.83$).

Five items related to the respondents’ ($n = 373$) confidence levels regarding issues related to **Professionalism**. The means ranged from 2.56 to 2.92, indicating students only feel somewhat confident about matters of professionalism. The standard deviations for these items were larger than the other scales ($SD = .84$ to 1.01), indicating a wide-range of student responses to these items. The item with the highest mean value ($M = 2.92$) was *Read research-based articles related to my field*. The item with the lowest mean value ($M = 2.56$) was *Initiate a job search*.

**Summary of open-ended responses**

All respondents were given the opportunity to provide open-ended comments (Appendix A-1 thru A-3) related to what they perceive to be the strengths ($n = 201$) and the challenges ($n = 170$) of the undergraduate program at Texas A&M University, as well as make suggestions ($n=175$) for program improvement. Overall, five common themes emerged: (a) Advising, (b) Courses and Curriculum, (c) Instructors, (d) Field Experience, and (e) Professionalism/Job Preparation.

On the whole, the students commented positively on their **advisors**. Specifically, issues such as the helpful nature of the department's mandatory advising policy, the accessibility to advisors, and the personable dispositions of the staff in the Undergraduate Advising Office were
identified as common strengths: “The mandatory advisor meetings are a definite strength. They make sure that the students are on track.” Also noted by another student, “The advisors . . . [are] extremely helpful, personable, and quick to respond.” One clear challenge, however, was identified: limited course availability. “The biggest challenge is getting into the course you need to take when . . . [it] is offered at a time of another course that you need to take.” Students noted that there were not always enough sections available for each course. One frequent suggestion that was made: “I would suggest more seats and sections for all education classes.”

Issues related to courses and curriculum was another widespread topic. Some strengths that were identified by the students included: “I love the discussion-based courses where participation and student input is valued. I feel more connected to the course and the material with the small class sizes and lower student-to-professor-ratio,” “The interdisciplinary program is exceptional, in my opinion,” and “Having an interdisciplinary program instead of just an educational program is good.” Three widespread concerns about courses, however, materialized: (a) too much of an emphasis on multiculturalism, (b) the futility of offering classroom management courses online, and (c) repetitive, overlapping classes. “Too much focus on multicultural education . . . It focuses on the balkanization of people.” While most students said they appreciated the importance of the topic, they also felt that the greater need is for “more classes on classroom management, parent-teacher conferences, use of technology, and interviewing.” As another student emphasized, “Do not offer classroom management online. It is arguably the most important class we will take while we are in college. You can’t witness classroom management through an online course.”

Two overarching themes surfaced with regard to instructors: (a) They are knowledgeable, having real-world experience, and (b) they care about their students. One student
said, “I really do feel like all of my professors genuinely cared about me and tried their best to teach us everything they knew.” Another student added, “They know their subjects and provide real classroom examples.” Nevertheless, a clear challenge the students identified was some instructors’ inability to communicate clearly and effectively in English: “We have a lot of professors and TAs where language barriers were hard to overcome, and it makes the class frustrating,” and “I think it is wonderful that our campus is diverse; but I don’t get much out of a class where I can barely understand what the professor is saying.”

Overwhelmingly, the students identified field experiences as the strength of the program, and numerous comments by the respondents addressed this reality: “I think that A&M does a really good job getting EC-4 students in the field very early on in their time at A&M,” “A&M puts you in the classroom right off the bat and gets you into a classroom with children to make sure that this is what you want to do,” and “I think the field experience is great. I have had the opportunity to interact with students every semester that I have been here.” But while the field experiences are clearly valued, many students described the field experience placement process as problematic. Specific students’ needs were overlooked. For example, one student requested a close field placement due to a lack of transportation but ended up being placed at a school over 20 miles away: “We learn in class about addressing the different needs of students and making accommodations, but I feel the program doesn’t try to make accommodations for students like me, without transportation.” Another student said, “For the placement of field experiences, it seems like everyone got what they did not want. Why even ask us where we want to be if we will not be placed where we requested?” One final request by many was the opportunity to spend even more time in the classroom.
The final common theme dealt with **professionalism and job preparation**. A few specific suggestions from students were: “I think that there should be a class, or at least an online training, that would prepare us for job searching and interviews. I do not feel confident going into an interview. I would love to have in-depth instruction on how to search for teaching jobs, how to interview best, and how to choose a school district where I would fit in well,” and “Continue to help students with finding a job. I felt like while I was in student teaching I was very distant and done with school already. I didn’t know when I could start applying for jobs, and I did not know how to respond to some of the questions on my applications.”

**Summary of Undergraduate Program – current students**

On the whole, more students felt more confident teaching Reading/Language Arts and Early Childhood Education than Mathematics and Science. In both Mathematics and Science, mean scores for all indicators were less than 3.00 (on a four-point Likert-type scale). Students’ feelings about teaching Social Studies also indicated less confidence; although the mean scores did indicate confidence with two indicators, *assessing prior knowledge* and *making connections to events in students’ lives, current events, and other content areas*. Conversely, mean scores for all Reading/Language Arts and Early Childhood Education indicators were higher than 3.00, providing evidence for students’ confidence in teaching these areas. Mean scores for ESL instruction split almost evenly, with about half of the students reflecting confidence teaching English Language Learners and half not feeling confident. The findings pertaining to General Instruction revealed three issues where students felt less confident: *teaching students with special needs, differentiating instruction*, and *conducting parent/teacher conferences*.

While the majority of responses reflected positively on Texas A&M’s instructors in terms of knowledge, accessibility, and caring for students as individuals, an obvious area of weakness,
as identified by the students, is the area of *Professionalism*. All indicators showed a mean score that fell below the *confident* level (Means < than 3.00). The concerns that students identified were: *initiate a job search; conduct myself in an interview; identify and join professional organizations pertinent to my field; and read research-based articles related to my field*.

Students were asked to reflect on the past as well as their future career aspirations. When asked whether or not they would once again choose Texas A&M University and the field of education should they have the opportunity to “start over,” most students generally responded that they would. The majority of students (90%) indicated that they planned to obtain a full-time teaching job immediately following graduation. Additionally, for the most part, students plan to still be teaching in the classroom three, five, and ten years following graduation. Finally, most students agreed or strongly agreed that they intend to pursue a graduate degree in education at some point in the future.

The open-ended responses reflected trends that were similar to the Likert-type scale indicators. By and large, five widespread themes emerged: (a) Advising, (b) Courses and Curriculum, (c) Instructors, (d) Field Experience, and (e) Professionalism/Job Preparation. Students are pleased with their advisors; however, they find registering for the classes they need, when they need them, to be challenging. Overall, they find their instructors to be knowledgeable; but students report that taking courses from instructors who do not speak English as their native language can be difficult. Also, students enjoy the interdisciplinary nature of their coursework; however, on the whole, they believe far too much emphasis is placed on multicultural education, as opposed to classroom management—a topic of which many respondents suggested the department offer much more (but not online). In addition, practical field experiences emerged as a strength of the program; but students indicated that more effort should be made to meet their
needs with regard to school/site placements. Lastly, across the board, the respondents want more instruction and guidance in the job-hunting process. Specifically, they want to learn how to identify good jobs, complete applications effectively, and make a good impression during interviews.
Undergraduate Summary – former students

Summary of scale-item responses

Table 2-1 reports the characteristics of the 341 participants who responded to the online survey of former undergraduate students. Of the respondents, 95% were female and nearly 91% were white. Seventy-three percent of the respondents are currently employed as teachers. In terms of certification, 37% are 4–8, and 63% are EC–4. Of the former students who are 4–8 teacher certified, 42% have a math/science emphasis, and 58% are reading/language arts/social studies-focused. The distribution of grade-levels currently taught by the respondents was fairly even, ranging from 12-18% for kindergarten to eighth grade (8% teach Pre-K; 5% teach others). Thirty-eight percent of the former students reported that they currently serve as Team Leader, and 45% reported holding the role of student organization sponsor. With regard to the location of the schools where respondents are currently employed, 9% reported working in an inner city environment, 16% in an urban school, 53% in a suburban setting, 13% in a small town, 7% in a rural environment, and 2% were “not sure” of their school’s location.

Table 2-2 depicts former students’ responses to items in four categories (Field Experience, Instructors, Reflections, Future Aspirations, and Current School Environment) using a four-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree).

In the area of Field Experience, 281 students responded to two items. The mean values were 3.45 and 3.47, indicating that most of the former students agreed that their field experiences were beneficial. The standard deviations were .79 and .72, indicating that there was little variance among respondents in their attitudes toward field experiences. The two items were: Overall, my field experiences/student teaching opportunities better prepared me for entering a classroom as
a first-year teacher \((M = 3.47)\) and Overall, my mentor teachers increased my knowledge and use of effective instructional practices \((M = 3.45)\).

Former students \((n = 281)\) responded to three items related to their Instructors. The mean values ranged from 3.35 to 3.45, indicating that most students agreed or strongly agreed that their instructors were knowledgeable and accessible.

Former students \((n = 282)\) responded to seven items concerning Reflections and Future Aspirations. The mean values ranged from 2.77 to 3.63. The standard deviations ranged from .69 to 1.04, indicating that there was some variation in the way former students reflected on their program. The item with the highest value was: If I could start over, I would again choose to attend Texas A&M University for a degree in education \((M = 3.63)\). The lowest item was: Ten years after graduation, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching \((M = 2.77)\).

For the Current School Environment section of the survey 204 former students responded to eight items, ranging from 3.08 to 3.74. Standard deviations ranged from .46 to .76, indicating little variation in responses regarding current school environment. The high item \((M = 3.74)\) was Teaching makes a difference in students’ lives.

As reported in Table 2-3, former students also responded to items in eight categories (Mathematics, Science, Reading/Language Arts, Social Studies, Early Childhood Education, English as a Second Language, General Instruction, and Professionalism) using a slightly different, four-point Likert-type scale that examined their confidence in teaching these areas \((1 = \text{not at all confident}, 2 = \text{somewhat confident}, 3 = \text{confident}, 4 = \text{extremely confident})\). There were seven items that examined students’ perceptions about their ability to teach Mathematics \((n = 194)\). The mean values for mathematics ranged from 3.20 to 3.45, which indicate that most respondents were confident to extremely confident in their ability to teach mathematics. The
standard deviations ranged from .65 to .75, indicating that there was some variance among respondents in their confidence levels. The items with the highest mean values were: *Solve a wide range of math problems relevant to certification area* (*M* = 3.45) and *Provide instruction that meets math content standards (district, state, or national)* (*M* = 3.44).

Seven items pertained to the 185 former students who responded about their perceptions of teaching **Science**. The mean values ranged from 2.84 to 3.24 and the standard deviations ranged from .70 to .81. The items with the highest mean values were: *Provide instruction that meets science content standards (district, state, or national)* (*M* = 3.21) and *Apply science concepts to real and authentic life scenarios* (*M* = 3.21). The items with the lowest mean values were *Design and implement student-led inquiry activities* (*M* = 2.84), and *When planning, consider students’ prior conceptions about natural phenomena* (*M* = 2.86).

Seven items examined 217 former students’ perceptions about their ability to teach **Reading/Language Arts**. The mean values for language arts/reading ranged from 2.96 to 3.37, which indicate that most respondents are confident in their ability to teach reading/language arts. The standard deviations ranged from .67 to .79. The item with the highest mean value was: *Build student interest and motivation to read* (*M* = 3.37). The item with the lowest mean value (*M* = 2.96) was *Support older readers who are learning to read*.

Seven items gauged 182 students’ perceptions about their ability to teach **Social Studies**. The mean values for social studies ranged from 2.93 to 3.24. The standard deviations ranged from .67 to .75. The items with the highest mean value were: *Make connections to events in students’ lives, current events, and other content areas* (*M* = 3.24) and *Provide instruction that meets social studies content standards (district, state, or national)* (*M* = 3.22). The item with the
lowest mean value was: *Provide opportunities for students to support or defend a position, analyze information and draw conclusions, create and carry-out an action plan, etc. (M = 2.93).*

Eight items related to the 167 former students who described their perceptions of teaching in an **Early Childhood Education** learning environment. The means ranged from 3.37 to 3.51 indicating that these teachers are confident or very confident teaching in an early childhood education environment. The standard deviations ranged from .56 to .67. The items with the highest mean values were: *Provide instruction that meets early childhood guidelines and standards (district, state, or national) (M = 3.51); Support young learners in the development of social and emotional skills (M = 3.47); and Plan classroom activities based on a variety of learning areas and activities (M = 3.46.)*

Three items related to the 282 former students who indicated their perceptions of teaching **English as a Second Language**. The means ranged from 2.76 to 2.84, indicating the students do not feel confident teaching ESL learners. The standard deviations ranged from .83 to .86, indicating some variation in the way students responded to these items. The three items were: *Plan instruction that recognizes different proficiency levels within the language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing (M = 2.76); Integrate social language instruction with content and academic language instruction (M = 2.84); and Provide opportunities for English Language Learners to listen, speak, read, and write at their current levels of English development, while gradually increasing the linguistic complexity of the English (M = 2.79).*

Former students (n = 283) responded to 15 items related to their confidence levels in **General Instruction**. The means ranged from 3.12 to 3.67. The standard deviations ranged from .56 to .83, indicating some variance for the items. The items with the highest mean value were: *Create a lesson plan (M = 3.41) and Recognize diverse learning styles (M = 3.53). The items
with the lowest mean values, though still indicating confidence, were: *Differentiate instruction for all students* \((M = 3.16)\) and *Employ effective instructional strategies for students with special needs* \((M = 3.12)\).

Five items related to the respondents’ \((n = 283)\) confidence levels regarding issues related to **Professionalism**. The means ranged from 3.24 to 3.41, indicating students feel confident about matters of professionalism. The standard deviations for these items \((SD = .74 \text{ to } .79)\), indicating some variance. The item with the highest mean value \((M =3.42)\) was *Initiate a job search*. The item with the highest mean value \((M = 2.92)\), though still indicating confidence was *Read research-based articles related to my field*.

**Summary of open-ended responses**

All respondents were given the opportunity to provide open-ended comments (Appendix B-1 thru B-3) related to what they perceive to be the strengths \((n = 194)\) and the challenges \((n = 165)\) of the undergraduate program at Texas A&M University, as well as make suggestions \((n=160)\) for program improvement. Overall, four general themes emerged: (a) **Field Experience**, (b) **Coursework and Curriculum**, (c) **Instructors**, and (d) **General Job Preparation**.

More so than any other strength identified by the survey respondents, the former students acknowledged their **field experiences** as being a main strength of the program. Typical comments were: “*Allowing us to be in the classroom from early on helped to prepare me to have my own classroom,*” “*The field-based assignments were one of the great strengths of the university. Being involved in at least one [field-based] experience a semester for 2.5 years really helped me see a broad view of teaching,*” and “*Each year at least one of my classes involved some type of field experience, which helped me see/use implementation of strategies I was learning about in my classes. Rather than simply learning theory . . . A&M stresses application*
Field experiences was also listed by respondents as a challenge, with former students/current educators saying they wished they had had even more classroom opportunities prior to graduating: “I learned more from my field experience than anything else, and I wish I had had more,” “I wish that A&M would put their undergrads in more situations where they observe teaching. I feel the most effective way to learn how to be a good teacher is to observe good teachers,” and “Not enough experience in the classroom. I loved that we started so early, but I wish there was even more experience in the classroom.”

Coursework and Curriculum—for various reasons—was mentioned by many of the respondents as both a program strength and weakness: “I was taught how to create lessons and curriculum maps. So when I began teaching, I felt very confident in planning, because I had the experience of creating curriculum in all subjects . . . This gave me a strong working knowledge when implementing the school’s various curricula with my own ideas,” “. . . the classes were relevant to what I would need to know when I entered the classroom,” “The varied curriculum shaping the interdisciplinary degree was invaluable,” and “Each and every class that I took at Texas A&M had the students actively engaged in both researching effective instructional methods and reflections on those methods. We wrote lesson plans, practiced delivering those lesson plans, received peer feedback, and had the opportunity to teaching some of them in the field.” The topic of “courses,” however, was not entirely immune to criticism: (a) too much of an emphasis on multiculturalism, (b) much curriculum overlap among classes, and (c) a lack of focus on classroom management: “Extreme over-saturation of cultural diversity courses in education plan,” and ”The multicultural courses need an overhaul . . . and are counter-productive” are two examples that underscored this sentiment. Also mentioned repeatedly was too much repetition of material from one class to another: “There is a lot of overlap with the
curriculum. I feel like they beat us over the head time and again with certain things that weren’t even helpful or useful to us as a classroom teacher,” “... some of the courses are quite repetitive and basically reiterate what another course has presented in a prior semester,” and “Material presented was occasionally repetitive.” Not unlike the open-ended comments made by current students, former Texas A&M undergraduates also emphasized a great need for more classes focusing on classroom management: “I felt underprepared in the area of classroom management when I entered student teaching,” As another student emphasized, “Classroom Management!! What an important course!! This class should incorporate so much more than it did and should be taught by an instructor who is VERY qualified,” and “Now that I have had my own classroom I have come to the conclusion that I did NOT have enough experience and training on classroom management.” The overarching sentiment: “I feel (as do many of my classmates) that the biggest hole in our education was in classroom management courses.”

The former students, on the whole, have very positive memories of their instructors. As one respondent stated: “During my time there, my professors always referred back to the statement, ‘Always Expect More from Aggie Teachers’ during class. When times are rough during the year, I think back to this statement, and it helps me remember where I came from and represent. My professors were very supportive and informative during class instruction.” Another former student explained: “I had excellent instructors that worked with me to develop my strengths in teaching. I could come to them with any questions regarding the content or issues in my field classroom experiences, and they would work to help me learn more from the situations.” Still another comment regarding instructors indicated, “I feel the professors are amazing. One of the greatest things I left with was my confidence that they helped bestow in me.” A few respondents, however, expressed concern that all of their professors may not have
been as up-to-date on current education practices as they could have been. When answering the question about what challenges they perceive, several former students made comments such as: “Professors who were not up to date on what is currently in classrooms . . . I know that professors dislike the [statewide test of accountability], but I felt completely unprepared to get my students ready for it,” and, “All the changes occurring currently in the education field and the professors who taught 15 years ago.” Another respondent concurred, stating: “Some of the instructors are not as knowledgeable about what is going on in the classrooms these days and what is expected of teachers now as opposed to when they taught.”

The final theme dealt with general job preparation. Most felt exceedingly prepared to enter the classroom: “Our program was very thorough in preparing us to become teachers. We were exposed to many different teaching strategies as well as encouraged to participate hand-on in all of our lessons.” Another comment on preparation: “I have heard people in high positions from my district praise Texas A&M for its reputation of turning out well prepared, effective teachers. Aggie teachers, according to these people, come more prepared in classroom management strategies, confidence in the classroom, dedication to the position, and the ability to write effective lesson plans.” Two other former students echoed this sentiment: “I was much more prepared than students from ANY other school,” and “I feel that everything from ECHE classes to methods to field placements adequately prepared me to teach in the classroom.”

Respondents, nevertheless, also offered a few suggestions regarding preparedness—usually regarding specific content areas: “I did not feel prepared to teach the ESL students when I first began teaching,” and “The ESL program is weak and the courses only teach you how to pass the certification test. They do not in any way teach you how to actually be an ESL teacher.” This sentiment was also reflected in several comments about mathematics and science: “There were
not enough courses in the fundamentals of teaching math and science.” Lastly, former students mentioned a lack of preparation for the actual job search process: “I had trouble initially getting a job and was told from day 1 in orientations that would not be a problem. I feel there could be a better push and role to help ensure everything possible [is] being done to help students to get a job post-graduation.”

Former students were also asked whether or not they were currently employed as classroom teachers. Of the 27% who indicated that they were not, some of the reasons included: going to graduate school, being a stay-at-home parent, and inability to find a job. Some of the areas in which former students are/were studying in graduate school include: speech pathology, counseling, and theology.

On the whole, more students felt more confident teaching Reading/Language Arts, Early Childhood Education, and Mathematics than Science and Social Studies. In both Science and Social Studies, three mean scores out of seven were less than 3.00 (on the 4-point Likert-type scale). Of all areas of teaching, former students clearly felt less confident teaching ESL, as evidenced by all indicators having mean values below the confidence level of 3.00. On the other hand, mean scores for Reading/Language Arts, Early Childhood Education, and Mathematics indicators provided evidence for former students’ confidence in teaching these areas.

Responses reflected positively on Texas A&M’s instructors in terms of knowledge, accessibility, and caring for students as individuals. Former students indicated that, 10 years from now, they were not confident that they would still be in the classroom. When asked, should they have the ability to “start over,” whether or not they would once again choose Texas A&M University for a degree in education, most students (92%) responded that they would.
The open-ended responses reflected trends that were similar to the Likert-type scale indicators. Overall, the former students felt well-prepared to enter their own classrooms and become effective teachers. As was the case with the current students, confidence in teaching mathematics and science, as well as ESL, were areas of weakness as compared to other content areas.
Secondary Graduate Certification Program Summary – current students

Summary of scale-item responses

Table 3-1 reports the characteristics of the 37 participants who responded to the online survey of current Secondary Graduate Certification students. Of the respondents, 81% were female and 81% were white. Eighty-four percent of the respondents were between the ages of 22 - 25, 11% between the ages of 26 - 30, and 5% respondents above the age of 41. Of the current students in the Secondary Graduate Certification program, 22% hold a bachelor’s degree in liberal arts/humanities, 8% in mathematics-related fields, 5% in science-related fields, 4% in political science/history/geography, 4% other, and 2% in business.

Of the 37 respondents, 78% are currently employed as teachers during the 2009-2010 school year. With regard to the location of the schools where respondents are currently employed, 50% reported working in a suburban school, 19% in a small town, 17% in an urban setting, 11% in a rural environment, and 3% in an inner city. In terms of certification, 43% were Language Arts/Reading, 16% History, 16% Social Studies Composite, 11% Math, 8% Communication, 5% Life Sciences, 5% Science Composite, 2% Spanish, and 2% Theatre Arts. When the students were asked to indicate all the grade levels they were currently teaching, 59% indicated they were teaching sophomores, 56% juniors, 53% freshmen, 41% seniors, and 26% 8th grade. The majority of students in the program currently hold a leadership role within their school; 64% sponsor of a student organization, 27% other, 14% are coaches, and 9% are Team Leaders.

Students responded to items in six categories (Undergraduate Prerequisite Course/Field Experience, Application Process and Advising, Mentor Teacher/University Supervisors, Current School Environment, Instructors, and Reflections and Future Aspirations) using a four-point
Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree), as reported in Table 3-2. In the area of Undergraduate Prerequisite Courses/Field Experience, 37 students responded to four items. The mean values ranged from 2.95 to 3.19, with standard deviations ranging from .76 to .91. The item with the highest mean value was Overall, upon entering my field experience campuses, I felt welcome and respected ($M = 3.19$), and the lowest was Overall, my field experience opportunities better prepared me for entering the classroom as a first-year teacher ($M = 2.95$). Overall students agreed that prerequisite courses and field experiences provided valuable knowledge; however, they felt slightly less confident that these aspects better prepared them for entering the classroom as a first-year teacher.

For the Application Process and Advising section of the survey, students ($n = 37$) responded to five items with means ranging from 3.22 to 3.41. The standard deviations ranged from .79 to .98 indicating some variance among respondents in their attitudes toward these items.

Current students ($n = 34$) responded to seven items related to Mentor Teacher/University Supervisors. The mean values ranged from 3.18 to 3.36, with standard deviations ranging from .76 to 1.04. Variation existed in students’ experiences with their mentor teacher/university supervisor. Most students agreed or strongly agreed that both their mentor teacher and university supervisor were capable and effective.

Eight items examined 33 students’ Current School Environment. The mean values ranged from 2.94 to 3.58. The standard deviations ranged from .50 to .96. The item with the highest mean value was: Teaching makes a difference in students’ lives ($M = 3.58$). The item with the lowest mean value was: Teachers in my school feel they can get through to even the most difficult students ($M = 2.94$).
Three items pertained to the 34 students who responded about their perceptions of their **Instructors**. The mean values ranged from 3.50 to 3.56, indicating that most students agreed or strongly agreed that their instructors were knowledgeable and accessible.

Finally, students (n = 35) responded to six items concerning **Reflections and Future Aspirations**. The mean values ranged from 3.32 to 3.69. The standard deviations ranged from .50 to .83, indicating that there was some variation in the way students reflected on their future. The items with the highest values were: *If I could start over, I would again choose to attend Texas A&M University to obtain my teaching certification (M = 3.69)*; and *Three years from now, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching (M = 3.60)*. The lowest item was: *Ten years from now, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching (M = 3.32)*.

Students also responded to items in seven categories (Job Search, General Instruction, Mathematics, Science, Reading/Language Arts, Social Studies, Professionalism,) using a slightly different, four-point Likert-type scale, that examined their confidence in teaching these areas (1 = not at all confident, 2 = somewhat confident, 3 = confident, 4 = extremely confident), as illustrated in Table 3-3. There were three items that examined students’ perceptions about their ability to conduct a job search (n = 37). The mean values ranged from 3.22 to 3.38, which indicate that most respondents were confident in creating a résumé, initiating a job search, and conducting themselves in an interview. The standard deviations ranged from .72 to .84.

Students (n = 36) responded to 18 items related to their confidence levels in **General Instruction**. The means ranged from 2.53 to 3.37. The standard deviations ranged from .69 to .81. The item with the highest mean value was *Integrate technology in the development and delivery of instructional content (M = 3.46)*. The items with the lowest mean values were:
Conduct parent-teacher conferences ($M = 2.69$) and Employ effective instructional strategies for students with special needs ($M = 2.69$).

Students enrolled in one methods certification course (Mathematics, Science, Reading/Language Arts, or Social Studies) responded to items related teaching ability in their concentration area. The mean values for Mathematics ($n = 4$) ranged from 3.50 to 4.00, which indicate that most respondents were confident to extremely confident in their ability to teach mathematics. The standard deviations ranged from .00 to 1.00, indicating that there was variance among respondents in their confidence levels.

Seven items pertained to the three students who responded about their perceptions of teaching Science. The mean values ranged from 2.67 to 3.33, and the standard deviations ranged from .58 to 1.53. Standard deviations indicate a large amount of variation in the responses. The item with the lowest mean value was Design and implement student-led, inquiry activities ($M = 2.67$).

Ten items examined 19 students’ perceptions about their ability to teach Reading/Language Arts. The mean values for language arts/reading ranged from 2.84 to 3.32, which indicate that most respondents are somewhat confident to confident in their ability to teach reading/language arts. The standard deviations ranged from .68 to .90. The items with the highest mean values were: Study and analyze literature ($M = 3.32$); and Model writing, including drafting and revising ($M = 3.26$). The item with the lowest mean value ($M = 2.84$) was Provide opportunities for English Language Learners to listen, speak, read, and write at their current level of English development, while gradually increasing the linguistic complexity of the English.
Seven items gauged eight students’ perceptions about their ability to teach Social Studies. The mean values for social studies ranged from 3.13 to 3.88. The standard deviations ranged from .35 to .83. The item with the highest mean value was: *Provide instruction that meets social studies content standards (district, state, or national)* (M = 3.88). Though still indicating confidence, the item with the lowest mean value was *Provide opportunities for students to support or defend a position, analyze information and draw conclusions, create and carry-out an action plan, etc.* (M = 3.13).

Students (n = 35) responded to five items related to Professionalism. The means ranged from 2.31 to 3.17. The standard deviations ranged from .66 to 1.13, indicating a wide range of responses for some items. The items with the highest mean values were: *Reading research-based articles related to my field* (M = 3.17) and *Attending professional conferences in my field* (M = 3.14). The item with the lowest mean value was *Presenting at professional conferences in my field* (M = 2.31).

**Summary of open-ended responses**

All respondents were given the opportunity to provide open-ended comments (Appendix C-1 thru C-3) related to what they perceive to be the strengths (n = 26) and the challenges (n = 26) of the Secondary Graduate Certification program at Texas A&M University, as well as make suggestions (n = 27) for program improvement. Students identified clear strengths: “Great teachers, a highly respected program, and lots of support from not only our professors but from the interaction we had with our fellow students becoming teachers;” “It totally prepares you for the classroom and gives you everything you need to know to be a good teacher;” and “Availability of instructors and advisors.”
The Secondary Graduate Certification students openly commented on perceived challenges and suggestions. Some specific concerns and recommendations include: “Need more field experience and practice in managing a classroom, not just guidelines on doing it;” and “It might be beneficial to actually spend time putting the . . . methods we learn about into practice, rather than only reading articles and talking about them.” Moreover, several students identified a feeling of favoritism towards some content areas more so than others.

Summary of Secondary Graduate Certification Program – current students

On the whole, students expressed confidence in their abilities to teach their chosen content areas. Mean scores for Mathematics and Social Studies were all higher than 3.00, providing evidence for students’ confidence in teaching these areas. Concerning Science, all mean scores were above 3.00, with the exception of designing and implementing student-led, inquiry activities. All but two mean scores for ESL (teach students to recognize and apply various strategies to interpret a writer’s purpose and provide opportunities for English Language Learners to listen, speak, read, and write at their current levels of English development, while gradually increasing the linguistic complexity of the English) were also above 3.0. Pertaining to General Instruction, three issues emerged with which students felt less confident: developing strategies for working with parents and families; conducting parent/teacher conferences; and employing effective instructional strategies for students with special needs.

The majority of responses reflected positively on the Undergraduate Prerequisite Courses/Field Experience, Application Process and Advising, Mentor Teacher/University Supervisor, Instructors, Job Search, and Current School Environment. All indicators showed a mean score either above or marginally below the confident level (M = 3.0). Professionalism was
an area identified that the program could improve upon. The issues identified as weaknesses were: writing academic papers and articles; identifying and joining professional organizations pertinent to my field; and presenting at professional conferences in my field.

When students were given the opportunity to reflect on their decision to choose teaching as a profession, overwhelmingly (94%), students agreed that they would do so again. In addition, almost all students agreed that Texas A&M would be their choice for obtaining their teacher certification. Also, the surveys revealed that 90% of students plan to continue teaching at their current school. Finally, most of the students indicated that they would remain in the classroom teaching three, five, and ten years from now.

The open-ended responses identified clear strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the Secondary Graduate Certification program. An identified strength was the quality of the instructors. Overall, respondents find their instructors to be knowledgeable, available, and caring with regard to students. Another strength the students referred to was the cohort-nature of the program. Students reported that such a structure allows them to interact with others that are having similar experiences in their first year of teaching. A majority of students commented that the field experience component of the program is lacking. Students recognize the value of field experiences, and they believe that more opportunities for practical classroom experience should be included within the program. Lastly, some respondents reported an ever-present feeling of favoritism within the program towards some content areas as opposed to others.
Secondary Graduate Certification Program Summary – former students

Summary of scale-item responses

Table 4-1 reports the characteristics of the 53 participants who responded to the online survey of former Secondary Graduate Certification students. Of the respondents, 83% were female and 87% were white. Sixty-four percent of the respondents were between the ages of 22-25, 32% between the ages of 26-30, 2% between the ages of 31-40, and 2% of respondents were above the age of 41. Of the former students who participated in the Secondary Graduate Certification program, 49% hold a bachelor’s degree from liberal arts/humanities, 21% science-related fields, 17% political science/history/geography, 8% other, 4% engineering-related fields, and 2% mathematics-related fields.

Of the 37 respondents, 78% are currently employed as a teacher during the 2009-2010 school year. For those respondents who indicated they were not currently teaching, the primary explanation was the inability to find a job. With the regard to the location of the schools where respondents are currently employed, 50% reported working in a suburban setting, 19% small town, 17% urban, 11% rural, and 3% inner city. In terms of certification, 40% are certified Language Arts/Reading, 26% Social Studies Composite, 22% History, 14% Life Sciences, 10% Spanish, 8% Physical Sciences, 8% Science Composite, 6% Chemistry, 4% Math, 4% Communication, and 2% Latin. When the former students were asked to indicate all the grade levels they were currently teaching, 60% indicated they were teaching sophomores, 53% juniors, 38% freshmen, 30% seniors, and 13% 8th grade. The majority of respondents currently hold a leadership role in their school; 72% sponsor of a student organization, 23% coaching, 21% team leader, 17% other, and 14% department head.
Former students responded to items in seven categories (Undergraduate Prerequisite Course/Field Experience, Mentor Teacher/University Supervisors, Current School Environment, Instructors, TLAC Core Courses, Action Research Project, and Reflections and Future Aspirations) using a four-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree), as reported in Table 4-2. In the area of Undergraduate Prerequisite Courses/Field Experience, 51 former students responded to 4 items. The mean values ranged from 3.02 to 3.35, with standard deviations ranging from .67 to .87. Overall former students agreed that prerequisite courses and field experience provided valuable knowledge and prepared them to enter the classroom as a first-year teacher.

For the Mentor Teacher/University Supervisors section of the survey, former students (n = 50) responded to seven items with means ranging from 3.24 to 3.51. The standard deviations ranged from .58 to .83. The majority of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that their mentor teacher and university supervisor were capable and effective.

Former students (n = 48) responded to seven items related to Current School Environment. The mean values ranged from 2.98 to 3.71, with standard deviations ranging from .46 to .81. Minimal variation existed in respondents’ perceptions of their current school environment. The item with the highest mean value, indicating almost all former students strongly agree, was: Teaching makes a difference in students’ lives (M = 3.71). The item with the lowest mean value was: Teachers in my school feel they can get through to even the most difficult students (M = 2.98).

Three items examined 51 former students’ perceptions of their Instructors. The mean values ranged from 3.55 to 3.69, indicating that most former students agreed or strongly agreed
that their instructors were knowledgeable and accessible. The standard deviations ranged from .47 to .61.

Five items pertained to the 47 respondents of their opinion of the TLAC Core Courses. The mean values ranged from 3.06 to 3.53 and standard deviations ranging from .50 to .79. Respondents agreed to strongly agree the TLAC core courses provided foundational knowledge, were challenging, and readily available during registration.

Pertaining to the Action Research Project section of the survey, former students \((n = 47)\) responded to three items. Mean values ranged from 3.19 to 2.87. Standard deviations ranged from .88-.89, indicating some variation among responses. The item with the highest mean value was: *The action research project required informed my classroom teaching practices* \((M = 3.17)\). The item with the lowest mean value was: *The action research project changed my classroom teaching practices* \((M = 2.87)\). Former students’ responses indicate that action research projects inform their classroom teaching practices but did not actually change them.

Finally, former students \((n = 47)\) responded to six items concerning Reflections and Future Aspirations. The mean values ranged from 3.78 to 2.89. The standard deviations ranged from .42 to .91, indicating variation existed in some of the items pertaining to reflections and future aspirations. The item with the highest mean value was: *If I could start over, I would again choose to attend Texas A&M University to obtain my teaching certification* \((M = 3.78)\). The lowest item was: *Ten years from now, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching* \((M = 2.89)\).

Former students also responded to items in seven categories (Job Search, General Instruction, Mathematics, Science, Reading/Language Arts, Social Studies, Professionalism, ) using a slightly different, four-point Likert-type scale that examined their confidence in teaching these areas \((1 = \text{not at all confident}, \ 2 = \text{somewhat confident}, \ 3 = \text{confident}, \ 4 = \text{extremely confident})\).
confident), as shown in Table 4-3. There were 3 items that examined former students’ perceptions about their ability conduct a Job Search (n = 51). The mean values ranged from 3.31 to 3.31, which indicate that most respondents were confident in creating a resume, initiating a job search, and conducting themselves in an interview. The standard deviations ranged from .71 to .76.

Former students (n = 51) responded to 18 items related to their confidence levels in General Instruction. The means ranged from 2.53 to 3.37. The standard deviations ranged from .69 to .81 to .97, indicating variation among responses. The item with the highest mean value was: Recognize and respect individual family differences (M = 3.37). The item with the lowest mean value was: Support older readers who are learning to read (M = 2.53).

Former students enrolled in one methods certification course (Mathematics, Science, Reading/Language Arts, or Social Studies) responded to items related teaching ability in their concentration area. The mean values for Mathematics (n = 2) ranged from 3.50 to 4.00, which indicate that respondents were confident to extremely confident in their ability to teach mathematics. The standard deviations ranged from .00 to .71.

Seven items pertained to the 9 former students who responded about their perceptions of teaching Science. The mean values ranged from 2.78 to 3.78 and the standard deviations ranged from .44 to 1.09. Standard Deviations indicate a large amount of variation in the responses to some items. The item with the highest mean value was: Use a variety of appropriate science assessment strategies (M = 3.78). The item with the lowest mean value was Design and implement student-led, inquiry activities (M = 2.78).

Ten items examined 9 former students’ perceptions about their ability to teach Reading/Language Arts. The mean values for language arts/reading ranged from 3.00 to 3.67,
which indicate that most respondents are somewhat confident to confident in their ability to teach reading/language arts. The standard deviations ranged from .53 to 1.00, indicating large amounts of variation on some items. The item with the highest mean value was: *Model writing, including drafting and revising* ($M = 3.67$).

Seven items gauged 12 former students’ perceptions about their ability to teach **Social Studies**. The mean values for social studies ranged from 3.00 to 3.67. The standard deviations ranged from .49 to 1.00. The item with the highest mean value was: *Make connections to events in students’ lives, current events, and other content areas* ($M = 3.67$). Though still indicating confidence, the item with the lowest mean value was: *Plan opportunities for students to investigate topics in depth* ($M = 3.00$).

Former students ($n = 51$) responded to 5 items related to **Professionalism**. The means ranged from 2.25 to 3.29. The standard deviations ranged from .76 to 98, indicating some variation in responses. The item with the highest mean value was: *Attending professional conferences in my field* ($M = 3.29$). The items with the lowest mean values were: *Writing academic papers and articles* ($M = 2.68$) and *Presenting at professional conferences in my field* ($M = 2.25$).

**Summary of open-ended responses**

All respondents were given the opportunity to provide open-ended comments (Appendix D-1 thru D-3) related to what they perceive to be the strengths ($n = 24$) and the challenges ($n = 25$) of the Secondary Graduate Certification program at Texas A&M University, as well as make suggestions ($n = 24$) for program improvement. Former students identified clear strengths: “*The program has great professors who truly care- years later, I can still ask them for assistance;***”
“[Meeting] other people in my field that I can call on for help and support;” and “I was able to easily finish my Master’s Degree at the end of the program . . . .”

The former Secondary Graduate Certification students openly commented on perceived challenges and suggestions. Some specific concerns and recommendations include: “Lack of experience in the classroom environment by students before they begin teaching;” and “In general, the level of rigor and difficulty of the program needs to be amped up;” “More marketing- when I was in the program few people seemed to know about it”

Summary of Secondary Graduate Certification Program – former students

On the whole, former students expressed confidence in their abilities to teach their chosen content areas. Mean scores for Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts, and Social Studies were all higher than 3.00, providing evidence for former students’ confidence in teaching these areas. Concerning Science, all mean scores were above 3.00, with the exception of designing and implementing student-led, inquiry activities. Pertaining to General Instruction, three issues emerged with which former students felt less confident: differentiate instruction for all students; employing effective instructional strategies for students with special needs; and support older readers who are learning to read.

The majority of responses reflected positively on the Undergraduate Prerequisite Courses/Field Experience, Mentor Teacher/University Supervisor, Current School Environment, Instructors, TLAC Core Courses, and Job Search. All indicators showed a mean score above or the confident level. In the Action Research Project portion of the survey, a weakness that was identified was: The action research project changed my classroom teaching practices.

Professionalism was another area identified that the program could improve upon. Other issues
identified as weaknesses were: writing academic papers and articles and presenting at professional conferences in my field.

When former students were given the opportunity to reflect on their decision to attend Texas A&M University to obtain their teaching certification, overwhelmingly, former students (100%) agreed. In addition, almost all former students (87%) agreed that they would again choose teaching as their profession. In addition, the surveys revealed that only 67% of former students plan to continue teaching at their current school. Finally, most of the former students indicated that they would remain in the classroom teaching three, and five years from now, but they were less confident on whether they would still be in the classroom ten years from now.

The open-ended responses identified clear strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the Secondary Graduate Certification program. An identified strength was the quality of the instructors. Overall, respondents find their instructors to be caring with regard to former students and knowledgeable about the realities of the classroom. Another strength the former students referred to was the ability to complete a Master’s degree in Education upon completion of the program. Finally, former students commented on the cohort-nature of the program. The structure of the program allows former students to interact with others that are having similar experiences in their first year of teaching. A majority of former students commented that the field experience component of the program is lacking. Former students feel as though the amount of field experience needs to be increased to better prepare future students in the program for the classroom. Another suggestion from former students was to increase the difficulty and rigor of the program. Lastly, some respondents suggested more marketing of the program to increase the number of people who are aware of its presence on campus.
Master’s Program Summary – current students

Summary of scale-item responses

Table 5-1 reports the characteristics of the 32 participants who responded to the online survey of current master’s students. Of the respondents, 81% were female and 26% were male. Seventy-five percent of the respondents classified themselves as White, 13% as Other, 6% as Asian or Pacific Islander, and 6% Latino(a). The age range of the students was sub-divided into five categories and split as follows: 22 - 25 = 50%; 26 - 30 = 28%; 31 – 40 = 16%; and 41+ = 6%.

The respondents were asked to describe their current employment status and student status. Sixty-three percent of the students are employed full-time; 25% are not employed; and 12% are part-time employed. Of the current master’s students, 56% are classified as part-time students and 44% are classified as full-time. The students’ proximity to Texas A&M University broke-down fairly evenly, with 55% living more than 50 miles from TAMU and 45% living within 50 miles of the university. In regard to previous work experience, 78% had previous experience in the field of education, 16% in another field of employment, and 6% have never been employed. Of those with experience in the field of education, 83% had five or fewer years of experience, 13% had six to 10 years of experience, and 4% had 16+ years of experience. Respondents were also asked to indicate the area of experience within the field of education. Sixty-five percent indicated experience as a classroom teacher, 15% other, 12% classroom teachers’ assistant, 4% administrator, and 4% administrative assistant. Finally, students indicated the number of years they planned to work in the field of education: 58% responded 16+ years; 26% 6 – 10 years; 10% 11 – 15 years; and 2% 1 – 5 years.
General academic demographics were also collected. When asked whether or not they had received an undergraduate degree from Texas A&M University, 53% reported that they did not, while 47% reported they had. The percentages of students identifying themselves in the various TLAC concentration areas broke-down as follows: 50% Generalist (Online Master’s); 22% Culture and Curriculum; 13% Science Education; 6% Early Childhood Education; 6% Urban Education; and 3% Mathematics Education. Excluding the Online Master’s students, 69% of current students indicated that they did not intend to pursue the thesis option and 88% indicated that the practicum experience was not a mandatory component of their degree plan.

The survey also collected data from the current master’s students’ coursework choices. Excluding Online Master’s students, students reported on the number of online and/or hybrid courses they have taken. Eighty-one percent have enrolled in such courses.

Table 5-2 shows master’s students’ responses to items in seven categories (TLAC Core Courses, Concentration Area Electives, Online and Hybrid Classes, Advising, Instructors, Future Career Aspirations, and Overall Experience) using a four-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree). In the area of TLAC Core Courses, 31 students responded to the five items. The mean values ranged from 2.76 to 3.03. The standard deviations ranged from .73 to 1.07, indicating some variation among respondents in their attitudes toward these items. The item with the highest mean value, indicating that students agreed with the statement, was Core courses were challenging ($M = 3.03$). The lowest mean—indicating that students disagreed with the statement—was There were open seats in the core courses when I went to register for them ($M = 2.76$).

For the Concentration Area Electives section of the survey, 32 master’s students responded to six items. The mean values of the indicators ranged from 2.52 to 3.07. The standard
deviations in this section ranged from .52 to .75. The item with the highest mean value ($M = 3.07$), was *The content area courses were challenging*, and the lowest mean item ($M = 3.52$) was *The content area courses for my specialization were available during the semester that I needed to take them.*

Master’s students ($n = 28$) responded to eight items related to **Online and Hybrid Courses**. The mean values ranged from 3.18 to 2.73 and standard deviations for these items ranged from .41 to .76. The indicator with the highest mean value ($M = 3.18$) was *I had the opportunity to interact with some other students in the courses through online discussion, group projects, etc.* and item with the lowest mean value ($M = 2.73$) was *I received prompt feedback on my assignments.*

For the **Advising** section of the survey, 31 master’s students responded to five items. The mean values of the indicators ranged from 3.06 to 3.17, indicating that nearly all of the students agreed that both graduate advisors and chairs of advisory committees were accessible, knowledgeable, and treated students with respect. The standard deviations in this section ranged from .58 to .78. The items with the highest mean values were: *I felt like the graduate advisors treat me with respect* ($M = 3.17$) and *The chair of my advisory committee answers my questions* ($M = 3.17$).

In the area of **Instructors**, 31 students responded to four items. The mean values ranged from 3.16 to 3.36. The standard deviations ranged from .47 to .53, indicating little variation among respondents in their attitudes toward these items. Mean values show that most students agreed that their instructors were knowledgeable, accessible, and caring with regard to students.

Students ($n = 31$) responded to four items concerning **Future Career Aspirations**. The mean values ranged from 2.84 to 3.31. The standard deviations ranged from .59 to .95, indicating
that there was variation on some of the items. The item with the highest value was: *Upon completion of my master’s degree, I plan to seek a job in the field of education* ($M = 3.31$) and the lowest item was: *I plan to continue with graduate school after I complete my master’s* ($M = 2.84$).

Finally, master’s students ($n = 31$) responded to four items concerning **Overall Experience** in the program. The mean values ranged from 3.03 to 3.32 and standard deviations ranged from .59 to .65. Overall students agreed that the master’s program furthered their knowledge about their area of specialization and that the information they learned will be useful in the future. In addition, students agreed that the experience helped prepare them for a future job and provided important networking opportunities.

Master’s students ($n = 31$) also responded to nine items in the category of **Professionalism**, using a slightly different, four-point Likert-type scale that examined their confidence in teaching these areas ($1 = $not at all confident, $2 =$somewhat confident, $3 =$confident, $4 =$extremely confident), as shown in Table 5-3. The mean values ranged from 2.23 to 3.03, which indicate that most respondents were somewhat confident to confident regarding these items. The standard deviations ranged from .52 to .86. The item with the highest value was: *Initiating a job search* ($M = 3.03$). The lowest items were: *Professional activities (i.e. editing/reviewing for a journal)* ($M = 2.23$) and *Presenting at professional conferences in my field* ($M = 2.30$).

Current master’s students who were not participating in the Online Master’s program were asked to respond to items in two additional categories, **Thesis** and **Practicum** (see Table 5-4). These items were measured using a four-point Likert-type scale ($1 =$strongly disagree, $2 =$disagree, $3 =$agree, $4 =$strongly agree). Of the 16 students not participating in the Online
Master’s program, only five students indicated that they were pursuing the thesis option. These students were given an opportunity to respond to three items regarding the thesis option, and the mean values for all thesis options questions was 3.0; however, it should be noted that only one student chose to answer questions in this category.

In regard to the Practicum, only two students indicated that they intended to pursue this option. These students responded to four items on the topic, and the mean values ranged from 2.50 to 3.00. Standard deviations ranged from .00 to .71. Both students agreed that the practicum experience: helped to prepare them for their future job, was related to their area of specialization, and was informed by information from graduate school courses; however, the two students disagreed on whether or not the practicum provided networking opportunities for the future.

Finally, students participating in the Online Master’s program (n = 15) were given an opportunity to respond to eight items pertaining to Technology using a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = not at all skilled, 2 = not very skilled, 3 = fairly skilled, 4 = very skilled, 5 = expert). As illustrated in Table 5-5, mean values ranged from 2.79 to 3.93. Standard deviations ranged from .53 to 1.12, indicating large amounts of variance on some items pertaining to students’ proficiency with some technology. The item with the highest mean value (M = 4.14) was Using the internet to search for information, indicating students’ confidence in their skill level in this area. The item with the lowest mean value (M = 2.79) was: Using graphics software.

Summary of open-ended responses

All respondents were given the opportunity to provide open-ended comments (Appendix E-1 thru E-3) related to what they perceive to be the strengths (n = 19) and the challenges (n = 19) of the master’s program at Texas A&M University, as well as make suggestions (n=17) for program improvement. Overall, two common themes emerged as strengths: (a) instructors and
(b) flexibility of the program. With regard to instructors, one student said, “The professors and advisors are very passionate about what they do.” Another student commented, “The professors really get to know the students and care for their education and job.” The flexibility of the program showed to be a strength for all students but especially the for the Online Master’s program. One respondent noted, “With a full-time job as a teacher, the online program allows me to work on my own time, rather than having to attend a class on campus, which would require travel time, too.” Students commented on being able to receive a quality master’s degree without having to relocate. Master’s students in other programs also commented on the flexibility: “The master’s program is flexible and accessible for both full time and working part time students;” and “Flexibility with the various programs.”

The challenges and suggestions of students participating in the Online Master’s program differed from those completing their degree in another concentration area. The biggest challenge for these students was the number and availability of courses during registration, as stated by several students: “During the last 3 semesters I have felt that I am just being funneled into classes and not had real choices or had to take classes I had no interest in;” “When registering for my 2nd semester [I] struggled to find classes available online which are listed as a part of the recommended degree plan;” “There are not enough seats in each section, the classes fill up fast and there’s less of a choice about what classes I can take;” and “I have had issues every semester with courses not being offered, or not enough space in the courses that are offered.” One student offered the suggestion of, “Offer more classes online. Open the distance learning sections to students that don’t live in College Station before opening them to local students.”

Master’s’ students not participating in the Online Master’s program also had their own concerns and suggestions; however, these concerns were contextual, based on personal
experiences with the program. Some specific examples include: “There is not a feeling of community here. The classes focus too much on specifically being a teacher rather than on other areas of education . . . ;” “The biggest challenge I have faced is not finding a job;” “Lack of diversity, lack of interdepartmental overlap, lack of funding, and it seems specifically geared toward pre-service teachers, less attentive to mid-career, experienced educators;” and “Language and socialization with classmates.” Two suggestions offered by these students were “Separate the two tracks for some of the course: pre-service and experienced educators” and “More classes offered each semester.”

Summary of Master’s Program – current students

On the whole, students agreed that the TLAC core courses, concentration area courses, and online or hybrid courses were challenging and not repetitive; however, students disagreed that TLAC core courses and concentration area courses were offered during the semester(s) in which they needed them or whether or not seats were available in these courses during registration. With regard to online or hybrid courses, students did not agree that instructors provided prompt feedback or were able to assist with technology issues when they arose.

The majority of responses reflected positively on Advising and Instructors. All indicators showed a mean score above the agree level. Professionalism was an area identified on which the program could improve. The only indicators that demonstrated student confidence (M > 2.99) were Initiating a job search and Reading research-based articles related to my field. Three clear weaknesses (mean values below 3.00) were: writing academic papers and articles, professional activities (i.e. editing/reviewing for a journal) and presenting at professional conferences in my field.
Students were asked to reflect on their future career aspirations and overall experience with the program. Concerning future career aspirations, 93% agreed that after completing their degree they would seek a job in education, and that their degree would lead to a professional career opportunity. When reflecting on the overall experience in the program, 93% agreed that the information they learned in graduate courses would be beneficial in their chosen career. Finally, most agreed that the graduate experience helped prepare them for a future job and provided networking opportunities.

The open-ended responses identified clear strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the Masters’ program. All students identified the quality of instructors and the flexibility of the program as strengths. Overall, respondents find their instructors to be caring with regard to students and knowledgeable about current trends in the field. In addition, the program structure gives current students the flexibility to complete a Master’s degree at their own pace. In fact, many students commented that the flexibility allowed them to pursue a graduate degree that they might not have been able to pursue otherwise. The responses pertaining to challenges and suggestions were clearly divided by those participating in the Online Master’s program and those who did not. Online Master’s students signified their biggest challenge as the number of online courses and the availability of online classes. These respondents suggested allowing students at a distance first choice at online classes before allowing other students to register for them. Other Master’s students’ challenges were more closely related to their own experiences in the program. Examples of these challenges include: not being able to find a job, not enough funding while in the program, and too much emphasis on pre-service educators as opposed to experienced educators.
Master’s Program Summary – former students

Summary of scale-item responses

Table 6-1 reports the characteristics of the 49 participants who responded to the online survey of former master’s students. Of the respondents, 90% were female. Seventy-six percent of the respondents classified themselves as White, 4% as other, 4% African-American, 4% Latino(a), and 3% Asian or Pacific Islander. The age range of the students was sub-divided into five categories and split as follows: 26 - 30 = 35%; 41+ = 29%; 31 – 40 = 27%; and 22 - 25 = 10%.

The former master’s students were asked to describe their current employment status and student status. Seventy-three percent of the students are currently employed full-time; 23% part-time employed; 2% not employed; and 2% not employed but seeking. Of the former students, 51% were classified as part-time students while completing their master’s and 49% were classified as full-time. The students’ graduate year from Texas A&M University broke-down as: 31% graduated in 2005; 22% 2006; 22% 2008; 18% 2007; and 6% 2009. In regards to work experience since receiving their master’s degree, 90% are have worked in the field of education, 8% in another field of employment, and 2% have not been employed. If respondents indicated employment in the field of education, they were also asked to indicate the area of experience. Sixty-eight percent indicated experience as a classroom teacher, 23% other, and 9% administration. Finally, former students indicated the number of years they planned to work in the field of education: 44% responded 16+ years; 18% 6 – 10 years; 16% 11 – 15 years; 16% 1 – 5 years and 7% didn’t plan to work in the field of education.

General academic demographics were also collected. When asked whether or not they had received an undergraduate degree from Texas A&M University, 51% reported that they did,
while 49% reported they had not. The percentages of former students identifying themselves in
the various TLAC concentration areas broke-down as follows: 33% Culture and Curriculum;
21% Science Education; 15% Reading and Language Arts Education; 13% English as a Second
Language (ESL); 6% Urban Education; and 2% Early Childhood Education. With regards to the
thesis option and a practicum, only 8% of former students chose to pursue the thesis option and
44% indicated that the practicum experience was mandatory component of their degree plan.
Finally, of the former master’s’ students 27% are currently pursuing an additional degree.

The survey also collected data from the current master’s students’ coursework choices.
Former students reported on the number of online and/or hybrid courses they have taken: 82%
have enrolled in such courses.

Table 6-2 shows master’s students’ responses to items in nine categories (TLAC Core
Courses, Concentration Area Electives, Online and Hybrid Classes, Advising, Instructors,
Practicum, Thesis Option, Future Career Aspirations, and Overall Experience) using a four-
point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree). In the
area of TLAC Core Courses, 49 students responded to the four items. The mean values ranged
from 2.96 to 3.33 and standard deviations ranged from .67 to .76. The item with the highest mean
value, indicating that students agreed with the statement, was The core courses were not
repetitive of courses I already completed during my undergraduate work (M = 3.33).

For the Concentration Area Electives section of the survey, 49 former master’s students
responded to three items. The mean values of the indicators ranged from 3.04 to 3.29. The
standard deviations in this section ranged from .58 to .73. Mean scores for these items indicated
the content area courses prepared former students for their current jobs, were challenging, and
were not repetitive of undergraduate courses they had already taken.
Former master’s students ($n = 40$) responded to eight items related to Online and Hybrid Courses. The mean values ranged from 3.05 to 3.25 and standard deviations for these items ranged from .53 to .79. Former students agreed that the online or hybrid course instructors had well organized classes, provided prompt responses, thoroughly explained assignments, offered prompt feedback on assignments, and were able to assist with technology issues. In addition, respondents agreed that the courses were challenging, creating learning environments where students could interact with others through venues such as online discussions, and were not repetitive of undergraduate coursework.

For the Advising section of the survey, 48 former master’s students responded to seven items. The mean values of the indicators ranged from 2.71 to 3.50. The standard deviations in this section ranged from .65 to .87. The items with the highest mean values were: The chair of my advisory committee answered my questions ($M = 3.50$) and The chair of my advisory committee was accessible ($M = 3.17$). The indicators with the lowest mean values were: I continue to keep in contact with the chair/other members of my advisory committee ($M = 2.73$) and My chair/members of my advisory committee were helpful when looking for a job ($M = 2.71$).

In the area of Instructors, 48 students responded to five items. The mean values ranged from 2.42 to 3.46. The standard deviations ranged from .50 to .86, indicating some variation among respondents in their attitudes toward these items. Overall former students agreed that their graduate course instructors were knowledgeable about current trends in curriculum and instruction and genuinely cared about the students. Former students, however, disagreed that their instructors were helpful when looking for a job or that they have kept in contact with them after graduation.
Respondents to the survey were asked to indicate whether if they had chosen to pursue a thesis option as a part of their master’s degree. Of the 49 former students, only four students indicated that they did pursue this option. These students were given an opportunity to respond to five items regarding the thesis option; the mean value for these items was 3.25 to 3.75. The standard deviations ranged from .50 to .96, indicating variation in some of the items. Overall students agreed to strongly agreed that while pursuing the thesis option their chair provided guidance with research and individuals received prompt feedback about their research. They also strongly agreed that their graduate coursework had prepared them to complete a thesis. Finally, students agreed that the thesis option helped them when looking for a job and these students have continued to research since completing the thesis.

In regards to the Practicum, 21 former students indicated that they would be pursuing this option. These students responded to three items concerning this topic, and mean values ranged from 3.11 to 3.63. Standard deviations ranged from .50 to .96. Former students agreed that the practicum experience: helped to prepare them for their future job, was related to their area of specialization, and was informed by information from graduate school courses.

Students \((n = 45)\) responded to four items concerning Future Career Aspirations. The mean values ranged from 2.40 to 3.07. The standard deviations ranged from .93 to 1.14, indicating that there a large amount of variation on these items. The item with the highest value was: My master’s degree will lead to a professional career opportunity \((M = 3.07)\) and the lowest item was: I continued with graduate school after I complete my master’s \((M = 2.40)\).

Finally, master’s students \((n = 44)\) responded to five items concerning Overall Experience in the program. The mean values ranged from 2.91 to 3.36 and standard deviations ranging from .64 to .84. Overall former students agreed that the master’s program furthered their
knowledge about their area of specialization, information learned has been helpful with my career, and helped prepare them for their current job or any future jobs. However, former students disagreed that the graduate experience provided important networking opportunities.

Finally, master’s students ($n = 48$) were asked to respond to nine items in the category of **Professionalism**, using a slightly different, four-point Likert-type scale that examined their confidence in teaching these areas ($1 = $ not at all confident, $2 = $ somewhat confident, $3 =$ confident, $4 = $ extremely confident), as shown in Table 6-3. The mean values ranged from 2.64 to 3.44, which indicate that most respondents were somewhat confident to confident regarding these items. The standard deviations ranged from .67 to 1.06. This ranges indicates large amounts of variation on some items. The item with the highest value was: *Reading research-based articles related to my field* ($M = 3.44$). The lowest item was: *Professional activities (i.e. editing/reviewing for a journal)* ($M = 2.64$).

**Summary of open-ended responses**

All respondents were given the opportunity to provide open-ended comments (Appendix F-1 thru F-3) related to what they perceive to be the strengths ($n = 29$) and the challenges ($n = 30$) of the master’s program at Texas A&M University, as well as make suggestions ($n= 23$) for program improvement. Overall, two common themes emerged as strengths of the master’s program at Texas A&M: (a) instructors and (b) course content. With regards to instructors one student said, “*Great support from advisors/professors.*” Another student commented, “*The advisors cared about their students.*” The course content provided by the master’s program showed to be a strength for all students. One respondent noted, “*The [information] covered was very comprehensive. Often times I encounter concepts that were first presented to me during my graduate work and it has made me very confident when discussing education related issues in my*
career.” Finally, “The program was academically rigorous in that readings, projects, and papers were comprehensive.”

Former master’s’ students also had their own concerns and suggestions; however, they seemed to be contextualized to their own experiences with the program. Some specific examples include: “Finding time to coordinate working full time and complete a master’s degree;” “Some online professors were unclear of their expectations and unwilling to talk about issues I was having in class;” “Sometimes the commuting is somewhat of a challenge for distance students;” and “Integrating more meaningful lecture/discussion and learning opportunities in online classes including more feedback from instructors throughout discussion boards and after assignment submissions.” Two suggestions offered by these students were “Announce a two-year cycle of when classes, core and electives will be offered” and “Clear expectations for online courses.”

Summary of Master’s Program – former students

On the whole, students agreed that the TLAC core courses, concentration area courses, and online or hybrid courses were challenging, not repetitive, were offered during the semester they needed them, and seats were available in these courses during registration. With regards to online or hybrid courses, students indicated they agreed that instructors provided prompt feedback or were able to assist with technology issues when they arose.

The majority of responses reflected positively on the Advising and Instructors. All indicators showed a mean score above or the agree level ($M = 3.00$), except items that pertained to keeping in contact with professors or advisors once they finished their degree. Professionalism was an area identified that the program could improve upon. Three clear weaknesses (those with a mean value below 3.00) illustrated from responses were: writing academic papers and articles;
professional activities (i.e. editing/reviewing for a journal); and presenting at professional conferences in my field.

Former students were asked to reflect on their future career aspirations and overall experience with the program. In regards to future career aspirations, 66% agreed that after completing their degree they did seek a job in education (54% in a public school district) and 70% indicated that their degree led to a professional career opportunity. In addition, only 40% have continued with graduate school after completing their masters’ degree. When reflecting on the overall experience in the program, 91% agreed that the information they learned in graduate courses would be beneficial in their chosen career. Overwhelmingly, former students also agreed that the overall graduate experience helped prepare them for their current job or a job in the future. Finally, most agreed that the graduate experience provided networking opportunities.

The former master’s students identified clear strengths, weaknesses and challenges of the program in the open-ended responses. All students identified the quality of instructors and course content of the program as strengths. Overall, respondents find their instructors to be knowledgeable and students appreciated their guidance throughout the program. In addition, the course content of the program provided foundational knowledge and allowed students to be confident discussing current educational issues. Former masters’ students’ challenges were more closely related to their own experiences in the program. Examples of these challenges included finding time to coordinate a full time job with obtaining a graduate degree, commuting for classes, and not receiving feedback in online classes from professors.
Doctoral Program Summary – current students

Summary of scale-item responses

Table 7-1 reports the characteristics of the 100 participants who responded to the online survey of current doctoral students. Of the respondents, 73% were female and 27% were male. Fifty-four percent of the respondents classified themselves as White, 19% as African-American, 14% as Asian or Pacific Islander, 8% as Latino(a), and 5% as other. Thirty-one percent of the current doctoral students reported that English is not their first language. The age range of the students was sub-divided into five categories and split as follows: 30 - 39 = 43%; 20 - 29 = 25%; 50 - 59 = 18%; 40 - 49 = 13%; and 60 - 69 = 1%.

The current doctoral students were asked to describe their current employment status and residency conditions. Not including Graduate Assistantships, 50% of the students are employed full-time; 13% are employed part-time; and 36% are not employed. Graduate Assistantships are held by 39% of the respondents, and 15% have Graduate Student Fellowships. Excluding the required semesters of residency, 65% of current doctoral students are typically classified as full-time students. The majority of students (65%) are classified as in-state, 10% are classified as out-of-state, and 21% as international. The students’ proximity to Texas A&M University broke-down fairly evenly, with 56% living within 50 miles of the university and 54% living more than 50 miles from TAMU.

General academic demographics were also collected. When asked whether or not they held any previous degrees from Texas A&M University, 36% reported that they received a Bachelor’s degree; 76% a Master’s degree, and 18% a Doctorate. The percentages of students identifying themselves in the various TLAC concentration areas broke-down as follows: 22% Culture and Curriculum; 17% Reading and Language Arts; 16% Science Education; 13% Urban
Education; 12% English as a Second Language (ESL); 12% Mathematics Education; and 6% Early Childhood Education. The current students are in various stages within the program: 25% have completed 0 - 1 year; 19% 1 - 2 years; 22% 2 - 3 years; 18% 3-4 years; 7% 4 - 5 years; and 8% 5+ years. Furthermore, at the time of completing the survey, doctoral students had completed various program requirements: 93% had chosen their dissertation committee and filed their degree plans; 57% had completed their coursework; 44% had defended their preliminary examination; 21% had defended their dissertation proposals; and 7% had defended their dissertations.

The survey collected general descriptive data about current doctoral students’ coursework choices. Regarding the core courses they have taken: 82% have completed Instruction Theory; 78% have taken Curriculum Theory; 66% have taken Philosophy of Education; 57% have completed PhD Studies in TLAC; 55% have taken History of Education; and 22% have completed Cognition, Culture, & Literacy. Concerning research sequences selected, 27% chose Sequence C (TLAC Sequence—EDCI 689 Research Methods in EDCI - I; EDCI 689 Research Methods in EDCI - II; EDCI 689 Advanced Research Methods in EDCI - III); 16% chose Sequence A (EDCI 689 Intro to Qualitative Research; OR EHRD 655 Qualitative Research; EPSY 640 Experimental Design in Education I; EPSY 641 Experimental Design in Education II); 12% chose Sequence B (EDCI 689 Intro to Qualitative Research; OR EHRD 655 Qualitative Research; STAT 651 Statistics in Research I; STAT 652 Statistics in Research II); 12% chose Other; 10% chose Sequence D (EPSY 640 Experimental Design in Education I; OR STAT 651 Statistics in Research I; EDCI 689 Introduction to Qualitative Research; OR EHRD 655 Qualitative Research Methods; EDCI 689 Advanced Research Methods in Qualitative Research); and 23% indicated that they did not know which research sequence they intended to select.
Furthermore, students reported on the number of online and/or hybrid courses they have taken: 13% have not enrolled in such courses; 22% have taken one; 16% have taken two; 20% have taken three; and 28% have taken four or more online/hybrid classes.

Table 7-2 shows doctoral students’ responses to items in six categories (TLAC Core Courses, Concentration Area Courses, Research Courses, Online and Hybrid Courses, Learning Environment, TLAC Graduate Advising Office, Dissertation, Presentations and Publications, and Reflections) using a four-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree). In the area of TLAC Core Courses, 90 students responded to the five items. The mean values ranged from 2.97 to 3.16. The standard deviations ranged from .70 to .86, indicating some variation among respondents in their attitudes toward these items. The item with the highest mean value (\(M = 3.16\)), indicating that students agreed with the statement, was Core courses were available during the semesters I needed to take them, and the lowest means (\(M = 2.97, M = 2.97\)) — both indicating that students disagreed with the statements — were Overall, the core courses were challenging and The core courses were not repetitive of other doctoral courses I had already taken.

For the Concentration Area Courses section of the survey, 91 doctoral students responded to six items. The mean values of the indicators ranged from 3.04 - 3.45, indicating that nearly all of the students agreed or strongly agreed that their content area courses were available, challenging, not repetitive, taught by well-informed professors, and informative with regard to current issues in the students’ field of emphasis. The standard deviations in this section ranged from .65 to .81. The item with the highest mean value (\(M = 3.45\)) was I feel as though the professors in my content area are well-informed regarding research trends in my field, and the
The lowest mean ($M = 3.04$), though still greater than 3.00, was *The content area courses for my specialization were available during the semesters in which I needed to take them.*

Doctoral students ($n = 84$) responded to seven items related to their **Research Courses**, the mean values ranged from 3.03 to 3.38, indicating that most students agreed that their research courses were available, challenging, provided sufficient preparation for writing their dissertations, prepared them to review scholarly articles, and prepared them to be contributing scholars in their respective fields. The standard deviations for these items ranged from .64 to .89, indicating some variation. The indicator with the highest mean value ($M = 3.38$) was *Overall, the research courses were challenging*, and item with the lowest mean value ($M = 3.03$), though still indicating agreement, was *There were open seats in the research courses when I needed to register for them.***

For the **Online and Hybrid Courses** section of the survey, 74 doctoral students responded to seven items. The mean values of the indicators ranged from 3.11 to 3.33, indicating that nearly all of the students agreed that the online and hybrid courses were positive, to include such issues as organization, challenging, the opportunity to interact with others, and taught by thorough and prompt professors. The standard deviations in this section ranged from .62 to .81. The items with the highest mean values ($M = 3.33, M = 3.30$) were: *I had the opportunity to interact with other students in the course through online discussions, group projects, etc.* and *Overall, the online classes were not repetitive of courses I already completed during my undergraduate work.*

In the area of **Learning Environment**, 86 students responded to nine items. The mean values ranged from 3.17 to 3.69. The standard deviations ranged from .49 to .70, indicating some variation among respondents in their attitudes toward these items. The item with the highest
mean value \((M = 3.69)\), indicating that students strongly agreed with the statement, was I am familiar with WebCT/eLearning; and the lowest mean value \((M = 3.17)\) was Most professors in my courses enhance learning with the use of technology.

Regarding the TLAC Graduate Advising Office, 86 students responded to three items: The TLAC Graduate Advising Office is accessible; In general, the advisors in the TLAC Graduate Advising Office answer my questions; and I feel like the advisors in the TLAC Graduate Advising Office treat me with respect. The respective mean values for those indicators were 3.23, 3.31, and 3.39. The corresponding standard deviations for these three items were .70, .66, and .67, indicating some variation among respondents in their attitudes.

Students \((n = 378)\) responded to eight items concerning the Dissertation. The mean values ranged from 2.70 to 3.54. The standard deviations ranged from .67 to .99, indicating a large amount of variation on some items. The item with the highest value \((M = 3.54)\) was: I feel as though my dissertation committee chair treats me with respect. The lowest \((M = 2.70)\) item was: I have attended a workshop on how to write a dissertation.

In the survey section on Presentations and Publications, 79 students responded to seven items. The mean values ranged from 2.45 to 3.24. The standard deviations ranged from .57 to 1.06, indicating a large amount of variation among respondents in their attitudes toward these items. The items with the highest mean values \((M = 3.24, M = 3.22)\) were: Before I graduate, I feel as though I will be the primary author of a paper to submit for publication and I am aware of research conferences—particularly those that encourage graduate students to present their research. The lowest means \((M = 2.81, M = 2.45)\)—both below the 3.00 level of agreement—were: I know how to apply for graduate student conference funding and I am or have been a reviewer for a peer reviewed journal.
Finally, current doctoral students were asked to reflect on decisions they have made with regard to their career and academic choices. Regarding these Reflections, 86 students responded to three items: *I feel I am prepared to secure a position in higher education and/or leadership (M = 3.18)*; *If I could start over, I would again choose to attend Texas A&M University for a doctoral degree in education (M = 3.21)*; and *If I could start over, I would again choose education as my program of study (M = 3.34)*. The corresponding standard deviations for these three items were .87, 1.00, and .92, indicating a large degree of variation among respondents with regard to these indicators.

**Summary of open-ended responses**

All current doctoral students were given the chance to provide open-ended comments (Appendix G-1 thru G-4) on the topics of: what they perceive to be the strengths (n = 57) and challenges (n = 60) of the doctoral program at Texas A&M University; and their plans for future employment (n = 64). Additionally, they were asked to make suggestions (n=46) for program improvement.

Responses to the question, *Immediately following the completion of your doctoral degree, where and in what capacity do you envision yourself being employed?* revealed four general career paths and/or settings: (a) professor (tenured and clinical) at an institution of higher education, (b) post-doctoral work, (c) working in the public school setting, and (d) remaining in current job. Overwhelmingly, most students intend to work at a university: “*I see myself being employed in a higher education capacity teaching undergraduates and conducting research,*” “*I can visualize myself teaching undergraduate pre-service teachers at a university or working with teachers to further education . . . .*” and “*Other than the generic tier one research university, I am not quite sure. I continue to play with the idea of consulting as well. At this stage I truly*”
would like to do more research and focus my attention [on] improving inservice teachers’ understanding of their profession . . . .”

Concerning strengths, challenges, and suggestions, six common themes emerged: (a) Coursework, (b) Professors, (c) Committee/Chair, (d) Conferences and Publishing, (e) Funding, and (f) Collegiality. A range of comments was made with regard to coursework, with a couple of respondents finding this particular area to be a program strength: “Our strength is that there are courses available in the evenings and on Saturdays that can accommodate the schedules of those students that work full-time,” and “The vast array of courses offered [is a strength].”

The preponderance of comments related to coursework, however, identified this topic as a program challenge, and numerous students had much to say on the issue: “A lack of beneficial courses specific to my content area; too much focus on specific populations (i.e., English Language Learners, perceived minority groups, urban education, etc.), as opposed to ALL learners.” Another student offered, “Due to the diversity of program areas, it is a challenge to create core courses that meet all of those needs. I felt the core courses were almost too broad, with one exception: Curriculum Theory was too narrow, focusing on one theorist (Pinar). Since I entered the program new to the field of education, I would have liked for my courses to have included other key players (Dewey, for example). Instead, I am seeking out his and others’ work on my own.” Students felt “a lack of availability of appropriate advanced research courses.” As one respondent described, “The greatest challenge would be the inconsistent research course offerings. Occasionally we’ll offer a qualitative studies course, and then it will disappear . . . that’s quite frustrating . . . now knowing what to expect.” Some specific suggestions were made with regard to coursework: “Classes need to be offered more—not just once per year (in some cases);” “ . . . offer classes that don’t do the same things over and over (for example . . . I’ve
seen an ancient video, [Video X], in FOUR CLASSES);” “I highly suggest all members of TLAC take the new three level series of courses for the research sector . . . it addresses many of the problems I have experienced . . . ;” and “Increase the rigor of the courses.”

The doctoral students, overall, commented positively on their professors, and two overarching trends surfaced with regard to the topic: (a) Professors are knowledgeable, having real-world experience, and (b) they care about their students. One respondent said,” . . . the faculty members are amazing as researchers and teachers . . . very approachable and willing to work with students.” Another student added, “The professors in the TLAC program treat you with respect and are willing to go the extra mile for you when you need them. I feel as if I could talk with any of the professors in [my program] at any time and that they would be honest with me and guide me in the right direction.”

Nonetheless, several survey participants commented that some professors are not attentive enough and can be too insular with regard to promoting their personal ideologies: “Faculty seem greatly over-extended & unable to devote enough time outside of class to mentor graduate students; professors’ social agendas and personal beliefs ‘turn off’ many of our university’s core student constituency and stifle a true spirit of collegiality (there are only so many times you can be told that you aren’t qualified to teach minority children due to the color of your skin, before you want to find a new doctoral program/school to work with;.” “PhD students need more informal contact with faculty to learn more about life in the academy;” and “. . . the lack of any kind of consistency among professors with regard to expectations for different students (i.e., different requirements/expectations for different students, based on program areas, full-time/part-time status, etc.).
A number of current doctoral students also commented about their Dissertation Committee Chairs. Some indicated that their Chair is helpful and invaluable: “My chair is incredible and provides [her] graduate students mentoring that is properly scaffolded.” Another student commented, “. . . having a supportive . . . committee chair can really motivate a student to hang in there to complete the degree.” Several doctoral students, however, felt differently: “The biggest challenge would be the support for doctoral students to graduate from their faculty chairs. Committee chairs waste too much time not responding [to] the needs of the students. For example my chairs have not been responsive to my needs. It has taken 2 years for them to approve my dissertation proposal;” “I have had [little] input . . . from my chair and most committee members. I am six months to eighteen months behind my projected date and will be at least eighteen months behind when I get my degree, at best;” and “. . . my chairs have not been supportive and have often ignored my communication for months at a time.” Students noted that there were not always enough sections available for each course. Students felt passionately about this subject and offered a few suggestions: “I wish I was in the same location as my committee or that I could meet with them periodically via video conferencing. This would help much.” Another student offered the following: “Some guidance from committee members and professors and a more intricate knowledge of expectations on the part of both student and chair might be beneficial in setting up a degree plan.”

Respondents also made comments related to conferences/publishing and professional development. In the “strengths” section, many doctoral students pointed out the abundance in communication about upcoming seminars and conferences: “Professional opportunities and encouragement to go to conferences;” “I’ve really appreciated the level of communication about seminars and events relevant to graduate students;” and “There are plenty of available seminars
to help doctoral students gain the knowledge of how research is conducted. Other than the suggestion that “more opportunities for professional development (e.g., faculty-led reading groups)” be offered, this area was not described by any student as a program challenge.

In each of the open-ended question sections, many students commented on funding, with the overall sentiment being: Students are appreciative of any and every currently available funding opportunity; however, they very clearly articulated the need for additional assistance: “From the perspective of the student funding . . . it’s another burden when on top of the coursework and different projects a student already has to manage, the added worry of finding projects to support ourselves financially is stressful in itself. While I completely understand the 20 hour limitation in the TLAC department is designed to get us in and out, it is a strain when students have to find outside work to get funded because the GAs are just not paying enough.” Another student echoed this opinion: “Graduate assistantships/funding is a challenge university-wide, but TLAC is towards the bottom on funding amounts. In this economy, it’s a struggle to continue to fund higher education, and that struggle interferes with concentrating on grad school.” Students made some suggestions regarding funding: “For graduate students, begin the process early in writing their own grants for their own funding;” “. . . raise the stipend for graduate assistants to help them financially;” and “Fund [graduate assistants] over summer term so that they will complete course works within two years and other two years [are] devoted to dissertation research.”

The final common theme dealt with collegiality, as multiple doctoral students described it as a program strength: “The collegial environment is one of the strengths of the doctoral program here. I supposed the size and department course requirements make it easy to get to know our classmates across emphasis areas.” Words like “camaraderie,” “interactions,” and
“trans-/inter-disciplinary research” were all evident in the students’ responses: “The rapport and communication established among all educators and students is a PLUS!” On the other hand, some respondents held the opposite viewpoint: “Working with a greater collegiality between doctoral students/practitioners—those working full-time in education and [those working] full-time [in] academics . . . at times is tense.” Another student said, “There is no feeling of . . . partnership. Just individual scholarship.” Some doctoral students made some suggestions regarding collegiality—particularly a desire for cohorts: “Create learning cohorts (i.e., several students starting the program at the same time)” and “I like the cohort idea . . . this would help serve as a support group for many of us who are not on campus, and others who need some extra motivation. Finally, a suggestion was made that “More social events and communication on what projects are being done throughout the department” are/is needed.

Summary of Doctoral Program – current students

Current TLAC doctoral students represent a range of backgrounds and concentration areas. They hold various jobs, speak an assortment of languages, and come from (and currently live in) a mixture of communities. Their academic experiences and coursework have been both similar and different, and they are at varying stages in their doctoral studies.

As related to coursework, mean scores for two indicators (overall, the core courses were challenging, and the core courses were not repetitive of other doctoral courses I had already taken) were less than 3.00. The open-ended comments supported these lower scores, indicating that doctoral students desire increased academic rigor and less repetition in their core courses. They did, however, respond with higher levels of agreement to those items related to courses within their own concentration areas. Unlike the core courses, students do not find their concentration area courses to be “too easy,” nor do they consider them to be repetitive.
Moreover, respondents indicated that their concentration area courses are taught by well-informed professors who are knowledgeable with regard to current issues in their areas of emphasis.

Doctoral students, in cooperation with their committee chair(s), select both a sequence of research coursework and additional advanced research courses. Almost one-third of the respondents have taken or plan to enroll in the TLAC research sequence (Sequence C); otherwise, students are distributed fairly evenly in their enrollment in the other research sequence options. The lowest area of agreement was *there were open seats in the research courses when I needed to register for them.* When combined with the open-ended comments on coursework, the overall sentiment appears to be that students appreciate the knowledge and competency levels of their professors; however, there exists concern that some professors are too narrow with their approaches to specific topics.

On the whole, respondents view both the TLAC Graduate Advising Office and their Dissertation Committee Chair in a positive light, reporting that both are helpful and treat them with respect; however, several students described problems related to communication with their chair. Some stated that their chair fails to respond in a timely manner and that logistical issues (often related to communication) have served as impediments to completing the doctoral program at an acceptable rate.

As evidenced by the open-ended comments, the areas of *publications, presentations,* and *funding* all tended to interconnect. Students indicated that they intend to publish papers and present at conferences during their academic program at TAMU; however, a multitude of respondents described funding options as a legitimate obstacle in accomplishing this and many
of their goals. On the whole, students face challenges in meeting their day-to-day responsibilities while trying to finance their doctoral pursuits.

Finally, current doctoral students reported that they feel prepared and intend to secure a position in higher education and/or leadership. If they could start over, most (85%) agreed they would once again choose to attend Texas A&M University for a doctoral degree in education.
Doctoral Program Summary – former students

Summary of scale-item responses

Table 8-1 reports the characteristics of the 30 participants who responded to the online survey of former doctoral students. Of the respondents, 90% were female and 59% white, 10% Asian or Pacific Islander, 10% Latino (a), 10% African American, and 10% responded as other. The age range of former students varied: 30% were 50 – 59 years old, 23% were 30 – 39 years old, 23% were 40 – 49 years old, 20% were 60 – 69 years old, and 3% were 20 – 29 years old. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents classified themselves as having been part-time students during their doctoral work. Sixty-three percent of the former students lived more than 50 miles from the Texas A&M campus and 37% of former students lived less than 50 miles away during their doctoral program. Of the former student respondents, 14% spoke a first language other than English. In terms of TLAC concentration area, 23% were Culture and Curriculum; 17% were Mathematics Education; 17% were Reading and Language Arts Education; 17% were Science Education; 13% were English as a Second Language (ESL); and 13% were Urban Education. Currently, 70% of the former doctoral students are employed at a university, 27% are employed with a school district, and 3% are employed at a community college.

Former doctoral students responded to items in nine categories (TLAC Core, Concentration Area Courses, Research Courses, Online and Hybrid Courses, Learning Environment, TLAC Graduate Advising Office, Dissertation, Presentations and Publications, and Reflections) using a four-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree), as reported in Table 8-2. In the area of TLAC Core, 29 former doctoral students responded to the five items. The mean values ranged from 3.21 - 3.41, indicating that most of the formal doctoral students agreed that the TLAC core courses provided a strong
foundation, were challenging, available when needed, and were not repetitive. The standard deviations ranged from .74 - .87, indicating that there was some variance among respondents in their attitudes toward these items. The item with the highest mean value was *There were open seats in the core courses when I needed to register for them* (*M* = 3.41).

For the **Concentration Area Courses** section of the survey, 30 former doctoral students responded to six items with means ranging from 3.28 - 3.47 and standard deviations varying from .63 - .88. The means indicated that nearly all of the students agreed that their concentration area courses were informative on current issues and research trends in their specific field, were challenging, were available when needed, and were not repetitive of former courses. The item with the highest mean value was *There were open seats in the core courses when I needed to register for them* (*M* = 3.47).

Former doctoral students (*n* = 30) responded to six items related to their **Research Courses**. The mean values ranged from 2.80 to 3.48 and the standard deviations varied from .69 to 1.00 indicating a large amount of variation on some items. The item with the highest mean value was *Overall, the research courses were challenging* (*M* = 3.48). The lowest items were: *I feel like the research courses sufficiently prepared me to complete my dissertation research* (*M* = 2.80) and *I feel like my advanced research courses further prepared me to complete my dissertation research* (*M* = 2.90).

Former doctoral students (*n* = 26) responded to seven items concerning **Online and Hybrid Classes**. The mean values ranged from 2.85 to 3.23. The standard deviations ranged from .71 to 1.13, indicating that there was a large amount of variation on some items. The items with the highest values were: *I had the opportunity to interact with other students in the course through online discussions, group projects, etc.* (*M* = 3.23); and *Overall, the online classes were*
not repetitive of courses I already completed during my undergraduate work \((M = 3.55)\). The lowest items were: The assignments were thoroughly explained \((M = 2.85)\); I received prompt feedback on my assignments \((M = 2.85)\); and The online classes were well organized \((M = 2.92)\).

Former doctoral students \((n = 28)\) responded to eight items related to their **Research Courses**. The mean values ranged from 2.96 to 3.68 and the standard deviations varied from .55 to .84 indicating some variation on certain items. The item with the highest mean value was Overall, professors in my courses encouraged classroom discussions \((M = 3.68)\). The lowest item was Most professors in my courses enhanced learning with the use of technology \((M = 2.96)\).

Former doctoral students \((n = 28)\) responded to three items about the **TLAC Graduate Advising Office**. The mean values ranged from 3.15 to 3.22. The standard deviations ranged from .93 to .95 indicating large variation on the three items. The three items were: I feel like the advisors in the TLAC Graduate Advising Office treat me with respect \((M = 3.22)\); In general, the advisors in the TLAC Graduate Advising Office answered my questions \((M = 3.22)\); and I feel like the advisors in the TLAC Graduate Advising Office were accessible \((M = 3.15)\).

Twenty-eight former doctoral students responded to six items pertaining to their **Dissertation**. The mean values ranged from 2.96 to 3.50. The standard deviations ranged from .79 to 1.20 indicating large variation on some items. The item with the highest mean value was I provided my dissertation chair with a timeline of my plan to complete my Ph.D. \((M = 3.50)\). The item with the lowest mean value was I received instruction and guidance on writing my dissertation (i.e., how to write a review of literature, discuss research results, etc.) \((M = 2.96)\).

Former doctoral students \((n = 28)\) responded to five items on **Presentations and Publications**. The mean values ranged from 2.43 to 3.43. The standard deviations ranged from
.69 to 1.14 indicating large variation on some items. The items with the highest mean values were: Before completing my doctorate, I attended conferences in my field of interest (M = 3.43); and Before completing my doctorate, I submitted proposals for presentation (M = 3.39). The items with the lowest mean values were: Before completing my doctorate, I was a reviewer for a peer reviewed journal (M = 2.43); and I knew how to apply for graduate student conference funding (M = 2.43).

Twenty-eight former doctoral students responded to three items about their Reflections on the TLAC doctoral program. The means ranged from 3.11 to 3.50. The standard deviations ranged from .58 to .96, indicating some variation in the way students responded to these items. The three items were: If I could start over, I would again choose education as my program of study (M = 3.50); I feel my doctoral education at Texas A&M University prepared me to secure a position in higher education and/or leadership (M = 3.25); and If I could start over, I would again choose to attend Texas A&M University for a doctoral degree in education (M = 3.11).

Summary of open-ended responses

All respondents were given the opportunity to provide open-ended comments (Appendix H-1 thru H-3) related to what they perceive to be the strengths (n = 23) and the challenges (n = 22) of the doctoral program at Texas A&M University, as well as make suggestions (n = 19) for program improvement. Overall, four common themes emerged: (a) Coursework, (b) Professors, (c) Committee/Chair, and (d) Collegiality.

Issues related to coursework were common topics for the open-ended comments. Strengths that were identified by the former doctoral students included: “The high standards that were expected in most coursework inspired me,” and “the core courses are fantastic. I loved the rigor of the coursework.” Several concerns and suggestions about coursework also arose.
including: “TAMU did not have/offer all of the research courses I needed to complete my dissertation, e.g., discourse analysis, as such I had to gain that information elsewhere.” Other former doctoral students provided suggestions to improve the doctoral program, including to “offer a wider range of elective classes,” to “[have] papers written with the goal of publishing in a variety of classes,” and to “maintain some of the challenge and meaningfulness of face-to-face classes that cannot be replaced with an online class.”

For the most part, former doctoral students had positive comments with regard to professors. They are knowledgeable, well published, diverse, and approachable. One former doctoral student said, “[The professors] were well versed in their fields of expertise and their teaching behaviors were exemplary. They gave themselves beyond the required hours.” Another former doctoral student added, “The leadership and innovation of [department] and some of the other talented and motivated professors who stay abreast of the leading research in their field and maintain a positive relationship of sharing such knowledge and experiences with their students.” Nevertheless, there were also a small number of former doctoral student who commented about negative experiences with certain professors: “Graduate students talk and we know the reputation of several of the professors as being demeaning, rude, or flat out unavailable to you.”

Former doctoral students provided suggestions and commented on challenges they experienced when working with their committee/chair. One former doctoral student stated, “Committee chairs need to be more helpful with the dissertation process.” Other former doctoral students pointed out specific challenges they experienced: “lack of choice for committee chairs,” “chair was seldom on campus,” and “chair was overwhelmed with too many doctoral students.”
However, one student did note that, “the members of my committee continuously encouraged and provided a forum for discussion and preparation.”

The final common theme to emerge dealt with collegiality. Comments about collegiality from former doctoral students were overwhelmingly positive. Two specific strengths from former doctoral students were: “There were several opportunities to interact with doctoral students who were going through the program as well as those students who were ahead of me in the program,” and “The class members were encouraging and [they] became my study partners and my support group.”

Summary of Doctoral Program – former students

Former TLAC doctoral students represent a range of backgrounds and concentration areas, and the majority of them are currently employed at a university. During their time as TAMU students, the majority lived more than 50 miles from the campus, with less than 40% residing locally. They responded to a variety of questions on coursework and general experiences they had while attending Texas A&M for their Ph.D.

As related to the TLAC Core and Concentration Area Courses, mean scores for all items were above 3.20. The open-ended comments made by former doctoral students indicated that former doctoral students appreciated the high standards and rigor that their courses; however, it was noted that former doctoral students would like more available options for their elective courses. The survey items associated with Research courses had two items where the mean fell below 3.00 (I feel like my advanced research courses further prepared me to complete my dissertation research and I feel like the research courses sufficiently prepared me to complete my dissertation research). The lower scores were supported by the open-ended comments where
former doctoral students indicated that not enough advanced research courses were provided in certain areas of research.

Former students reflected favorably on both the TLAC Graduate Advising Office and their Dissertation Committee Chair. They indicated the Advising Office answered their questions and were accessible. The same sentiment was reflected in comments about Committee Chairs; however, respondents’ attitudes fell below the “agreement” level when asked about receiving specific instruction and guidance on writing their dissertations. Also, some regretted that their Chair was seldom on campus or had too many doctoral students. Though not specific to Committee Chairs, former students had generally positive comments concerning their professors’ knowledge levels and demeanors; but some did comment on negative experiences relating to attitude and availability.

The Publications and Presentations segment of the survey showed a wide range of sentiment, based on the indicator. Former students demonstrated high levels of agreement with regard to attended conferences and submitted proposals for presentation. Conversely, a lower percentage said that they served as journal reviewers or that they knew how to apply for graduate student conference funding.

Lastly, former doctoral students reported that if they could start over, they would once again pursue a doctoral degree in education; and though slightly lower, mean values indicated that most would again attend Texas A&M University to do so. They appreciated the collegiality that emerged among their peers and believed the opportunities to interact were plentiful.
Conclusion

In summary, current and former students from all TLAC programs at Texas A&M University—Undergraduate, Secondary Graduate Certification, Master’s, and Doctoral—completed online surveys. For all program areas, respondents identified their instructors as a program strength, specifically citing their knowledge levels and caring demeanors. Additionally, program-specific trends emerged.

Specific to undergraduates, both current and former students’ responses overwhelmingly indicated that the field experiences component of the program is a strength; however, both undergraduate groups, as well as the Secondary Graduate Certification program students, said that issues related to professionalism and job preparation were a program challenge. In particular, students do not feel confident writing a résumé, interviewing, and the overall job-search process. Master’s students identified course availability as a challenge. Finally, doctoral students described collegiality among their peers as a strength. Also, most found their committee chair to be both motivational and supportive. Specific areas for improvement, as suggested by both current and former doctoral students, were: more TLAC departmental options for advanced research coursework, additional opportunities for funding, and fewer courses where professors offer a constricted viewpoint, based on their personal philosophies and research interests.
Table 1-1

*Characteristics of Current Undergraduate Respondents (N = 464)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino (a)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth-year Senior</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certification Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC-4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC-6</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4-8 Certification Emphasis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Science</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Language Arts/ Social Studies</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students who took an Online/Hybrid Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1-2

Current Undergraduate Students’ Perceptions of the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration and Advising</td>
<td>I felt like the undergraduate advisors treated me with respect.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Undergraduate Advising Office is accessible.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, upon entering my field experience campuses, I felt welcomed and respected.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When registering for education courses, the class meeting days and times (including field experience requirements) are clearly defined.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The education courses required by my degree plan are offered when needed.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Experience</td>
<td>Overall, upon entering my field experiences/student teaching campuses, I felt welcome and respected.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, my field experiences/student teaching opportunities better prepared me for entering a classroom as a first-year teacher.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I felt like the TAMU field experience and/or student teaching staff treated me with respect.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, my mentor teachers increased my knowledge and use of effective instructional practices.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The field experiences and/or student placement process was seamless and efficient.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>Overall, my education course instructors genuinely seemed to care about me as an individual.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, my education course instructors were accessible. 3.43 .54

Overall, I feel my education course instructors were knowledgeable about the latest trends in curriculum and instruction. 3.34 .65

**Reflections/Future Aspirations**

If I could start over, I would again choose to attend Texas A&M University for a degree in education. 3.62 .65

Three years after graduation, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching. 3.55 .65

If I could start over, I would again choose education as my program of study. 3.54 .63

Immediately following graduation I plan on obtaining a full-time teaching position in my certification area. 3.48 .74

Five years after graduation, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching. 3.43 .73

Ten years after graduation, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching. 3.20 .84

At some point in the future, I plan to attend graduate school for an advanced degree in education. 3.13 .83

**NOTE:** For Likert-type responses, 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree.
Table 1-3

**Current Undergraduate Students Confidence in Education Domains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate opportunities for math learning in small groups.</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore various ways to incorporate the use of math manipulatives in the curriculum.</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide instruction that meets math content standards (district, state, or national).</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve a wide range of math problems, relevant to certification area.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach different strategies that students can utilize in order to solve math problems.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of appropriate math assessment strategies.</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design student-initiated math lessons.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply science concepts to real and authentic life scenarios.</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide instruction that meets science content standards (district, state, or national).</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and implement teacher-guided inquiry activities</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage a classroom of students who are using hands-on and/or laboratory activities.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of appropriate science assessment strategies.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and implement student-lead, inquiry activities.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When planning, consider students’ prior conceptions about natural phenomena.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reading/Language Arts

- Build student interest and motivation to read. 3.31 .67
- Use a variety of appropriate reading and language arts assessment strategies. 3.27 .72
- Use a variety of instructional strategies to facilitate increased reading comprehension. 3.27 .72
- Provide instruction that meets reading and language arts content standards (district, state, or national). 3.24 .75
- Study and analyze children’s literature. 3.22 .73
- Support older readers who are learning to read. 3.21 .72
- Recognize the various stages and characteristics of emergent readers. 3.12 .72

Social Studies

- Plan opportunities for students to investigate topics in depth. 2.95 .72
- Develop curriculum that considers and builds on individual student experiences. 2.96 .70
- Make connections to events in students’ lives, current events, and other content areas. 3.11 .73
- Assess prior knowledge of students for each unit. 3.03 .73
- Provide opportunities for students to support or defend a position, analyze information and draw conclusions, create and carry out an action plan, etc. 2.93 .72
- Provide instruction that meets social studies content standards (district, state, or national). 2.99 .78
- Use a variety of appropriate social studies assessment strategies 2.95 .75

Early Childhood

- Plan classroom activities based on a variety of learning areas and activities (i.e., dramatic play, construction, art, music, science experience, etc.). 3.48 .64
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Value1</th>
<th>Value2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for meaningful play that facilitate learning.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support young learners in the development of social and emotional skills.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for student-centered, child-initiated learning.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of appropriate early learning assessment strategies.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop curriculum that considers and builds on individual student experiences.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide instruction that meets early childhood guidelines and standards (district, state, or national).</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the stages of child development and plan learning experiences using developmentally appropriate practices.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**English as a Second Language (ESL)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Value1</th>
<th>Value2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for English language learners to listen, speak, read, and write at their current levels of English development, while gradually increasing the linguistic complexity of the English.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan instruction that recognizes different proficiency levels within the language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate social language instruction with content, academic language instruction.</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Value1</th>
<th>Value2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and respect individual family differences.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize diverse learning styles.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a learning environment that encourages students to appreciate cultural diversity.</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use manipulatives across subject areas to teach concepts</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate technology in the development and delivery of instructional content.</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use reflective action to develop a deeper understanding of personal teaching beliefs, styles, and practices. 3.18 .76
Create a lesson plan. 3.16 .91
Employ effective instructional strategies for students from varying socioeconomic backgrounds. 3.12 .70
Integrate multiple subject areas. 3.10 .76
Employ effective instructional strategies for students from a variety of cultural backgrounds. 3.08 .72
Develop strategies for working with parents and families. 3.08 .77
Establish and maintain effective classroom management. 3.03 .78
Differentiate instruction for all students. 2.99 .76
Conduct parent-teacher conferences. 2.83 .88
Employ effective instructional strategies for students with special needs. 2.80 .82

Professionalism

Read research-based articles related to my field. 2.92 .84
Identifying and joining professional organizations pertinent to my field. 2.84 .90
Conduct myself in an interview. 2.80 .84
Create a resume. 2.73 1.01
Initiate a job search. 2.56 .95

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = not at all confident; 2 = somewhat confident; 3 = confident; 4 = extremely confident.
Table 2-1

**Characteristics of Former Undergraduate Respondents (N = 341)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino (a)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently Employed as a Teacher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certification Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC – 4</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 8</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 – 8 Certification Emphasis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Science</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Language Arts/ Social Studies</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Level Taught</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Grade</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner City</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Leadership Roles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor of Student Organization</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-2

*Former Undergraduate Students’ Perceptions of the Program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, my field experiences/student teaching opportunities better prepared me for entering a classroom as a first-year teacher.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, my mentor teachers increased my knowledge and use of effective instructional practices.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, my education course instructors were accessible.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, my education course instructors genuinely seemed to care about me as an individual.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I feel my education course instructors were knowledgeable about the latest trends in curriculum and instruction.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflections/Future Aspirations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I could start over, I would again choose to attend Texas A&amp;M University for a degree in education.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediately following graduation I plan on obtaining a full-time teaching position in my certification area.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three years after graduation, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I could start over, I would again choose education as my program of study.</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five years after graduation, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At some point in the future, I plan to attend graduate school for an advanced degree in education.

Ten years after graduation, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching.

Current School Environment

Teaching makes a difference in students’ lives. 3.74 .46

Teachers in my school work together to improve student learning. 3.37 .70

Teachers in my school use time together to discuss teaching and learning. 3.28 .73

Teachers in my school believe every child can learn. 3.25 .71

Teachers in my school are confident they will be able to motivate their students. 3.23 .60

Teachers in my school trust each other. 3.22 .72

Teachers in my school feel responsible to help each other do their best. 3.21 .76

Teachers in my school feel they can get through to even the most difficult students. 3.08 .71

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve a wide range of math problems, relevant to certification area.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide instruction that meets math content standards (district, state, or national).</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore various ways to incorporate the use of math manipulatives in the curriculum.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate opportunities for math learning in small groups.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach different strategies that students can utilize in order to solve math problems.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of appropriate math assessment strategies.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design student-initiated math lessons.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide instruction that meets science content standards (district, state, or national).</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply science concepts to real and authentic life scenarios.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage a classroom of students who are using hands-on and/or laboratory activities.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and implement teacher-guided inquiry activities</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of appropriate science assessment strategies.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When planning, consider students’ prior conceptions about natural phenomena.</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and implement student-lead, inquiry activities.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Reading/Language Arts**

- Build student interest and motivation to read.  
  - 3.37 .67
- Provide instruction that meets reading and language arts content standards (district, state, or national).  
  - 3.34 .72
- Use a variety of appropriate reading and language arts assessment strategies.  
  - 3.32 .71
- Study and analyze children’s literature.  
  - 3.30 .71
- Use a variety of instructional strategies to facilitate increased reading comprehension.  
  - 3.21 .76
- Recognize the various stages and characteristics of emergent readers.  
  - 3.09 .76
- Support older readers who are learning to read.  
  - 2.96 .79

**Social Studies**

- Make connections to events in students’ lives, current events, and other content areas.  
  - 3.24 .68
- Provide instruction that meets social studies content standards (district, state, or national).  
  - 3.22 .67
- Assess prior knowledge of students for each unit.  
  - 3.12 .67
- Use a variety of appropriate social studies assessment strategies.  
  - 3.07 .75
- Develop curriculum that considers and builds on individual student experiences.  
  - 2.98 .71
- Plan opportunities for students to investigate topics in depth.  
  - 2.97 .71
- Provide opportunities for students to support or defend a position, analyze information and draw conclusions, create and carry out an action plan, etc.  
  - 2.93 .75

**Early Childhood**

- Provide instruction that meets early childhood guidelines and standards (district, state, or national).  
  - 3.51 .56
Support young learners in the development of social and emotional skills. 3.47 .61

Plan classroom activities based on a variety of learning areas and activities (i.e., dramatic play, construction, art, music, science experience, etc.). 3.46 .64

Provide opportunities for meaningful play that facilitate learning. 3.44 .65

Develop curriculum that considers and builds on individual student experiences. 3.43 .60

Provide opportunities for student-centered, child-initiated learning. 3.39 .62

Understand the stages of child development and plan learning experiences using developmentally appropriate practices. 3.37 .67

Use a variety of appropriate early learning assessment strategies. 3.37 .62

**English as a Second Language (ESL)**

Integrate social language instruction with content, academic language instruction. 2.84 .83

Provide opportunities for English language learners to listen, speak, read, and write at their current levels of English development, while gradually increasing the linguistic complexity of the English. 2.79 .86

Plan instruction that recognizes different proficiency levels within the language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. 2.76 .86

**General Instruction**

Create a lesson plan. 3.67 .56

Recognize and respect individual family differences. 3.53 .59

Recognize diverse learning styles. 3.45 .65

Integrate technology in the development and delivery of instructional content. 3.44 .69

Integrate multiple subject areas. 3.40 .64
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a learning environment that encourages students to appreciate cultural diversity.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use manipulatives across subject areas to teach concepts</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and maintain effective classroom management.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategies for working with parents and families.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ effective instructional strategies for students from a variety of cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ effective instructional strategies for students from varying socioeconomic backgrounds.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use reflective action to develop a deeper understanding of personal teaching beliefs, styles, and practices.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct parent-teacher conferences.</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiate instruction for all students.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ effective instructional strategies for students with special needs.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professionalism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiate a job search.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a resume.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct myself in an interview.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and joining professional organizations pertinent to my field.</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read research-based articles related to my field.</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = not at all confident; 2 = somewhat confident; 3 = confident; 4 = extremely confident.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino (a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 – 25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor’s Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science-related field</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics-related field</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts/Humanities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science/History/Geography</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completing Master’s with Certification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods Course Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts/Reading Methods</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Methods</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certification Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Composite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts/Reading</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Composite</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently Employed as a Teacher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### School Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grade Level Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leadership Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor of Student Organization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-2

Current Secondary Graduate Certification Students’ Perceptions of the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Prerequisite Courses/Field Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, upon entering my field experience campuses, I felt welcome and respected.</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the undergraduate prerequisite courses provided foundational knowledge of the teaching profession.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the undergraduate prerequisite courses provided valuable knowledge.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, my field experience opportunities better prepared me for entering a classroom as a first-year teacher.</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application Process and Advising</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt like the Graduate advisors treated me with respect.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, the advisors in the Graduate Advising Office answered my questions.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prerequisite requirements for the program were clearly defined.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Graduate Advising Office is accessible.</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application process was easy to understand and seamless.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentor Teacher/University Supervisors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My campus mentor teacher assisted me in finding useful materials and resources</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My campus mentor teacher was easily accessible</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My campus mentor teacher helps me solve problems as they arise</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My university supervisor helps me improve my teaching skills</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My campus mentor teacher gives me frequent, helpful feedback and ideas  
My university supervisor visits my classroom on a regular basis  
My university supervisor assists me with classroom management techniques

**Current School Environment**

Teaching makes a difference in students’ lives.  
Teachers in my school work together to improve student learning.  
Teachers in my school trust each other.
Teachers in my school use time together to discuss teaching and learning.  
Teachers in my school feel responsible to help each other do their best.  
Teachers in my school are confident they will be able to motivate their students.  
Teachers in my school believe every child can learn.  
Teachers in my school feel they can get through to even the most difficult students.

**Instructors**

Overall, the instructors in the program were accessible.
Overall, I feel the instructors in the program are knowledgeable about the latest trends in curriculum and instruction.

Overall, instructors in the program genuinely seemed to care about me as an individual.

**Reflections/Future Aspirations**

If I could start over again, I would choose to attend Texas A&M University to obtain my teaching certification.

Three years from now, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching.
If I could start over again, I would choose teaching as my profession.  

Five years from now, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching.  

Immediately following the 2009-2010 school year, I plan on continuing to teach at my current school.  

Ten years from now, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching.  

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree.
Table 3-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Secondary Graduate Certification Confidence in Education Domains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Search</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a resume.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate a job search.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct yourself in an interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Instruction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate technology in the development and delivery of instructional content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and respect individual family differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a lesson plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a learning environment that encourages students to appreciate cultural diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use reflective action to develop a deeper understanding of personal teaching beliefs, styles, and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ effective instructional strategies for students from varying socioeconomic backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize strategies for different learning styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ effective instructional strategies for students from a variety of cultural backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of instructional strategies to facilitate increased reading comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support older readers who are learning to read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and maintain effective classroom management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Integrate multiple subject areas.  
Use manipulatives across subject areas to teach concepts.  
Differentiate instruction for all students.  
Develop strategies for working with parents and families.  
Conduct parent-teacher conferences.  
Employ effective instructional strategies for students with special needs.  

**Mathematics**

Solve a wide range of math problems, relevant to certification area.  
Facilitate opportunities for math learning in small groups.  
Provide instruction that meets math content standards (district, state, or national).  
Use a variety of appropriate math assessment strategies.  
Design student-initiated math lessons.  
Teaching different strategies that students can utilize in order to solve math problems.  
Explore various ways to incorporate the use of math manipulatives in the curriculum.  

**Science**

When planning, consider students’ prior conceptions about natural phenomena.  
Design and implement teacher-guided inquiry activities.  
Apply science concepts to real and authentic life scenarios.  
Provide instruction that meets science content standards (district, state, or national).  
Use a variety of appropriate science assessment strategies.
Manage a classroom of students who are using hands-on and/or laboratory activities.  
Design and implement student-led, inquiry activities.

**Reading/Language Arts**

Study and analyze literature.  
Model writing, including drafting and revising  
Use a variety of appropriate reading and language arts assessment strategies.  
Teaching grammar and mechanics in context, at the editing stage, and as items are needed  
Exposing students to a wide and rich range of literature  
Plan instruction that recognizes different proficiency levels within the language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Provide instruction that meets reading and language arts content standards (district, state, or national).  
Build student interest and motivation to read  
Teach students to recognize and apply various strategies to interpret a writer’s purpose  
Provide opportunities for English language learners to listen, speak, read, and write at their current levels of English development, while gradually increasing the linguistic complexity of the English.

**Social Studies**

Provide instruction that meets social studies content standards (district, state, or national).  
Assess prior knowledge of students for each unit.  
Make connections to events in students’ lives, current events, and other content areas.  
Use a variety of appropriate social studies assessment strategies.
Plan opportunities for students to investigate topics in depth 3.50 .53

Develop curriculum that considers and builds on individual student experiences.

Provide opportunities for students to support or defend a position, analyze information and draw conclusions, create and carry out an action plan, etc.

3.13 .83

**Professionalism**

Reading research-based articles related to my field. 3.17 .66

Attending professional conferences in my field. 3.14 .85

Writing academic papers and articles. 2.88 .88

Identifying and joining professional organizations pertinent to my field. 2.91 .74

Presenting at professional conferences in my field. 2.31 1.13

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = not at all confident; 2 = somewhat confident; 3 = confident; 4 = extremely confident.
### Characteristics of Former Secondary Graduate Certification Respondents (N = 53)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino (a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 – 25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor’s Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science-related field</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics-related field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering-related field</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts/Humanities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science/History/Geography</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed Master’s with Certification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods Course Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Methods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Methods</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts/Reading Methods</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Methods</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certification Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Composite</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts/Reading</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Composite</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Currently Employed as a Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inner City</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Small Town</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade Level Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8th Grade</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor of Student Organization</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4-2

**Former Secondary Graduate Certification Students’ Perceptions of the Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Prerequisite Course/Field Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, upon entering my field experience campuses, I felt welcome and respected.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the undergraduate prerequisite courses provided foundational knowledge of the teaching profession.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the undergraduate prerequisite courses provided valuable knowledge.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, my field experience opportunities better prepared me for entering a classroom as a first-year teacher.</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentor Teacher/University Supervisors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My campus mentor teacher was easily accessible</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My university supervisor assists me with classroom management techniques</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My university supervisor helps me improve my teaching skills</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My campus mentor teacher assisted me in finding useful materials and resources</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My campus mentor teacher helps me solve problems as they arise</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My campus mentor teacher gives me frequent, helpful feedback and ideas</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My university supervisor visits my classroom on a regular basis</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current School Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching makes a difference in students’ lives.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in my school work together to improve student learning.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers in my school use time together to discuss teaching and learning. 3.23 .69

Teachers in my school trust each other. 3.21 .62

Teachers in my school are confident they will be able to motivate their students. 3.17 .63

Teachers in my school feel responsible to help each other do their best. 3.13 .76

Teachers in my school believe every child can learn. 3.02 .80

Teachers in my school feel they can get through to even the most difficult students. 2.98 .81

Instructors

Overall, instructors in the program genuinely seemed to care about me as an individual. 3.69 .47

Overall, the instructors in the program were accessible. 3.61 .57

Overall, I feel the instructors in the program are knowledgeable about the latest trends in curriculum and instruction. 3.55 .61

TLAC Core Courses

The core courses for my degree were available during the semester that I needed to take them. 3.53 .50

The core courses provided a strong foundation for my degree. 3.34 .70

There were open seats in the core courses when I went to register for them. 3.32 .73

The core courses were not repetitive of courses I already completed during my undergraduate work. 3.11 .79

The core courses were challenging. 3.06 .76

Action Research Project

The action research project required informed my classroom teaching practices. 3.19 .88
As a result of completing the action research project, I feel as though I am a better classroom teacher. 3.06 .89

The action research project changed my classroom teaching practices. 2.87 .88

**Reflections/Future Aspirations**

If I could start over again, I would choose to attend Texas A&M University to obtain my teaching certification. 3.78 .42

If I could start over again, I would choose teaching as my profession. 3.45 .83

Three years from now, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching. 3.26 .92

Five years from now, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching. 3.17 .92

Immediately following the 2009-2010 school year, I plan on continuing to teach at my current school. 3.12 .99

Ten years from now, I plan to still be in the classroom teaching. 2.89 .91

---

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Search</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct yourself in an interview.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate a job search.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a resume.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and respect individual family differences.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a lesson plan.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate technology in the development and delivery of instructional content.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a learning environment that encourages students to appreciate cultural diversity.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize strategies for different learning styles.</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ effective instructional strategies for students from a variety of cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize diverse learning styles.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ effective instructional strategies for students from varying socioeconomic backgrounds.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and maintain effective classroom management.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use reflective action to develop a deeper understanding of personal teaching beliefs, styles, and practices.</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct parent-teacher conferences.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of instructional strategies to facilitate increased</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reading comprehension.

Develop strategies for working with parents and families.  
Integrate multiple subject areas.
Use manipulatives across subject areas to teach concepts
Differentiate instruction for all students.
Employ effective instructional strategies for students with special needs.
Support older readers who are learning to read.

**Mathematics**

Solve a wide range of math problems, relevant to certification area.
Design student-initiated math lessons.
Teaching different strategies that students can utilize in order to solve math problems.
Facilitate opportunities for math learning in small groups.
Provide instruction that meets math content standards (district, state, or national).
Use a variety of appropriate math assessment strategies.
Explore various ways to incorporate the use of math manipulatives in the curriculum.

**Science**

Use a variety of appropriate science assessment strategies.
Apply science concepts to real and authentic life scenarios.
Provide instruction that meets science content standards (district, state, or national).
Design and implement teacher-guided inquiry activities.
Manage a classroom of students who are using hands-on and/or
laboratory activities.

When planning, consider students’ prior conceptions about natural phenomena.

Design and implement student-lead, inquiry activities.

Reading/Language Arts

Model writing, including drafting and revising

Study and analyze literature.

Teach students to recognize and apply various strategies to interpret a writer’s purpose

Provide instruction that meets reading and language arts content standards (district, state, or national).

Use a variety of appropriate reading and language arts assessment strategies.

Exposing students to a wide and rich range of literature

Build student interest and motivation to read

Teaching grammar and mechanics in context, at the editing stage, and as items are needed

Provide opportunities for English language learners to listen, speak, read, and write at their current levels of English development, while gradually increasing the linguistic complexity of the English.

Plan instruction that recognizes different proficiency levels within the language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Social Studies

Make connections to events in students’ lives, current events, and other content areas.

Provide opportunities for students to support or defend a position, analyze information and draw conclusions, create and carry out an action plan, etc.
Assess prior knowledge of students for each unit. 3.42 .67

Provide instruction that meets social studies content standards (district, state, or national). 3.42 .51

Use a variety of appropriate social studies assessment strategies. 3.42 .51

Develop curriculum that considers and builds on individual student experiences. 3.25 .75

Plan opportunities for students to investigate topics in depth 3.00 .60

**Professionalism**

Attending professional conferences in my field. 3.29 .76

Identifying and joining professional organizations pertinent to my field. 3.20 .87

Reading research-based articles related to my field. 3.18 .79

Writing academic papers and articles. 2.68 .98

Presenting at professional conferences in my field. 2.25 .98

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = not at all confident; 2 = somewhat confident; 3 = confident; 4 = extremely confident.
Table 5-1

*Characteristics of Current Master’s and Online Master’s Respondents (N = 32)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino (a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 – 25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Employed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Work Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the field of education</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In another field of employment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Experience in Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or less</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher’s Assistant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximity to TAMU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally (within 50 mi. of TAMU)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (50+ mi. from TAMU)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TLAC Core Courses Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Foundations of Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Teaching Behavior
None

Received Undergraduate Degree from TAMU
Yes
No

Area of Specialization (from Current Master’s survey only)
Culture & Curriculum
Early Childhood Education
Mathematics Education
Science Education
Urban Education
Generalist (Online Master’s)

Participated in online/hybrid classes (from Current Master’s survey only)
Yes
No

Pursuing the Thesis Option (from Current Master’s survey only)
Yes
No

Practicum Experience is a mandatory component (from Current Master’s survey only)
Yes
No

I plan to work in the field of education for the next _____ years.
1 – 5
6 – 10
11 – 15
16+
Table 5-2

**Current Master’s and Online Master’s Students’ Perceptions of the Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TLAC Core</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The core courses were challenging.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The core courses were not repetitive of courses I already completed during my undergraduate work.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The courses for my degree were available during the semester that I needed to take them.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The core courses provided a strong foundation for my degree.</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were open seats in the core courses when I went to register for them.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Area Electives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content area courses were challenging.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content area courses were not repetitive of courses I already completed during my undergraduate work.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were open seats in the content area courses when I went to register for them.</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content area courses for my specialization were available during the semester that I needed to take them.</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online and Hybrid Classes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had the opportunity to interact with some other students in the courses through online discussion, group projects, etc.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The online and/or hybrid classes were well organized.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The online classes were not repetitive of courses I already completed during my undergraduate work.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The assignments were thoroughly explained. 3.04 .50
The online classes were challenging. 3.04 .50
The instructors responded promptly to my questions. 3.00 .50
Overall, my instructors were able to assist with technology issues. 2.89 .65
I received prompt feedback on my assignments. 2.73 .76

Advising

I felt like the graduate advisors treat me with respect. 3.17 .78
The chair of my advisory committee answers my questions. 3.17 .58
The chair of my advisory committee is accessible. 3.16 .63
The graduate advisors are accessible. 3.06 .67
In general, the graduate advisors answer my questions. 3.06 .72

Instructors

Overall, I feel my graduate course instructors were knowledgeable about the latest trends in curriculum and instruction. 3.26 .44
Overall, my graduate course instructors were accessible. 3.19 .47
Overall, my graduate course instructors seemed to genuinely care about me as an individual. 3.19 .53
Overall, the workload assigned by my instructors was comparable to that of my fellow students in TLAC. 3.16 .47

Future Career Aspirations

Upon completion of my master’s degree, I plan to seek a job in the field of education. 3.31 .59
My master’s degree will lead to a professional career opportunity. 3.29 .63
Upon completion of my master’s degree, I plan to seek a job with a public school district. 2.97 .84
I plan to continue with graduate school after I complete my master’s

**Overall Experience**

I expect that the information I learned in my graduate courses will be helpful with my career. **3.32** .59

The content area courses furthered my knowledge about my area of specialization. **3.10** .65

The overall graduate experience helped to prepare me for my future job. **3.10** .59

The overall graduate experience provided networking opportunities. **3.03** .65

---

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree.
Table 5-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionalism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating a job search.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading research-based articles related to my field.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting myself in an interview.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending professional conferences in my field.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and joining professional organizations pertinent to my field.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a resume.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing academic papers and articles.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting at professional conferences in my field.</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional activities (i.e. editing/reviewing for a journal)</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = not at all confident; 2 = somewhat confident; 3 = confident; 4 = extremely confident.
Table 5-4

*Current Master’s Students’ Perceptions of the Practicum and Thesis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thesis (n=1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received guidance from my chair with my research.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I have questions, I receive prompt feedback about my research.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel my graduate courses helped to prepare me for my research.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practicum (n=2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practicum experience helped to prepare me for my future job.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practicum experience was in my area of specialization.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information I learned in my graduate courses was helpful during my practicum experience.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The practicum experience provided networking opportunities.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree.
### Table 5-5

**Current Online Master’s Students’ Perceptions of Technology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the internet to search for information.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using presentation software (PPT, etc.).</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the reliability and credibility of online sources of information.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the ethical/legal issues surrounding the access and use of digital information.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating spreadsheets.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting computer maintenance (software updates, security, etc.).</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the university library website.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using graphics software.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = not at all skilled; 2 = not very skilled; 3 = fairly skilled; 4 = very skilled; 5 = expert.
### Characteristics of Former Master’s Respondents \((N = 49)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino (a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 – 25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed but seeking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduation Year from Master’s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Experience Since Receiving Master’s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the field of education</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In another field of employment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received Undergraduate Degree from TAMU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Pursuing Additional Degree</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Specialization</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture &amp; Curriculum</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language (ESL)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading &amp; Language Arts Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participated in online/hybrid classes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pursuing the Thesis Option</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practicum Experience is a mandatory component</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I plan to work in the field of education for the next _____ years.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t plan to work in the field of education.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6-2

**Former Master’s Students’ Perceptions of the Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TLAC Core</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The core courses were not repetitive of courses I already completed during my undergraduate work.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The core courses provided a strong foundation for my degree.</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The core courses helped to prepare me for my current job.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The core courses were challenging.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Area Electives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content area courses were not repetitive of courses I already completed during my undergraduate work.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content area courses for my specialization helped to prepare me for my current job.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content area courses were challenging.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online and Hybrid Classes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The online classes were not repetitive of courses I already completed during my undergraduate work.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had the opportunity to interact with some other students in the courses through online discussion, group projects, etc.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, my instructors were able to assist with technology issues.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The online and/or hybrid classes were well organized.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assignments were thoroughly explained.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructors responded promptly to my questions.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received prompt feedback on my assignments.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The online classes were challenging.  

**Advising**

The chair of my advisory committee answered my questions. 3.50 .58

The chair of my advisory committee was accessible. 3.46 .65

I felt like the graduate advisors treated me with respect. 3.38 .68

In general, the graduate advisors answered my questions. 3.23 .69

The graduate advisors were accessible. 3.17 .72

I continue to keep in contact with the chair/other members of my advisory committee. 2.73 .87

My chair/members of my advisory committee were helpful when looking for a job. 2.71 .87

**Instructors**

Overall, my graduate course instructors were accessible. 3.46 .50

Overall, I feel my graduate course instructors were knowledgeable about the latest trends in curriculum and instruction. 3.44 .62

Overall, my graduate course instructors seemed to genuinely care about me as an individual. 3.33 .52

My instructors were helpful when looking for a job. 2.61 .86

I continue to keep in contact with instructors from my master’s degree. 2.42 .82

**Practicum (n=19)**

The practicum experience was in my area of specialization. 3.63 .50

The practicum experience provided networking opportunities. 3.16 .69

The practicum experience helped to prepare me for my current job. 3.11 .88

**Thesis Option (n=4)**

I feel my graduate courses helped to prepare me for my research. 3.75 .50
I received guidance from my chair with my research.  

When I have questions, I received prompt feedback about my research.  

The thesis option helped me when looking for a job.  

I have continued to research since completing my thesis.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I received guidance from my chair with my research.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I have questions, I received prompt feedback about my research.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The thesis option helped me when looking for a job.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have continued to research since completing my thesis.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Career Aspirations**

My master’s degree will lead to a professional career opportunity.  

Upon completion of my master’s degree, I accepted a job in the field of education.  

Upon completion of my master’s degree, I accepted a job with a public school district.  

I continued with graduate school after I completed my master’s.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My master’s degree will lead to a professional career opportunity.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon completion of my master’s degree, I accepted a job in the field of education.</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon completion of my master’s degree, I accepted a job with a public school district.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I continued with graduate school after I completed my master’s.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Experience**

The information I learned in my graduate courses has been helpful with my career.  

The content area courses furthered my knowledge about my area of specialization.  

The overall graduate experience helped to prepare me for my current job.  

The overall graduate experience helped to prepare me for my future job.  

The overall graduate experience provided networking opportunities.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The information I learned in my graduate courses has been helpful with my career.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content area courses furthered my knowledge about my area of specialization.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall graduate experience helped to prepare me for my current job.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall graduate experience helped to prepare me for my future job.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall graduate experience provided networking opportunities.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree.
Table 6-3

*Former Master’s Students Confidence in Education Domains*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Professionalism</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading research-based articles related to my field.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting myself in an interview.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending professional conferences in my field.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating a job search.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a resume.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and joining professional organizations pertinent to my field.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting at professional conferences in my field.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing academic papers and articles.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional activities (i.e. editing/reviewing for a journal)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = not at all confident; 2 = somewhat confident; 3 = confident; 4 = extremely confident.
### Table 7-1

**Characteristics of Current Doctoral Respondents (N = 100)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino (a)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Employment (not incl. GAs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Assistantship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Status (not incl. residency semesters)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Student Fellowship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence Classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximity to TAMU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (within 50 mi. of TAMU)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (50+ mi. from TAMU)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous A&amp;M Degrees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TLAC Concentration Area**
- Culture and Curriculum | 22 | 22 |
- Early Childhood Education | 6 | 6 |
- English as a Second Language (ESL) | 12 | 12 |
- Mathematics Education | 12 | 12 |
- Reading and Language Arts Education | 17 | 17 |
- Science Education | 16 | 16 |
- Urban Education | 13 | 13 |

**Years in Doctoral Program**
- 0-1 | 25 | 25 |
- 1-2 | 19 | 19 |
- 2-3 | 22 | 22 |
- 3-4 | 18 | 18 |
- 4-5 | 7 | 7 |
- 5+ | 8 | 8 |

**Doctoral Program Requirements Met**
- Chosen Dissertation Committee/Filed Degree Plan | 63 | 93 |
- Completed coursework | 39 | 57 |
- Defended Preliminary Examination | 30 | 44 |
- Defended Dissertation Proposal | 14 | 21 |
- Defended Dissertation | 5 | 7 |

**Number of Online/Hybrid Courses Taken**
- 0 | 12 | 13 |
- 1 | 20 | 22 |
- 2 | 14 | 16 |
- 3 | 18 | 20 |
- 4+ | 25 | 28 |

**TLAC Core Courses Completed**
- PhD Studies in TLAC | 51 | 57 |
- Instruction Theory | 73 | 82 |
- Curriculum Theory | 69 | 78 |
- History of Education | 49 | 55 |
- Philosophy of Education | 59 | 66 |
- Cognition, Culture, & Literacy | 20 | 22 |

**Research Sequence Selected**
- Sequence A | 14 | 16 |
- Sequence B | 11 | 12 |
- Sequence C | 24 | 27 |
- Sequence D | 9 | 10 |
- Other | 11 | 12 |
- Don’t know | 21 | 23 |
Table 7-2

*Current Doctoral Students’ Perceptions of the Program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TLAC Core Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core courses were available during the semesters I needed to take them.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were open seats in the core courses when I needed to register for them.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the core courses provided a strong foundation for my degree.</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the core courses were challenging.</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The core courses were not repetitive of other doctoral courses I had already taken.</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concentration Area Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel as though the professors in my content area are well-informed regarding research trends in my field.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of taking courses in my content area, I feel better informed on current issues in my field of emphasis.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were open seats in the content area courses when I needed to register for them.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the content area courses were challenging.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the content area courses were not repetitive of courses I had already completed during my undergraduate work.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content area courses for my specialization were available during the semesters in which I needed to take them.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the research courses were challenging.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel like my advanced research courses further prepared me to begin my dissertation research.  3.22 .68

My research sequence prepared me to understand and interpret scholarly, peer-reviewed articles.  3.20 .77

Overall, I feel my research courses (required sequence and advanced) have prepared me to be a contributing scholar in my field.  3.18 .68

I feel like the courses in my research sequence have sufficiently prepared me to begin my dissertation research.  3.14 .78

The courses in my research sequence were available during the semesters in which I needed to take them.  3.02 .89

There were open seats in the research courses when I needed to register for them.  3.03 .86

**Online and Hybrid Courses**

I had the opportunity to interact with other students in the course through online discussions, group projects, etc.  3.33 .62

Overall, the online classes were not repetitive of courses I already completed during my undergraduate work.  3.30 .68

The instructor responded promptly to my questions.  3.22 .69

The assignments were thoroughly explained.  3.19 .68

I received prompt feedback on my assignments.  3.15 .70

The online classes were well organized.  3.12 .74

The online classes were challenging.  3.11 .81

**Learning Environment**

I am familiar with WebCT/eLearning.  3.69 .49

In most of my courses, I feel free to ask questions.  3.51 .55

Overall, professors in my courses encourage classroom discussions.  3.48 .53
I feel as if most of my professors treat me with respect. 3.47 .55
An atmosphere of collegiality is present during my doctoral studies. 3.33 .64
My professors are accessible and willing to meet with me outside of class. 3.29 .63
Most professors in my courses answer emails in a timely manner. 3.29 .61
Overall, the online classes were not repetitive of courses I already completed during my undergraduate work. 3.27 .69
Most professors in my courses enhance learning with the use of technology. 3.17 .70

**TLAC Graduate Advising Office**

I feel like the advisors in the TLAC Graduate Advising Office treat me with respect. 3.39 .67
In general, the advisors in the TLAC Graduate Advising Office answer my questions. 3.31 .66
The TLAC Graduate Advising Office is accessible 3.23 .70

**Dissertation**

I feel as though my dissertation committee chair treats me with respect. 3.54 .67
My dissertation committee chair encourages me to complete in a timely manner, the necessary steps and requirements for graduation. 3.41 .73
My dissertation committee chair is accessible and willing to meet with me regularly. 3.36 .70
I know the steps to completing my Ph.D. 3.25 .74
My dissertation committee chair has guided and mentored me in choosing a dissertation topic. 3.22 .91
I have provided my dissertation chair with a timeline of my plan to complete my Ph.D. 3.17 .86
I have received instruction and guidance on writing my dissertation (i.e., how to write a review of literature, discuss research results, etc.).

I have attended a workshop on how to write a dissertation.

**Presentations and Publications**

Before I graduate, I feel as though I will be the primary author of a paper to submit for publication.

I am aware of research conferences—particularly those that encourage graduate students to present their research.

Before I graduate, I feel as though I will have had an opportunity to co-author a paper for publication with a graduate faculty member.

I have attended conferences in my field of interest.

I have submitted proposals for presentation.

I know how to apply for graduate student conference funding.

I am or have been a reviewer for a peer reviewed journal.

**Current Doctoral Students’ Reflections**

If I could start over, I would again choose education as my program of study.

If I could start over, I would again choose to attend Texas A&M University of a doctoral degree in education.

I feel I am prepared to secure a position in higher education and/or leadership.

---

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree.
### Table 8-1

*Characteristics of Former Doctoral Respondents (N = 30)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino (a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Status (not incl. residency semesters)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximity to TAMU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (within 50 mi. of TAMU)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (50+ mi. from TAMU)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TLAC Concentration Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Curriculum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language (ESL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Language Arts Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8-2

**Former Doctoral Students’ Perceptions of the Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TLAC Core</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were open seats in the core courses when I needed to register for them.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core courses were available during the semester I needed to take them.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the core courses were challenging.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The core courses were not repetitive of other doctoral courses I had already taken.</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the core courses provided a strong foundation for my degree.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concentration Area Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were open seats in the content area courses when I went to register for them.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the content area courses were not repetitive of courses I had already completed during my undergraduate work.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of taking courses in my content area, I felt better informed on current issues in my field of emphasis.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel as though the professors in my content area were well-informed regarding research trends in my field.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall the content area courses were challenging.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the research courses were challenging.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The courses in my research sequence were available during the semesters in which I needed to take them.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were open seats in the research courses when I needed to register for them.

Overall, I feel my research courses (required and advance) have prepared me to be a contributing scholar in my field.

I feel like my advanced research courses further prepared me to complete my dissertation research.

I feel like the research courses sufficiently prepared me to complete my dissertation research.

**Online and Hybrid Courses**

I had the opportunity to interact with other students in the course through online discussions, group projects, etc.

Overall, the online classes were not repetitive of courses I already completed during my undergraduate work.

The instructor responded promptly to my questions.

The online classes were challenging.

The online classes were well organized.

I received prompt feedback on my assignments.

The assignments were thoroughly explained.

**Learning Environment**

Overall, professors in my courses encouraged classroom discussions.

In most of my courses, I felt free to ask questions.

I am familiar with WebCT/Blackboard.

I felt as if most of my professors treated me with respect.

An atmosphere of collegiality was present during my doctoral studies.

Most professors in my courses answered emails in a timely manner.
My professors were accessible and willing to meet with me outside of class.

Most professors in my courses enhanced learning with the use of technology.

**TLAC Graduate Advising Office**

I feel like the advisors in the TLAC Graduate Advising Office treat me with respect.

In general, the advisors in the TLAC Graduate Advising Office answered my questions.

I feel like the advisors in the TLAC Graduate Advising Office were accessible.

**Dissertation**

I provided my dissertation chair with a timeline of my plan to complete my Ph.D.

I feel as though my dissertation committee chair treated me with respect.

My dissertation committee chair encouraged me to complete, in a timely manner, the necessary steps and requirements for graduation.

My dissertation committee chair guided and mentored me in choosing a dissertation topic.

My dissertation committee chair was accessible and willing to meet with me regularly.

I received instruction and guidance on writing my dissertation (i.e., how to write a review of literature, discuss research results, etc.)

**Presentations and Publications**

Before completing my doctorate, I attended conferences in my field of interest.

Before completing my doctorate, I submitted proposals for
Before completing my doctorate, I was aware of research conferences—particularly those that encourage graduate students to present their research.

I knew how to apply for graduate student conference funding.

Before completing my doctorate, I was a reviewer for a peer reviewed journal.

**Reflections**

If I could start over, I would again choose education as my program of study.

I feel my doctoral education at Texas A&M University prepared me to secure a position in higher education and/or leadership.

If I could start over, I would again choose to attend Texas A&M University for a doctoral degree in education.

NOTE: For Likert-type responses, 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = agree; 4 = strongly agree.
Appendix A-1

Strengths – Undergraduate Program (current students)

- I feel that most of the professors share a lot of educational personal experiences and really care about helping us be the best teachers we can be. I came into college afraid of having my own classroom, and I feel that the combination of coursework, professors, and field experiences have made me become much more confident and prepared. The amount of time we are given in the field prior to graduating is a great advantage.

- The teachers are very accessible.

- The advisors, specifically [X] is extremely helpful, personable and quick to respond. The classes give alot of good discussion and help.

- Good advising and you are given many options as to which field and which area you would like to specialize in.

- They are very informative about students that are culturally diverse. I feel that I have been exposed to different situations in alot of the multicultural classes.

- The amount of time spent in the classroom.

- There are so many strengths this program has. It is helpful, attentive, welcoming, professional and successful. I feel like this program is going to enhance all my prior knowledge and strengths and of course provide tons of new knowledge and really influence me to become the best teacher I can possibly be.

- We are located in a community that provides plenty of opportunities to work with all types children and families so we go out into the field with more experience and a better understanding. I also feel that the teachers are very knowledgeable and have plenty of good experiences to incorporate into their classrooms.
• I think that the courses are very interesting
• I feel that the curriculum is great and the professors make the courses worthwhile.
• I appreciate the opportunity to get an ESL certification. If it wasn't built into the degree plan I wouldn't have thought about it.
• Availability
• They employ many resources in our education and seem to be knowledgable about the classroom.
• We really have learned the concepts behind the procedures used in mathematics. We have a thorough understanding of our subject. The field experiences are great as well.
• Every class that gives opportunities to apply the information is superb preparation for the classroom in my future. It does not have to be field based. RDNG [XXX] is a learning rich class that gave a lot of applied activities. It gave me much needed confidence about assessments and taught me how to find what I need in that area and interpret anything handed to me.
• The degree options and classes that are provided and the diversity of those classes that are given.
• The courses have educated me about children and teaching.
• Experienced teachers that are now professors are the greatest strenth.
• A strength of the undergraduate interdisciplinary program at Texas A&M is the advising. Having mandatory meetings each semester are great. It keeps us on track and it helps me to plan. I think this is beneficial for everyone in the program. I also feel that the program gets us out in the field for us to be fully prepared when we graduate.
• It seem that the professors chosen for teaching education based classes were well chosen
and carefully considered. I feel that they are well suited for their positions and genuinely care about their opportunity to teach the future teachers. I feel that they understand that the minds that they are molding will in turn mold other minds, maybe even those of the professor's children or grandchildren. Another strength that the college of education has been blessed with are the undergraduate advisors. I realize that maintain a highly stressful job deal with each and everyone of the undergraduate students in the college. However even though they see many faces everyday I feel that they are very personal and know me for who I am and not a Texas A&M student ID number.

- The advisors, and a few education profs. I feel like I was well prepared for my certification tests I passed both on the first try.
- Dr. [X]
- - up to date curriculum - lots of field experience - very professional - great instructors!
- I feel that one of the strengths would be the number of field experiences students are able to complete in their course of study at Texas A&M. Overall, I also feel that the professors are very effective in their teaching.
- They really taught me how to use my strengths to help the students. They also helped me understand how to work with the many different students and the differences in the way they learn in an effective way. The instructors were very helpful and really made a difference in my growth as a student and as a professional.
- I think the strengths are the field experience, and the math skill development class. (XXX-XXX).
- The amount of field experience.
- I feel that this program gives us a wonderful opportunity to be involved in classrooms
throughout our time at A&M.

• The interdisciplinary program is exceptional in my opinion. I always knew that I wanted to teach, but I have a very shy personality when I am first put into new situations. The program here at Texas A&M does a great job of gradually increasing your field experiences. My confidence grew with each new placement and I am very happy that I chose A&M over any other schools. Also, in comparison to other colleges in which some friends attend and participate in their education programs, I would have to say that I am the most prepared and confident to begin my first year of teaching.

• wide range of curriculum content addressed in education classes  good amount of field experience  mostly enjoyable professors

• The number of field experiences before student teaching is definitely a strength of the program. Overall, I was impressed by the classes and requirements for the senior methods block in particular - I felt ten million times better prepared for a career in education after just that semester. There are also several instructors - Dr. [X] and [Mrs. X] who were really incredible. The best education courses I took were classroom management (I took that online this semester) and social studies methods.

• Prepare us well for being in the classroom. Gives us lots of opportunities to be in classes and to talk about the experiences. Also gives us lots of opportunities to write lesson plans.

• The teachers are the biggest strength

• Accesability to advisors and knowledgable teachers

• Works hard to prepare you to be ready for teaching and to be a good teacher

• The professors provide you with real-world experiences.
• All the observation and field experiences.
• Field Experience
• The guidance councilors are great and really made me feel that I was getting somewhere.
• Instructors & time spent observing in the classroom as early as Freshman year
• We have an extensive reading program. We also give great field based opportunities.
• I think that A&M does a really good job getting EC-4 students in the field very early on in their time at A&M.
• They are very willing to help any and every student in, or desiring to be in the education program. It took me a couple of semesters to raise my gpa in order to get into the program and the education advisors went above and beyond their call of duty.
• All of the field experiences were great!
• Rigorous curriculum
• I have not had enough experience in TLAC to yet make this observation.
• The teachers. For the most part, the teachers I have had have been really nice and understanding. They also knew a lot about what they are teaching and could speak from personal experience on most of the topics.
• advising is good, and teachers are also great
• Great teachers who really have a wide knowledge and sincerely care about their students.
• The large number of classroom interaction hours prior to student teaching.
• I have only taken one teaching class so far, but I am very impressed with the level of commitment that my professor gave. She really wanted everyone in the class to participate and truly understand the concepts we were discussing. So far, I am impressed with the teaching professors here. I also like that the academic advisers really want to be
there to help us and are readily available.

• The amount of lesson plans we wrote was extremely helpful in us becoming confident in writing them. I liked the field placements for the most part. I though the experience with such a wide range of ages was helpful in experiencing the whole child. I think mandatory advising and attendance was a good idea to keep students like myself who have many other obligations on track and attentive to their work. I would say the main strength is the amount of field experience one receives. I also think the reading and language arts areas are covered thoroughly.

• The mandatory advisor meetings are a definite strength; they make sure that the students are on track.

• The methods block.

• I really like the classes that require you to go to schools and volunteer! I have been doing HOST for a while!

• I think that it is a great idea that in order to register we MUST meet with our advisor. I hear a lot of other students who are non-education majors not having to meet with their advisors and they seemed totally lost when it comes to what classes they need to be taking.

• I think the fact that we spend so much time in the field really gives us an advantage over other teacher preparation programs.

• The professors and faculty in the program are amazing. I have always felt that they have concerned for me and my needs as a students. They are very knowledgeable about the world I will be stepping into and very willing to share that knowledge with their students.

• The lesson plan format is great in my opinion. It requires us to think about each specific
step we will take. In general, I just think all the education courses combined that we are required to take are great classes that prepare us well.

- The TLAC department provides strong support and scaffolding for all of its students. Any issue I have ever had has been almost immediately remedied. Students have access to an extremely knowledgable faculty and staff, as well as an extremely organized department that has all possible options for its students clearly outlined and detailed.

- I really feel that Texas A&M provides more field experiences in all four years of the program than any other education program at any other school and it is so beneficial.

- By putting it's students in the classroom as soon as their freshman year, it really prepares them and gives them a lot of experience in the field.

- Small classrooms, knowledgeable teachers

- The professors are (mostly) willing to help & the classes are small so you get individual attention. Most of my professors have known me by name.

- Amount of field experience.

- The program offers various opportunities for hands-on experience(s).

- The strengths are preparing teachers for the actual classroom.

- Field experiences

- small classes, lots of field experience opportunities

- I think that the math classes I have taken are wonderful. I also like the opportunities to be in the classrooms in Bryan and College Station school districts.

- I really do feel like all of my professors genuinely cared about me and tried their best to teach us everything they knew. I think all around A&M is a great place to get my degree and I wouldn't choose any other school.
• It gives you so much experience before you actually are a teacher. It really helps you get prepared. I also love the teacher, Texas A&M has the best teachers in this department that they possibly can. The teachers are what make this program great!
• Very willing to work with each student for any amount of time.
• The strengths are the vast amount of field experience and the instructors.
• -good options of classes depending on the content focus -some very strong faculty -abundance of field experiences
• Na
• I believe that the program has definitely prepared me with the many hours in the field. I love how we slowly gained more time and responsibility in the classroom as the years passed. Seeing things first hand allows us to actually see what we're being taught put into action.
• A&M puts you in the classroom right off the bat (TEFB [XXX]) and gets you into a classroom and with children to make sure that this is what you want to do. Also, I think that A&M has more field based classes than other programs I've looked at or heard of. I actually have friends at other universities jealous of our opportunities. Also, it is extremely important that we have professors that have been in the field for a long time and know what they are talking about...it is nice to learn from their past experiences.
• I think the field experience that we have all throughout the program is great. I have had the opportunity to interact with students every semester that I have been here.
• The professors are all so knowledgeable and caring. They genuinely care about each of their students.
• Professors truly care about us.
• the advisors
• The teachers are passionate about what they do.
• Lots of student teaching experience.
• Very friendly
• First of all I applaud my advisor [X]! [They] has helped me so much in my process of switching to education and has helped me in any way to complete my registration. I love being an education major and Texas A&M and the program here is what makes me feel that way! The advising is awesome, and I had the best professor I have ever had in my INST [XXX] class. Dr. [X] was phenomenal!
• Covers a lot of different areas with plenty of field experiences. Also, the ESL certification with my degree plan is great. The ESL certification classes were also some of my favorites.
• The classes pertaining to the degree are very beneficial because they truly focus on the material in the field.
• It strongly prepares you for your future occupation.
• The instructors are really helpful and seem to genuinely care each and every student. They know their subjects and provide real classroom examples.
• They allowed you to portray yourself as a professional, while also giving back critical feedback which allowed you to progress in our work.
• My experience with the Texas A&M undergraduate education program has been exemplary. I think it’s strengths are the people, the professors are engaging and truly demonstrate a passion. I love the discussion based courses where participation and student input is valued. I feel more connected to the course and the material with the
small class sizes and lower student to professor ratio. I have only wonderful things to say of my advisor, [X]. He was my first impression of the program when I switched majors and immediately felt justified in my choice after meeting with him. He truly cares about his students and is willing to work with you not for you in order to reach your academic goals.

- Field experience is the best thing. Having an interdisciplinary program instead of an education program is good too. Part of being a good teacher is knowing the information.
- Being in the field. I learn kinesthetically and so for me actually being in the field and experiencing what I will be doing was the best thing for me.
- I feel very prepared to work with English Language Learners. Creativity in the classroom has also been portrayed as very important.
- I really like the advisors. They have helped me a lot especially since I am a transfer student. I also liked most of my professors. They were very knowledgeable and helpful when I needed guidance. Dr. [X] is amazing and I would recommend her to anyone! [They] know [their] stuff!
- Variety of classes offered that relate to education.
- Helpful advisors
- We take a lot of classes which is great because we learn a lot. The instructors, for the most part, are wonderful and really cared about my success.
Appendix A-2

Challenges – Undergraduate Program (current students)

- My Senior Methods semester was extremely stressful and overwhelming, trying to balance doing well with all in projects in my classes at A&M, being helpful to my mentor teacher, and maintaining any type of personal life was very challenging.
- Sometimes dealing with having blocks on schedules or getting into the advising office seemed to be a struggle. Other than that, I cannot think of anything.
- The biggest challenge for me was having poor placement sites. I really got tired of experiencing what not to do in my classroom. I feel that TAMU needs to do a better job at choosing which teachers should and should not be mentors.
- Professors that are really good teachers with lots of experience. We also have had alot of professors and TAs where language barriers were hard to overcome and it makes the class frustrating.
- It would be nice to have more male education students in our program, as well as more hybrid and online classes. Also, some classes seem repetitive and just seem to repeat the same information that other classes have covered.
- They aren't very flexible when it comes to content area classes. There should be more options in content area classes.
- I had a lot of "busy work" over the years that did not always further my learning. Some of my professors would tell instead of show.
- I have not had any challenges yet. I just transferred a semester ago so that may be the case. I love children and I love learning about teaching and education so it all seems
somewhat natural to me, the program at A&M basically enhances my abilities and helps me become more knowledgable.

- I feel that people do not have much exposure to actual teaching and how to conduct a classroom until they are a junior and that is not clearly conveyed. I am not saying that needs to be fixed, people need to finish their basic requirements, but people should understand that the first two years are not going to be all about learning how to be a teacher.

- There are just so many students enrolled right now

- I don't really understand why we have to take Statistics at A&M.

- Too much focus on Multicultural education. This is unAmerican. It focuses on balkanization of people. Places that focus on differences face uncontrollable violence and hatred, Palestine, Nazi Germany, Sudan, The Congo, and Korea to name a few areas. I was taught that only whites can be racist. This is outrageous and is NOT what I pay thousands of dollars a semester to be taught.

- Scheduling

- Our education classes just seem pointless. They don't ever really teach us anything, just vague topics that we basically already knew or observed.

- Getting professors that are organized, will effectively teach us in ways that will apply to our future careers and will give assignments that will benefit us for our future careers.

- Not all classes are tightly focused on teaching us to teach the information students need. There needs to be more role playing or interaction with students as a way to give us practice.

- Learning about the different cultures, and how to teach, work with those of different
social, and economical backgrounds.

- The homework, papers, projects and reading assignments.
- I have had many graduate students teaching me that are not very knowledgeable.
- Bridging the gaps between the idealism of all the education courses and the realism of what's actually going on at the schools and field experiences... Inquiry is great and all until you're at a district that doesn't care and only wants higher TAKS scores
- -even more field experience, starting early, with more variety of teachers, age levels, and more time spent - special education, even though this wasn't my major I would of liked more experience - classroom management! the one class offered is great but there should be more than one! - working on reading TEKS, and following curriculum of districts
- I think because the program is so large, it is hard for the professors to really get to know the students. I wish the program was perhaps smaller.
- Without taking any teaching basics before coming here it seemed as though i was somewhat behind, because they assume you already know somethings related to teaching. It was not too hard to catch up but i felt as though some of the basics on how to set up a teaching lesson were skipped.
- The biggest challenges are to prepare teachers for the everyday teaching experiences.
- The time commitment of the classes and field experience.
- The biggest challenges would have to be the number of group projects. I would not lessen them, but make students more aware of them prior to registering. I was advised to take 4 INST courses in one semester and struggled with time management as I also have to work on a daily basis.
- Finding a way to include electives in the program--There are already 129 credit hours
required (and student teaching only counts as 6 credit hours)

• Lots of students to put into schools for field experience.

• time management

• It is extremely challenging being in the education program if you do not have a car. We learn about addressing the different needs of students in the class and making accommodations for students, but I feel the program doesn't try to make accommodations for students like me without transportation. Even after clarifying that I needed close placement in the College Station area for that specific reason for my methods placement, I was still placed 20 or more miles away. It really takes away from the field experience when you're stressing and struggling to figure out how you're going to get there and back and on top of that it's like you have to figure out some way to manage or you risk failing. I think more should be taken into consideration for student needs when considering field placement.

• Making everyone happy. Scheduling classes

• The biggest challenges are managing your time and getting all the work done as well as going to your field experience.

• Teaching students classroom management skills because once you get into the classroom, it is completely different!

• Getting the most out of field experiences. Making sure mentor teachers want students in their class and feel comfortable with them there.

• Keeping the work to a minimum so that we can have enough time to do it for each class

• One professor that had no business trying to teach teachers.....very unorganized and not very clear.
• registration- courses are often full or difficult to get into the courses needed at that time
• I think even more lesson planning or teaching experiences would be beneficial. Even starting before methods, just allowing students to do role playing on classroom management and teaching in classrooms. Maybe have an end of the year group project that is presenting a lesson instead of presenting on a subject that the teacher has already expounded on in her daily lessons. In so many classes we do group projects that are look up this chapter or subject, but presenting lessons or actually trying the teaching methods we learn about are not used very often.
• I think the biggest challenge in being apart of the education program is time management. Although this is a good skill to be perfected for being coming a teacher, as well as the citizen in the working world, it is hard to juggle education classes, other classes, labs, and field experience.
• No training in other areas of emphasis. For example, my emphasis is reading but I have no experience teaching social studies, science, and just a little math.
• All of the group projects that were involved. It is really hard to get large groups together for major projects. I feel that I would benefit more by my own projects because then I would have the resources, information, and a nice project to keep, not split between the group.
• Rigid structure; some classes are also a waste of time.
• I have not had enough experience in TLAC to yet make this observation.
• Some of the teachers were not so friendly and I think it is utterly ridiculous that, as an education major, we have to take statistics or epsy with [X]. [They are] by far the rudest teacher I have ever had.
• moving around coursed that you thought would fit that didn’t

• Not enough classes provided for each course.

• Limited varying times for classes.

• I honestly have not been in the undergraduate interdisciplinary program long enough to see any challenges yet. Though I am classified as a junior, I am a freshman first year student at Texas A&M.

• I would say a challenge for the program appear quite a bit in the math/science aspect of the EC-4 program. I do not feel as though I received enough instruction to be as prepared for teaching those subjects as I am for teaching language arts and reading. I also think that the younger grades were hit quite a bit, but I feel like I would be challenged were I to step into a third or fourth grade classroom.

• The advisors sometimes do not coordinate responses. Whereas, one will tell you something completely different from the next.

• Not as much field experience time for 4-8 students.

• Not enough seat in all classes and not very many sections for each class. I had a lot of trouble getting into my education classes because of this.

• Classes can be extremely time consuming and scheduling can be difficult. This question should have been proofread! "Challenges with of the" does not make sense.

• The only struggles I've run into are in regards to scheduling. Sometimes it seemed like there were too many people and not enough seats.

• The B/CS area is large, and field placements are limited. I have had a couple of placements where I felt uncomfortable and unwelcome by the teachers.

• Time management
• I don't know of any.

• Some of the classes could be more structured and purposeful. I feel like I have had some courses that were unnecessary and/or a waste of my time because their relation to the classroom was not clear.

• A large number of students.

• Preparation and time management will alleviate all challenges in my opinion, so I really think there are none. But the course work is difficult at times.

• Pointless courses

• not sure

• Education classes are not challenging and have in the past 5 semesters not prepared me for teaching, with the exception of my mathematics courses (Math [XXX] through [XXX]). I have learned many "what not to do's" and almost no "what to do's". I have been extremely disappointed by this program time and time again and I do not feel that A&M cares very much about its Education students. We are the future of America and we will shape future A&M students.

• I think there needs to be more classes on classroom management and it should not be offered online. I took the online class and I feel so unprepared as a 1st year teacher when it comes to classroom management.

• The only nerve racking thing I have run into is trying to get into classes, but my adviser is always helpful and works with me. The only other thing I have problems with is just getting scheduled with classes at around the same time. I always have to end up going to class everyday of the week, but I guess that is just part of school.

• Need more classes offered online.
• The biggest challenge is placing students where they desire to be placed during their field experience. This will probably always remain a challenge.

• -keeping the faculty up to date with education and classroom trends and new strategies - faculty maintaining an appropriate level of practicality- especially with how to plan lessons for various types of students and learning environments. i.e. In [a] SR Methods class (Spring '09) the concept of "inquiry" was extremely overemphasized, as it is not a practical lesson style for ALL classroom environments, only ideal ones.

• Na

• I believe the balance is a little of with the way the program is designed. Meaning that if you look at my survey and what I feel confident in English/Language Arts and anything dealing with ELLs is at the top. Math, social studies, and science however were only introduced in senior methods. I understand that the subjects most concentrated on in the schools and language arts/reading and math, but I feel strongly that the others do not need to be overlooked.

• Trying to equip future teachers with rapidly changing society. Helping prepare teachers for whatever type of environment they will be working in.

• the core classes are very hard and seem pointless to wanting to teach early childhood

• I think one of the biggest challenges that I have faced so far is having professors for an education math class, like MASC, that are from the mathematics department and cannot teach us how to teach math to middle school students because they are used to teaching math to college students. It is almost like they have a problem bringing the mathematics down to a middle grades level.

• Lots of projects..possibly too many of the same kinds of things being taught.
• Working with online classes.
• registering for mandatory basic classes
• Teaching student how to teach at multiple grade levels.
• Some professors are difficult to understand and don't seem to put enough effort into the course.
• I really can't think of any...
• As someone who has to work and is paying their own way through college, I think making internships more readily available would be nice. The internship program is great but not everyone gets in and the places where it is available is very limited.
• As a student, the biggest challenge for me is to make it through the subject that I have no intentions on teaching, but is required.
• The classes are difficult and you have to be responsible to be able to keep up.
• NA
• Sometimes there have been many misunderstandings/miscommunications in assignments. Some teachers, such as [X], feel as though they did a good job explaining what to expect in a project and answer specific questions about directions. However, when about half of the class received unsatisfactory grades, [they] would deny answering those questions because half of the class "did follow directions correctly." I felt that these professors should be more specific and detailed in what they expect from the students.
• I believe the biggest challenge I see the program facing is the lack of attention from the university community. There are so many people wanting to be a part of this program that people are being turned away due to size and restraints based on budget or resources.
• I feel there were gaps in my education here. I do not feel prepared to help a fifth grader
learn how to read (and I had that issue in my field experience, so I know it happens). I do not know what sixth graders are learning in social studies. I am about to student teach; I should have been taught these things. On the other hand, some classes (i.e. Instruction of ELLs and Assessment of ELLs) weren't worth spending a semester on and could have been combined. More content area knowledge would have been more beneficial. Classes such as History for Adolescents because what adolescents learn and need to know is different than what college students learn and need to know.

- Inconsistency with professors. Some are AWESOME and know exactly what they are doing, and some are so scattered and unorganized.
- Trying to schedule classes has been a very frustrating challenge every semester.
- Classes fill up and are not available to take.
- I feel that we had a lot of educational math classes where we learned to teach math but we did not have a lot of however, there weren't a lot of educational science classes.
- There are numerous professors that are wonderful and only make the field of education better. However the department needs to really look at some of the professors based on PICA evaluations.
- I think A&M should do a better job at preparing and assisting pre-service teachers with the job search process. During our methods semester, we should have class time directed towards writing resumes, improving interview skills, and so forth.
- Classes take a lot of time and it is hard to maintain a job with all the out of class requirements.
- The girls in my classes are clueless. They all get A's because they ask hundreds of specific questions and want to know exactly what they need to do for an A. I feel like my
classes encourage busy work and technicalities more than they encourage thinking.

Professor [X] encouraged thinking and refused to tell my classmates exactly what to do and everyone freaked out. They yelled at [them] and said they needed a rubric. I think it's sad that more professors don't encourage thinking the way Dr. [X] did. [They are] by far my favorite professor because [they] didn't want cookie cutter answers. I feel like the rest of my professors do. The first one that comes to mind is [X]. I honestly feel like I did not provide one original thought in any of [their] assignments. My grades were higher when I quoted from our text book then when I applied my educational experiences to the material. We need fewer professors like [X] and more like Dr.[X].

• I would like to see more examples as we learn. We are students preparing to work with students. Even though we are older, we feel the same frustrations and such as they do. We can learn from this! I really would like to see more teaching manipulatives, experience using strategies, projects with purpose, in-depth class discussion. A lot of my classes have "busy work" but doesn't stimulate my mind. I want to be an intellectual. I want to push my mind.

• Staying awake in some of the classes since they become repetitive.

• It's not an easy program. Students need to come into this program ready for the work.

• It forces you to take allot of what seem to be frivolous subject classes to get the credit, rather than taking those subject classes in an educator oriented way. Example: business math [XXX] & [XXX]: they are general math classes way above what (as an elementary teacher) i would ever actually teach. give me more educator courses about math rather than having me struggle through these - i feel im wasting my money.

• The biggest challenge is getting into the course that you need to take when that course is
only offered once and is at a time of another course that you need to take.

• science, social studies and math requirements (national, state and local), i know what is required for reading but not the other subjects.

• N/A
Appendix A-3

Suggestions – Undergraduate Program (current students)

• For the EC degree plan I think it would be good to start out in the field your freshman year visiting a kindergarten and first grade class. Then, second grade sophomore year and so on. I think this would give every A&M graduate a more comprehensive look at child development and each grade level.

• I am hoping to teach science, and the only class I took that taught science methods was MEFB [XXX]. I think students who are thinking about specializing in science should be given the opportunity to take more science-geared methods classes because it seemed that most of them (before Senior Methods semester, such as MASC [XXX] and [XXX]) were geared towards math.

• Have a semester evaluation form the students of their mentor teachers and make changes each semester.

• Have more class availability, resulting in more teachers for these courses, such as math [XXX], MASC [XXX], etc, instead of one single class at 530pm. more instruction on how to make a lesson plan. not just the assignment, "here you go, construct a lesson plan due in one week."

• Have professors meet with each other and coordinate whose job it is to cover what information so that there is less repetition.

• I am very confident in how to manage a classroom and deal with culturally diverse students. However, I do not feel knowlegable in my content area or how to create a lesson plan for my content area. The math classes I am taking do not pertain to what I feel I will teach to middle school students. These math classes have made me not feel confident in
my content area.

- Evaluate that the professors are practicing what they teach.
- I would make no changes. I love it so far!!
- I am not sure. I think things are going fine thus far.
- Not sure maybe a few requirements but otherwise I believe it prepares teachers for the classroom.
- The instructors should have experience teaching in American public schools. If they have no experience they have no authority to tell me what I should do in my classroom.
- None
- Make the education classes more direct instruction on specific topics relevant to what we are majoring in. Challenge us more and believe that it will make us better teachers some day. The classes are just blow off classes, which can be seen by the overall grade average from the classes. If teachers are truly the future of America, as many claim, then why are you just letting them slide through and obtain the easiest degree possible.
- I have been very disappointed in the education I received here at A&M. Though I have taken a handful of classes that have definitely prepared me for the future, the majority of them have missed their opportunity to teach me effectively. I took a physics class that was extremely beyond my knowledge and never applied to teaching middle schoolers. I have taken two classes that were supposed to better prepare me for teaching middle schoolers in general, yet this did not happen to the extent that it should have. Nobody in that class knew what we were supposed to be doing the majority of the time because the in-class assignments were so random and pointless. Those two classes were an UNBELIEVABLE waste of my time. I am mainly disappointed in the professors in our
field. The majority are so scatterbrained and unorganized. It is so weird that we are being taught how to be teachers by mostly people that are not good teachers. It does not make sense. I feel that the teaching department does not value hiring quality professors because I have not encountered many. Like I said, I have learned things here at A&M and I feel like I have gained great conceptual understanding of mathematics through the courses I have taken in that area. However, in the other areas, I feel like I could have learned SO much more had the professors been better. My suggestion: get better professors that teach relevant information and assign relevant tasks. Also, the methods semester needs to be fixed. I have been SWAMPED with work all semester. The methods professors need to coordinate so that they are not giving us such an unbelievable amount of work. Not only was the work so abundant, the majority was pointless and I did not learn much from it. A webography, seriously?, we know how to search the internet. Because there was so much work, I was not able to give my 100% on each of the tasks because I was racing to get on to the next thing. Also, in reading and science, we were teaching the classes half the time ourselves through presentations, rather than actually learning from the professors themselves. I was very excited to receive the invitation for this survey because I have wanted to share my thoughts about the system for a very long time. I am very glad people are coming to critique our department because it is in desperate need of a huge transformation!

- I know there are classroom management classes and each subject is covered individually but I would like to see a class created that walks us through classroom planning, curriculum planning, assessments, parent conferences, etc. You would assign groups in a semester long project with a class role of students, mentor teachers, parents, etc. Then the
groups would change places or roles during the semester. A virtual class might not be possible but get as close as it can get.

- Maybe give more options in courses, but really for the most part I do not think that I would make any changes, because the program has been great and effective and gives a broad area of learning for this specific major.
- None.
- I think that the program would be better if we were required to volunteer and work in classrooms in College Station and Bryan ISD. I believe that many of us learn better by being in a classroom. I work in a daycare and volunteer in the schools and I learn so much more from the teachers I watch. There are a lot of classes that we waste time in that teach irrelevant or common sense material that most of us already know.
- I would train professors to teach for application.
- The fact that there are many group assignments. It could be beneficial if there is a class that incorporates what we learn as teachers in front of a class and actually perform this in front of class without another person working with the student. In the classroom, teachers will not be able to speak for a couple of minutes and then pass it over to another; they have to do it by themselves.
- One suggestion I have is for the classroom management class. After it changed from MEFB [XXX] to TEFB [XXX] and it became writing intensive and online, I feel that the effectiveness of the class decreased. As a preservice teacher, classroom management is something that I am less confident about. Being online, I feel that I do not get as much out of the class as I would if it was held in a classroom. Also, maybe if you had to take two classroom management classes, one during junior II and the second one during senior
methods.

- math [XXX] and math [XXX] are useless classes we will never use in teaching math grades 4-8. We need to have more math classes like math [XXX] and math [XXX]. I liked those classes because they taught us how to teach the material that we would be using. We need more time in the classroom, experience is everything and I am now graduating and I still dont feel ready for my own classroom.

- I think a class about the professional aspects of schools would be good. I think we get drilled with subject matter and teaching strategies, but not enough teaching on the general structure and professional aspects of the school system

- see above

- I would suggest another course on classroom management, as well as making it mandatory to complete in the classroom. I feel confident in classroom management, but because of what I learned in my field experience and not my professors.

- None

- More class that deal with teaching science, and more classes on the everyday tasks of teachers.

- I would suggest that the e-folio be a bigger part of the education program. I changed my major to education during my sophomore year and have only now created an e-folio account as a senior entering student teaching. The e-folio is a great tool, but only if you have held onto all of your old projects. Luckily, I had everything saved on my computer, but some of the other students in my senior methods course did not so their e-folios are not the caliber they could have been.

- The classes/field experience are very time consuming. I think we should get extra credit
hours for field experience time (count it like a lab). I don't think the classroom management course should be given online. I took it online this semester and feel that it would have been more beneficial in a physical classroom.

• There were multiple "fluff" classes that I took (ex. reading with [X]). I think eliminating those and replacing them with classes with high expectations would be helpful to students. I think it is very important for senior methods students to have the best of the best education professors but I didn't feel that happened (I thought one out of three was good). I think the senior methods block professors should work more closely together when it comes to scheduling and assignments. Sometimes there was confusion about what was due when and sometimes I felt like I had to re-do work that I had already done (that only added stress to an already stressful semester). More training in classroom management, professional communication and professionalism, and interviewing would be helpful. We learned about each of these things but I still feel underprepared – workshops on how to dress professionally, etc. could be really helpful to students. I think that students should be able to rate their field experience mentors - my Junior II mentor teacher was absolutely awful but I didn't say anything because of the pressure to "just deal with it." I regret that decision now and take responsibility for it, but I also wish that I had been encouraged to share my thoughts about the experience. I would have appreciated if all my education classes had focused on creating useful tools and portfolio artifacts like the senior methods block did. I would have liked if we had focused on lesson planning and how to use different types of technology in the classroom (smartboard, audio podcasts, digital storytelling, etc.) earlier in the program so I could have had more time to practice and develop artifacts. Tell students to save what they
create in earlier classes – to many people this may be common knowledge or habit, but I’m a perfectionist and deleted anything from earlier classes that didn’t meet my standards instead of saving it and adapting it later. Also, I would have enjoyed having a more flexible degree plan – other majors seemed to have room when it came to choosing classes of interest to them, but I felt locked into our plan and I really regretted not having more time to take classes that tied to my content areas of focus (language arts and social studies) since those were often the classes that helped me grow the most as an individual.

- more classroom management courses and more individualized instruction courses
- For the placement of field experiences, it seems like everyone got what they did not want. Why even ask us if we will not be placed where we requested?
- Hold a seminar or integrate interviewing and job searching in one of the classes.
- more focus on subject matter
- I think they are doing great!
- If I could change something it would be some of the teachers. Throughout my time at A&M I took classes telling me how to be a good teacher. I have been taught to be thoughtful of the students, be enthusiastic, and much more. It really made me mad when I would have a teacher for one of my class for my major would look like they hated to be there every day, and would talk to be like i was dumb. I did not appreciate that. Most of the teachers i had were great and modeled a good teacher very well. Although some did not.
- I wouldn't change anything. I learned a lot!
- More classroom management in classes. Not just one class to go over it, but incorporating
it into multiple classes.

- No online Classroom Management classes. These should be in-class.
- Jr. Methods has problems.....ie the time in the classroom is not worth enough of the total grade.
- Offer more courses, at different times. Incorporate electives of some time. Focus on individual subjects. I'm taking both science and math courses for MS math/science degree, but my main interest is math.
- I believe classes such as Geology for someone who will never teach that subject is almost futile. I understand why certain Math and Science classes are necessary but a whole semester of a class such as Geology I will never use is a waste of time. Why can't Geology be substituted for teaching about Science? I really do value learning, and I take classes based on my curiosity and because I want to learn that subject. I think that if people take a class in order to get a grade or credit is it really serving a purpose for that person's later career? Teachers do need a good foundation of certain subjects, but even in classrooms what are we teaching students? It should be to also have a curiosity for learning. Producing a curiosity means that student will be able to be a functional member of society and be self-motivated to learn to reach their goals.
- If I could change anything it would be the online discussions. Some of the discussion topics are relevant and helpful, but the others seem pointless and other student I have talked to feel this way as well. I think that the e-folio has good intentions, but after to talking to several districts, a lot of them do not go and look at these. I would rather have something that I could take away, like maybe a binder and such from Junior II and Senior Methods.
• I think it was a very well organized program...very prepared!

• Try not to put graduate students as teachers- I'd rather have someone who was in the field for some time...

• I have not had enough experience in TLAC to yet make this observation.

• Overall I have enjoyed taking classes here but I would definitely either get rid of [X] or bring in other teachers to instruct the EPSY class.

• Again, I have not been here long enough to see what changes could be made.

• I would suggest that their be a course devoted to educational law: nutrition, classroom behavior, teachers rights, etc. coupled with a career fair preparation program to help instruct on preparing education philosophies, resumes, interviews, etc. These things were covered sparsely in a spare block of time in a couple of my classes, and had someone not asked, they would not have been covered at all. Additionally, it is widely regarded that employers do not look at the efolio, so I think the efolio should be made optional. I think a course strictly devoted to technology would be extremely helpful. Learning to use smartboards, how to make digital stories, podcasts, and how to use flip videos would be an excellent course seeing as how technology is becoming more and more present in the classroom.

• It is hard to get certified in the high school level in the content areas of English and Social Studies. The TLAC/ Education departments do not need to require teachers in the secondary level to get a master’s in their content area. Upon coming to A&M I was excited to finish up my degree; now after all of the changes in my expectations; I would not have chosen A&M to attend if not for the name sake of the school. Please improve this for the future generation of Aggie teachers.
• More field experience, better equipped professors

• I feels like some of the classes are basically the same curriculum but with different names. After a while the classes begin to bore me.

• I would suggest more seats and sections for all education classes.

• I believe that all of the meetings we have to attend are basically a waste of time. I do not need to be reminded every semester to dress professionally in the field. This information could be communicated in class or in an email.

• Perhaps an orientation for all mentor teachers would better prepare them for the students they will have observing in their classroom. Also, this might help make them aware of how the observer is to participate in the classroom (i.e. not as a grader or janitor, but as a teaching assistant).

• More classes on classroom management, ESL classes, student/parent/parent conferences, use on technology, and interviewing.

• I don't have any.

• I wish I could have gotten a wide grade range of field experiences. Even when I requested older grades, I never got anything above 1st grade. I feel that this hurts my knowledge and flexibility when I am searching for a job.

• There should be stricter requirements for the professors or at least someone who sits in on a lesson once a semester to see if the professor is organized and efficient enough to maintain their position at the University.

• Do not offer classroom management online. It is arguably the most important class that we will take while in college. You can't witness classroom management through an online course. The instructors in our department have a lot of experience in education and
online classes prevent you from really learning from your instructors experiences.

- N/A

- We went over ELL information in too many classes. I felt like I was taking the same classes with the same information just with different professors which was frustrating. A lot of the classes were theory and general. I would have liked more specific scenarios in regard to teaching students complicated concepts (like in [X]'s senior methods class) and teaching students HOW to read based on their specific reading issue.

- More Field Experiences, less pointless courses

- Needs a required classroom management course, and maybe a whole course dedicated to how to address teaching for TAKS/TEKS tests

- I would appreciate it if the program would work harder to help education students feel prepared for the classroom. I have taken several classes that are an absolute waste of time. I think that our degree program needs major adjustments and the number of hours we are required to have is absolutely unreasonable. Even coming in with over a semester's worth of hours I have been struggling to keep up. If we want better teachers this program must be changed greatly. I have never spoken to a single education student who is pleased with the program. Classes are always at very inconvenient times as well, which makes it hard to have a steady job among other things.

- I think the more time you have in the classroom, the better prepared you will be to become a 1st year teacher. More is always better.

- Just keep hiring wonderful professors that really care. People say when you go to college your teachers do not care who you are anymore. That is a lie if you go to Texas A&M because the education teachers are truly wonderful and show that they do care about you!
• Require Classroom Management to be taken in the classroom (not online).
• Have more online classes.
• I would suggest the students take the classroom management class in-class and with a professor as opposed to online.
• -incorporate basic education laws (besides special education-based laws) into a required class  
  -introduce and briefly explain some of the administrative-type responsibilities teachers have, even if the examples are based on one certain school district- looking at examples of paperwork from even just one school district would better prepare us than not looking at any.
• Na
• ECHE [XXX] professors...make sure all are creative. Also, I believe it is very important for the teachers to carry out what they are teaching such as appealing to different types of learners and not just teaching but allowing student-led approaches to learning.
• I would like to have a field based class my sophomore year. I feel like I got a taste of what I love and now I have to wait a long time to get one again.
• Do not have professors teaching education classes, where communication skills are key, that cannot speak English well. I think it is wonderful that our campus is diverse, but I don't get much out of a class that I can barely understand what the professor is saying.
• Rethink the TEFB [XXX] class offered online...it should be a class offered on campus and possibly a field placement paired with the curriculum.
• Not as many online classes.
• None
• Push for more male involvement in the education program. I am usually the only male in my classes that is an education major.

• I'm not sure if it's possible, but like high school teachers, middle school teachers should have the option to focus on the exact subject they wish to teach.

• Make registration not so hectic.

• NA

• Make sure that all the lesson plan formats are the same, have all the teachers provide detailed rubrics for projects and assignments, and make sure that technology projects are not due all on the same week!

• I would suggest offering more than one section for classes each semester.

• Many of the classes say they are junior level classes but many sophomores are in them, but they are hard to register for because we are not juniors yet. make them more accessible for sophomores.

• Instead of trying to squeeze technology education into classes, have a required technology course. I cannot explain to you the frustration my peers exhibited when they were required to do technology projects but the instructor did not/could not provide any support. The professors are not experts in technology, but maybe someone who is should teach a class for those going into education. I am confident that if we were required to take a technology course, we would gain more knowledge and expertise. Then, we would be better prepared for teaching with technology. As I mentioned in Question 98, I think some classes should be combined. That would be a better use of our time and money. I also think some classes should be added. There were so many How to Teach Reading, etc. classes, but not enough How to Teach Social Studies classes. There needs to be more.
• I am a junior and I have still not learned how to make a lesson plan. I wish that I would have learned this sooner. I also wish I had more opportunities to observe in different classrooms at different schools.

• I would say that we should choose more of a specific interest. For example I want to be a science teacher so I wish I would have been instructed on how to teach science and how to do labs with students.

• More time should be focused on teaching and practicing classroom management strategies. I think pre-service teachers should be introduced to the legal aspect surrounding the education career field. We need more information on differentiated instruction.

• More flexible times. It is very hard for me to get good work hours around my schedule. I am a struggling mom so having a job isn't an option. It seems difficult to manage.

• Value thought and ideas more than you value busy work! I honestly get so frustrated when I listen to the way my classmates complain when they are asked to write a reflection without a rubric. A's shouldn't be rewarded just because girls can quote the textbook. There should be some original thought and depth behind those answers. We cannot fight the "standardized testing epidemic" if we are educating our future teachers to look for one right answer. We should encourage thinking rather than memorizing!

• My favorite classrooms are those with tables. I think more education classes should have this set-up. When we are learning something in class, for example: collaboration, I think we should demonstrate it that day. We should see how it works. In special education, if we are learning about ADD in class and how to best handle situations, we should demonstrate this. We can view a short you-tube video of a few students with the disorder
and then set up a theoretical situation involving it. This is how I learn, and it is enjoyable.

- combine some courses and make others longer. Special Education needs more of an emphasis as well as ESL courses. Other general education courses become very repetitive and boring.

- stop thinking that using technology, for the sake of using technology, is a good thing. It's aggravating having your computer replace your teacher, and her think it is for the better.

- Some professors use workbooks in their classroom. They teach us not to use workbooks in the classroom so I will not. After completing a workbook for one of my courses this semester, I will never use a workbook in my future classroom. I feel like it is just busy work and boring. I don't feel like I learned that much from the workbook. I just did it to get it done.

- Continue to help students with finding a job. I felt like while I was in student teaching I was very distant and done with school already. I didn't know when I could start applying for jobs and I did not know how to respond to questions on some of my applications. I didn't feel like the career fair helped at all. All I heard all day was to apply online.

- N/A

- --more how to teach science classes...not just science knowledge courses --teach half your student teaching in one grade level and half your student teaching in another

- Again, the advising office needs serious restructuring. Transfer students should not be treated with less respect because they didn't start in your program. They pay the same tuition and went through the same hardships to get to your program. Because of the disrespect towards me from the TLAC advising office I changed my major to another on campus that gladly accepted me and actually gave me sound advising.
• I think that there should be a class, or at least an on-line training, that would prepare us for job searching and interviews. I do not feel confident going into an interview. I would love to have an in-depth instruction on how to search for teaching jobs, how to interview best, and how to choose a school district where I would fit in well.

• More night classes and internet classes available for non-traditional, non-traditional students.
Appendix B-1

Strengths – Undergraduate Program (former students)

• Low student-professor ratios kept the classes personal; instructors were caring and knowledgeable. The "seminar" before graduation with mock interviews, ethics discussions, etc. was fantastic.

• Our program was very thorough in preparing us to become teachers. We were exposed to many different teaching strategies as well as encouraged to participate hands-on in all of our lessons.

• Academic preparation, almost to the extreme. I was much more prepared than students from ANY other school.

• Support from staff and small classes

• The professors were extremely knowledgeable in the field of education. They provided experiences and materials to help better prepare me for the classroom.

• A goal to prepare future teachers for the curriculum they will be teaching.

• The instructors were very knowledgeable and very easy to communicate with. It also helped that Academic Adviser were always willing to go the extra mile to help students get into courses or give advice. I also think it was great to have classroom experiences throughout our Academic career's.

• The amount of time in the classroom helped me the most. It was far more than other education programs I've heard about.

• I believe that the Methods semester was invaluable and I wouldn't mind seeing more classes that focus on teaching the individual subjects. This seemed to help me the most in my classroom and I have used different strategies and materials from that last semester
before teaching. Also, the experience of teaching at least 4 lessons in a classroom that semester helped as well.

- Good networking

- The professors are knowledgeable in their subject areas, there are many options for non traditional students (I had 2-4 children while attending TAMU and the schedule allowed me to be a mom and a student)

- I feel like I had many opportunities to work in the classroom with students. My professors were accessible and encouraging.

- I think some of the strengths at the undergraduate interdisciplinary program are the professors. They were often knowledgeable, very personable, and willing to help.

- They give you a wide range of viewpoints from educators with multiple levels of experience. The reading program is fantastic and engaging. The instructors really seemed to care about their students and their students success. The academic advisors are amazing! They were always on top of it... and prepared. I appreciated their hard work and help.

- The large amount of hours of field experience.

- I feel like the program is very strong in providing the technology resources that are present in schools today. I was very ready to use them in the classroom after graduation.

- The classes teaching different assessment tools used in Texas (observation survey, dra, etc)

- I was taught how to create lessons and curriculum maps. So, when I began teaching, I felt very confident in planning because I had the experience of creating curriculum in all subjects with only the TEKS to work with. This gave me a strong working knowledge
when implementing the school's various curriculum with my own ideas. All the
observations and field experience helped with classroom management techniques. I saw
several great examples, and I learned from several bad examples.

• The strengths that I grew professionally from was the small class room "feel" in the upper
level classes. I really felt as if it was an environment where I could ask questions and get
thorough explanations from my professors.

• I was in the special education program and one of my favorite parts of that program was
the class size. Our class size was around 30 which enabled all of us to become very close
to our teachers. I loved everything about our blocks and our course work and I feel that if
I had not gone to graduate school I would have been a very prepared resource special
education teacher. A lot of my course work in undergrad prepared me for my course
work in graduate school.

• lots of field experiences in many different settings

• The classroom experiences gained even from the first year in TEFB provide a huge basis
for knowledge. I think that students are able to take what they learn in their course work
and observe it in their placements. Pre-service teachers are gradually given more
responsibility in the classroom and are able to try different techniques out over the course
of several years and gain valuable experience from several mentors throughout the
undergraduate program. By the time student teaching comes around, pre-service teachers
are confident in their classroom theories and practices and are able to effectively use
strategies acquired throughout the years. The student teaching and methods blocks are
specifically the most beneficial part of the program.

• taken seriously
• One of the biggest strengths that I feel the program did was put us into the schools from the first day in education courses. Allowing us to be in the classroom from early on helped to prepare me to have my own classroom.

• I had some professors that truly cared about what they were teaching and how we were going to teach our students.

• abundant and varied field experiences  learning as a community

• I feel that the A&M undergraduate program does a great job preparing teachers for the classroom. I think that our methods and student teaching semesters are well designed compared to other University programs in the state.

• Course material (science, math, etc)

• Faculty support and the extensive field experiences.

• Most of my professors were extremely knowledgeable about the area's school districts. In turn they were able to direct the students and inform them about the differences and cultural conduct that can take place in a particular school.

• I feel that Texas A&M provided me with updated and new teaching practices and techniques in my field of study. Interviewing and creating a resume came natural to me as well as preparing lessons and guiding student learning during my first year of teaching. I feel that everything from eche classes to methods to field placements adequately prepared me to teach in the classroom.

• I like the website building at the end. I felt that my classes were generally small enough that the teacher knew who I was.

• Much of the faculty is nice and welcoming. There are many valuable courses (especially in the realm of developmental psychology). Required academic advising.
Dr. [X]'s math methods course was by far the best course that I took at TAMU. It prepared me to prevent misconceptions among children and integrate many manipulatives that foster the importance of learning at every single level EC - 4. They were a great professor who genuinely cared about their students and really wanted us to go out and teach the correct way and prevent as many misconceptions as possible. The field-based assignments also were one of the great strengths of the University. Being involved in at least one FB experience a semester for 2.5 years really helped me see a broad view of teaching. Some of the teachers that I was with were not great teachers but helped me learn what not to do and see one aspect of teaching. There was a great student teaching experience for me at [X] Elementary which was the cornerstone of who I am as an educator now.

I loved all the field based experiences we were able to participate in. Each semester we were able to get our feet a little wetter so that when it was time for us to take over we knew what to expect, and what was reasonable.

I was taught various skills related to how lessons work.

I believe the strengths of Texas A&M's undergraduate interdisciplinary program are the academic advisors, their confidence in their students who become teachers, and the professors who instructed the classes. My academic advisor was always there to answer any question I had during my time at A&M. During my time there, my professors always referred back to the statement "Always Expect More From Aggie Teachers" during class. When times are rough during the year, I think back to this statement and it helps me remember where I came from and represent. My professors were very supportive and informative during class instruction.
• The ESL program and opportunities out in the field early in the program.

• I entered the teaching profession as a first year teacher, however, I had gained so much field experience over the course of earning my degree that I felt more like a second or even third year teacher. I knew how to work with paraprofessionals, coworkers, and parents to ensure my student had a safe and effective learning environment. Lesson plans and speaking in front of my students was not nerve racking but exciting because I had already done it so many times. The study of writing quality IEP's and classroom management were both extremely valuable. The staff in the Interdisciplinary Program at TAMU is outstanding. In the future I hope to return to the College Station area and complete my doctorate degree so I can join the team! :)

• I feel the professors are amazing. One of the greatest things I left with was my confidence that they helped bestow in me. During my methods semester I was highly engaged in learning through manipulatives, etc. This really helped prepare me. I also feel my mentor teacher during methods was AMAZING which really helped prepare me for my internship with Humble ISD. (I skipped student teaching).

• The internship program.

• The field exp. I had vs. other colleagues was greater.

• I think that the strengths of Texas A&M's Interdisciplinary program are that they have smaller class sizes in comparison to many other A&M classes, the professors were really eager to help you, and the classes were relevant to what I would need to know when I entered the classroom. When I graduated and started teaching, I felt prepared and I was able to bring a few teaching ideas/strategies to the table that my older colleagues had not learned and we were all able to implement them into our classrooms.
• great reputation in the education community, ample field work, terrific faculty

• During my time at Texas A&M, I had wonderful professors who knew the subject areas they were teaching, and who really cared about us as individual students. The way that classroom time/field experience was set up was wonderful, I really enjoyed going to new schools and getting to be in the classroom for more than just methods and student teaching.

• Organization and set up of the program.

• the strengths i think would be the actual field work you get to do before you graduate and go into the classroom by yourself for the first time. I felt confident the first time i was infront of a new class. That is because of all the wonderful instructors and all the opprotunities that we received at Texas A&M interdisciplinary program.

• -how much time we spent in classrooms working with students and teachers -the variety of grades and subjects we were exposed to -the professors and material we were taught from -the way observation times are schedule with the class you are taking

• Being in the classroom from the first semester on. This allows students to decide early on whether or not they truly do want to teach.

• Strengths: all of the professors and staff within TLAC have a passion and dedication to lifelong learning and seek the highest level of professionalism from each other and his/her students; the interdisciplinary program provided me with SO much more hands on experience with classroom management, curriculum development, differentiated instruction, and many other important areas of teaching that I feel confident in my ability to teach and grow; I feel an unbelievable amount of support from TLAC and former students of Texas A&M for me as a professional seeking to become a master teacher.
• Lots of time to be in the actual classroom, not just learning about it
• The varied curriculum shaping the interdisciplinary degree was invaluable. I felt able to teach in a variety of subjects with my interdisciplinary degree as opposed to other institutions that provide more of a general elective requirement.
• All the in classroom experience
• Classroom management, professionalism, early childhood development, ESL courses and absolutely courses related to teaching with creativity and arts.
• I loved the course that had to do with my real field of bilingual or dual-language programs. I wish the methodology classes and all the other education classes would have taught in a real life real classroom state of mind not "by the book" & "textbook classrooms." I am a VERY knowledgable person when it comes to education and children yet I really did not expand much on that background & prior knowledge; they are two different things after all, that I already had. Nor did I ever really get to express my views and philosophy.
• The undergraduate program prepared me better for teaching because I was in the field all throughout my college experience.
• I like how it started the very first semester of college. I also like how much experience I got in the field. I felt very prepared for the first year.
• I think the courses that A&M requires its teachers to take makes us very qualified teachers. I know there are other teachers who attended other universities and they had to take one math and one science course. I am also working on my master's at UNT right now. I think the coursework at A&M prepared me for graduate level courses.
• The various internships required to attain a BS in interdisciplinary studies (special
• Most of the instructors are knowledgeable and do their best to assign projects that will help/challenge/prepare us for what is to come.

• I really got a lot out of my methods courses in terms of how to teach Social Studies and Writing. I taught at an inner city school for two years before switching to my current school. The principal who brought me in for an interview told me that everytime she sees that a teacher is from Texas A&M, she nearly always calls them in for an interview.

• The wide experiences and backgrounds of the people who teach the courses.

• The overall program and courses prepared students well for a teaching position.

• A&M offers the opportunity to spend countless hours INSIDE of the classroom... rather than hearing instructors talk about what happens in the classroom. This is invaluable experience.

• STRENGTHS: TECHNOLOGY; DIVERSIFICATION OF CLASSES; EXPERIENCE AND KNOWLEDGE OF PROFESSORS; STUDENT BODY.

• The amount of time they allow for field experiences.

• My freshman year I started working in the classrooms. The experience in the classroom from the first year in the program really helped me realize what direction I wanted to take in the field of education.

• I felt extremely well prepared for teaching my content areas. The coursework through TLAC and other colleges (Enlgish, History, Geography)helped me know throughly the TEKS and contents necessary to teach my current students well. My methods courses served as my student teaching as I participated in the internship program. This was the right choice for me as I was well on my way to easily handling the pressures of
conducting my own classroom. The professors in my methods courses did an excellent job of preparing me for the difficulties associated with teaching, especially in an urban environment. I was not surprised by the expectations set for me by my principal.

- One of the biggest strengths of the Texas A&M program is the amount of field experience provided to undergraduates. Each year, at least one of my classes involved some type of field experience, which helped me see/use implementation of strategies I was learning about in my classes. Rather than simply learning theory and research-based methods, A&M stresses application of theory/research. This brings me to another strength. Each and every class that I took at Texas A&M had the students actively engaged in both researching effective instructional methods and reflections on those methods. We wrote lesson plans, practiced delivering those lesson plans, received peer feedback, and had the opportunity to teach some of them in the field. I have heard people in high positions from my district praise Texas A&M for its reputation of turning out well prepared, effective teachers. Aggie teachers, according to these people, come more prepared in classroom management strategies, confidence in the classroom, dedication to the position, and the ability to write effective lesson plans.

- The faculty's knowledge of the latest trends and research in the academic world.

- Math education program

- Cultural diversity and financial diversity emphasis throughout learning experience. I still reference books read on both subjects during my studies.

- The personal stories from the instructors

- I feel that the undergraduate program is structured to give a wide variety of experiences (in and out of classrooms) in different fields of study within the education world.
• Lots of in class instruction from early on in the program. As a new teacher, I still didn’t feel completely prepared, but much better than friends from other schools did entering their own classroom on their first year.

• I feel like a lot of the classes give you a good grasp on what being a teacher really looks like. I really enjoyed learning about Harry Wong and his style of teaching. I also liked being able to go and observe in many different types of schools. I feel like A&M is very well known and liked which helps when looking for a job.

• Personable and knowledgeable professors, field experience throughout program

• I think the best thing I took away from this program was how often I was actually in the classroom. Nothing prepares you for the real thing better than being in other teacher’s rooms, observing them and trying to develop your own teaching style. A&M is one of the very few schools that lets students observe prior to student teaching.

• Knowledgeable instructors with classroom experience. Student teaching and field experiences helped to make everything I’d learned practical.

• The amount of observations helped prepare me for the classroom. It allowed me to observe several situations with several different grade levels.

• Lots of opportunities for the students to learn.

• As a SPED major, we spent many hours in various classrooms - both general & special education - and that gave me the most insight. I was then able to bring those experiences back to my professors and discuss with them how they would handle each situation.

• the extra-curricular experiences that are offered to students; the detailed summative evaluations given by supervisors during student teaching; the high standards required of students in senior block.
• The professors were great and very knowledgeable.

• The access to real life classrooms is what made me so prepared for teaching. I am a product of the internship and I never student taught. I do not feel I missed out by not student teaching, in fact, I feel that the mentor teacher I had through [a regional] ISD was amazing and made me able to really learn about how to better my own teaching style.

• Faculty and staff, curriculum that gears our understanding of the content we will teach in the field, professionalism, experience in the classroom

• Teaching current educational practices. Teaching students how to make wise and ethical decisions as educators.

• I participated in the Texas A&M partnership program. I thoroughly enjoyed this experience as I truly feel like the best learning comes from actually having your own classroom. While this program could have been managed a little better, I feel like I learned the most through this.

• lots of field experience

• THE PROGRAM IS EXTREMELY DIVERSIFIED AND FOCUSED ON TRULY PREPARING STUDENTS FOR THE SITUATIONS THEY WILL ENCOUNTER IN THE CLASSROOM. HAVING PLACEMENTS THROUGHOUT MY ENTIRE EDUCATION AT TEXAS A&M ALSO ALLOWED ME TO PUT INTO PRACTICE ALL THAT I WAS LEARNING THE MOMENT IT WAS TAUGHT INSTEAD OF STORING IT FOR LATER. THE COURSES ARE EXTREMELY PREVALENT AND TRULY FURTHERED MY UNDERSTANDING AND KNOWLEDGE.

• A lot of in classroom experience.
• One big difference between my experience and others at other universities was the amount of classroom experience I had even before I entered student teaching.

• There are many students at Texas A&M that want to be teachers NO MATTER the quality of the program. The undergraduate students will stay in the college no matter how poor the classes are taught or how uninspiring the courses may be.

• Most courses I took I found to be helpful and relevant to my field and prepared me to become a successful teacher.

• I had excellent instructors that worked with me to develop my strengths in teaching. I could come to them with any questions regarding the content or issues in my field classroom experiences, and they would work to help me learn more from the situations.

• Staff and student interactions, updated information, in-depth studies for special education majors

• We are exposed to a variety of professors, courses, books, classrooms, teachers and children that help us have a pretty good perspective of what the actually teaching field presents

• The academic advisors could not be better. They are the best.

• The program focuses on teaching to a diverse group of students, differentiating, special education, ESL, etc. I would be completely lost if I had not learned about these various topics. The program also did an excellent job of modeling how to teach mathematics. Dr. [X] and Ms. [X] were especially amazing at doing this.

• All the time spent in the classroom, starting freshman year. That was invaluable.
Appendix B-2

Challenges – Undergraduate Program (former students)

- Short of being in the classroom, it's hard to prepare a future teacher for the things they will encounter. Classroom management strategies in an applicable setting (ie. role play, mock classrooms, etc.) might have been helpful.

- Advising. The only negative thing I can say about the program at all is that I could have probably done a better job advising myself. Horrible experiences.

- Offering certain classes only once a semester.

- The department has many students, and for a young student it can be hard to get to know people as well as being on a personal level with the professors.

- Too much focus on the material taught and not enough hands-on practice. Also, when I was in my undergrad, the facilities to create our webpage for class did not accommodate enough students.

- I didn't feel the Interdisciplinary undergrad program was challenging.

- I did not feel prepared to teach the ESL students when I first began teaching. This was not due to my professor, but I did not feel like I had experience working with ESL students or teachers.

- I felt very unprepared for realistically planning lessons and creating classroom procedures.

- MORE FIELD EXPERIENCE! I learned more from my field experience than anything else and I wish I had had more.

- I feel like the ESL components of my program were weak and did not prepare me to enter
an ESL classroom. Additionally, I thought some of the practices taught during the [XXX] were old and not current. I think classes should focus on differentiation in all subject areas, including small group instruction in math and reading. I learned very little about guided reading and had to struggle and figure it out on my own once I had my own classroom. Though I liked a [local school district] at the time, now that I have taught in 2 different school districts I can see how the [local school district] does not use best practices and are behind in current instructional strategies.

• I think one of the challenges facing the program is the diversity. I am a product of a regional school which is what I am currently teaching in, but I am not sure that the program at Texas A&M truly prepares all teachers for the diversity of the classroom. Also, I did not have that great of a student teaching experience. Maybe more time going into making sure mentor teachers were committed to helping student teachers? I don't know if this is possible, but just a suggestion.

• There is a lot of overlap with the curriculum. I feel like they beat us over the head time and again (wasting valuable teaching moments and time) with certain things that weren't even helpful or useful to us as a classroom teacher. This time could have been spent better preparing us to teach. I feel like this was especially true in the ESL classes. Although it was prevalent throughout the curriculum.

• None

• Now that I have had my own classroom I have come to the conclusion that I did NOT have enough experience and training on classroom management. The only class that covered it was an online class and I feel that more classroom management courses could be VERY beneficial to all students. I know that I am not the only one who believes this.
This was a topic that we covered during student teaching. My biggest struggle as a first year teacher was definitely classroom management. I felt like many of the courses could have been combined in order to create room for more management courses. By my junior year I felt like I was taking the same courses over and over again because they seemed to all cover the same things. So a variety of courses would be very beneficial.

- Finding an array of classroom environment in the bcs area that offer a good example if what a teacher can expect if planning to teach in a different district.
- This is not necessarily a challenge, but sometimes it was degrading to be treated like the child. Many of us would rather learn certain material and not be forced to "act" like the child while learning.
- Teacher retention.
- The biggest challenge to the undergraduate interdisciplinary program is that some of the courses are quite repetitive and basically reiterate what another course has presented in a prior semester.
- need more experience in the classroom
- too many "chiefs", tenure valued over ability
- ESL, more practice teaching (even if it is to other college students), Classroom management
- I wish we could have spent more time in the classroom rather than on the picky details of lesson planning. I learned more working with students than I ever did in some of my college classes.
- The biggest challenge for the program is to fully integrate the students into the class and allow them the opportunity to see the intangibles. Ex. the effect of time management, or
lack of.

- The methods semester could be organized better and the time used in a wiser fashion.
- 1. In elementary school classrooms, there were too many people and not enough opportunities to teach. 2. Professors who were not up to date on what is currently in classrooms (such as that we don't teach thematic units anymore...) 3. I know that professors dislike the Taks test, but I felt completely unprepared to get my students ready for it.
- Lack of communication amongst faculty and staff. Extreme over saturation of cultural diversity courses in education plan. Too many pointless and ineffective courses in reading assessment. Not enough valuable preparation in terms of ESL skills.
- The inability to observe and have field experience in other levels of education (secondary)
- One of the biggest challenges of the program was literacy. As a first-year teacher, I was not prepared in any way for literacy. As a first-year teacher, there are people showing me the way but the difference in learning about math in methods with Dr. [X] made me comfortable and confident in teaching mathematics. However, reading methods with Dr. [X] never even gave me an idea about activities for teaching fluency, comprehension, or accuracy. Of course your first year teaching is about learning, but literacy could have been enforced ALOT more than it was. Dr. [X]’s class was more of a discussion forum rather than a class to learn about reading methods. They were a great professor, however, being exposed to things such as comprehension activities or small group guided reading in your first year teaching is something that should have been covered in reading methods with her rather than talking about what's going on in the FB experience for 1.25 hours
every week. More valuable time should have been spent on an ideal look at Balanced Literacy and activities that go with it.

- I was not prepared at all for dealing with parents, other teachers attitudes, the politics of upper management. I was not the typical chipper, cutesy teacher and I was treated as if I were a leper. I was and am an effective and personable teacher and had many people who took the time to know me knew this. Unfortunately, most of those in the field are not keen on teachers that actually enjoy their students and truly individualized lessons.

- A challenge I see that A&M has is making the real connection to the actual classroom setting for when we are to take over the classroom for the first time by ourselves. One area is with classroom management. We learn of strategies in class, but it is always harder to use it and to know exactly how to implement it. Reading textbooks are not always the best way to learn classroom management.

- I am not sure that there are challenges that need to be fixed so much with the program as there is a need to figure out how to make some of the more timid individuals and less confident individuals more verbal and more confident in our ability to be teachers in our rapidly changing public school system. Maybe that idea would fit under the category of some self-development classes.

- Paying tuition.

- I think the greatest challenge is and will always be finding very motivated, high-achieving, awesome teachers that you can place students with during thier methods AND student teaching expereinces. I know some of my friends had horrible teachers during thier methods semseter. They need teachers that will challenge them and help them realize what teaching really is all about.
• Need to stress how to make lesson plans that are tied to the TEKS. Making relevant activities.

• Sometimes communication to the whole major was a problem, since there are so many of us. I know they have implemented new ways of communication since I left to help ease this though.

• Within the university, the program had the reputation of being "easy". I would like to have seen more opportunities for undergraduate research or other prestigious honors programs within the department.

• No enough time is spent on special education information or the day to day responsibilities of a teacher.

• -all classes not being offered every semester

• I would have liked more guidance with the certification process and creating my resume.

• Some classes seemed irrelevant. Most of what I learned was in my methods and student teaching

• I felt underprepared in the area of classroom management when I entered student teaching. My classroom experiences throughout the program were valuable, but I would have benefited from a greater level of direct instruction as to practices to manage a larger class size

• Providing great reading and writing courses that prepare us for teaching young children phonics, phonemic awareness, grammar, reading strategies and writing. We need better special education courses with more real world situations to prepare us for students that have not been diagnosed and real accommodations to use for specific needs.

• Unfairness! Monolingual future educators have soooooo much more opportunity than
sped or bilingual at A&M, yet when you get into the real world it is the other way around! My peers and I almost felt like we were always behind them and not created 100% equal in the eyes of TLAC.

- The biggest challenge is learning the various lesson plans and not using the same ones each semester.
- Some of the classes weren't challenging enough. I remember making an art file, and my homework would be to draw a picture using chalk... that didn't really seem worth my time. I would have liked something that felt a little more valuable than that.
- Preparing perspective regular educators for understanding what special educators do.
- Some of the instructors are not as knowledgeable about what is going on in the classrooms these days and what is expected of teachers now as opposed to when they taught.
- All the changes occurring currently in the education field and the professors who taught 15 years ago.
- Material presented was occasionally repetitive.
- Classroom Management!! What an important course!! This class should incorporate so much more than it did and should be taught by an instructor who is VERY qualified. When teachers walk into their classrooms on the first day, it doesn't matter how well they know their content how passionate they are about teaching... if they cannot manage the classroom, they will be able to effectively teach.
- CHALLENGES: UNABLE TO THINK OF ANY AT THE MOMENT.
- Too much of it focuses on the childhood development. I think more needs to be given to grades 2-4.
• Not enough experience in the classroom. I loved that we started so early but I wish there was even more experience in the classroom.

• The biggest challenge facing TLAC is diversity. Exposure to new ideas, thinking, and perspectives through diversity of people from various backgrounds. Many of my classmates and professors came from similar backgrounds and pasts with similar ideas. I now teach in a school with students coming from extremely different backgrounds than myself. Greater diversity in my thinking would have been beneficial before starting my career as a classroom teacher.

• The communication between the student teacher's mentors and the university's expectations. I had a TERRIBLE experience in student teaching. A&M told me, "don't take over the classroom- respect that it is an already established classroom- don't try to steal the show from the teacher." The mentor's expectations were that I needed to do exactly that, and when I did not take her classroom over on day one, she treated me like worthless dirt the rest of the experience.

• While I was attending Texas A&M, I was very happy with my coursework. I felt that the professors were very knowledgeable and helpful, and the field experiences were extremely valuable in my preparation as a teacher. Now that I am in the classroom teaching, however, I see that the program is challenged with providing experience prior to student teaching working with ESL and Special Education students, and differentiating instruction for them in a real classroom setting. As I said before, Texas A&M is known for its exemplary reputation of producing effective teachers - that is still the case in handling both of these types of students in the classroom. The reason I bring it up as a challenge for the program is because of the challenge it presents in the classroom due to
the diverse needs these students bring to the table that need to be met. I do feel that Texas A&M prepared me to meet these challenges in the classroom, however. Honestly, it was difficult for me to think of an answer to this question.

- I think the biggest challenge is that nothing in a college class can really prepare you for being in charge of your own classroom.
- The Child Development aspect of the degree could be strengthened.
- Science education program. Very little emphasis on science education and the 1 course I took in which it was the main idea, the teacher focused on concepts that did not further my education in the subject. I left college knowing very little about science education.
- It is a fabulous program.
- I feel (as do many of my classmates) that the biggest hole in our education was in classroom management courses. If it had not been for my long-distance mentor teacher for student teaching in a [local area school] I don't think I would have had a clue what to do for classroom management. The one course that just seemed to discuss classroom rules was not enough, as sweet as the prof was. I lucked out with my mentor teacher and I hate to think of how my classroom would be controlled without her guidance.
- I had trouble initially getting a job, and was told from day 1 in orientations that would not be problem. I feel there could be a better push and role to help ensure there is everything possible being done to help students to get a job post graduation.
- I wish that A&M would put their undergrads in more situations where they observe teaching. I feel the most effective way to learn how to be a good teacher is to observe good teachers. I also would have liked to have observe all grade levels of my certification. In my district, most of the curriculum is layed out for me to follow so all of
the classes where I had to create my own unit dont really come in handy. (It might have if I worked in another district.)

• classroom management- Never in the field experiences (except ST) was I able to manage the classroom and test my ability. Having control of the classroom seems just as important as the material you are teaching.

• One thing I wish I would have had more preparation for was SPED students. I have quite a few as a first year and felt like there was so much I didn't know.

• Lack of communication between instructors--one example--I felt like we were often told different things specifically about putting portfolios together & how to take/present them to interviewers. Some instructors pushed putting everything online, saying potential employers didn't have time to look at a physical portfolio while other instructors stressed having an actual binder/portfolio to take to interviews because a potential employer didn't have time or that it was too much to ask of them to look on our online portfolio. It was frustrating to make an online portfolio to one professors exact specifications only to have to change it's format completely for the next professor. Universal standards would have been nice to have.

• Sometimes the amount of work between all the classes was overwhelming...most professors were great at scheduling around each other so there were several projects due at the same time.

• There needs to be more emphasis on the different ways to teach and study different philosophies of teaching.

• I think the biggest challenge is that General Education teachers do not spend any time in Special Ed classes or take many courses on students with disabilities. There is a push (at
least in Texas) to have more student in inclusion settings and many of my General Ed coworkers have no experiences and have difficulties working with my SPED students who come to their classroom.

• keeping a realistic perspective of what teachers will face in the classroom; equipping students to work in a bi-lingual atmosphere; preparing students to better work with low-income, non-motivated students.

• So much of the stuff that we did was outdated and not with current curriculum and instruction practices across the state. - The schools that we were placed in seemed to be behind the times as well. - Not much technology was used in our instruction or instruction we saw in the classrooms we observed in. - Most projects were based on hypothetical "dream classes". The projects were "cutesy" and weren't content based. Everything was theme based (bears, winter, apples, etc.) and that's not how it is in my district I teach in now, so that was a shock to me.

• More time in the classrooms.

• During my time at TAMU, I felt that the ESL / Multi-cultural classes were not sufficient in preparing for the realities of the classroom. ESL Strategies, in relation to TELPAS and TEKS, were not covered. As for becoming an ELAR educator, I felt that there was not enough preparation in the "how to" parts of teaching different literary and grammar concepts.

• Can't think of any.

• The lack of time spent in the classroom with a "mastery" teacher. Often times our time spent in the classroom we were used to run copies and run errands for the teacher. This was really irritating as we were not able to learn effectively.
• not enough individualization or mixture of challenging courses for EC-4 certification

• THE ONLY NEGATIVE I HAVE WITH THE PROGRAM, AND WHY I WOULD NOT PURSUE A DEGREE IN EDUCATION IF I DID IT OVER AGAIN, IS THAT IT IS EXTREMELY LIMITING. I AM ONLY ABLE TO TEACH UP THROUGH 4TH GRADE. THE PROGRAM FULLY PREPARED ME AND QUALIFIED ME TO TEACH THESE GRADES BUT THAT IS THE ONLY CAREER I CAN CHOOSE WITH MY DEGREE. HAD I PURSUED A DEGREE IN MATH, I WOULD BE ABLE TO STILL PURSUE TEACHING (IN A WIDER RANGE OF GRADES) AS WELL AS OTHER CAREER OPTIONS THAT MIGHT FIT MY LIFE A BIT BETTER IN MY CURRENT SITUATION (OVERSEAS). I WOULD NOT BE AS PREPARED FOR THE CLASSROOM AND STRONGLY FEEL THAT OUR TEACHERS SHOULD BE AS TRAINED AS THE EDUCATION PROGRAM TRAINED ME, BUT CURRENTLY OUR STATE FEELS DIFFERENTLY. THEREFORE, I WOULD HAVE TO LOOK AT MY DEGREE CHOICE AS AN ECONOMICAL ONE, WHICH PATH OPENS THE MOST DOORS.

• Not getting enough credits for all of the hours spent in field based settings.

• The program is not effectively teaching college students to teach ESL students, at-risk students, and in schools with low academic performance. The courses are weak, not challenging and not relevant to first year teachers. There should be 4 times as much time spent in classrooms to help in teacher development. The best way to learn how to teach is to spend time in a classroom with another quality teacher. This was poorly provided in my education experience.

• Time management.
• My methods and student teaching were spent in a [local school] district. I worked with amazing faculty, with great resources, and phenomenal students. I got my first teaching job working in a regionally located school district. I resigned by September. Part of my problems in the classroom stemmed from working in a 4th grade classroom. They were very much below a "middle school" level that I had been trained to work with. I was terribly behind my "elementary" trained counter-parts. And believe me, this was not from a lack of my not studying or paying attention in class. I knew how to effectively manage a middle school class. On the other hand, nothing had prepared me for the hardships of working in a district that did not support their staff and dealing with the attitude from the community and parents. I did my best, but I felt ill equipped. 4 years later, I can look back and I still don't have a desire to go back to the classroom.

• Giving future teachers enough information related to planning and curriculum.

• I often times felt that I was given work that was a waste of time. Not in my regular education classes, but in my Bilingual Education classes. It was readings then responses and no discussion. I understand the need to read and expose ourselves to research but to have me answer questions, turn it in, get a check mark, and have it returned was a waste of time.

• The multicultural courses need an overhaul and need "to get a life". As they are presented they are counter productive. The field experience needs organizing; it is the most important part of preparing the undergraduate for the classroom and the program is discombobulated, boring and hackneyed; it is in need of a total overhaul. A local academic institution has a much better program which allows for the undergraduate to observe several different schools and gives the burden of scheduling to the student
instead of the administration. This program provides helpful information as to what to notice in the observation which was not the case at Texas A&M Department of Education. This is probably the most important of courses for the undergraduate and the worst course I had at Texas A&M University.

- I was part of the math/science 4 - 8 certification. Even though I originally wanted to teach science, I do not feel prepared to do so. Only one of my science classes involved methodology, and that was physics. I fear I will be asked to teach science, since I am certified to do so. While I could manage, I would be extremely frustrated and would struggle with lesson planning. I know the program is changing, and I know that administration is aware of this challenge.

- Ensuring that the needs of individual students are met with large classes.

- The program is extremely challenging, but it makes educators confident in their abilities to take on becoming a teacher. The classes that one has to take to become an aggie teacher are very difficult. Yet, these course shaped me into an excellent teacher. I left A & M knowing that I would succeed as a teacher.

- Getting more time in the actual classrooms, as well as incorporating teaching opportunities.

- *There is the reputation that if you are an education major then you are just getting your MRS degree or if you can't make it in any other degree then you can at least get a teaching degree*  *The district I teach in now is the district I attended when I was a child...A&M tried to prepare me for the diversity by talking about diversity all the time but that doesn't prepare you...I think my experience is what prepared me.

- Not emphasizing the classroom management/behavioral aspect of teaching. I did not feel
prepared to handle severe behavior issues as a first year teacher.

• Allowing me to take the English and History classes I want, and still get credit for them.

• Trying to educate all future teachers to excel in teaching all subject areas at the EC-4 level.

• The ESL program is weak and the courses only teach you how to pass the certification test. They do not in any way teach you how to actually be an ESL teacher. It is a very challenging job to teach ESL students at the EC-4 level. Only 1 out of all of my ESL professors even had any actual classroom experience with teaching ESL students. Another challenge is keeping the program up to date and aligned with how most large districts in the surrounding areas are requiring teachers to teach.

• Cost.

• I didn't really feel there were any.

• None

• Because every school, every grade, every district is different, it's difficult to teach to each of them. I know that the Education program is a general program, but I didn't graduate feeling confident in writing a lesson plan, or confident in how to talk with parents, or confident in asserting myself to administrators, teachers, or parents. I am now because I'm in my 3rd year of teaching, have had a lot of exposure to it all, and been guided along the way by certain people. I know it's hard to prepare us completely, but I felt really unprepared and did a lot of trial and error and ask tons of questions to figure my way.

• There were not enough courses in the fundamentals of teaching math and science.

• Motivation to go above and beyond the other teachers in a school. You can't teach the desire to help students achieve in social and academic setting. Teachers need to have
more experiences so that they can relate what they have learned to the classroom.

- I think one of the biggest challenges is remembering to focus not only on how to teach so in the future your students can pass the TAKS test, but teaching to mold future teachers into real good educators. I also think the focus is sometimes too great on recognizing the diversity of classroom, and not so much on how to teach differently to a diverse classroom.
Appendix B-3

Suggestions – Undergraduate Program (former students)

- Needs to be more well rounded, incorporating other areas to enhance the undergraduate experience. More help in making knowledge available, especially for students who want to double major or study abroad.

- Offer more of the same classes at different times throughout the same semester

- Less math proofs classes, unnecessary...

- I would like to see students in more classroom's to get more experience and practice their classroom management.

- Give undergraduates more experience with the first day/week of school. Even if it is just a video... I had no idea what to do during that time. It would've been nice to have seen some examples.

- I would do away with the statistics math class. This class did not help me as an elementary school teacher. Also, I think there should be more time in the classrooms and working with students.

- Much more content-relevant instruction. Dr. [X]'s methods class especially was irrelevant as far as preparing me to teach.

- Get future teachers in the classrooms throughout the community as soon as possible. Also, the reading assessment course needs to be during methods, so teachers can actually practice on children in person, not in theory.

- Encourage students to study abroad (this was one of the best decisions I made). Work with students to continue their education my getting a Master's degree. Make sure
students are having filed experiences in different school districts around the area. I only had experience in [a local school district] when I graduated and did not know the practices of other school districts.

- Better mentor teachers
- [X] was extremely detached from reality. [They] didn't care about the students, faculty, or staff. [They were] only concerned about making [themselves] look good and money. It worried me that he was the one making decisions. I am so glad that this attitude seemed to stop at [them].

Take a good look at you curriculum... where are the overlaps? Communicate from instructor to instructor. Our methods teachers DID NOT communicate. It made for a very stressful semester. They didn't like each other and it was VERY evident. It impeded their communication... and we suffered. Due dates for multiple projects were clumped on the same day... making our life hell. We didn't get out of the projects what we were supposed to or could have... because we were just rushed and forced to turn in crap. Be careful about the quality of observation times. It seems like I didn't get the best experiences that I could. My TEFB class I was... as the HOSTS coordinator told me an "extra". Some how they scheduled too many volunteers and I was the odd MAN out. I NEVER got to work one on one with a student that semester. Even though there were tons and tons of Business and other non teaching majors who participated with the program and got to have that TEACHING experience. Instead... I got to shelve books in the library(ironically I now work for Texas A&M's Evans Library... THANKS for the experience)and sell pickles in the cafeteria(yay for smelling like pickles for 2 weeks). This made it extremely difficult to write all my reflection papers that semester about TEACHING EXPERIENCE. Another semester I was
scheduled for an experience on a day where it was swim day. So my experience consisted of watching the kids and their glorified babysitters have a quick snack time and then go for a swim/play time. Once again... this made it hard to write and learn about teaching. I was however VERY fortunate to have an amazing Methods and Student Teaching classroom experience... it even led to a (very short lived) job. Promote your amazing teacher related organizations... TSTA and ACEI more. They are amazing organizations. Students at A&M need to get involved in meaningful organizations.

- None

- I would add more classroom management classes, and possibly another class about special populations. One thing that I found through my four years was that the professors would say "provide modifications" but we were rarely ever told what KIND of modifications to provide. I also think that during the Methods semester there should be a class that focuses on professional development, as in, I have a degree now what? How to formulate a resume, what to say in an interview, how to go about finding a job...etc. I feel that that would be HIGHLY beneficial to every student. That was something I struggled with after graduation.

- More classroom experience, more lesson plan writing in a way you could actually use (not 5 pages for one lesson), More exposure to small group instruction (math and guided reading), more exposure to readers and writers workshop and things you can use, decreased emphasis on the creators/philosophy of education.

- It would have been very helpful to be explicitly shown HOW to apply for certification, what counts as continuing ed, and how to document your hours for re-certification. This part was confusing for everybody.
• I would have focused more on classroom management and discipline. (I would highly recommend this not being an online course and challenging students with a real "out of control" classroom environment) I worked in regional school district where the behavior in the classroom was outrageous. I was not prepared for handling situations in an "inner city" environment. I also felt there needed to be more of a focus on how to "motivate" students. The students in my classroom were very unmotivated and had been retained multiple times. I felt helpless.

• I can not say what would improve teacher retention. In the special education program, the instructors did everything possible to make sure we were adequately prepared for all the good and bad that comes with being a special education teacher.

• I feel that there are some areas that more emphasis could be spent on such as differentiated teaching, classroom management, student motivation techniques, special needs students with modifications, and parent interaction.

• more experience in the classroom more opportunities to teach

• more knowledgeable academic advisors

• I wish that during my time at A&M we were required to graduate with ESL certification as well. That is something I had to go back and do on my own after graduation.

• Courses that are to repetitive...reading courses! EPSY or STAT, this in no way is has been beneficial to me as a teacher. This was the hardest course of my college career along with the worst professor.

• More opportunities for field experiences.

• I'm not sure. I absolutely cherish my education from Texas A&M and it is the best place for me to have attended.
I feel that a lot of instructional time was wasted during some methods classes. The semester was jam-packed with projects and assignments, but few authentic learning experiences were available. Most hours (from 8-5) were spent listening to other groups present information we were all accountable for or completing half of an activity we really needed to experience all of. It was demeaning to be spoken to as school-aged children during demonstrations and I feel that as college students, we could have spent our time using higher levels of learning, questioning, and thinking.

Greater efficiency and appropriate communication in administration. The chastisement of known rude and hypocritical professors. Greater emphasis on developmental needs of young students. Greater emphasis on valuable skills when working with students with special needs. Greater emphasis on classroom management skills. A better understanding of the fact that all teachers in training (and practicing teachers) have different strengths and abilities; this understanding resulting in a less dogmatic stance on which method of teaching is best. More electives.

Allow students to see all levels of education regardless of field chosen - this would give a better idea of what grade he/she would like to teach

I would suggest more hands-on practice with the Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing for ESL students in the ESL classes. This would have been an asset with learning activities to help those learners. Also, creating lesson plans in college was helpful and helped us see how to create one. I feel that less time should be spent on creating 4-5 lesson plans in each class, each semester and more focused on that subject area. Lesson plans are great and you really get a feel for writing and creating those in student teaching.
I feel that all the lesson plans that I created in Undergrad were designed for busywork. Also, another change that I would make would be in the Classroom Management aspect. Classroom Management was only available through one 3-hour course and it was online. Classroom Management is the center value in a classroom. If you don't have control of children, how can you expect to teach them? I think that the University should offer more Classroom Management courses that are face-to-face instruction incorporated bad, good, and great ideas on ways to manage a classroom. It could be through technology and incorporating children with classroom setup at the beginning of the year etc. I think this would be a chance for undergrads to talk more in an open forum about what they have seen in classrooms, what works and what doesn't. I think it would make first-year teachers more comfortable entering their classroom and more confident in their first year if you just gave them idea after idea of things they could use. In the district that I currently work in, they offer training constantly on Classroom Management integrated with technology and I think I benefit from this. I think the change needs to take place because teachers should be introduced to these ideas in college and get their minds going with ideas rather than learning them halfway into their first year teaching.

• I think for me personally working with some of the older staff at my school was an uncomfortable situation for me at first. I felt as a new teacher I wanted to share my thoughts that all kids are reachable, and all kids are amazing if you get to know them, but some teachers really do not get that. It seems once a teacher is burnt out their minds will not be changed. It took awhile for me to understand this and not feel bad. I think it would have been nice to see the "bad" side as well as all the great sides to teaching.

• Have more of the professors practice what they preach in that they understand that not all
teachers are the same and therefore also needed differentiate instruction.

- A suggestion would be to pair up students who goes into the teaching field experience classes to be paired up with a teacher who is not the same age as the student or within 5 years. Both during methods and student teaching experiences, I was to working with teachers who were very close in age and didn't see how to help but more so how to keep control of the situation where they made learning difficult. My student teaching teacher never gave me complete control of the class. They saw me more of as a inconvenience. I think it may have been my prior knowledge of education due to my mom being a teacher and my ability to know what was going on without their input.
- See above.
- A stronger focus on learning and using a curriculum would have really helped that first year. Maybe one of the semester courses that requires mock teaching could have students choose one grade level and curriculum book to use and they must search through that book to create their lesson plans (approximately 3-4 lessons). This might force students to examine the curriculum/teacher's manual book a little closer than if they are choosing a different level and subject for each lesson plan. I understand the need for students to do the different grades and subjects, but maybe in one of the entry level courses with mock lessons this could work. Also, a semester long project in one of the classes could be to review one teacher's manual. I would have benefited from holding and more closely viewing one of these before entering the classroom even for student teaching.
- Have REALLY great teachers avaliable, always. Have students going into the classroom starting thier freshman year- the more experience, the better!
- I think the biggest thing I lacked coming out of the program was knowledge of what a
"Professional Learning Community" is. This is a term used in our school a lot, and I had a few schools ask my opinions/thoughts of this type of community during interviews. I understand now what it is, and had learned the ideals behing it at A&M, but didn't connect the two because I had never learned about them in that context. Also, my school has been working with Larry Ainsworth on the development of Common Formative Assessments. It seems that many schools are going to this method of assessing student progress across a grade level, so it would have been nice to learn this while I was in the program as a method of assessment, and also learn how to create these types of assessments using the TEKS.

- I know the vast majority of students in this program end up teaching in the classroom at least initially. After student teaching, however, I knew this was not the route I wanted to take. I found it very hard to get any advice about what I could do with my degree if I did not want to be a classroom teacher. I visited with my departmental advisor in addition to an advisor at the career center. More support for alternative education careers would have been terrific.

- Start methods semester earlier. Plan teacher assessments to mirror the PDAS evaluations. Go more in depth with special education students and how to accomodate them. Review more of the day to day tasks how to work with a co teacher, how to work with an ICS teacher, how to make a parent phone call, suggestions on how to handle a leadership role etc.

- Continue to keep up to date with the technology and dedication to cutting edge research and resources.

- Make sure all knowledge is relevant. Maybe have a class on dealing with parents
• Greater focus on marketability. The teacher market is filled with new teachers and I was unable to distinguish myself despite having great references, teaching experience, and solid grades at TAMU. The job market where I applied received over 2,000 teaching applications for each open position and I never could rise to the top over other applicants who were required to have a second non-education major.

• Make bilingual courses mandatory because ESL certification is great but those ELLs need someone who can communicate with their families and truly understand the difficulty of learning a new language. Provide more in depth courses on special education and the accommodation and process of diagnosis. Have multiple courses teaching guided reading and writing courses. Provide more in field experiences with ARD meetings that develop IEPs, observations of guided reading in schools, and observations of literacy stations.

• Read the above! That will make a lot of people think; maybe even changes.

• Please teach the same lesson plans each semester.

• See above. I also think it would be good during methods or student teaching to be able to see the first day of school and how routines and classroom management techniques are set up. We didn't start until a week or so later, and missed all of that. I would have felt even more prepared walking in that first year had I seen what it should have looked like. I also would have liked a panel of second year teachers to come and tell us what their biggest challenges were, the most important things they learned that year, special tricks or management techniques they found, etc.

• I wish I could have had a clinical type experience while I was taking my reading courses. I learned a lot of theory but I was not able to apply what I was learning. I listened to a
recording of a child reading once in one of my classes. When I entered into my own classroom I did not feel like I was capable of teaching reading, I knew a lot of theory, but not a lot of best practices.

- My internship experiences made me well rounded, highly qualified, and helped me decide what kind of classroom I wanted to work in.
- Be more selective about which instructors you hire. Make sure they have plenty of classroom experience and are currently plugged into classrooms or are in teacher communities that allow them to see what current expectations are for classroom teachers.
- The reading part of my methods semester was not effective. It was focused on assessing reading, but I didn't yet feel like I had been taught how to teach reading or comprehension. I know that assessment is important, but I would have preferred strategies on how to teach major comprehension skills.
- More focuses on behavioral challenges and how to deal with family and social issues in children
- I believe there should be more opportunities to observe and practice teaching in the classrooms before the student teaching semester.
- Lesson Plans, Lesson Plans, Lesson Plans! (We would spend weeks developing one! This is not real world practice!) Classroom Management (This course should really prepare teachers!)

SUGGESTIONS/CHANGES: MORE HANDS ON TIME WITH CLASSES (STUDENT TEACHING)

- Include more information on multicultural education, less emphasis on lesson plan writing, training on how to write grants and actually follow through with the grant
projects. I think students need to be doing research papers. Writing is a great way to be a reflective practitioner which is essential to education.

- I would like to have had more coursework teaching me about the various stages of emerging readers. More like what the EC-4 teachers recieve. There are numerous students in Texas that are in grades 4-8 still learning to read and I wish I was more knowledgeable about how to help them succeed by filling in the gaps from their past.

- I was taught very little on guided reading.

- Methods students should be required to attend one or more faculty meetings to get a sense of how a school functions other than just within the classroom - especially those who plan on completing the internship program in lieu of student teaching. There should be more than one course on the degree plan for students receiving special education/504 services, or the course could include some type of field experience - perhaps an interview with someone from the special education department, or with the classroom teacher on his/her experiences with inclusion students and others with special needs. Dr. [X] had a project for one of the ESL courses where we had to design a tutoring plan and work with an ELL student. This project was not required, and that was the only professor who offered it. I think this project should be required. I completed it, and I feel that it helped prepare me for the ELL students in my class better than simply learning diagnostics and lesson modifications. I got to apply my knowledge, which studies show is the best way to learn. This is a wonderful program that already does a great job of preparing teachers for the field. Any improvements would only add to that strong reputation.

- Thinking back on it now, I wasted time in classes like statistics, when I should have been
spending much more of my time in actual schools and classrooms.

• I would add child development courses dealing with developmental appropriateness in the early childhood classroom.

• More emphasis on science for future science teachers.

• No one ever taught me how to use a copy machine! Creating a lesson plan in college is not at all like what I have had to do for the schools that I have worked for. They do not need to be that lengthy in the "real world" to be successful.

• My biggest suggestion is just about the classroom management course. I do not feel like I got anything from it. More needs to be done to prepare teachers for behavior issues in the classroom, including minor to severe misbehaviors.

• See question 100

• See answer to question 100.

• I would suggest changing the student teaching placements. I was placed in a third grade classroom for twelve weeks and did not like third grade at all. I would have liked to have another grade level for a few weeks. So, maybe six weeks in one grade level and six weeks in another.

• Implement more study of different philosophies of teaching.

• I think all General Education majors should spend time in both General & Special Education classrooms. I also think that we should be encouraged to get our ESL degree. In [a regional] ISD they are strongly encouraging all teachers to get that certification and said they will be requiring it with the next few years.

• Professors should visit regular classrooms to observe what is going on in our public schools (valuable information for upcoming teachers)
• - Allow students a chance to observe in both Bryan ISD AND College Station ISD. They are two very different school districts. I was always in [one local] ISD and never got to see the newer schools, and newer technology that some of my classmates were seeing.

• More time in classrooms with students to teach and observe. Things are constantly changing and it would be nice to observe that.

• I feel that the courses in the program are appropriate for the education degree and would not need to add anything else to make the program more successful.

• Pick better teachers to put us in their classrooms. This was a huge disappointment for many of my peers. Although I managed to get a very helpful classroom teacher during my methods semester.

• more courses on student FORMATIVE assessment rather than summative. I am teaching at a school that does not have grades and I am finding it difficult to change up and diversify my assessments.

• CONTINUING FROM MY ANSWER TO QUESTION 100, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT PERHAPS OFFER A PROGRAM WITH A DECLARED MAJOR (LIKE MATH) WITH A MINOR IN EDUCATION OR EMPHASIS IN EDUCATION. THAT WAY THE STUDENT WOULD STILL RECEIVE IMPORTANT EDUCATION PREVALENT MATERIAL (I.E. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND ASSESSMENT) WHILE GAINING A STRONG KNOWLEDGE IN A WIDE DEGREE. PERHAPS THIS PLAN IS ALREADY OFFERED BUT WAS NOT PUBLICIZED WHEN I ATTENDED. IF IT IS OFFERED, PERHAPS THIS COULD BE MADE MORE KNOWN SO THAT THE NUMEROUS PEOPLE GETTING ALTERNATIVELY CERTIFIED ARE RECEIVING
SOME NECESSARY CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT EDUCATION.

- I never got to experience a first day or week of school because of the timing of my field based classes. I know that seeing a class during the first week of school while the teacher sets up routines and expectations would be so helpful.

- One challenge that I am facing now in the workplace is teaching the General Ed teachers about SPED. They have very little experience working with these students. The one class they take does not even touch on the types of students they will be working with. As a SPED major I feel I was prepared to teach both general ed and special ed. Also, EVERYONE should be required to do the ESL cert test. It will make them more hireable since many districts are requiring it now.

- The most valuable teaching education is done through experience in the classroom. I was VERY disappointed that we had little to no student interactions until the final year of our program. After graduation, I joined Teach For America where they taught me how to be a teacher through a summer school program where we taught everyday while we had intensive teaching instruction. I feel like entering the classroom without this rigorous instruction that I got from Teach For America would have been a mess. Instead, my classroom teaching experience in Washington DC was successful and valuable. There is a serious inferiority complex that the College of Education has at Texas A&M. As a male wanting to enter a female dominated profession, I was greatly disappointed once I began to take the courses. The courses were not challenging, not engaging, not inspiring and nearly killed my passion in education. Please consider the models of education program at Vanderbilt University and Columbia's Teacher's College.

- More in the classroom training and less courses. A college classroom lecture can only
get you so far but I feel that I learned more in the actual elementary classroom than I did from any lecture hall.

- I wish that we had even one class devoted to dealing with an inner-city or rural classroom. It might have made a difference. And I think it might make a difference in your future teachers coming from your program. I had spent time working in [a local] Junior High and [local] Middle school before I started my methods semester, but the time spent there wasn't enough to move full time to a [local district]. In addition, there needs to be some focus on the differences between a 4th grade classroom and an 8th. At the middle school level, there is such a huge gap between those age ranges, more so than the others. More focus on that would make an impact that first year, going into an age you're not used to.

- Specifically for the special education program, it would be nice to see more subject specific classes, especially in the Language Arts field. Special education majors graduate knowing how to modify and teach basics, but it is hard to know what type of things we need to be teaching for Reading and Writing specifically. What are some other good programs we can use?

- I was not exposed to things that I need as a kindergarten teacher. Basically all the underlying things. OSI testing, TELPAS, CBAs, Guided Reading. I definitely needed to be exposed to schools during the first weeks of school. Also courses in behavior management. How to deal with kids who have me sexually abused and are not well in lala land. How to deal with criers. How to identify kids in poverty by appearances and behavior. Most importantly how to deal with administration that does not treat you like a professional.
• I would suggest a complete overhaul of the field experience program before it blemishes the rest of the undergraduate interdisciplinary program. Texas A&M is a great university and I am surprised that there has not already been some changes here.

• I would allow undergraduates to pick one field of study for 4 - 8 certification, if they wish. Also, ensure that the professors have valuable experience in the educational field.

• We aren't really told how to go about getting a job. I had no idea what I was supposed to do once I graduated. I think meetings for seniors about how to search for jobs would really help.

• I would suggest providing a wide array of grade levels for field experiences. Unfortunately, I was placed primarily in prek during my field experiences and I did not experience other grade levels until I was in methods and student teaching. In addition, the behavior management class I took at A&M was online and I do not feel it was beneficial at all to me. I feel that requiring future teachers to take more than one behavior management class would better prepare them for teacher. After all, a teacher has to establish routines and know how to manage student behavior in order to provide quality instruction. Also, I feel that incorporating an "establishing routines and organization" component would help teachers be more successful, especially in their first year of teaching.

• I think A & M should offer more classes about how to deal with special needs student. As a teacher, I know that even in the main stream classroom one will have students with extreme issues. I was not prepared to deal with suicide, anger issues, and ED students. Teachers need to be made more aware of the extreme diversity one will face within the classroom.
• More field based instruction! But there was a good amount.

• *Make the program more challenging....I felt like I did a lot of work but not necessarily challenging/higher level work. *More emphasis on technology. All my lesson plans are online and curriculum is online. I have to have a class webpage. I feel like I learned how to research and look up information but not how to teach with it or how to get my students to learn with technology. *The major thing I felt unprepared for is all the behind the scenes things...that is what truly overwhelmed me...not the children...but the lesson planning/grading/time management. When I was a student at A&M I thought that I would have to get all my own materials/etc...I didn't understand that there would be textbook adoptions/ manipulative labs/etc..... I know it is hard because who knows where all the students will go to become teachers but maybe look at a few different districts and how they work...their pacing guides...their expectations...or have former students that now teach come back and talk about a Week in the Life of... I would love to do that!

• Include classes on behavior management techniques and require readings that help prepare students for what a classroom is really like (i.e. Wong's First Days of School)

• None! Dr. [X] and Dr. [X] are the reasons why I am so knowledgeable!!!!!

• None

• 1. Look in to how other statewide universities do their student teaching block. Both require students to spend part time at one level and another amount of time at a different level. This makes the student teacher assume more responsibility quicker and also gives them more guidance and information to use in their resume. 2. Allow the ESL program to become more aligned with what an actual elementary ESL general classroom teacher would come across. There are lots of neat strategies that several districts in Texas are
using that are not being discussed. 3. The Senior methods block prior to student teaching, needs to be focused more on lesson design based on what an actual classroom teacher would do to create a plan. Model how to pull resources from textbooks, outside sources, etc. Discuss resources to use and active engagement strategies. 4. Differentiation is not discussed enough.

• Cost.
• I would incorporate more instruction for children who are struggling academically and SPED students.
• I would include a course over Math Investigations and how to teach it as many schools in Texas are adopting this curriculum for math (mine included!). I also think a course on the positive behavior incentive system, CHAMPS, would be beneficial, as well.
• increased instruction on classroom management increased instruction on working with students of different ethnic & cultural backgrounds
• More classes in classroom discipline/management, more time spent on how to deal with other teachers, principals, parents, problems students, tips on getting organized, etc.
• I think that the real teaching experiences were more valuable than time spent in class. I think that classes should focus on real issues in classrooms and should be a place to talk about student's experiences in the field (methods/student teaching).
• I would offer more courses for learning about math and science in the elementary setting. The courses should be available for at least an elective choice. However, I feel that if offered they should be required.
• With regards to the integration of technology, teachers should be aware of the tools that are available to them. Moodle, Comic Life, Inspiration, I-movie, and many other
computer programs should be introduced to teachers to make them aware of the resources available.
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Strengths – Secondary Graduate Certification Program (current students)

• One-on-one education with professors who know what theatre education is like.
• I appreciate that the classes are offered as distance education. That helps a ton when everyone lives so far from campus.
• Great teachers, a highly respected program, and lots of support from not only our professors but from the interaction we had with our fellow students becoming teachers. The summer program is great because we made so many connections with people who are going through the same things as we are at the same time.
• The instructors are readily available, and the course work is a manageable amount making it easy to work and go to class. I also liked all the encouragement the instructor gave us and their positive feedback. The instructor were always very positive and encouraging.
• It totally prepares you for the classroom and gives you everything you need to know to be a good teacher. It has also been an easy process to apply, a relaxed and friendly environment, good work load, and not so stressful that it distracts from my teaching job.
• I wasn't in the undergraduate program education program at TAMU. I joined the post-bacc program after I graduated from the TAMU College of Veterinary Medicine
• I was not in the undergrad education program at A&M.
• The professors are really accessible, and very quick to respond to questions that we had. They, also, were very amenable to our stretching our creative wings. If we wanted to try something new they always encouraged us and asked for a full report for future cohorts! I really enjoyed the professors. I was not such a fan of some of the courses. I thought that
the two reading classes that we had to take could have been confined into one.

- It allowed for a different major and another minor.
- It prepares you better in the subject you are planning to teach and it has reputation.
- Don't know, did not do undergraduate education work.
- Preparing you for a diversity of ideas and beliefs.
- Creates a good environment for learning- lots of support
- The undergraduate program is dedicated to supporting its students.
- The staff at TAMU provide more than enough support and positive feedback to teachers in the classroom. This is increasingly important because as a first year teacher their support is vital.
- N/A
- It is beneficial to be grouped with other future teachers who are in the same boat as us. I made a lot of friends who are probably more helpful than the courses even are sometimes. Sharing war stories in a relaxed environment is also helpful because we can give each other good ideas that have actually worked in the classroom.
- It makes new teachers very aware of the realities of teaching in a public school classroom. There are lots of knowledgeable people who can help you, share stories, and keep you motivated.
- Two of the main strengths of this program is that it is highly respected by Texas districts and the advisers are former teachers. This helps in getting jobs and receiving effective feedback in teaching.
- I like the cohorts that we have. I feel as if I have some good friends that teach at other schools who know what I am going through. Also this program to a certain extent does
prepare you for some things that happen in teaching.

- Courses set up to prepare you as best without actually experiencing being in the classroom
- Personal touch of the instructors
- I think it is a strong program that funnels easily in to obtaining a Master degree for those willing to put in the extra effort.
- It really taught information that was applicable and really helped prepare me for the classroom.
- Availability of instructors and advisers.
- It prepared me for the work that I would do in my graduate courses, but was also a good way to figure out if this was the career path for you.
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Challenges – Secondary Graduate Certification Program (current students)

- Advising.

- Attempting to find a job without having student teaching already completed was probably the biggest challenge. Most of the schools in the area I was searching for jobs refused to interview persons who had not completed student teaching.

- The prerequisites. The classes themselves were not difficult but the fact that there were 9 hours to fit in during my time as an undergraduate made me postpone graduation a semester.

- I feel like there were no instruction techniques every taught. Classroom management needs to be addressed. I think their need to be some lesson devoted to working in low social economic school. We need adivce on how to handle students. I think it would also be helpful to walk us through how an effective classroom should be run and provide suggestion. Showing not telling is always more effective.

- I don't really have anything negative to say about the program.

- The biggest challenge was the distance, but it wasn't that big of a challenge.

- Going into the classroom with no teaching experience. When I decided to do this program, I was told that one of the prereq courses would sit in a teacher's classroom while she taught. I was excited by this because I would be able to see a classroom through a teacher's eyes before I was actually the teacher. Any other time I had been in a classroom, I was the students: things are quite different. I did not like that this was changed; therefore, I really didn't know what to expect when I went into the classroom on the first day of school--so much has changed since I was in high school. I wish I had been
able to observe before I was the teacher.

- I think that there should be a refresher, or even a more rigorous education law course during the master's work. I was a bit annoyed with the ESL course we were told we probably wouldn't have many ESL kids, yet the other subject cohorts didn't have to take one? That didn't make sense to me. We really could use a course on education law, though.

- I really have not seen any challenges with the program it is extremely flexible with people's schedule which makes it so great.

- Now spending enough time teaching before entering the classroom.

- Getting online and doing stuff in a town where the internet is not available and if it is, it is very slow.

- Need more field experience and practice in managing a classroom, not just guidelines on doing it.

- preparing you for all of the little things. No one can prepare you for the paperwork and the phone calls and all of the little things we have to do on an everyday basis.

- Passing the GRE

- The biggest challenges is probably keeping track of the large amount of students in the program.

- Getting teachers the tools and knowledge they need for the first day of school, because most of the members have not been in a classroom as a teacher before.

- Lack of support for the English/Language Arts, Spanish, and Communication teachers. No actual experience with classroom management.

- Sometimes it feels like we are paying a lot of money just for a piece of paper. Sometimes
the instruction is not relevant or is not helpful in real-world situations. The assignments are often just a nuisance instead of something that actually helps me to learn more about teaching.

• It would help to focus on some of the smaller things in the classroom too, like make up work procedures or where to place the pencil sharpener.

• Since there is no student teaching component it felt like I was just being thrown into the lions den. The program cannot really help out with that. Going over all the different scenarios was helpful but in no way prepared me for what was to come.

• Keeping up with everything while going through the first year of teaching.

• Not enough opportunities to teach locally. In other words there should be a stronger partnership between A&M, and [school districts]. I think they feel that students will only stay a year or two and move on, while a lot of students will stay put if they are given a warm welcome. I had to move to another area of the state to teach, and while I am happy here, I had lived in the B/CS area for many years and would have preferred to stay local.

• I had a difficult time finding a job for the 2009-2010 school year since I was not certified yet and had not had any teaching experience.

• Distance learning.

• I think the biggest challenge was not having any prior classroom experience.

• finding a job while doing the work. It was a challenge and, while most of them didn't have a problem with it, one professor was irritated when we left class to field a call, or hopefully field a job offer!
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Strengths – Secondary Graduate Certification Program (current students)

- When applicants are taking the GRE, the TLAC office should tell every person that their scores must be in the top 25% percent of test scores for that particular day. I was not informed of this rule until months later, after I thought I was finished with the exam.

- Though two of my courses were labeled "TEFB" I never actually had any field experience. My first day of teaching high school was my first day in a high school classroom since I graduated high school in 2004. I felt confident, but others I am sure did not. Please make sure all courses with the "field-base" label actually have classroom experience attached to them.

- Visits to successful classrooms. We need to see observe several real classrooms with many different techniques. Too much is left up to trial and error. We received little helpful information that could be carried over to an actual classroom.

- It might be beneficial to actually spend time putting the math methods we learn about into practice, rather than only reading articles and talking about them.

- I have no suggestions for the program.

- I've found a lot of the information pointless. I feel like Saturday seminars are a waste of time. I'm not learning anything new but I'm made to drive an hour there and an hour back on my day off in order to hear other teachers (who also don't want to be there) talk about their experiences. I feel like we could easily do the same thing online without having to spend time and money driving to College Station.

- Allow students to observe a classroom for a certain number of hours before we are "thrown" into the classroom. I don't think student-teaching is necessary; I would have just
like to see how things ran, how lesson plans were created and implemented before I set foot into a classroom as a teacher. Yes, we talked about all of this in our 2009 summer classes, but there's only so much that can be learned until you actually see it for yourself.

- The ESL course. I also felt a bit like the English cohort was treated differently than the other cohorts. We didn't get as much attention from Dr. X.
- Have students teach lessons to the rest of the class.
- I would give everyone a skype account to make communication with other students easier.
- Make the prerequisite course that used field experience as part of the curriculum a required course, or have all the alternates to that course provide for field experience too.
- Try and teach more about the little things.
- None!
- I think requiring a one on one meeting with each student would be useful in directing us on the right path.
- NONE!
- More support for the English/Language Arts, Spanish, and Communication teachers.
- I have attended a few classes of professional development in my district and they were infinitely more helpful than our graduate classes because they focused on theory (lesson planning, for example), then they let us work on our own projects and assisted us with those and provided feedback. So I actually felt I could apply what I learned. I think it would also be nice if one of the requirements of our program was to have us choose our own professional development books to read (like Teaching with Love and Logic or books on teaching our subject, etc.) and do assignments or reflections based on those.
That way we would feel more able to direct our own development, which is like what I am doing now because our class is not necessarily helpful in the needs I have day-to-day in the classroom. This self-selection method would also make the online discussions more positive (rather than a waste of time where we are all basically saying the same things) because we could share what we learned and see what insights other materials have and what direction we might want to take our development individually. And we should also have more opportunities to provide more feedback about the course because we could communicate ideas like this in time for it to make a difference.

- I think it works very very well!
- During the summer, we shouldn't have all our classes every day.
- I would not play favorites.
- Design courses that are more centered around instruction, rather than just on what we can expect to see.
- None, great program.
- Help TLAC students understand and map out their graduate degree plan early. Other programs available at the Bush School and Mays Business School offer a five year BS/MS or BBA/MBA combination degree plan. I already had an undergrad degree but took my core courses along with my graduate courses and while I will finish on track, it has not been easy to understand or complete the requirements. I have sometimes felt like I am imposing on the advisory staff by asking questions and trying to figure this system out, while all I was really seeking was information on how to finish what I signed up for. A well defined blue-print for success would have been very helpful.
- none at the time.
• Nothing.

• I think that an education law class would be handy as grad students, just familiarize everyone with what we are bound by and so that we will really understand our contracts with the schools and the state!
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Strengths – Secondary Graduate Certification Program (former students)

- N/A
- My undergraduate education in the Department of History at Texas A&M was extremely strong in teaching me how to understand history. The courses I completed helped me to find and sort through information and then analyze the information taking possible bias into consideration.
- The accessibility to courses (online for those not living in College Station); Wonderful professors and staff who are friendly, knowledgeable, and supportive
- Dr. [X] is your strongest asset, without a doubt the man helped shape my first year teaching. They were understanding of all the things needed for all the students in his class to be successful. They knew that the first summer in the master's program was hard and that we were all worried about our first year but they made everyone feel as though we would all make it and really was there for us. I am glad to have them as a mentor.
- They are taught by well-educated professionals who are familiar with what teaching involves and know what information would be helpful to us as future teachers.
- N/A. My undergraduate degree was not in Education.
- Dr. [X] - is a great mentor and it was obvious that [they] care about students. [They] also gave very practical advice to the program participants which is useful. The emphasis on teaching technology is also good.
- The strengths are definitely in its people. [X] and [X] helped me learn so much about how to handle a classroom, with no nonsense. They cut through all of the academic
theories and jargon to the real heart of why we become teachers - to teach students and graduate kids. They taught me so much about classroom management and caring about students.

• Dr. [X] was the biggest strength. Without a doubt they care about the students who came through to program and worked with them on an individual basis to make sure their needs were met. I still highly recommend the program because of this professor. I was able to easily finish my Master’s Degree at the end of this program since I had much of my course work done early. I finished my Bachelor's Degree in a little under four years and therefore the program allowed me to get a jump start on the work during the spring of my final undergraduate year.

• Meet other people in my field that I can call on for help and support.

• graduate advisors

• I did not have much experience with the undergrad teaching program.

• N/A my undergraduate program was not in TLAC

• The program has great professors who truly care- years later, I can still ask them for assistance. I appreciated the reputation of the program and its ties with great school districts, such as a local district and a regional district.

• I loved working with teachers who were in touch with what was going on. [X] was really the one who exemplified this for me. They obviously cared about us greatly

• I was just discussing this yesterday with a co-worker who is working on her Doctorate through the TLAC department. We were both in agreement that the Master's of Education degrees from A&M were a bit of a joke. The classes just required you to go through the motions and the formalities and when you were finished you were awarded your degree.
As an undergraduate, my classes were challenging. I worry that lack of rigor will lessen the value of my degree.

- I was not a part of the undergraduate education program at Texas A&M University. I received my Bachelor of Science degree from the Dwight Lock College of Engineering in Electrical Engineering. The only undergraduate education course that I took was a mini-semester course. It was very informative and extremely fast paced, but it was foundational information that I needed to know prior to starting the cohort secondary graduate certification program at Texas A&M University.
- I was not an undergraduate education major.
- Variety of courses
- The biggest strength of the undergraduate education program at TAMU is definitely the professors. Professors are challenging, yet caring, accessible, and helpful. One class that was particularly interesting and helpful was INST [XXX]. I feel ashamed that I can't remember the professor's name because they did such a great job!
- They not only teach the art of teaching, but they make sure you know how to care for your students.
- tough classes
- I used it as a time to test and see if teaching was for me. Since we have field-based classes, you are truly able to see if you want to make a career of teaching.
- N/A
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Challenges – Secondary Graduate Certification Program (former students)

• Lack of experience in the classroom environment by the students before they begin teaching. I had zero hours of field experience when I arrived at my school.

• Becoming recognized by all school districts as the amazing program that it is.

• Being qualified to take the content area test that will allow you the greatest opportunity to be hired. Also, I believe it is important for students enrolling in this program to know that not all school districts are open to hiring teachers in internship programs. This is a misconception I entered the program with and found it to be very discouraging along with the guest speakers who made it clear that a Social Studies teacher would almost HAVE to be a coach to get hired and History only certification will be nearly impossible.

• The nature of education itself has changed (and is changing). This problem does not belong to A&M alone - every program needs to create a program that keeps up with those changes.

• The online courses were hard because the professors were consistently hard to get a hold of. I want to opportunity to call my professor because sometimes emails take so many tries to get across what you want and and to understand what they want. I want to be able to have a conversation with you for you to understand what I am asking you and for me then to ask questions when I get your response. More than once the professors told me that they could not call me back that I could only correspond through email, one of my professors wasn't even in the country and could not get onto webct for the longest time. Most professors assigned so many assignments and then did not keep up with grading so
we would be six to ten assignments ahead of grading and not being able to change how
we were doing the assignments or see how the professor was grading. Too many
assignments for most classes not because of the work but because the professors could
not keep up with the grading.

• Perhaps the biggest challenge is that it does not provide a semester of student teaching, so
that first year teachers in the program may not have any prior experience in the
classroom.

• Many of the instructors have been out of the schools for so long that it's tough for them to
accurately prepare us to go out into our own classrooms.

• It really was not extremely challenging. They were very attuned to our needs and time
constraints. I never felt overwhelmed with school work in addition to my job as a 1st
year teacher.

• Some of the courses I took were a waste of time - the cultural course and the reading
course - both of which would have been useful to me in my current situation had I had a
good experience in those courses. Also the classes don't truly prepare you for what
teaching is really like

• I took almost 200 hours of coursework over 5 years at Texas A&M University. In only
two classes did I ever have trouble with professors. In the "computer" class that was
mandatory for this program, I had a professor that truly did not care about their students.
Although this was four summers ago in the year of 2006, I still remember how they
treated me and this was a lasting impression as you can tell. In this class the major
project was to complete an internet site online. We were to work in partners with each
partner receiving the same grade. This professor routinely tried to manipulate me in the
classroom and failed to give my partner and myself the same grade. My partner went on
toe receive an A on the project and I received a C. I was a straight A student throughout
the program, but was a little disheartening.

- Paying for it. During the summer it was really hard to work enough to cover my bills and
have time for school. (I pay for my own schooling)
- disconnect between content professors and the students
- accessibility of the program.
- Not doing a student teaching and going straight into an internship. I feel that is the best
way to learn especially if the person has had some prior experience in the classroom
(subbing, tutoring, etc). However, if a person has had no classroom experience it can be a
bit overwhelming.
- More marketing- when I was in the program, few people seemed to know about it.
- Participation in such a large group is tough sometimes. There is less accountability.
- I really didn't perceive any challenges that weren't resolved within the program. I think, if
anything, it would be the distance Dr. [X] had to drive in order to observe me and other
colleagues, but [they were] able to observe me in class three times throughout my first
year of teaching. I felt the program was very thorough and managed to provide all
necessary and practical information to pre-service teachers. I've met other teachers going
through other programs and felt that I was at a great advantage and was better prepared
for the classroom.
- Communications with professors and staff during the school year when not teaching in
College Station.
- I don't see any big challenges with the post-bacc program. I felt it was a great program
for people like myself who were very competent in their subject area and simply needed guidance for teaching and a certification.

- None
- I believe if there was a way to incorporate more live setting teaching experiences, the educational experiences for the teacher would be more beneficial.
- None
- For me it was just making it to class over the summer. The classes were interesting and engaging where we learned a lot, but summer school has never been easy for me.
- The research project was very time consuming. I taught nearly 200 students in a new school. The school was still in the process of organization and so forth which made it difficult as I went through several class changes (the school spent an entire semester working out the master schedule).
- need more experience before entering classroom, something like an internship or student teaching
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Suggestions – Secondary Graduate Certification Program (former students)

• Require that students spend 10-20 observing hours in a variety of classrooms in the grade and subject they are seeking certification in prior to beginning graduate courses. Offer better methods of managing a classroom. This is the hardest part of teaching but one of the least taught in the program. The weekend courses were not very valuable. I spent 15 hours on the road round trip for the weekend seminar, but we only were in class for 1 - 3 hours and it was not very valuable.

• Please see the above answer regarding question #117.

• I have two suggestions: one broad, one specific. In general, the level of rigor and difficulty of the program needs to be amped up. A&M is not alone in this, as most education programs in our state (and country) do not adequately weed out people who should not be teachers. (I do not apologize for suggesting that NOT every person who wants teach should.) Our programs need to be more rigorous, if we truly want to change the reputation of teachers. A specific area for change would be the stress the integration of technology (including cell phones and iPods, or other music players) into instruction. These devices are a part of our society, but most teachers have no idea how to "control" their use in the classroom. They have their place, and students have to be taught APPROPRIATE use - not given restrictions which say "NO USE!" For students to be taught this, teachers need to be given instruction and ideas for incorporation.

• Courses should be consistent. If you take a course with one professor and someone takes the same course in the same master's program that course should be very similar. I understand that two professors are never going to teach a course the same exact way, but
classes should be similar. One class should not have a 10 page essay and another only 5, one should not have any test while the other has 3 scantron test that are much more difficult than showing up for a luncheon, and one class should not have a completely different set up including different books and different assignments than its counterpart. The course has the same name and should be similar to it's counterpart.

- Put more of a focus on preparing teachers for how to look for available jobs and provide resources to become employed as a teacher.
- I loved the program and felt very supported throughout.
- perhaps a mini-internship with a certified teacher (even two weeks would be long enough) in which the teacher actually lets you lead class and deal with issues would be useful. Sort of like student teaching but it isn't necessary to do a whole semester.
- I just loved it all. The online courses were perfect for after my internship, as I had moved away from College Station. The action research project and threaded discussions helped me focus on school while also teaching, and gave me a place to put my creativity. The discussions also allowed me to vent.
- I would suggest that the program continue to run very similar to the way it has in the past. I feel this was a great part of my educational experience at Texas A&M and I owe a lot of it to Dr. [X].
- It would be nice if we had some sort of network of Aggie Teachers who went through the program - that way I would know where I could get help when I am looking for a job.
- do not make promises about final exams that you cannot keep!
- more advertisement
- Have more communication on a regular basis with the tlac mentor.
• None!

• If we could be grouped into similar school size and/or socio-economic situations (projected) then I think we'd have an easier time relating to one another. I did love making the webquest and use that in my class.

• It needs to be more challenging.

• I'd say keep up the great work. I think this program is amazing and I hope that Texas A&M University continues to develop great teachers. I know my old high school was very pleased with my performance and was very eager for more teachers from Texas A&M's Secondary Graduate Certification program to head their way in a local city school district. In regards to a previous question on this survey, it asked what I was currently certified in but it didn't give Mathematics as an option. I'm currently certified in Mathematics 8-12. Also for the questions based on my current school I based on the school I taught at last year. Currently, I'm completing my last three courses required for my MEd, transferring my certification out of state, and thus, am not working.

• The program tends to assume that students already know all of the basic information, and some not so basic information. Many times I felt like I was the only one lost when the professor would mention a theory or technique and ask if we already knew what it was and several people would nod and [they] would move on. People coming into a secondary certification, do so because they don't already have a teaching degree, and I wish that they had covered the basics better.

• None. I am a big fan.

• None

• I would like to see more field experience.
• Give Dr. [X] a raise
• I would add just a little more about the laws that teachers are subject to. This is not an exciting topic, but I think they could spend a little more time talking about it.
• Classroom management is the most important thing for students to learn before entering the classroom. I think it would beneficial to emphasize the area more. Otherwise I was very happy with the program.
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Strengths – Master’s Program (current students)

• the professors

• The master's program is flexible and accessible for both full time and working part time students. The urban ed cohort seems much more cohesive and supportive of each other, which is a strength. Professors from each different strand of study are accessible to all students.

• The program allows people who cannot come to College Station to take online classes.

• Its easy, and there are diverse professors with whom to work.

• strong foundation and great professors

• the curriculum

• The professors and advisors are very passionate about they do. They know through experiences in the school systems and classrooms what kind of things we should expect.

• Small classes Experienced Instructors Flexibility with the various programs

• The professors really get to know the students and care for their education and job
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Strengths – Online Master’s Program (current students)

- Flexibility of taking various classes.
- Online education is a more comfortable environment for me personally. I am more able to express my true feelings and opinions and receive valid feedback.
- The professors seem very knowledgeable.
- Accessible
- As a former student familiar with Texas A&M's College of Education, I was thrilled to work towards a M.Ed. at the same institution with familiar faculty. The online program has been especially helpful because I lived within driving distance of College Station when I began my program, but moved before my second semester in grad school. I also believe that an online program is more flexible than attending classes at scheduled times. I am able to complete my work on my schedule.
- Ability to pursue a degree that would otherwise be impossible for me as I am a full time educator.
- The schedule flexibility, as a student I get to interact with people from a variety of backgrounds and with various professional experiences.
- Ability to do my class work when I get home from work and on the weekends. I am able to do the work on my own time.
- With a full-time job as a teacher, the online program allows me to work on my own time, rather than having to attend a class on campus, which would require travel time, too.
• Receiving a quality education while not having to relocate.
Challenges – Master’s Program (current students)

- The issue of diversity seems to be all talk, when there is not diversity amongst faculty, staff, and reading assignments. Diversity at A&M also seems to focus on race rather than gender, orientation, religion, socio-economics, ability, etc. The program, much like Aggieland in general, seems ethnocentric and narrow. I take issue with stereotypes and tokenism perpetuated in "multicultural" classes, especially in the undergraduate classes for which I assist as a TA. [X] is a discriminatory bigot. Why do we continue to require [this] book about poverty for all undergrads?

- Having all classes listed and available when registration begins – having enough seats in each course

- There is not a feeling of community here. The classes focus to much on specifically being a teacher rather than other areas of education (curriculum developer, administrator, working in the field of education with a company or nonprofit).

- Lack of diversity, lack of interdepartmental overlap, lack of funding, and that it seems specifically geared toward pre-service teachers, less attentive to mid-career, experienced educators.

- 1st, English language  2nd, the somewhat strange teaching and learning process

- Language and socialization with classmates

- The biggest challenge I have faced is not finding a job. With the economy the way it is, many districts have cut back and sub jobs have been slim in my area. I also feel that I will not have all of the coursework done in order to get my Master's on schedule.

- The Master's program along with the school are very large. People fall through the cracks
when first getting started in the program. Many mistakes were made as my account was set up. For example, I was put in the system as a foreign student and not an American student. This caused much trouble when trying to register for class. Also, it took extremely too long to receive an answer as to whether or not I had been accepted into the program. Because of this, I was not able to begin school as I had originally planned and it put a huge strain on me as I attempted to find a job and a place to live on such short notice.

• Balancing full time job and the course work
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Challenges – Online Master’s Program (current students)

• Lack of communication between advisors and students. Lack of accessibility of advisors. Classes being full at 10 people and having to email professors many times before being able to get a class. Extremely inconvenient!

• Number of classes offered. When registering for my 2nd semester (Took the 3 core classes this fall) and struggled to find classes available online which are listed as part of the recommended degree plan.

• The course availability. I have had issues every semester with courses not being offered, or not enough space in the courses that are offered.

• Many of the professors do an excellent job of giving feedback and answering questions. In some of the classes, I receive very little feedback and unsure about the expectations. It is difficult to make modifications and improvements if you receive so little feedback.

• The cost You can go to Lamar University - finish in 18 months taking one class at a time for only $5,000. I work with 5 other people getting their master’s. All 5 with Lamar for this reason.

• I have taken one or two courses where I received very little feedback and communication from professors. Registering for my classes has also been a frustrating experience since A&M switched to the Howdy system. I have also been uncertain about expectations as I complete my program. A timeline including information such as when to file a degree plan, when to find a committee, when to complete
comprehensive exams, etc. would have been helpful.

- During the last 3 semesters I have felt that I am just being funneled into classes and had not real choices or had to take classes I had no interest in. Once the basic courses were out of the way, my choices were extremely limited.

- There are not enough seats in each section, the classes fill up fast and there's less of a choice about what classes I can take.

- The face to face interaction is important and is hard to replace with chat rooms and discussion threads.

- Trying to register for courses I need. For example, I could not take any during the summer session because too few were offered and the closed very quickly. As a I am working full-time, the summer is prime time to take classes so this was frustrating.
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Suggestions – Master’s Program (current students)

• 1) Soft "multiculturalism" does not undo racism.  2) I think there needs to be more collaboration amongst departments and colleges. A requirement that at least one grad class come from a different department may help.  3) The Master's program seems specifically geared toward students who are continuing work from their undergrad, catering to the needs of pre-service teachers, without addressing the needs of older, experienced teachers who have left teaching to pursue grad school. The content and rigor seems lacking as a result.  4) Not enough aid/scholarships.

• -more classes offered each semester

• Classes should pertain more to all careers involving education.

• Separate the two tracks for some of the courses: pre-service and experienced educators. While all students have valuable thoughts to add to the discussion, it feels like training wheels for those who have been in the classroom for a while. In particular, courses such as Analysis of Teacher Behavior, Curriculum Development, etc. It is tedious to have a conversation when more than half of the class disclaims every contribution with the sentence "I'm not sure because I've never had my own classroom, but I think..." Also, there is little funding to support students.

• None

• better instruction

• For subs, I think the internship class should require a bit more of us. Getting sub jobs everyday is not a guarantee so I feel I should not be graded just based on that. I think maybe those of us having to sub should have to submit maybe a journal entry for the days
we do sub (our experiences, what methods do/don't work, etc).

- Double check to make sure students are registered correctly in the system to avoid major mistakes that could cost them more time and money.

- It seemed like most professors cared, but Dr. [X] didn't seem to care about us.
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Suggestions - Online Master’s Program (current students)

• Notice at the beginning of the degree program as to when students should register for their initial classes for their first semester.

• I think there should be more required support for job searching and career advice. Resume building and cover letter creation is a very important aspect of graduation, and I have not had any help in this area. With this being an online program, there should be support available at a distance, not in person.

• I would suggest that all professors give feedback on assignments within 2 weeks of the assignment's due date. This would enable students to learn from past assignments and would improve the quality of future assignments.

• I would appreciate receiving fewer mass emails from [X]. It would be great if I only received emails that were relevant to me and the program I am in.

• Add more class choices past the basic courses.

• Offer more classes online. Open the distance learning sections to students that don't live in College Station before opening them to local students.

• N/A

• More sections or more seats in sections.
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Strengths – Master’s Program (former students)

• online classes

• The program was accessible/flexible enough that I was able to find a job in Corpus Christi when there were no options in the College Station area.

• Reading, writing, and reviewing scholarly articles in the education field, including using APA style and formatting.

• +Research +Mentoring +Advising +Teaching

• Being up to date on the current trends in Education.

• Great support from advisors/professors Accomodating schedule/course structure Great practical advice/strategies for beginning teachers

• The advisors cared about their students.

• Many course options.

• Flexibility. I was able to find classes when I needed to take them with a wide variety of delivery techniques.

• Easy to transition from an A&M undergrad to Master’s program. The Post-Bacc program was also geared to getting a teacher in the field asap which was an excellent bonus. I liked that it didn't put off work another year.

• Dr. [X]

• The degree covered was very comprehensive. Often times I encounter concepts that were first presented to me during my graduate work. It has made me very confident when discussing education related issues in my career. I am seldom intimidated and I attribute that to the education I received through TLAC.
• It was flexible, in that I could specialize in science instruction and the course offerings were diverse and useful. The good classes were excellent.
• Widely respected, emphasis on research, excellent content area courses
• The opportunities to work and share my own professional issues with other graduate students was an excellent part of the program. Dr. [X] did an excellent job of preparing his graduate students for the "real world" of the classroom. They didn't candy-coat anything...explained it like it was, which enabled me to be more prepared for the work place.
• Well informed and prepared instructors. Friendly and professional atmosphere. Being held to high standards. Great experience.
• Great instructors
• I believe the advisors were very helpful and providing advice and direction to me as an aspiring inexperienced college student trying to prepare for a job in public education. The ability to earn hours towards a graduate degree while working on a teaching certificate. Because once I started teaching, I would not have finished my master’s if not for the hours I had already obtained. I have seen how difficult it is for classroom teachers to go back to school and earn a master’s and I feel it was a huge advantage for me to complete my master’s after one year of teaching.
• I liked the convenience of the program in conjunction with my first year of teaching. The professors were very helpful and understanding of our busy schedules.
• The program was academically rigorous in that readings, projects, and papers were comprehensive. Professors in on-campus classes were accessible and supportive. I took and passed the Reading Specialist's exam without difficulty.
• Professors were willing and available to help when I needed it.
• presentation training
• Variety of choices for classes to take.
• The "paid internship" whereby prospective teachers are assisted in finding employment where they are employed for a year while continuing classes and are monitored by TAMU faculty.
• I liked the cohort program because I didn't have to travel too much. I also liked my classes and my professors were very knowledgeable about their curriculum. They were very helpful and I enjoyed all of my classes.
• The flexibility - of all the schools I have attended, this program allowed me to truly pick classes based on interest. I had a minimum of required classes which tended to be my dullest
• The individualized attention I received in my non-core classes, I learned so much.
• Dr. [X]
• There is diversity in the course selections. In addition to the diversity in courses offered, the instructors are knowledgeable, professional, and well prepared for their courses.
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Challenges – Master’s Program (former students)

- flexibility in course work; class scheduling over the semesters; being told ahead of time what semesters classes will or will not be offered
- The community and surrounding communities are not big enough to support the number of education majors that come out of university.
- Transitioning between the Master's program and the workforce - helping students switch from being a student to having a career.
- None
- Making the information needed to complete all of the requirements, i.e. degree plan, committees, easily accessible.
- The ESL course was the only course that I believe wasn't practical/relevant
- There were not enough teaching opportunities in Texas to give everyone in the program a job as a teacher.
- The program is weak all around. Students are not held accountable for learning. Weak attempts at doing the material are rewarded. High standards were not set for students. The curriculum was not demanding however it did access up to date research in the respective courses. I took several online courses. With the exception of EDTC, the courses were a joke. Faculty rarely participated and the level of student interaction was "what was just required." In one course I actually submitted a paper that asked the instructor if [they were] reading the paper. [They ]clearly was not since the paper was a repeat of the first paper, just had a different title. I did do the real paper, because I was
interested, but the faculty member could not even bother to read a research paper that was half of the grade. This was not atypical.

- Finding the time to coordinate working full time and complete a master’s degree
- The future of public school budgets and bureaucracy.
- My area is Spanish...there was nothing for Spanish majors/future teachers.
- The Master’s program was great.
- It is very expensive, especially the on-line offerings. Some of the teachers were very good, but a few of the on-line classes never provided any feedback. I can imagine that a student who is not a self-learner would have struggled.
- The biggest challenges, I believe may be making the core courses relevant to teaching and learning in today's classroom. Many of my core courses dealt heavily with pie-in-the-sky ideals and theories that were not practical in my everyday work. I would like to see more emphasis in child psychology, learning theory and brain research, in which I had surprisingly little training (either in my undergraduate work as a middle grades ed major or in my graduate work in math education).
- Time constraints. Some of the courses during the summer cohort were only offered at one (and only one) time, which meant scheduling issues for those of us with families. I had 3 children at the time...and was pregnant with the fourth child. The one and only time slots for some of the summer courses made it difficult for some of us.
- I feel the biggest challenge with the TLAC master's program would be the professor/student ratio. (Specifically within the ESL area). This is not relating to class size, but to advisors and advisees. The advisor I was originally placed with never contacted me, rarely returned emails/phone calls, and because [they] only met me 2 times
(the initial meeting, and then at my thesis defence!), [they] didn't even recognize my face enough to say "hello" in the hallway. I'm not sure if there are not enough professors to go around to be an advisor, or if [they] just [weren't] an attentive advisor. But this was a major problem in my graduate studies. Thankfully, other professors with whom I took classes advised me, helped me, and made sure I was on the right track.

- daily commute
- None
- Advertising the program to the student body. I believe more students would enroll in the program if they knew about it.
- A big challenge for me was and is not having student teaching experience. Most schools looking to hire are skeptical of my lack of student teaching. It has not inhibited my job acquisitions, but it did bring up questions.
- 1. Helping practitioners develop plans and or research for utilizing evidenced based literacy instructional practices in differentiated instruction. 2. Integrating more meaningful lecture/discussion and learning opportunities in online classes including more feedback from instructors throughout discussion boards and after assignment submissions.
- Some online course professors (not the hy-brid) were unclear of their expectations and unwilling to talk about issues I was having.
- Reading and paper writing
- Not enough courses offered in the evening. As a teacher working full-time, it was very difficult to get to some of my classes on-time, and there were some courses I was unable to take due to the time they were offered.
• How spread out students (teachers) are and the requirement of faculty to visit and mentor them on their job. This is one of the most important but also challenging problems facing TAMU.

• The courses offered are so limited. With the limitation and the schedule class, students end up taking things they are not interested in.

• Please stop using [X]'s book for curriculum course. It is so dense and boring.... I hated that class so much even though I got an A overall. I also didn't feel like that class was very realistic. The idealism of it all led to many grand ideas but left us with little instruction on how to even begin to implement them.

• My biggest problem was balancing a full-time special education job (which I currently have due to my undergraduate degree), graduate school, taking care of two small children, and taking care of my house.

• Sometimes the commuting is somewhat challenging for distance students.
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Suggestions – Master’s Program (former students)

• The program did give me flexibility, but I still had to drive from Corpus Christi for a summer class that could have been provided online. I don't know if more of the classes have been made available online, but that would definitely improve the program.

• communication; and inviting family to join events

• Provide/Emphasize career services available to graduate students. Also, I think there should be more oversight on committee members to ensure that they are more focused on helping students achieve success, rather than focused on their own success in writing and publishing papers.

• None

• Offer more online courses.

• Encourage more students to pursue this degree - it wasn't well publicized and I feel very fortunate to have found this program!

• Maybe take "field trips" to watch other teachers teach.

• Have the students connected on social networking sites like Linkedin.com or Facebook and continue to stay in touch. Have an advisor be a moderator for the group and foster a sense of online community.

• Add something to do with Spanish (& other areas of education). Have more interactive lesson planning with more feedback to REALLY prepare.

• The challenges seem to be with the doctoral programs. It seems that the programs would benefit from scheduling that permits those currently working in the field of education to simultaneously pursue a PhD. I've had to look to second tier universities for a doctorate.
due to scheduling of classes. I would have loved to continue my education at a top tier institution like A&M or UT, but I cannot afford to stop working full time to do that.

- Look around and price the degree programs from other universities and become a little more competitive. Offer master's programs at satellite campuses.
- None that I can remember.
- One thing I was slightly frustrated about was my research project evaluation. A large amount of work went into the project and I feel like it was not evaluated very well. A more formal presentation might be helpful.
- 1. Announce a two-year cycle of when classes, core and electives, will be offered. 2. An on campus reading clinic/lab that operated throughout the year.
- Clear expectations for online courses.
- More group study.
- Larger variety of evening classes offered.
- Continue everything they are doing, do more mentoring/monitoring of new teachers. I would like to see students who have graduated from this program and are currently teaching be recruited to do some further mentoring or support of graduating teachers. I think it would be possible to ask former graduates if they would willingly participate, create a database, and then when a new teacher receives an internship match them with a former graduate who is working nearby as an additional source of support and monitoring.
- Offer more classes so the students can take what they are interested in and benefit from every single class they take.
- The science education courses were not as accessible as I would have liked. In a couple
of cases, the faculty tried to plan too many classes as once which meant that the few students available spread out between the classes. Then all the science education classes got cancelled because they were too small! To be perfectly honest, I would have loved to have taken more science education courses than I got to because they were cancelled or only offered in the summer (which I could not afford).

- More tuition assistance
- Additional Urban classes.
- If more courses were offered online that would open up more opportunities for distance students.
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Strengths – Doctoral Program (current students)

- Competitions among peers
- most faculty seem to genuinely care about students
- Excellent professors  friendly environment
- The faculty have national reputations and serve as editors of journals. They are generally open to discussions outside of class.
- My chair is incredible and provides her/his graduate students mentoring that is properly scaffolded.
- The collegial environment is one of the strengths of the doctoral program here. I suppose the size and departmental course requirements make it easy to get to know our classmates across emphasis areas. Lastly, the faculty members are amazing as researchers and teachers...very approachable and willing to work with students.
- The faculty members that I have been taught by in my program specialty bring a strength. Also having a supportive department head and committee chair can really motivate a student to hang in there to complete the degree. Also having "high" minority representation of faculty is a strength compared to other departments on campus. Professional opportunities and encourage meant to go to conferences.
- Emphasis on completing the program; interactions among trans-disciplinary content areas
- I have not been in the program very long. Every professor that I have had has been extremely caring and very knowledgeable in their field.
- The staff and professors are very supportive of the students and want the student to
succeed.

- The professors are exceptionally knowledgable, respectful, and supportive. They are easily accessible and willing to answer questions and assist in any way possible.

- There are some prominent researchers that I can rely on as being my mentors.

- Leadership Emphasis placed on Technology Expertise of Faculty Mentoring Advising Professional Development Camaraderie Funding availability for Professional Conferences

- 1. The students you meet and interact with. 2. Some of the faculty are very good such as [Dr. X]. Out of all my courses from the department, [they have] been the best.

- The sense of family, the level of support, the knowledge of the professors

- It's fairly well-organized and appears to be very family-friendly, as well as accessible for nontraditional students. I've really appreciated the level of communication about seminars and events relevant to graduate students. [X] is just awesome and we (grad students) would be lost without them. It's nice that there are grad student travel awards available (more of them and larger amounts would be really nice).

- All of the profs I've had have been so knowledgeable and caring. Couldn't ask for better faculty! Love their diversity!

- Faculty

- The diversity of the faculty and their varying views. Specifically its human capital such as [Dr. X, Dr. X, Dr. X, and Dr. X], just to name a few.

- eminent professors, abundant resources, and facilities

- The professors in the TLAC program treat you with respect and are willing to go the extra mile for you when you need them. I feel as if I could talk with any of the professors
in the reading program at any time and that they would be honest with me and guide me in the right direction.

- The cohort aspect is a definite strength.
- There are plenty of available seminars to help doctoral students gain the knowledge of how research is conducted.
- Cultural components of the doctoral program are very much interesting. Interdisciplinary research interest is largely encouraged by the professors.
- In the area of reading, the profs are knowledgeable in the current research and trends. Very willing to help and assist in anyway! This is not limited to reading, but most time and interaction has been in that area.
- The collegial support among other PhD students; the administrative support to pursue professional opportunities; faculty who chair PhD committees seem supportive and committed to helping candidates finish their program/dissertation.
- Some amazing professors that have world-class credentials, yet are as humble and personable as they come!
- The few strengths about the TLAC program involve Dr. [X]. [They are] a wonderful faculty member with a heart of gold. Dr. [X] is another wonderful faculty member and a great advisor. Other than that there are no other strengths.
- Professors
- The Reading Department has some really well-known, well-published professors who are scholars in their specific fields. They have great content knowledge as well as far-reaching professional connections. The various opportunities to collaborate with several of these professors was not only beneficial to my future career but was much appreciated
as a novice researcher.

- The vast array of courses offered and the diverse philosophies of the professors who teach here.

- I don't have much experience with the TLAC Department at Texas A&M as I am about to finish my fourth course in the doctoral program. From my limited experience I find that the expected collegiality fostered by my professors is an undeniable plus for the program.

- good variety of professors

- We provide assistantships for most students. The faculty are passionate about their respective disciplines.

- Funding, support, and great faculty.

- It allowed me to remain a full time teacher and be a part-time A&M student; however, since I was off campus the academic world of research eluded me.

- One strength is that there are courses available in the evenings and on Saturdays that can accommodate the schedules of those students that work full-time.

- emphasizing research methods

- Accessibility of tenured faculty, size of program, and

- the professors

- One of the strengths of the Doctoral Program would be the desire for the professors to have their students succeed. There is a great deal of respect between students and professors. My professors have provided candid guidance and mentorship.

- Openness to diversity of opinion

- channel doctoral students to be familiar with other educational issues rather than my own doctoral specialization. It opens a door either to work in your area of interest or to work
in the area of education in general. That is why it is called Phd. in curriculum and instruction with specialization in science ed.

• Very approachable faculty who are experts in their field.

• The faculty and staff are very helpful.

• diversity of classes and research interests

• The degree to which support is available for students, as well as opportunities to gain financial assistance with attending conferences.

• There are services for everything - how to write a literature review, how to write a proposal, how to apply for funding, how to write a conference proposal. EVERYTHING!

• Strong interaction between cohort members because we have chosen to do so

• Too many to list.

• The professors from TLAC are well versed in their area of expertise and are always willing to help students further their studies through their help and guidance.

• Location, [Dr. X], library and on-line resources

• The rapport and communication established among all educators and students is a PLUS!

All faculty members have created a very friendly, at-ease environment that really encourages us to continue furthering our education and to seek our passions.

• I feel the major strength our program is the quality of the professors. They are very well respected and knowledgeable in their respective fields. They are approachable and personable, yet thorough and professional. All whom I have had, encourage a highly interactive approach in the classroom. No, they expect, almost demand student participation and interaction. This is a good thing as it helps build confidence and promotes open mindedness, not to mention exposing people to other lines of thought
• The committee members/SOME professors

• Most professors are accessible and provide learning opportunities that engage you.

• on-going support; immediate feedback when needed

• Respect from the professors and students in my department.

• The writing requirements from the professors allows us to be better, researched based scholars.

• I feel all but two of my courses I have grown.
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Challenges – Doctoral Program (current students)

• Writing the dissertation

• faculty seem greatly over-extended & unable to devote enough time outside of class to mentor graduate students; professors' social agendas and personal beliefs "turn off" many of our university's core student-constituency and stifle a true spirit of collegiality (there are only so many times you can be told that you aren't qualified to teach minority children due to the color of your skin, before you want to find a new doctoral program/school to work with); a lack of graduate student funding available(particularly)to non-minority students prevents prevents many great students from attending our University, or having the financial freedom to engage in quality research while here

• Due to the diversity of program areas, it is a challenge to create core courses that meet all of those needs. I felt the core courses were almost too broad, with one exception. [A core curriculum course] was too narrow, focusing on one theorist (Pinar). Since I entered the program new to the field of education, I would have liked for my courses to have included other key players (Dewey for example). Instead, I am seeking out his and others' work on my own.

• Some of the newer graduate students are not strong writers. Incoming students should be required to take a technical writing course at the start of their program unless they demonstrate outstanding writing abilities.

• The greatest challenge would be the inconsistent research course offerings. Occasionally
we'll offer a qualitative studies course, and then it will disappear for a while and perhaps show up again under a different name. That's quite frustrating...not knowing what to expect. I suppose having a research course that involves students in the complete experience--from identifying a problem, posing a question, developing a design, conducting the research, collecting data, to reporting the findings--would be invaluable.

- From the perspective of the student funding, room for growth and the dangers of idle conversations. While I understand completing the doctorate is not for everyone and that only the students possess the mental capacity, demonstrate their capability, as well as just endure the coursework and dissertation process, sometimes I feel like grad students in general across all programs are cheap labor. Its another burden when on top of the coursework and different projects a student already has to manage, the added worry of finding projects to support ourselves financially is stressful in itself. While I completely understand the 20 hour limitation in the TLAC department is designed to get us in and out, it is somewhat of a strain when students have to find outside work to get funded because the GRAs are just not paying enough. If you are trying to pick up a course to teach and tuition only is covered and not stipend, thats hours lost towards finding enough financial support. While a student could find other campus work for support, the 20hr rule may limit that. Of there is anything I have learned since I have been here, outside of travel funding opportunities, is that there is a price for every opportunity, no matter how meaningful. The consequence of giving up either more of your time or experiencing a pay decrease falls on the grad student's decision to accept it. In regards to conversations, I have had my earful about what this and that faculty member has said about a student or another professor, or have done. I personally would caution against such conversations,
because some have lead to defamation of character and interfered with a graduate student trying to find employment outside of TAMU. I do not think anyone would want to be held accountable for messing with someone's livelihood based on assumptions.

- The existence of very few students/professors within my particular content area; a lack of availability of appropriate advanced research courses; the lack of any kind of consistency among professors with regard to expectations of different students (i.e., different requirements/expectations for different students, based on program areas, full-time/part-time status, etc.); a lack of beneficial courses specific to my content emphasis area; too much focus on specific populations (i.e., English Language Learners, perceived minority groups, urban education, etc.), as opposed to ALL learners; a very obvious disconnect between the faculty/professors and their support for students (when compared to their focus on their own research, promotion/tenure-track, etc.); a very sterile "3rd Floor Harrington" environment, when compared with other programs--in other words, a tangible lack of focus towards relationship-building when compared to the disconcerting emphasis placed on grant-receiving, publication-producing, presentation-making endpoints.

- The biggest challenges that I have had with the Doctoral Program in the TLAC Department @ TAMU is getting into the correct classes. I see that EDCI [XXX] is being offered this spring 2010, and in a weekend format that I can take. I really hope that there are seats available for me by the time it is my time to register. It was very frustrating for all seats to be already taken in the distance or hybrid classes when it came time for me to register! Maybe that will be better this spring. However, there seemed to be plenty of seats available in STAT [XXX] and STAT [XXX], so I took that first! My biggest
challenge is the driving time and distance from my home to TAMU (90 miles each way), so I hope to take more on-line classes. However, driving to TAMU every Monday evening has given me a chance to experience The Blue Baker!, and you just can't experience that as well on-line!

- Budgeting time to complete assignments.
- Not sure. I have not noticed any.

- There is too much ambiguity in everything; it is somehow a chaotic place. Some people are inefficient, I feel I waste my time in some classes. Students have very low expectations about their responsibilities, although they are highly ambitious.

- University Funding needs to be increased for TLAC Programming

- The biggest challenge would be the support for doctoral students to graduate from their faculty chairs. Committee chairs waste too much time not responding the needs of the students. For example my chairs have not been responsive to my needs. It has taken 2 years for them to approve my dissertation proposal, considering I finished my last course in the Spring of 2008. I have published books and in peer reviewed journals on my own and have the skills to conduct research, however, my chairs do not work with me. This is my fourth year and I have serious doubts about graduating in May 2010, I doubt it will happen. I tried to get advice from one faculty in confidence, however [they] went back and told the very person I told [them] not to tell. How can you trust faculty when they reveal things you tell them in confidence to other faculty? This program should not and does not take more than 4 years however, my chairs have not been supportive and have often time ignored my communication for months at a time. My chairs are not supportive. This has led to a frustrating time in the TLAC program. I wish I had not
come to the department. If you all want to contact me about this please feel free.

• recruiting great professors

• The number of nontraditional students who have families or work full-time sometimes gives a feeling that more traditional/younger grad students are looked down upon. There are a number of people in the program (grad & faculty) who have been very negative towards grad students who are divorced or have gone through other hardship. Graduate assistantships/funding is a challenge university-wide, but TLAC is towards the bottom on funding amounts. In this economy, it's a struggle to continue to fund higher education and that struggle interferes with concentrating on grad school. There are several issues regarding favoritism of some students over others and a strict focus on K-12 teacher preparation only that has hindered my program from growing to a potential I know it has.

• Not sure-

• insufficient funding for assistantship, fellowship, and scholarship insufficient resource (e.g., computer lab)

• Appealing to more students who live outside of College Station.

• They are so unorganized. I feel like I am/was never informed of important information. My paperwork has been lost in the past. I have trouble getting a response from my personal advisors and the TLAC advisor.

• conducting the dissertation

• I would have to say that the biggest challenge that I have faced is dealing with money issues. Even with a graduate assistantship, I have a hard time making ends meet. It's frustrating and stressful.

• Balance of work, family and program work.
• I don't feel some professors believe that ALL students want to become a Ph.D. If a person in authority or a mentorship position doesn't believe that you can do what it takes to become that Ph.D., then it will never happen.

• As an international student of the first year, I assume that improving my English proficiency is still my primary concern. Since I have never majored in Education, these relevant theories, as well as the underlying philosophies are really challenging for me.

• Funding!!!! Even with a GA position, still a struggle and hinders the learning process. Some GA positions are unrealistic in the work load. Challenge: to complete degree in 3 years, but realistic in 3 1/2 to 4 years!

• One challenge is to move from a traditional knowledge preparation (common core, plus programmatic courses) into more flexible programs that support the blurring of knowledge and research among the disciplines. While programmatic discourse seems to have an importance for "territory" (financing), the divisions don't appear to be as useful when preparing for a PhD in Curriculum & Instruction.

• Helping first-generation Doctoral students navigate the waters of Doctoral study. It is a lot of figure-it-out-on-your-own and by chance. However, I understand I am different in ways from the full-time, on-campus-all-the-time Doctoral student: the graduate experience is different when one teaches full-time off-campus and pursues one's study after hours and on weekends.

• The challenges include a very unprofessional and unhelpful Graduate Advising Office. [X] and [X] are rude, disrespectful, unhelpful and unprofessional. I have never been so disrespected and treated in a non professional manner as I have by them. This needs to change. Second challenge is that the process of completing forms and other
documentation is not feasible students who don't live on campus. I live over 200 miles away from Texas A&M and have to drive up to turn in and or pick up a form to send to another department on campus. We are in the 21st century and this campus has no mean of a electronic communication system to send documents to various departments.

• Acquiring a seat in an on-line or hybrid class. Classes meeting less times for long periods of time to accommodate the driving students. TAMU is 95 miles one way from my residence. The week-ender EDCI [XXX] is a wonderful idea! (at least it seems so at this point)

• Initially the lack of communication for new doctoral students, however, it seems in the past year and a half there has been much progress made in this area.

• This is my first semester here so I don't feel qualified to answer this.

• keeping all students on a timeline

• not being connected after coursework ends

• It is (as most education programs are) very, very easy. With a 1 or 2 exceptions, I've found most of my classes completely unworthy of "doctoral" status; they would do for undergrads though. Fortunately, most of my content courses are in another discipline (in the humanities). The bar for admission to Texas A&M is shockingly low. We have seriously undermined the value of the diploma by letting some folks in. My area--culture and curriculum--is infested with constructivist post-moderns who are so amazingly intolerant of any other point of view...well, I would never recommend A&M to anybody interested in the field.

• PhD students need more informal contact with faculty to learn more about life in the academy.
• Keeping up with online course work and off campus students. Not many core classes were offered for distant learners.

• Being a full-time administrator, being a highly successful student and also having time for family, research and other outside interests.

• advisor or committees' guidance regularly

• publishing

• Informing everyone of time lines and requirements. navigating the TAMU system can be tough.

• i could not find any other doctoral students at the same field.

• The biggest challenge I have found with the Doctoral Program in the TLAC Department would be the challenge of balancing graduate assistant work with classwork.

• Working with a greater collegiality between doctoral students/practitioners- those working full time in education- and full time academics....At times it is tense.

Providing long distance learners with video taped access to meetings/seminars held during our working hours...many times great seminars are being held, but I am in my classroom 100 miles away.

• Some core courses along with their textbooks may be more reading or social science oriented for science/math grad. students rather than education in general.

• This is a two edged question - challenges for you - maintaining high standards of education. Standard for doctoral students - learning enough in their residency to propose and write a dissertation.

• Tuition is crazy.

• balancing classes and outside research
• Completing the program in a timely manner. It is more difficult and challenging than one would anticipate.

• Lack of guidance from some faculty. Everyone is worried about themselves and therefore they have little time to appropriate to the students who want to work with them. Professors teaching off the cuff and not planning; lack of guidance on how to do research. In my observations the professors do to doctoral students exactly what they write should not be done - sink or swim, one size fits all, "I did it now you do it" mentality. Oh, and more communication between professors in a discipline. In my program there are three primary researchers and they rarely exchange words. Each is his own island. There is no feeling of congeniality and partnership. Just individual scholarship.

• amount of readin/expected on-line time

• Dissertation

• Lack of courses for Master/Ph.D. combos.

• Speaking on behalf of a student who does not live in College Station and who is working full-time, but who welcomes education to move upward, the biggest challenge was to fulfill the residency requirement of living in College Station for a summer session. But, I must say that my committee chairperson helped immensely to accommodate the cohort with living arrangements and class schedule for the cohort to fulfill the residency requirement.

• Communication, red tape, class offerings, professors, awful building, the ECE plan is too focused on multi-cultural/bilingual/cultural issues.

• For those of us who are taking long-distance courses, it is a bit difficult not to have face-to-face interaction with the professors at times. It is very helpful that all of them are
prompt at responding our e-mails and some of them have actually provided us with their cell-phone numbers so that we can communicate with them.

- I would have to say the process wrapped around the dissertation, writing the proposal, and prelims are the only real challenges as such. The course work itself is a challenge, but we are prepared for that and have done that sort of thing our whole academic lives. The whole dissertation thing is totally new and different, especially if your master’s program was a non-thesis one. The committee selection, and subsequent communication/lack thereof is so totally critical to a timely completion of the PhD. This is even worse for a student who tends to put things off or get "busy doing other stuff". Another challenge closely related is the idea of a job, financial support, and blending academic, family, and professional lives. The inability to merge these and not knowing or being able to figure out how to narrow my dissertation topic and articulate it are the reasons I have not yet graduated. Sufficient it to say I have had some input here, but very little from my chair and most committee members. I am six months to eighteen months behind my projected date and will be at least eighteen months behind when I get my degree, at best.

- Finding a good chair

- Those professors who simply are not well-organized and show disrespect toward students and their interests.

- continued financing

- I had a lot of trouble finding classrooms in which to conduct my study. Other students have mentioned the same problem.

- Dealing with professors in other departments who do not understand how the research in my area works and how to help me translate it into different areas of research.
• Quantitative research. There needs to be a course that teaches the use of SPSS, how to analyze and how to write the data.
• Doing the program long distance
Appendix G-3

Future Employment (current doctoral students)

• small university, as a tenure-track associate professor or curriculum development/research assistance with a state education agency
• professor at a university
• Small college or university with a teaching focus.
• I shall be working as PostDoc researcher for a multimillion dollar NSF funded grant.
• I expect to be hired at a university as a professor and also as a professional development consultant for either a school district or a charter school.
• Currently I am unsure of what I will do with this degree. I do not have a strong interest to spend a career teaching in the classroom. I would like to work for a government agency.
• I plan to be hired as a professor within my emphasis area at an institution of higher education
• I envision myself being employed with my current employer, Navarro College, possibly in a higher position.
• Working in the staff development office of a school district.
• I desire to work at a Research I Institution as a professor.
• A post-doc position at a leading university; or a researcher at a private institute.
• I envision myself becoming a tenure-tracked university professor at a R-I institution within the U.S.
• Higher Education as an assistant professor on the tenure track.
• I would like to be employed as a professor in higher education.
• My goal is to become a professor at a small institution (possibly a community college or liberal arts college) that is supportive of research in the classroom. I'm most interested in teaching and doing research in higher education settings.

• Hopefully teaching in higher ed.

• Technology in education, Integration of culture and curriculum, Degree of English as a Second Language, Experience of faculty and professional development

• I would like to be a professor in a teacher education program.

• I will teach for a few years in the public school system, then work for a region or district. I intend to one day return to research.

• I'm not sure....either in academia or back to public education.

• probably in the U.S. or back to my country

• I see myself being employed in a higher education capacity teaching undergraduates and conducting research.

• Assistant Director Of Special Edcuation in a public school system or working for the state ina similar capacity.

• I plan to become an assistant professor at a university or a school district adminstrator.

• I wish I could be employed as a teacher of English, helping the students whose first language is not English.

• Administrative position / curriculum development / assistant super at a district level. Research position at state / federal level.

• Employment entirely depends on the view of the field. A first choice would be an asst. prof. appointment in an R-1 institution. Yet, a Carnegie II or teaching University that had PhD/EdD granting privileges would also be sought.
• Continue to teach high school, but begin applying for a position in high school administration (assistant principal)

• I plan to seek employment at a university as an assistant professor or a director level college administrator.

• I envision myself continuing my employment with Navarro Community College, taking more of a leadership role.

• Running the Professional Development program for a school district.

• Higher education - teaching and research

• As a full time college professor.

• I hope to be picked up by a university where I can teach preservice science teachers.

• public school system

• I will try to gain employment at a university.

• I would like to teach at a DRU or HBCU as an assistant professor in mathematics/mathematics education.

• I will seek university level positions; however, due to the economy I highly doubt there will be many openings. In the field of education more and more graduating public school district. This higher degree will advance my pay scale, but will it provide more doors to open? I do not know.

• I would like to have the opportunity to become a tenured professor instructing pre-service teachers working within the Early Childhood Education major.

• writing, presentation, research ability

• I am not sure what my options are. I know that I want to be a professor, but I would like exposure to other career fields. Informing me of my options would be extremely helpful,
as this entire process is new to me.

• in my own country

• Upon finishing my doctora degree I can visualize myself teaching undergraduate pre-service teachers at a university or working with teachers to further their education in elementary science education.

• Directing non-profit educational initiatives.

• Professorship- Northwest, Northeast U.S./Canada

• I am planning to find post-doc position after the completion of doctoral degree in order to have more experience with research and produce journal articles and then find a tenure-track position in flagship universities across the world. Overall, I trust my methodological background but I need more practice. Theory does not make sense without practice.

• Not sure at this point, but considering teaching in higher education and/or doing consulting work in education

• Academic Affairs, Qatar

• I hope to work for an educational research institution.

• k-12 administration or state/federal department of education

• I hope to remain in College Station, if possible. It would be ideal for me to teach at TAMU.

• I look forward to working at a Research High (new Carnegie designation) Institution. I look forward to teaching and doing research that is conceptualized on a deeper level than is often done in my field. I look forward to using local theory to strengthen the educational environments of all students. I look forward to consulting with school districts, teachers, and policymakers.
• Same place I am now
• Teaching
• Probably in educational administration in a public school setting.
• I am currently employed as a school administrator, and after completing my doctoral degree, will continue working in the school district, but am sure many doors will open that will provide rich opportunities for me.
• Clinical professor
• I am currently an Assistant Principal at a public school. My goal is to higher education. I would like to be able to prepare future educators and have a bigger, positive impact in my community.
• Other than the generic tier one research university, I am not quite sure. I continue to play with the idea of consulting as well. At this stage I truly would like to do more research and focus my attention to improving inservice teachers' understanding of their profession as well as helping develop a more "workable" and application centered curriculum for preservice teachers.
• hopefully at a university and very highly possible
• In Higher Education-teaching and researching
• Public school department director
• with the economy as it is, I will be just happy having a job.
• As a clinical associate professor in an institution of higher education.
• I envision being employed as a professor at a state university in EDAD.
• Teacher
Appendix G-4

Suggestions – Doctoral Program (current students)

- relieve [X] of teaching duties; require accountability (accessibility to students, dissemination of information to students, etc.) from faculty in temporary advisor positions; make it clear that it is unacceptable for a faculty member to ask a student to drive to another city in order to meet with a faculty in an advisory capacity (simply because that faculty member lives in another city and does not keep regular office hours on campus as required)

- More opportunities for professional development. Faculty led reading groups would be nice. I would like to have had the opportunity to, for example, work through how to design a simple study (and maybe actually conduct a study) outside of the pressures of a course. I would also suggest the department partner with community organizations such as the Children's Museum to provide a kind of living laboratory for those opportunities to conduct small-scale research.

- See #83

- For graduate students begin the process early in writing their own grants for their own funding. More support for decisions that grad students make regarding our pathway to completing the dissertation. Also limiting the assumption that every graduate student who comes through TLAC wants to teach, offer other tracts to other positions outside of the classroom

- Create learning cohorts (i.e., several students starting the program at the same time); discontinue the option for part-time PhD students; support students' research endeavors in terms of quality/depth of inquiry, rather than such a focus on quantity of
presentations/publications and expediency with which students complete the program

• So far, everything has been good. I am looking forward to getting farther into my classes. Hopefully I will complete my research core this spring 2010 and my core classes completed at least by December 2010 (if the classes offered line up with what I still lack)

• none.

• None.

• Rules should be clearly written down, and followed by everyone. Exceptions make me uncomfortable.

• Establish a 24-Hour Working Computer Lab- limited access to currently enrolled grad students

• 1. Get rid of unhelpful faculty  2. Hire better faculty who can add rigor and depth to the courses  3. Support Doctoral students to graduate in 4 years.

• *More welcoming atmosphere for both traditional and nontraditional students, as well as support for those facing hardships. *No dues/charge for GSA (most GSAs don't have membership fees and tracking membership/attendance for funding decisions feels manipulative). *Increase graduate funding (assistantships, travel awards, research stipends, etc.). *More social events and communication on what research projects are being done throughout the department.

• Classes need to be offered more- not just once per year (in some cases.)

• Raise more money for department, ensure every phd students having funding

• organize yourselves! communicate!

• open more content area courses in every semester

• I would suggest that the faculty offer their courses more often, especially the ones that are
only offered every few years. The only other thing would be to raise the stipend for graduate assistants to help them financially.

- Continue summer opportunities to met with staff face to face.
- If Ph.. students are to be of high quality when they graduate, then the TLAC Department should choose high quality students to begin with—students who are excellent writers, collaborators, and motivators.
- I major in ESL. Personally, I think, courses offered in this emphasis are rather limited.
- Find helpful staff employees who are helpful to doctoral students. Increase the rigor of the courses.
- Creative class scheduling for long distance driving students.
- I was really pleased with my experience at Texas A&M. I learned a great deal and had numerous opportunities to work with faculty and other graduate students on research endeavors. I considered it just as much my responsibility to get involved in TLAC as it was for TLAC to provide time and space for graduate students to get involved.
- none so far.
- have a good liason to continually interact with doctoral students
- more interaction with faculty
- Up the standard to get into this joint. Make it harder. Cease the indoctrination
- Open up the core classes for off distant learners.
- Have mentors to guide students for the future career and have better preparation.
- writing skill
- Re-work the website for all programs, mandating the posting of degree outlines, class choices, etc. Also, creating a site index on the TLAC website that can quickly take a
student to a desired location.

• My suggestions for the department would be to available to new students a mentorship program for the first semester to first year. I would also suggest that a technical writing course be added to degree requirements.

• I like the cohort idea...this would help serve as a support group for many of us who are not on campus, and others who need some extra motivation....

• funding grad asst's. over summer term so that they will complete course works within two years and other two years must be devoted to dissertation research.

• I wish I was in the same location as my committee or that I could meet with them periodically via video conferencing. This would help much.

• Distance learners have less opportunities for assistantships and fellows. The program could partner up with the universities of the students' hometown in order to provide these opportunities for distance learners.

• increased technology reaching for distance students

• How can you improve on something that is so great! However, some students could use more assistance with co-authorship for publishing an article.

• Most of the faculty members are open to helping students whether they are on a committee or not, there are others who take the spirit out of doing doctoral work. They've given me the impression that working at a Research Very High institution is not all it's cracked up to be. There is no quality of life and the most important thing is "scholarship" and not people. Take time to get to know the students. Find out where they are overwhelmed and offer an ear. Pay attention to students who are on the verge of leaving the program.
• not sure
• None
• Fire some of the professors, offer more interesting classes, offer classes more than once every three years, have better communication, offer classes that don't do the same things over and over (for example...I've seen an ancient video "Preschool in Three Cultures" in FOUR CLASSES), ECE needs more variety in professors...too many from Harvard that think alike.
• None
• I highly suggest all members of TLAC take the new three level series of courses for the research sector. which DR [X] started as it addresses many of the problems I have experienced and am still struggling to over come. Some guidance from committee members and professors and a more intricate knowledge of expectancies on the part of both student and chair might be beneficial in setting up a degree plan. For example, I had completed 36 hours and was enrolled and in classes through 45 hours before I had a committee or submitted the formal plan as I took twelve hours stright through my first year. Another thing which might be highly discouraged, or at least monitored. I may have suffered some burn out. The main problem was I could not enroll in my last three courses without committee endorsements and/or a degree plan, or I would not have had one then. I know the constraints are there, but during Spring early enrollment I only had 24 hours so twelve summer and nine fall put me at 45 hours. My interim chair recommended I select someone else in the summer, which I did. We added another member or two and finally filled the committee out so I could sign up for classes. No real discussion took place regarding any of the classes, my interests, or my dissertation
thoughts, ideas, etc. To date nothing really has other than my chair has asked me for my proposal. Another major item, which may be being addressed in the new "intoductory class" is the importance of conference presentations, both on our own and collaborative ones. I have only ever had one professor mention a collaborative effort, and that was not a professor I had, nor was the professor from my "area of study", though an area I am very interested in and related to my area of study. I have presented at at least three national and state conferences as well as doing several local poster presentations. The same goes for publications. I have been a minor co-author on at least four publications, two with a professor here from the department, but nothing has really been pushed, nor has anything ever been discussed. It is only through the course of study that I really became aware of the total impact of these things. Then I saw and heard many of my colleagues doing collaborative work on publishing, presentations, and so forth. I have no idea how to approach someone in these areas and, for that matter have made my presentations solely on my own. One of them I might have discussed with a professor a little bit first. That professor was at the conference, attended the session, and provided some very valuable feedback. That was the only thing close to collaboration.

- To somehow allow students to evaluate professors in a manner that is truly confidential. As a graduate student, I fear giving feedback because I am afraid that someone with tenure can hinder my progress in the program. While the evaluations appear to be confidential, somehow professors seem to know when certain students have completed them and when others have not. To me, this is not totally confidential.

- None

- I would suggest that doctoral dissertation defenses be open to all students so that we can
get a feel for how it will be when we graduate. I would suggest that departmental classes
be offered more than every other year so that students can get done faster with their
course work. I would suggest making sure that incoming students take PhD studies the
first semester of their doctoral program, not the second or third. That class is really
important to understand the process of completing your degree. I would also suggest that
the graduate assistantships for students should be increased to 4 years in length to give
students enough time to find additional funding to cover expenses or to get to the point
that they are doctoral candidates and not students. I would also suggest that all students
get to teach several classes at the undergraduate level in order for them to gain the
experience they need to become a faculty member at an institution of higher education.
More lectures on how to interview and apply for jobs in higher institutions of learning are
needed.

• See above.

• you got rid of the only professor that did not teach.
Appendix H-1

Strengths – Doctoral Program (former students)

• Dr. [X]

• They have a really strong EPSY department that works well with the graduate students. They prepare them to conduct research within their field.

• A timeline of courses was pre-determined. Admittance/registration in the courses was not a problem since I was a non-traditional student. Extra time was allotted for assignments if personal issues arose. Professors were approachable when they were on campus. Scheduled appointments with professors were necessary since I was a non-traditional student living over 100 miles from College Station. Having digital service available from the library are a "God-send" especially for non-traditional students.

• *small classes

• The advisors were excellent. They took care of all my needs.

• The number of individuals highly regarded as experts in qualitative and quantitative research - the EPSY & EDAD folks I took from were very supportive and challenged me to do my best. The emphasis to publish and present in almost all graduate level classes.

• I think one of the major strengths was the diversity of people and projects I was exposed to and interacted with during my time at Texas A&M. I learned so much and feel as though I gained an incredibly from seeing research others were doing and being able to discuss it with them

• The support that the faculty provided The diversity of the faculty. The effort to create cohorts. Belonging to a cohort was instrumental in facilitating the completing of the
doctrinal program.

• Knowlegable professors.

• Inexpensive

• Prestigious. Professors are published.

• The high standards that were expected in most course work inspired me. The class members were encouraging and these became my study partners and my support group.

• Research methodologies were taught.

• I loved being a part of a cohort. It allowed me to talk to others that were going through the same issues that I went through regardless of the topic.

• The core courses are fantastic. The faculty are an important asset to A&M. I loved the rigor of the course work.

• The professors

• The professors were very helpful and provided stimulating classroom discussions. There were several opportunities to interact with doctoral students who were going through the program as well as those students who were ahead of me in the program. The members of my committee continuously encouraged and provided a forum for discussion and preparation. It is also noteworthy that the ethnic diversity of the staff provided a setting that strengthens my position that those who teach us should be able to live and look at topics through multiple perspectives.

• The high standards that were expected in most course work inspired me. The class members were encouraging and these became my study partners and my support group.

• There are some truly great faculty at TAMU and within the department; you just have to seek them out.
• The leadership and innovation of department, Dr. [X] and some of the other talented and motivated professors who stay abreast of the leading research in their field and maintain a positive relationship of sharing such knowledge and experiences with their students.

• Flexibility! There are many courses available to take with a wide range of faculty who have interesting specialized interests, which may be true at most land-grant, research universities. I really like that faculty were always willing to assist me no matter if I had ever had a class with them or if, for lack of a better way to say it, there might ever be an advantage for them in assisting me.

• The strengths of the program relate to the name and prestige of the institution, TAMU.

• The strength of the TAMU TLAC Department is the professors who taught me. They were well versed in their fields of expertise and their teaching behaviors were exemplary. They gave of themselves beyond the hours required. Three of the professors actually took students under their wings and supported them as mentors beyond graduation. I appreciate the opportunity to work with one of my professors as an associate editor of a peer reviewed journal. I could not have had that opportunity without the mentoring guidance of Dr [X]. I was able to present at AERA because of Dr. [X]. The strength of the TAMU TLAC Department is professors like Dr. [X], Dr. [X], and Dr.[X]. I also could not have written my dissertation without the qualitative research course from Dr. [X] in the HR/Admin Department.
Appendix H-2

Challenges – Doctoral Program (former students)

- Lack of respect from advisor accompanied with the advisor's demeaning manner of treating graduate students. Lack of leadership in helping students feel that they could approach people with this problem.
- At the time, foundational courses weren't as detailed as necessary for me.
- Online courses should address current research, not just information re: professor's interests of 30 years prior. Professors should implement strategies using current learning theory in assignments. As TTVN classes are used, the professor conducting the class should be aware of the students at the remote location by including them in questioning, group work presentations, etc. Ignoring the remote students fails to enhance the learning experience. Research classes should be related to actual mini-research projects so that the student can practice/be involved in the actual process. Just reading the definitions/book and regurgitating the info for a test does not assist the student in conducting research. SPSS classes should be a requirement for quantitative classes. Atlas.ti or another qualitative computer program should also be available and taught in qualitative classes. Additional assistance using the programs should be available especially for non-traditional students. Require 2 quantitative research classes and 2 qualitative classes or a mixed method class so that the student has a better understanding of both types of research and can successfully apply the principles of each after the doctoral work has been completed i.e. more applicable assignments should be required in research classes. Have tutoring available for information regarding research classes for
non-traditional students. Students should write chapters 1, 2 & 3 based on their research agenda in the proposal writing class. This class should be restructured to accomplish more than just Ch. 1. Students should know EXACTLY what is required within a proposal at the end of this class. More conformity of the requirements of the proposal written within this class and the proposal submitted to the committee should exist. There should be continuity in the requirements for both of these entities, not specific items required only by a specific committee chair. These requirements should be included in the first 3 chapters of the proposal submitted for the proposal hearing. The committee chair should be available monthly for questions and guidance (or during a reasonable time frame) during the writing process. The committee chair should be given release time dependent on the number of doctoral candidates in the process of writing their dissertations so that they are available to students as needed. Chairs should not have an overabundance of students going through the dissertation phase at the same time so that they will be available to assist those students. E-mails/phone calls should be answered timely by the chair. If the chair isn't available, then another committee member could be called to answer questions. When student materials are received, notice should be sent by the chair to the student so that they know that materials were received. When materials are received and the chair has had time to reflect, feedback should be given at that time to guide the student to complete his/her dissertation within a timely manner. While I agree that the student assume responsibility, some person on the committee should be able to answer questions - rather than the student be totally isolated from committee members during the writing process. A meeting should be held between the chair and the student prior to defense so that any questions/concerns (from the chair and
the student) can be addressed at that time--not wait until the actual defense. Committee member's additional responsibilities should not hinder the defense date/discussion of the student's study. If these responsibilities continue to limit the amount of time of the professor's availability, then that person should be replaced on the committee. It's hard to know the exact expectations when you aren't aware of any available assistance during the time the dissertation is being written - except for the Thesis Manual. Address all of these issues/services available from the perspective of the non-traditional student. During the 5 years I was in the program, I was only aware of the library services available. No other orientation was available/conducted during that time especially for non-traditional students.

- *accomplishing all of the procedural things necessary to graduate in addition to class requirements
- Committee chairs need to be more helpful with the dissertation process. They need to be available to guide in the dissertation process especially for students who live 225 miles away. I felt I was left alone to make it through this process. I only had the support of one committee member and another PhD student.
- Lack of understanding scheduling needs for commuting students who work full time. Full time graduate assistants were allowed to choose classes first, blocking me from some core classes. I ended up having to take some of the Stats classes in the mathematics department. Lack of choice for committee chairs. Graduate students talk and we know the reputation of several of the professors as being demeaning, rude, or flat out unavailable to you. As a commuting student I would schedule appointments and have my time taken up by other demands on the professor - although when the meeting was initially scheduled I
was told that I was coming at a good time.

- The freedom, which was a blessing and a curse. I learned more messing about with lots of different ideas than I ever could have if I had been offered an easier path, but at many times the lack of clarity was daunting and frustrating. Part of that was just the broadness of the literature and field in general, something I now love and appreciate, but there may have been opportunities for more structured reading and discussion of keystone pieces of literature. Creating meaningful experiences like those are difficult -- there's a delicate and fine line that needs to be to tread with the complex ideas we see in educational research to keep interest and motivation up while broadening understanding.

- Because I was not a full time student living close to the university, I felt out of touch and lacked information that was assumed that graduate students knew. I felt very alone and isolated while working on my dissertation. I missed having other students to share my ideas with.

- My committee chair was seldom on campus. There was a lack of interaction and communication among my committee members and chair. It took lots of efforts and compromise to get funded. Low sense of security. Hidden racial discrimination.

- Professors not accessible, too busy for students. Chair not responsive or misleading.

- For those desiring a career in research, the push and expectation for publication are not very strong. While it is encouraged, there are no systems in place to help students along with this very important part of their career.

- The timeline was not my timeline during the research phase. The lack of interest in my goals and needs stopped my creativity. Therefore, I enthusiasm for my research turned into doing what was necessary to complete my dissertation and get on with my career.
• Long term study and economic problem.

• When professors recruit cohorts (student's) for Master’s and Doctoral level studies, they should realize that they do not own the students. Many students that belong to cohorts should feel free to converse and talk to the other campus level professors at the University, especially when they have taken courses from them. Many times my cohort felt threatened that if we spoke to other professors (experts on the campus) that we would not graduate. Additionally, at the time of writing and formulating the dissertation, we should have been free to give credit and acknowledgement to any professor that we grew to admire and not just the professors that recruited us into the program.

• Working with diverse (minority) students

• When I was enrolled, there were times when some of the required courses were not available. That was the only challenged that I faced.

• The timeline was not my timeline during the research phase. The lack of interest in my goals and needs stopped my creativity. Therefore, I enthusiasm for my research turned into doing what was necessary to complete my dissertation and get on with my career.

• In reading- it was the limited number of faculty members and limited scope of the faculty present at the time I was finishing my dissertation. Much of my committee came from outside my department, because many of the faculty members would not have supported my research interests. Additionally, TAMU did not have/ offer all of the research courses I needed to complete my dissertation, e.g, discourse analysis, as such I had to gain that information elsewhere.

• A few of the "sticks in the mud" professors, such as Dr. [X], who are notoriously rude to graduate students, perpetuate rumors, and make inappropriate remarks towards students
and to other professors. The rigor of online classes was a bit lacking as well.

- I cannot think of any.
- Chair was overwhelmed with too many doctoral students.
- For me the pragmatic challenge of the distance to and from TAMU was a major challenge. The dissertation took too long to complete, and almost made me ABD. The cost of traveling to and from CS to meet with my professor over seven years (including loss of income due to absence from my job) was most challenging.
Appendix H-3

Suggestions – Doctoral Program (former students)

• Take students complaints seriously when they have a problem with a faculty member. Several students had difficulties with the same faculty member and students watched nothing happen as those complaints went forward. The message was to the other students that you had to take whatever was given because administration would not support you. I was not one of the students who went forward. Other than problems with that faculty member, I had positive relationships and experiences at Texas A&M.

• It is a very challenging program. I am discouraged to see many people sail through an administrative program/diss with few if any challenges that I faced; seems as though either they were held to a much more lenient standard, or I (in TLAC in general) was held to much more rigorous standards.

• The above challenges should be addressed for future doctoral students, especially for online/virtual classrooms and non-traditional students. Suggestions were included above. More information should be available to non-traditional students regarding services available. No information was received from the graduate office as to their services.

• *offer a wider range of elective classes  *hold students to a higher standard, i.e., provide honest feedback and make sure that a grade represents what the student has truly achieved  *revamp the research courses to provide clearer conceptions of how to conduct a study

• Make sure that you are hiring committee chairs who are truly committed to help students do well on their dissertations so that they can go on into the workplace and become great
researchers if they so desire. I do not feel I learned how to do research or become a great researcher. I am teaching myself at this point.

- More options for dissertation advisors and provide resources for commuting students to see proposals, examples of lit reviews, etc. I felt like I was pretty well self-taught on many things about the dissertation and spent hours on the phone with the thesis office.
- Not sure I have enough brain power left tonight to think of any. I sure wish there was a way I could save this survey and come back to write more later....
- Having papers written with the goal of publishing in a variety of classes. More focus on dissertation ideas toward the beginning of the program and time to collaborate with other students about those ideas and/or to provide suggestions or edits on writings.
- Students' (especially international students') rights should be protected. Students' aren't given the opportunities or accesses to do practicum or action research. Curriculum isn't strong enough for us to be competitive. No one helped me with job-hunting.
- Require chairs to have professional development in being a chair. Provide students with more guidance and support while writing their dissertation. For the education field you would think the professors are versed in appropriate pedagogy in how to teach their content; however, I felt the students did most of the teaching with little knowledge coming from the professors. The distance learning courses were a joke. Also, the on-line courses were not very well designed. Professors in these courses just gave out a list of assignments with little feedback provided back. Chair and committee should meet at least once a month during the dissertation phase to discuss progress and give more direction to the student.
- I would suggest accepting students in cohorts that complete core courses as a group. This
would great a greater community of support and possible opportunities for publications. A beginning class for doctorate students could be completing a research review and submit it for publication.

• I have found when I ask anyone who has completed a doctorate, if they would do it again; they complain for 20 minutes before they say the answer is yes. My suggestion is to take the personalities out by reviewing the research as is done with the articles in a journal. Perhaps, a blind review could work. Have advice and support available from experts, but until the candidate has some power in the process, it will remain stifling.

• Provide teaching positions to new graduates.

• Professors that recruit students should make it an extreme effort to have students meet the exit timeline of completion. It should not take students 5-10 years to complete their doctoral studies. We realize that professors have their own lives and commitments, but when students are showing effort, they should have continuous support from start to finish.

• I have found when I ask anyone who has completed a doctorate, if they would do it again; they complain for 20 minutes before they say the answer is yes. My suggestion is to take the personalities out by reviewing the research as is done with the articles in a journal. Perhaps, a blind review could work. Have advice and support available from experts, but until the candidate has some power in the process, it will remain stifling.

• Maintain some of the challenge and meaningfulness of face-to-face classes that cannot be replaced with an online class; get rid of negative professors; provide more rigorous research methods (particularly quantitative) courses.

• I enjoyed working on my dissertation in the 3-article format. I feel that this could be a
great marketing point for admission's staff of the program.

- Limit the number of doctoral students assigned to chairs, ensure that all students are aware of various professional opportunities, reduce sense of territorialism (is that a word?) among professors towards students.

- Of my cohort, there is still one person who has not completed. By far, she is the most intellectually capable and research driven of our cohort. Yet, she has not been able to finish. My suggestion is for TAMU TLAC Department to follow up on those who have not finished. Professors, like teachers, make pedagogical decisions and choices in their instructional interactions that may have negative outcomes for disadvantaged students. Such practices may create scenarios that increase the likelihood of the continuation of low expectations and dismal educational outcomes for graduate students from oppressed minority subgroups like Latinas.
Appendix 10:

Available Fund Balance:
Exec V.P. & Provost - Academic Affairs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Available Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College: Education</td>
<td>CLED - College Of Education - Admin - Dean</td>
<td>3,712,358.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>334,564.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,128,877.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>416,637.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,759,162.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,274,314.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,171,603.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,313,245.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EAHR - Educational Adm &amp; Human Resource Dev.</td>
<td>754,284.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>313,665.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,831,646.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>443,372.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,456,224.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,802,001.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(406,677.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY - Educational Psychology</td>
<td>1,422,622.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>271,912.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,044,935.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>725,040.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,014,430.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>451,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,237,009.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(673,578.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HLKN - Health And Kinesiology</td>
<td>3,952,123.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,530,498.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,041,026.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>913,801.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,609,847.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,571,311.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,986,535.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLAC - Teaching, Learning And Culture</td>
<td>1,386,423.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>546,740.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,323,848.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>617,483.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,639,530.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>215,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,795,018.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>629,512.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - College: Education</td>
<td>11,227,812.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,997,381.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,370,336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,116,334.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,479,195.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,053,214.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,576,944.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,849,037.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total - Exec V.P. &amp; Provost - Acad Affairs</td>
<td>11,227,812.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,997,381.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,370,336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,116,334.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,479,195.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,053,214.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,576,944.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,849,037.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11,227,812.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,997,381.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,370,336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,116,334.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33,479,195.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,053,214.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,576,944.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,849,037.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division/College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - College: Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Exec V.P. &amp; Provost - Acad Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division/College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: Exec V.P. &amp; Provost - Acad Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Available Fund Balance: College: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>Revenue &amp; Additions</th>
<th>Budgets &amp; Transfers</th>
<th>Expense &amp; Deductions</th>
<th>Ending Fund Balance</th>
<th>Unit Obligations</th>
<th>Encumb</th>
<th>Available Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLED - College Of Education - Admin - Dean</td>
<td>E&amp;G</td>
<td>013150-Doe &amp; Faculty Salaries-Education</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>013730-Instructional Admin-Education</td>
<td>46,553.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,107,060.58</td>
<td>176,473.92</td>
<td>1,977,140.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,067,830.17</td>
<td>(90,689.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131502-College Of Education Support Servic</td>
<td>44,749.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,212.64</td>
<td>40,537.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40,537.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131506-Graduate Assistants - Education</td>
<td>3,132.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,132.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,132.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131507-Fac Sav-Education</td>
<td>726,692.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,286,292.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,012,984.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>393,221.00</td>
<td>1,619,763.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131511-College Of Education Renovation</td>
<td>3,181.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,181.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,181.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131513-Grad Tuition Utilization - Cled</td>
<td>4,708.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>161,981.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>149,598.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158016-Res Dev Education</td>
<td>136,594.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,211.13</td>
<td>133,383.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
<td>20,887.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>163726-Cled-Graduate Scholarship Fund</td>
<td>17,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>163804-Grad Pgm Enhancement - Education</td>
<td>5,538.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,618.40</td>
<td>919.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>919.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E&amp;G</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>993,749.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,284,245.65</td>
<td>200,516.09</td>
<td>5,077,479.09</td>
<td>513,221.00</td>
<td>2,187,717.86</td>
<td>2,376,540.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des</td>
<td></td>
<td>020118-Cdtr - Verizon Training</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>020119-Development And Consulting Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>020120-Cdtr - Verizon</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>020121-Cdtr - Polycom Gap</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>020275-Exec Vp &amp; Provost Search Committee</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021180-Computer Access Fee - Education</td>
<td>16,613.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16,613.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,800.00</td>
<td>2,813.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021353-Start Up Funds Signature Hires Cled</td>
<td>153,570.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>153,570.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>153,570.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021354-Teacher Education Admission Fee</td>
<td>2,308.30</td>
<td>45,200.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,175.59</td>
<td>41,332.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>68,182.90</td>
<td>(26,850.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021633-Cdtr - Services</td>
<td>8,727.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,727.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,727.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021669-Cdtr-Training &amp; Material Dev. Svcs.</td>
<td>2,608.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,608.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,608.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021847-Equip Access Fee - Coll Of Ed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021864-Distance Education Support-Edu</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>Revenue &amp; Additions</td>
<td>Budgets &amp; Transfers</td>
<td>Expense &amp; Deductions</td>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>Unit Obligations</td>
<td>Encumb</td>
<td>Available Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLED - College Of Education - Admin - Dean</td>
<td>Des</td>
<td>021999-Indirect Cost Returns - Education</td>
<td>41,113.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>41,113.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>41,113.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022026-Technology Mediated Instruction</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022518-Instructional EnrhEquip Fee-Educ</td>
<td>212,507.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,106.85</td>
<td>207,400.54</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>112,789.17</td>
<td>(55,388.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022572-Distance Instruct EnrhEquip - Cled</td>
<td>4,401.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,433.53</td>
<td>(9,032.35)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>138,458.96</td>
<td>(147,491.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022608-Cled Ieef - Development</td>
<td>17,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022609-Cled Ieef - Administrative</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022610-Cled Ieef - Program Support</td>
<td>2,121.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,121.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,121.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>024130-Dt Desgn Fds - Education</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>027147-Cdlr-Service Center</td>
<td>23.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230054-Indirect Cost - Education</td>
<td>416,005.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14,734.05</td>
<td>401,271.05</td>
<td>243,723.00</td>
<td>71,808.84</td>
<td>85,739.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230112-Education Research Center</td>
<td>61,300.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,499.64</td>
<td>58,800.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27,496.02</td>
<td>31,304.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>235004-Residual Funds - Dean Of Education</td>
<td>95.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>95.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>95.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>235041-Residual Funds - College Of Educ</td>
<td>4,502.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,502.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,502.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>235110-Residual Funds - Cled - Qatar Sec</td>
<td>601,146.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(112.37)</td>
<td>601,259.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>63,154.66</td>
<td>538,104.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241302-College Of Education Support Servic</td>
<td>18,361.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>93,720.00</td>
<td>2,278.82</td>
<td>109,802.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>29,346.02</td>
<td>80,456.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241384-Faculty Workstation Allocation</td>
<td>1,663.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,663.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,663.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241390-Dean Of Education</td>
<td>384,391.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>665,967.00</td>
<td>14,204.29</td>
<td>1,036,154.33</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>29,341.49</td>
<td>806,812.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>245013-New Faculty Start Up</td>
<td>116,130.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>235.30</td>
<td>115,895.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,875.26</td>
<td>114,020.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>246025-Regents Fellowship/Education</td>
<td>9,477.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,252.74</td>
<td>3,225.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,225.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250060-Master Technology Teacher Cert Prog</td>
<td>4,874.63</td>
<td>4,037.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,912.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,912.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250348-Distance Learning Certification Pro</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250351-Cdlr - Training Services</td>
<td>1,723.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>953.20</td>
<td>770.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>770.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250427-Cehd - Support</td>
<td>5,489.94</td>
<td>876.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>455.84</td>
<td>5,910.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>5,810.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250453-Cdlr - Virtual Instr Certi Pgrm</td>
<td>1,068.67</td>
<td>3,750.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>4,638.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,638.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Available Fund Balance: College: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>Revenue &amp; Additions</th>
<th>Budgets &amp; Transfers</th>
<th>Expense &amp; Deductions</th>
<th>Ending Fund Balance</th>
<th>Unit Obligations</th>
<th>Encumb</th>
<th>Available Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLED - College Of Education</td>
<td>Admin - Dean</td>
<td>Des 250612-Conference Fees- Cehd Grants Office</td>
<td>1,332.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,332.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,332.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 250696-Program Income-Tea Nstern &amp; M-Star</td>
<td>560.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>560.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 289270-Advising Fees - Education</td>
<td>345.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>38,945.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>39,290.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>34,441.69</td>
<td>4,848.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 290001-State Auf-Chair &amp; Bridg-Ed/Huffines</td>
<td>3,035.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,035.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,035.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 289270-Advising Fees - Education</td>
<td>345.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>38,945.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>39,290.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>34,441.69</td>
<td>4,848.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 290001-State Auf-Chair &amp; Bridg-Ed/Huffines</td>
<td>3,035.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,035.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,035.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Des</td>
<td>Des Subtotal</td>
<td>2,239,975.30</td>
<td>53,863.75</td>
<td>844,632.00</td>
<td>77,178.60</td>
<td>3,061,292.45</td>
<td>761,093.00</td>
<td>606,542.41</td>
<td>1,693,657.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contr</td>
<td>Des 415099-Ed-Balanced Leadership Program</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,810.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15,417.04</td>
<td>(8,607.04)</td>
<td>104,291.14</td>
<td>(112,898.18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 421106-Tea - North Texas Stem Center</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>178,690.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25,422.02</td>
<td>153,268.69</td>
<td>56,726.66</td>
<td>96,542.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 421148-Tea - North Tx Stem Center - Fy2010</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16,589.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16,589.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25,064.61</td>
<td>(25,064.61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 426046-Somerville Isd - Star Grant Prof Dv</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>791.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>791.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>791.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>791.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 430810-Thecb - P-16 College Readiness</td>
<td>5,862.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>490.41</td>
<td>5,372.05</td>
<td>3,980.10</td>
<td>1,391.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 430845-Tea-Echs Small &amp; Rural Planning Gra</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 450078-Cws - Read Tutors Prog-Cs Isd &quot;Tcr&quot;</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 450079-Cws - Read Tutors Prog-Bry Isd &quot;Tcr&quot;</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>46.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>46.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 450124-Bryan Isd-Bryan Collegiate High Sch</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 455434-Cws - Read Tutors-Boys &amp; Girls Bv</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 460034-Sec - College Educ Year 3 - Fixed</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 460037-Sec-Qatar Univ - Cled Year 4 Cost R</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 460049-Qatar Univ - Year 5 - Fixed Price</td>
<td>124,917.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>124,917.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>124,917.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 460050-Qatar Univ-Year 5-Cost Reimbursable</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,616.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(46,117.52)</td>
<td>47,734.30</td>
<td>68,631.92</td>
<td>(20,897.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des 490004-Education Restricted Contract Acct</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contr</td>
<td>Contr Subtotal</td>
<td>200,780.00</td>
<td>265,997.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(85,165.04)</td>
<td>551,942.18</td>
<td>377,343.42</td>
<td>174,598.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Fund Description</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>Revenue &amp; Additions</th>
<th>Budgets &amp; Transfers</th>
<th>Expense &amp; Deductions</th>
<th>Ending Fund Balance</th>
<th>Unit Obligations</th>
<th>Encumb</th>
<th>Available Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>CLED - College Of Education - Admin - Dean</td>
<td>500019-Afs-Deans Cont Fund – Education</td>
<td>15,961.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15,961.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15,961.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500045-Afs-Dept Cont Fund - Interdisc Educ</td>
<td>1,397.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,397.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,397.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500149-Devel Fee Return - Education</td>
<td>1,156.80</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,171.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,171.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500337-Dean's Discretionary Fund-Education</td>
<td>2,921.39</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,283.45</td>
<td>(5,673.15)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(5,673.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500486-Cdlr-Development Foundation Salarie</td>
<td>4,646.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,805.82</td>
<td>(159.11)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(159.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>510802-Faculty Development Leave - Educati</td>
<td>4,127.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,127.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,127.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511995-Huffines, Sydney &amp; James Chair</td>
<td>19,866.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14,147.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14,147.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>512320-Marilyn Kent Byrne Chair-Student</td>
<td>42,693.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>42,693.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>42,693.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>512432-Lechner Graduate Program</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>108,067.81</td>
<td>703.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19,808.18</td>
<td>88,963.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>88,963.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schol</td>
<td>650665-Dick Scobee Memorial Scholarship</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>650992-Gen Scholarship Fund - Education</td>
<td>37,744.95</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>78,625.00</td>
<td>(26,880.05)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(26,880.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>651216-Terry Underwood School-Ed</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>651797-Culturally Diverse Teacher Ed Fund</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>652088-Dow Aggies End-Education</td>
<td>2,875.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>875.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>652090-Mattei, Joe B. &amp; Edna Earle Scholar</td>
<td>5,849.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>2,849.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,849.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>652233-Scott, Wilda Smith Endowed Scholars</td>
<td>8,125.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>2,125.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>652257-Class Of '66 Scholarship In Educati</td>
<td>1,002.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>652715-Flack/Cap Cty A&amp;M Cib Sch Teach Edu</td>
<td>7,952.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>6,452.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,452.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>653012-Cammack, Jennifer Scholarship</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>653013-Shaping The Future Endowed Schlorship</td>
<td>3,750.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,875.00</td>
<td>1,875.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>653042-Shutes, R/Johnson, G Grad Scholarsh</td>
<td>215.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>215.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>653264-Houston Endowment Scholarship</td>
<td>52,530.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>105,000.00</td>
<td>(52,469.16)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(52,469.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>Revenue &amp; Additions</td>
<td>Budgets &amp; Transfers</td>
<td>Expense &amp; Deductions</td>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>Unit Obligations</td>
<td>Encumb</td>
<td>Available Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLED - College Of Education - Admin - Dean</td>
<td>Schol 653922-Cled Graduate Student Award</td>
<td>3,900.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,900.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schol</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>132,295.39</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>204,300.00</td>
<td>(58,004.61)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(58,004.61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant 809029-Education Equipment</td>
<td>Plant 825003-Cled-leef</td>
<td>237.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>237.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>237.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLED - College Of Education - Admin - Dean Total</td>
<td>3,712,358.57</td>
<td>334,564.53</td>
<td>5,128,877.65</td>
<td>416,637.83</td>
<td>8,759,162.92</td>
<td>1,274,314.00</td>
<td>3,171,603.69</td>
<td>4,313,245.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Run: 10/5/09

reports@tamu.edu / 979-845-2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>Revenue &amp; Additions</th>
<th>Budgets &amp; Transfers</th>
<th>Expense &amp; Deductions</th>
<th>Ending Fund Balance</th>
<th>Unit Obligations</th>
<th>Encumb</th>
<th>Available Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAHR - Educational Adm &amp; Human Resource</td>
<td>E&amp;G</td>
<td>131503-Educational Administration</td>
<td>33,697.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,672,330.98</td>
<td>253,807.84</td>
<td>2,452,220.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,501,673.73</td>
<td>(49,453.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131519-Grad Tuition Utilization - Eahr</td>
<td>83.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,627.48</td>
<td>(9,543.50)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>81,835.75</td>
<td>(91,379.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131522-Graduate Growth Enhancement - Eahr</td>
<td>1,136.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,136.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,136.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158114-Research Dev - Educ Administration</td>
<td>5,756.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,756.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,756.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,674.54</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>2,672,330.98</strong></td>
<td><strong>263,435.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,449,570.20</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>2,583,509.48</strong></td>
<td>(133,939.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des</td>
<td></td>
<td>021062-American Traditions In Qualitative</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021115-Field Trip Ehrd 628</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021125-Start Up Funds - Eahr</td>
<td>5,706.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,706.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,706.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021486-Bush, Barbara Texas Fund/Literacy</td>
<td>470.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>470.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>470.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021609-Eahr Support</td>
<td>15,586.36</td>
<td>(3,750.00)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,336.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,336.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021882-Study Abroad - Ehrd</td>
<td>451.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>451.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>451.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021996-Ehrd - Best Test</td>
<td>107,986.45</td>
<td>29,654.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>304.72</td>
<td>137,335.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>54,039.52</td>
<td>83,296.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022040-Distance Education Conversion Grant</td>
<td>384.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>384.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>384.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022559-Instructional EnhEquip - Eahr</td>
<td>101,991.35</td>
<td>130,154.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23,208.42</td>
<td>208,937.43</td>
<td>60,900.00</td>
<td>117,400.62</td>
<td>30,636.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022568-Out-Of-State Distance Ed Fee - Ehar</td>
<td>2,259.59</td>
<td>28,926.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31,186.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31,186.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022573-Distance Instruct EnhEquip - Eahr</td>
<td>286.20</td>
<td>28,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,328.60</td>
<td>26,457.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,028.80</td>
<td>14,428.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230086-Indirect Costs - Eahr</td>
<td>30,879.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>42.06</td>
<td>30,837.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30,837.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>235009-Residual Funds - Eahr</td>
<td>61,604.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,743.58</td>
<td>53,861.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>28,259.59</td>
<td>25,601.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241303-Educational Administration</td>
<td>8,205.31</td>
<td>93,090.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,784.66</td>
<td>95,510.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21,018.98</td>
<td>74,491.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>246102-Research Development - Eahr</td>
<td>7,017.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,859.67</td>
<td>4,157.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,157.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>246747-2009 China Rtf-Goddard-Educational</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250038-Summer Seminar On Academic Admini</td>
<td>11,158.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>11,153.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11,153.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250039-Administrative Leadership Conf</td>
<td>28,669.06</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>32,669.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>32,669.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250047-Eahr Conferences</td>
<td>11,408.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,857.25</td>
<td>8,551.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,551.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>Revenue &amp; Additions</td>
<td>Budgets &amp; Transfers</td>
<td>Expense &amp; Deductions</td>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>Unit Obligations</td>
<td>Encumb</td>
<td>Available Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAHR - Educational Adm &amp; Human Resource</td>
<td>Des</td>
<td>250055-Tcall Conferences</td>
<td>8,596.94</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>166.24</td>
<td>8,515.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,515.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250093-Principals Center Operating</td>
<td>1,361.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>1,191.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,191.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250238-T &amp; D Certification Program</td>
<td>19,001.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19,001.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>590.32</td>
<td>18,411.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250384-Tcall Training And Evaluation</td>
<td>4,354.01</td>
<td>723.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>49.13</td>
<td>5,027.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,027.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>289340-Advise Fees - Eahr</td>
<td>6,608.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>66,226.00</td>
<td>5,545.25</td>
<td>67,289.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>60,999.23</td>
<td>6,290.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>443,991.91</td>
<td>218,293.48</td>
<td>159,316.00</td>
<td>53,117.62</td>
<td>768,483.77</td>
<td>60,900.00</td>
<td>294,337.06</td>
<td>413,246.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contri</td>
<td>421129-Tea-2008-09 Adult Literacy Clearing</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(14,161.69)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(14,161.69)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>690,019.23</td>
<td>690,019.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>421147-Tea-2009-2010 Adult Literacy Cleari</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>109,533.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>105,529.91</td>
<td>4,003.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(686,015.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>455610-Bbffl- Barbara Bush Fellows 08-09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>455645-Bbffl - Tech Assistance Proj - Fy09</td>
<td>4,644.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>4,636.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,636.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>455652-Richardson Fdn - Math &amp; Sci Perform</td>
<td>85,159.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,808.64</td>
<td>75,350.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23,601.17</td>
<td>51,749.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>455666-Bbffl - Disaster Recovery Project</td>
<td>1,982.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,982.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,982.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>455699-Bbffl- Barbara Bush Fellows 09-10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>460041-Ashrm - Hr Development-Prof Certif</td>
<td>5,017.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,017.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,017.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>460046-Ashrm - Hr Mgmt Professional Certif</td>
<td>107,552.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>107,552.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>107,552.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>460054-Ashrm - M.S. Hr Management-Cohort1</td>
<td>6,385.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,065.20</td>
<td>2,320.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>948.00</td>
<td>1,372.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contri</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>210,742.40</td>
<td>95,371.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>105,249.73</td>
<td>200,864.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>714,568.40</td>
<td>(513,704.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>500028-Armstrong, James Harvey Discretion</td>
<td>94.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>94.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>42,818.86</td>
<td>42,818.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500073-Afs-Dept Cont Fund - Educ Administr</td>
<td>592.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>592.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>592.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500173-Dist Prof Discr Fnd - Lincoln</td>
<td>4,229.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,229.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,229.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500210-Departmental Improvement Fund-Ehre</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,657.88</td>
<td>(17,657.88)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>134,950.96</td>
<td>(152,608.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510132-Educational Administration Fund</td>
<td>3,268.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,268.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,268.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510253-Urban Doctoral Development</td>
<td>1,388.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,388.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,388.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510299-Handbook Of Qualitative Research</td>
<td>8,329.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,329.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>5,329.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>Revenue &amp; Additions</td>
<td>Budgets &amp; Transfers</td>
<td>Expense &amp; Deductions</td>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>Unit Obligations</td>
<td>Encumb</td>
<td>Available Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAHR - Educational Adm &amp; Human Resource</td>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>510496-Interface Project - Dept Of Educati</td>
<td>620.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>620.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>620.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>510899-Harrington Chair <em>Dr</em></td>
<td>2,060.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,070.97</td>
<td>(10.40)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,802.73</td>
<td>(22,813.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511098-Faculty Devel Leave - Eahr</td>
<td>6,800.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,800.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,800.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511296-Journal Of Qualitative Inquiry</td>
<td>5,445.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>838.79</td>
<td>4,606.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,014.40</td>
<td>(1,408.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511586-Edad-Faculty, Staff &amp; Recruiting</td>
<td>597.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>597.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>597.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511937-Teachers Networking With Technology</td>
<td>6,562.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,562.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511956-Administrative Leadership Inst-Dell</td>
<td>528.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>528.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>528.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>553131-Higher Education Program</td>
<td>70.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>553176-Qse</td>
<td>7,980.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>391.22</td>
<td>7,589.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,589.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>48,568.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,958.86</td>
<td>27,609.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>209,586.95</td>
<td>(181,977.46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schol</td>
<td>652204-Frances, Mary &amp; Park, Mance Fellows</td>
<td>10,307.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>610.63</td>
<td>9,696.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,696.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schol</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>10,307.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>610.63</td>
<td>9,696.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,696.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>754,284.29</td>
<td>313,665.05</td>
<td>2,831,646.98</td>
<td>443,372.16</td>
<td>3,456,224.16</td>
<td>60,900.00</td>
<td>3,802,001.89</td>
<td>(406,677.73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Run: 10/5/09

reports@tamu.edu / 979-845-2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>Revenue &amp; Additions</th>
<th>Budgets &amp; Transfers</th>
<th>Expense &amp; Deductions</th>
<th>Ending Fund Balance</th>
<th>Unit Obligations</th>
<th>Encumb</th>
<th>Available Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPSY - Educational Psychology</td>
<td>E&amp;G</td>
<td>131504-Educational Psychology</td>
<td>352,799.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,930,021.60</td>
<td>499,856.97</td>
<td>3,782,963.95</td>
<td>280,000.00</td>
<td>3,826,768.17</td>
<td>(323,804.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131518-Grad Tuition Utilization - Epsy</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27,482.56</td>
<td>(27,482.56)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>266,531.68</td>
<td>(294,014.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131525-Graduate Growth Enhancement-Epsy</td>
<td>4,462.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,462.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,462.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158117-Research Dev-Educational Psych</td>
<td>10,764.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,764.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,764.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E&amp;G</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>368,026.43</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>3,930,021.60</strong></td>
<td><strong>527,339.53</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,770,708.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>280,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,093,299.85</strong></td>
<td>(602,591.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des</td>
<td></td>
<td>020315-Epsy Camp Life</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021022-Counseling &amp; Assessment Clinic</td>
<td>61,806.65</td>
<td>11,296.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,354.48</td>
<td>69,748.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,148.68</td>
<td>66,599.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021092-Epsy Royalty</td>
<td>2,684.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,684.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,684.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021356-Start Up Funds - Epsy</td>
<td>4,462.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,462.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,462.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>021502-Teacher Educ Admission Fee - Epsy</td>
<td>11,064.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,462.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,462.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022558-Instructional Enh/Equip Fee-Epsy</td>
<td>78,190.79</td>
<td>112,374.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,257.98</td>
<td>170,306.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>206,752.52</td>
<td>(36,445.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022569-Out-Of-State Distance Ed Fee - Epsy</td>
<td>4,016.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>390.00</td>
<td>3,626.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,626.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022576-Distance Instruct Enh/Equip - Epsy</td>
<td>85,264.21</td>
<td>60,200.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,895.93</td>
<td>132,568.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>34,859.11</td>
<td>97,709.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>028000-Educational Research &amp; Eval Lab</td>
<td>2,112.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>2,089.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,089.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>028001-Citel</td>
<td>21,117.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21,117.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21,117.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230085-Indirect Cost-Educational Psych</td>
<td>223,813.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,389.32</td>
<td>210,424.58</td>
<td>171,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>39,424.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>235005-Residual Funds - Educ Psychology</td>
<td>38,301.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>852.07</td>
<td>37,449.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37,449.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241304-Educational Psychology</td>
<td>115,526.67</td>
<td>67,711.00</td>
<td>4,341.19</td>
<td>178,896.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14,238.37</td>
<td>164,658.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>246110-Research Development - Epsy</td>
<td>53,336.94</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>715.63</td>
<td>53,121.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>49.90</td>
<td>53,071.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>246218-Epsy Honors Supplemental Funding</td>
<td>2,055.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,055.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,055.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250083-Institute For Applied Creativity Ed</td>
<td>1,762.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,762.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,762.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250109-Gifted And Talented Institute &quot;Dr&quot;</td>
<td>24,050.03</td>
<td>13,393.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,296.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>60,142.33</td>
<td>(49,846.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250227-Epsy Continuing Education</td>
<td>27,741.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>662.13</td>
<td>27,079.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27,079.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250431-Vocational Special Needs</td>
<td>7,209.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,209.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,209.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>Revenue &amp; Additions</td>
<td>Budgets &amp; Transfers</td>
<td>Expense &amp; Deductions</td>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>Unit Obligations</td>
<td>Encumb</td>
<td>Available Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY - Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Des</td>
<td>250532-Creativity And Innovation</td>
<td>623.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>623.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>623.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250626-Tx Transition Institute Conference</td>
<td>52,613.98</td>
<td>215.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,689.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50,139.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18,928.00</td>
<td>31,211.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250662-Online Bilingual Certification</td>
<td>67,364.75</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,625.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>65,339.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>65,339.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250684-Informed And Empowered Conference</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250691-Program Income-Todd-Talac-Registrar</td>
<td>4,872.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,872.49</td>
<td>4,872.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,872.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>289271-Advising Fee - Epsy</td>
<td>1,107.55</td>
<td>46,703.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,752.44</td>
<td>44,058.11</td>
<td>41,278.13</td>
<td>2,779.98</td>
<td>561,082.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400085-Nsf - Ci-Team Implementation(Vtech)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,887.00</td>
<td>17,887.00</td>
<td>171,000.00</td>
<td>379,397.04</td>
<td>561,082.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>402114-Nih-Nichd-Impact Of Grade Retention</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(17,850.24)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,930.51</td>
<td>(35,780.75)</td>
<td>68,546.91</td>
<td>104,327.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415087-Ed-Disability Training Network</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,872.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16,800.52</td>
<td>(7,928.52)</td>
<td>82,016.24</td>
<td>(90,643.64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415091-Ed-Working All Together (Wat)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11,677.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,304.40</td>
<td>(8,627.40)</td>
<td>38,884.58</td>
<td>(23,356.60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415093-Ed-Doctoral Training Program-Riccio</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415094-Ed-Master's Program (Lid)-Stough</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>42,049.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26,521.02</td>
<td>15,527.98</td>
<td>35,663.53</td>
<td>(2,716.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415095-Ed - Isse Program - Richard Parker</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,463.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,463.25</td>
<td>1,525.00</td>
<td>1,525.00</td>
<td>(2,716.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415096-Ed-Develop Quality Personnel-Burke</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>369.01</td>
<td>(369.01)</td>
<td>(369.01)</td>
<td>(369.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415097-Ed-Bryan Isd Gear Up Partnership</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,563.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,563.77</td>
<td>128,829.31</td>
<td>142,393.08</td>
<td>(142,393.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415098-Ed-Disability Training Network Fy09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,837.33</td>
<td>(1,837.33)</td>
<td>100,380.69</td>
<td>(102,218.02)</td>
<td>(102,218.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>421133-Tccd - Tx Advncd Leadership Conf</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,306.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,306.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>35,663.53</td>
<td>(35,663.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>421136-Tea - Idea-B Disc For Ihe - Vannest</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>421143-Tccd - Tx Transition Swd Conf 09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>422031-Tamut - Spec Educ Recruit Fy 09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>426053-Bvcd - Darcy Program 2008-2009</td>
<td>9,705.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,652.66</td>
<td>7,052.67</td>
<td>16,480.78</td>
<td>(9,428.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>426056-Leon County-Rural Hlth Network Dev</td>
<td>36,237.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,599.62</td>
<td>33,637.85</td>
<td>15,787.81</td>
<td>17,850.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>426065-Univ Kansas -Scaling Up Self-Determ</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,546.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,137.70</td>
<td>5,409.05</td>
<td>5,409.05</td>
<td>5,409.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Available Fund Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY - Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Contr</td>
<td>430801-Tdars - Youth Leadership Program</td>
<td>14,304.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>430847-Tea Cost Share - 3Rd Party 421136</td>
<td>256.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>430853-Tea - Online Bilingual Certif Proj</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>430861-Hogg Fdn-Ut Austin-Ethnic Differenc</td>
<td>430847-Tea Cost Share - 3Rd Party 421136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>455562-Amer Psyc Assoc-Rehab Psyc-Elliott</td>
<td>16,195.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>455679-Nasp-Fostering Healthy Relationship</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>455698-Ncs Person-Workplace Personality In</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>500075-Afs-Dept Cont Fund - Educ Psycholog</td>
<td>1,175.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500464-Tam Foundation Salaries</td>
<td>1,843.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500522-Dept Improv Fnd-Educational Psychol</td>
<td>603.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500573-Distinguished Professor - Thompson</td>
<td>13,060.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511099-Faculty Devel Leave - Epsy</td>
<td>2,508.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511138-Educational Psychology Fund</td>
<td>4,786.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511470-Knight Gift Account</td>
<td>3,876.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511558-Epsy Diversity Award</td>
<td>570.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511698-Epsy Development Fdn Salaries</td>
<td>334.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>553143-Center For Coll Improv Of Education</td>
<td>24,176.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>52,936.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schol</td>
<td>651723-Waker/Heep Fellowship</td>
<td>12,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>653835-Carol Wagner Scholarship Educationa</td>
<td>5,840.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schol</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>18,340.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY - Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,422,622.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Available Fund Balance: College: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>Revenue &amp; Additions</th>
<th>Budgets &amp; Transfers</th>
<th>Expense &amp; Deductions</th>
<th>Ending Fund Balance</th>
<th>Unit Obligations</th>
<th>Encumb</th>
<th>Available Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLKN - Health And Kinesiology</td>
<td>E&amp;G</td>
<td>131505-Health &amp; Kinesiology</td>
<td>148,740.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,690,541.98</td>
<td>625,426.56</td>
<td>5,213,856.04</td>
<td>52,000.00</td>
<td>5,180,051.35</td>
<td>(18,195.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131515-Center For Study Of Health Disparit</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,089.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>150.12</td>
<td>4,939.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,200.96</td>
<td>3,738.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131521-Grad Tuition Utilization - Hlkn</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,603.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,993.98</td>
<td>609.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>149,353.51</td>
<td>(148,744.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131523-Graduate Growth Enhancement - Hlk</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,246.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,471.08</td>
<td>150.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,939.72</td>
<td>3,738.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158080-Health And Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>183.80</td>
<td>(183.80)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(183.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158118-Research Dev-Health &amp; Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td>42,795.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>41,295.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16,500.00</td>
<td>24,795.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>163865-Health &amp; Kinesiology Grad Scholar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,922.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>(1,327.30)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(1,327.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E&amp;G Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>216,398.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,690,541.98</td>
<td>653,975.54</td>
<td>5,252,964.56</td>
<td>52,000.00</td>
<td>5,446,161.98</td>
<td>(24,197.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Des 020009-Hlkn Dance Minor Program Account</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,198.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(714.75)</td>
<td>32,913.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>31,413.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>020014-Hlkn Center For Sports Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,064.32</td>
<td>5,925.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>42.68</td>
<td>36,946.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>36,946.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>020039-Hlk Start Up Funds For New Hires</td>
<td></td>
<td>99,197.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>99,057.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>99,057.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>020102-Dexa Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,289.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,289.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,289.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>020199-Aggieland Day Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,393.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,128.19</td>
<td>4,265.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,265.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>020200-Motor Fitness Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td>941.49</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,076.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,076.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>020201-Camp Adventure</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,645.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>49,645.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>49,645.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>020219-Hlkn Girls Sports Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,188.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,188.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,188.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>020222-Hlkn Office Of Health Informatics</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,424.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,424.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,424.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>020261-Hlkn Irta Travel Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>020844-Field Trip Kine 199-535 White Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,083.44</td>
<td>6,490.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,573.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,573.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>021003-Oded 230 Field Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,258.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,258.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,258.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>021298-Kine 308 Field Trip</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,738.39</td>
<td>3,150.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,888.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,888.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>021310-Health And Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>021498-Instructional Technology Access Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>021506-Teacher Educ Admission Fee - Hlkn</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,323.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,387.58</td>
<td>15,935.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,276.64</td>
<td>5,658.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>Revenue &amp; Additions</td>
<td>Budgets &amp; Transfers</td>
<td>Expense &amp; Deductions</td>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>Unit Obligations</td>
<td>Encumb</td>
<td>Available Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLKN - Health And Kinesiology</td>
<td>Des</td>
<td>021763-Sfst Training Materials</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>021852-Kine 220 Coach/Offic Vb Fld Trip</td>
<td>1,791.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,791.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,791.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>022560-Instructional Enh/Equip Fee - Hlkn</td>
<td>76,687.89</td>
<td>562,019.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>41,857.37</td>
<td>596,850.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>456,526.63</td>
<td>140,323.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>022563-Instructional Enh/Equip Fee - Hlkn</td>
<td>210,511.52</td>
<td>7,475.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(42,289.99)</td>
<td>260,276.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>402,804.46</td>
<td>(142,527.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>022571-Out-Of-State Dist Ed Fee - Hlkn</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>022574-Distance Instruct Enh/Equip - Hlkn</td>
<td>5,692.46</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,492.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,492.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>022614-Center For Study Of Health Disparat</td>
<td>17,469.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>61.92</td>
<td>17,407.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>3,407.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>022615-Ieef Hlkn Dance Minor Program</td>
<td>1,060.83</td>
<td>11,090.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>11,900.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11,900.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>022617-Ieef - Hlkn Sports Management</td>
<td>67,110.06</td>
<td>210,280.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11,754.55</td>
<td>265,635.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>182,628.05</td>
<td>83,007.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>022618-Ieef - Hlkn Kinesiology</td>
<td>49,981.63</td>
<td>117,870.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,918.93</td>
<td>153,932.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>142,034.68</td>
<td>11,898.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>022619-Ieef - Hlkn Health</td>
<td>230,362.19</td>
<td>427,810.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>28,171.63</td>
<td>630,001.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>440,133.03</td>
<td>189,868.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>230088-Indirect Cost - Hlk</td>
<td>466,337.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,578.21</td>
<td>460,758.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,548.28</td>
<td>438,210.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>235006-Residual Funds - Hlkn</td>
<td>5,629.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,629.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,629.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>235024-Residual Funds - Cades - Saed</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>(33.09)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(33.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>241305-Health &amp; Kinesiology</td>
<td>53,846.16</td>
<td>248,113.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,737.15</td>
<td>294,222.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>56,879.18</td>
<td>237,342.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>241306-Hlkn Faculty/Graduate Asst Travel</td>
<td>22,792.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,057.39</td>
<td>21,734.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21,734.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>241307-Hlkn Dance Program</td>
<td>1,794.79</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,794.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,794.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>242914-Health &amp; Kinesiology - Start Up</td>
<td>7,534.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,614.54</td>
<td>920.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>825.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246107-Research Development-Health &amp; Kine</td>
<td>56,770.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,034.09</td>
<td>54,736.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25,818.05</td>
<td>28,917.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246542-Conacyt-2006 R Misra</td>
<td>10,876.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,876.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,876.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246759-09 Scholarly &amp; Creative-Gabbard</td>
<td>5,594.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,594.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,587.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250006-Local Mip Class</td>
<td>3,846.78</td>
<td>260.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>946.50</td>
<td>3,160.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11,065.37</td>
<td>(7,905.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250024-Wellness Workshops</td>
<td>29,659.20</td>
<td>77,950.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,066.01</td>
<td>102,543.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>29,826.02</td>
<td>72,717.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250343-Hlkn Maintenance</td>
<td>96,600.04</td>
<td>425.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,052.54</td>
<td>95,972.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>95,972.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>Revenue &amp; Additions</td>
<td>Budgets &amp; Transfers</td>
<td>Expense &amp; Deductions</td>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>Unit Obligations</td>
<td>Encumb</td>
<td>Available Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Des</strong></td>
<td>210.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>210.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>210.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>250364-Dadap Program Certification</strong></td>
<td>210.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>210.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>210.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>250369-Hlkn Volleyball Coaching Clinic</strong></td>
<td>69.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>69.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>69.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>250390-Ctr For Alcohol &amp; Drug Ed Studies</strong></td>
<td>1,875.70</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,025.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,025.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>250403-Challengeworks</strong></td>
<td>142,532.65</td>
<td>32,498.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,913.59</td>
<td>164,117.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>60,246.13</td>
<td>103,870.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>250405-Sport Management</strong></td>
<td>1,734.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,734.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,734.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>250536-National Emt Advanced Medical Works</strong></td>
<td>12,457.90</td>
<td>2,700.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,162.91</td>
<td>13,994.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90,547.74</td>
<td>334.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>250653-Hlkn Continuing Education Program</strong></td>
<td>34,416.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>410.40</td>
<td>34,416.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>34,416.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>289330-Advising Fees - Hlkn</strong></td>
<td>56.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>98,372.00</td>
<td>90,882.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90,547.74</td>
<td>334.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>290182-State Auf-Health &amp; Kinesiology</strong></td>
<td>32,095.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,095.42</td>
<td>8,000.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,000.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>290745-State Hlkn Scholarship-Vpr Funding</strong></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Des</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>1,905,568.17</td>
<td>1,468,028.45</td>
<td>350,485.00</td>
<td>129,553.2</td>
<td>3,594,528.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,947,485.59</td>
<td>1,647,042.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Aux</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>23,588.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>114.31</td>
<td>23,474.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23,081.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Contr</strong></td>
<td>55,120.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>445.00</td>
<td>54,675.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>54,675.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>455528-Hydroworx - Hydrotherapy &amp; Hydrotm</strong></td>
<td>13,570.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,570.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,570.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>455587-Ncaa - Diversity In Athletics</strong></td>
<td>4,465.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,565.73</td>
<td>1,899.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,207.36</td>
<td>(7,307.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>455629-Aha - Regulation Mnsod By Exercise</strong></td>
<td>10,695.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,570.85</td>
<td>8,125.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,218.00</td>
<td>(1,092.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>455643-Curves - Women's Health Initiative</strong></td>
<td>4,813.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>32,982.80</td>
<td>41,830.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>41,830.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>455674-Acsn-Paar's And Obesity</strong></td>
<td>104.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>104.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>104.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>455675-Acsn - Is Estrogen Signalling</strong></td>
<td>79.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>79.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>79.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Available Fund Balance: College: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>Revenue &amp; Additions</th>
<th>Budgets &amp; Transfers</th>
<th>Expense &amp; Deductions</th>
<th>Ending Fund Balance</th>
<th>Unit Obligations</th>
<th>Encumb</th>
<th>Available Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLKN - Health And Kinesiology</td>
<td>Contr</td>
<td>455686-Acsm - Pre-Diabetic - Nilsson</td>
<td>975.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>419.65</td>
<td>555.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>555.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>455688-Fla Sports Fdn-Sunshine St Games</td>
<td>3,932.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,932.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,300.00</td>
<td>1,632.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contr</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>163,756.40</td>
<td>52,510.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>91,494.10</td>
<td>124,772.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>225,192.56</td>
<td>(100,420.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>500076-Afs-Dept Cont Fund - Health &amp; Kines</td>
<td>2,690.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,690.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,690.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500403-Dist Prof Disc Fund - Armstrong</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500523-Dept Improv Fnd-Health &amp; Kinesiolog</td>
<td>205.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>205.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>205.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510124-Florence Oeding Gift</td>
<td>1,900.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,900.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510155-Anderson, John Health Ed Devel Fund</td>
<td>2,860.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,860.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,860.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510452-Read, T &amp; J Chair-Disadvantag Youth</td>
<td>183,523.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,439.57</td>
<td>174,083.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37,017.81</td>
<td>137,065.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510500-Dance Minor Program &amp; Emsu Compan</td>
<td>48.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>48.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>48.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510583-Health And Kinesiology</td>
<td>47,844.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,405.12</td>
<td>39,439.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,685.91</td>
<td>21,753.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>511037-Health &amp; Kinesiology - Gifts</td>
<td>359,163.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>359,163.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>359,163.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>511486-Smith, Omar Chair Support</td>
<td>12,611.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,611.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>63,138.54</td>
<td>(50,527.32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>511924-Faculty Development Leave - Hlkn</td>
<td>4,388.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>970.00</td>
<td>3,418.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,418.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>511953-Bridges To Success-Sports Manage</td>
<td>37.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512103-The Leonard D Ponder Chair In Hlkn</td>
<td>69,808.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>122.85</td>
<td>69,685.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>890.12</td>
<td>68,795.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512158-Diabetes Education Program In India</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512170-Trott Excellence Fund Sports Mangem</td>
<td>12,489.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,489.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,489.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512172-Kinesiology Excellence Fund</td>
<td>118.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>118.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>118.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512173-Physical Activity Excellence Fund</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512174-Health &amp; Safety Excellence Fund</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512329-Read Deerfoot Youth Camp Excellence</td>
<td>28,536.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,111.78</td>
<td>27,424.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,495.00</td>
<td>20,929.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>726,433.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,049.32</td>
<td>706,383.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>125,227.38</td>
<td>581,156.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schol</td>
<td>650663-Thomas &amp; Joan Read H/P Ed Schol.</td>
<td>2,883.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,883.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,883.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Last Run: 10/5/09
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Fund Description</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>Revenue &amp; Additions</th>
<th>Budgets &amp; Transfers</th>
<th>Expense &amp; Deductions</th>
<th>Ending Fund Balance</th>
<th>Unit Obligations</th>
<th>Encumb</th>
<th>Available Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLKN - Health And Kinesiology</td>
<td>Schol 653826-Health &amp; Kinesiology M. Duchin Scho</td>
<td>653826-Health &amp; Kinesiology M. Duchin Scho</td>
<td>2,919.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,919.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,919.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>653827-Health &amp; Kinesiology Read Scholarsh</td>
<td>653827-Health &amp; Kinesiology Read Scholarsh</td>
<td>54,613.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16,500.00</td>
<td>38,113.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>38,113.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>653941-Hlkn Scholarship From Gift Funding</td>
<td>653941-Hlkn Scholarship From Gift Funding</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>9,960.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>9,620.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schol</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,577.17</td>
<td>9,960.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,000.00</td>
<td>53,537.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>53,537.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>809504-Ieef - Hlkn Plant Account</td>
<td>809504-Ieef - Hlkn Plant Account</td>
<td>503,263.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>503,263.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>3,263.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>825001-Hlkn-leeff</td>
<td>825001-Hlkn-leeff</td>
<td>352,537.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,614.33</td>
<td>350,923.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>326,850.97</td>
<td>24,072.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>855,801.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,614.33</td>
<td>854,186.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>826,850.97</td>
<td>27,335.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLKN - Health And Kinesiology</td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,952,123.18</td>
<td>1,530,498.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,041,026.98</td>
<td>913,801.22</td>
<td>10,609,847.46</td>
<td>52,000.00</td>
<td>8,571,311.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>Revenue &amp; Additions</td>
<td>Budgets &amp; Transfers</td>
<td>Expense &amp; Deductions</td>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>Unit Obligations</td>
<td>Encumb</td>
<td>Available Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLAC - Teaching, Learning And Culture</td>
<td>E&amp;G</td>
<td>131501-Teaching, Learning And Culture</td>
<td>233,328.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,198,677.79</td>
<td>482,154.40</td>
<td>3,949,851.92</td>
<td>135,000.00</td>
<td>3,753,526.83</td>
<td>61,325.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131520-Grad Tuition Utilization - Tlac</td>
<td>19,622.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,879.60</td>
<td>14,742.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>55,990.80</td>
<td>(41,248.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131526-Graduate Growth Enhancement-Tlac</td>
<td>51.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>51.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>51.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158115-Research Dev-Educ Curric &amp; Instruc</td>
<td>31,587.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,650.00</td>
<td>29,937.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,200.00</td>
<td>16,737.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>163832-Grad Prgm Enhancement-Edu C &amp; I</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,643.29</td>
<td>(5,641.16)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(5,641.16)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;G</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td><strong>284,591.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,198,677.79</strong></td>
<td><strong>494,327.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,988,942.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>135,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,822,717.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,224.55</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des</td>
<td>020859-Edic 489 Spring Break Field Trip</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,493.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,493.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,493.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>020895-Tlac Field Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td>962.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>962.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,432.08</td>
<td>(1,469.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>021046-Edci Service Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td>157.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>157.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>157.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>021134-Educational Curriculum &amp; Instructio</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,572.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,572.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,572.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>021209-Teaching, Learning &amp; Culture Suppt</td>
<td></td>
<td>370.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>370.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>370.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>021364-Start Up Funds Signature Hires Tlac</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,840.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>99.47</td>
<td>8,741.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,741.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>021504-Teacher Educ Admission Fee - Edci</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,251.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,055.00</td>
<td>5,196.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>64,280.96</td>
<td>(59,084.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>022557-Instructional EnvEquip Fee-Tlac</td>
<td></td>
<td>43,851.26</td>
<td>340,600.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>62,212.44</td>
<td>322,238.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>482,084.10</td>
<td>(159,845.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>022570-Out-Of-State Distance Ed Fee - Tlac</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,309.83</td>
<td>1,496.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16,806.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16,806.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>022575-Distance Instruct EnvEquip - Tlac</td>
<td></td>
<td>187,865.86</td>
<td>88,020.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>275,885.86</td>
<td>80,000.00</td>
<td>30,112.00</td>
<td>165,773.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>022611-Online Doctoral Program - Tlac</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,883.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,328.30</td>
<td>12,555.50</td>
<td>47,863.82</td>
<td>(35,308.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>230087-Indirect Cost-Teaching, Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>156,078.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
<td>153,828.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>117,183.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>235007-Residual Funds - Tlac</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,540.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>724.66</td>
<td>33,816.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33,816.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>241301-Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,735.22</td>
<td>88,993.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>381.82</td>
<td>151,346.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,595.78</td>
<td>145,750.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246108-Research Development-Teaching, Lear</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,413.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27,413.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27,413.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250001-Early Childhood Education-Summer Wc</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,466.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,466.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,466.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250123-Mentor Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,253.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>32,253.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>32,253.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250164-Reading Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,848.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,848.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,848.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>Revenue &amp; Additions</td>
<td>Budgets &amp; Transfers</td>
<td>Expense &amp; Deductions</td>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>Unit Obligations</td>
<td>Encumb</td>
<td>Available Fund Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLAC - Teaching, Learning And Culture</td>
<td>Des</td>
<td>250505-Edci Support</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250572-Mentoring Training Program-Foster</td>
<td>128.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>128.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>128.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250607-E-Education Account</td>
<td>83,704.62</td>
<td>13,650.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,644.39</td>
<td>88,710.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>84,031.70</td>
<td>4,678.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250629-Tlac-Aggie Teacher Career Fair</td>
<td>8,201.77</td>
<td>8,150.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16,351.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16,351.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250668-Career Fair Scholarship - Tlac</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>289320-Advising Fees - Tlac</td>
<td>253.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>36,178.00</td>
<td>3,028.96</td>
<td>33,402.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33,319.28</td>
<td>83.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>708,684.84</td>
<td>451,916.22</td>
<td>125,171.00</td>
<td>94,225.04</td>
<td>1,191,547.02</td>
<td>80,000.00</td>
<td>786,364.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contr</td>
<td></td>
<td>415101-U. S. Dept Of Ed - Seminar On China</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>426050-Botanical Society-Plant It Careers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,455.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,455.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33,680.64</td>
<td>(33,680.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>426051-Botanical Society-Planting Sci Res</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>4,678.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,828.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33,680.64</td>
<td>(33,680.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>430780-Tamiu - Ph.D. Cohort Program</td>
<td>25,862.21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,530.05</td>
<td>24,332.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,240.40</td>
<td>12,091.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>430799-Thecb - Integrated Educ Res Center</td>
<td>259,431.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(5,816.41)</td>
<td>265,247.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47,868.07</td>
<td>217,379.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>430837-Thecb - Eval Gates Go Center Partnr</td>
<td>11,560.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,394.85</td>
<td>9,165.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,712.69</td>
<td>(15,546.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>430859-Thecb-2009-2011 Tx Governor's Schoo</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>62,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,085.41</td>
<td>61,415.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>61,415.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>430787-Thecb - Professional Development</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45564-Ssma - Editorial Support Journal</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,576.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,576.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,244.25</td>
<td>(24,244.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45565-College Texans Fdn-Gates Go Center</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>455659-Ab - Evaluation Of Ib Program</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>297,004.28</td>
<td>77,211.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14,055.04</td>
<td>360,160.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>176,426.69</td>
<td>183,733.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td>500074-Afs-Dept Cont Fund - Educ Cur &amp; Ins</td>
<td>1,488.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,488.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,488.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500202-Fund For Impv Of Teach - Education</td>
<td>975.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>975.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>975.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500249-Dept Improv Fnd - Educ Curr &amp; I&quot;Dr&quot;</td>
<td>5,645.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,645.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,645.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500419-Robert,Curtis Math Ed Endowed Chair</td>
<td>15,660.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>751.81</td>
<td>14,908.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14,908.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500538-Dept Improv Fnd - Tlac</td>
<td>109.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>109.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>109.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Available Fund Balance: College: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>Revenue &amp; Additions</th>
<th>Budgets &amp; Transfers</th>
<th>Expense &amp; Deductions</th>
<th>Ending Fund Balance</th>
<th>Unit Obligations</th>
<th>Encumb</th>
<th>Available Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLAC - Teaching, Learning And Culture</td>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>510134-Educational Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>25,568.89</td>
<td>2,613.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>28,110.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>28,110.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511097-Faculty Devel Leave - Edci</td>
<td>1,338.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,338.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,338.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>511925-Houston Endowment Inc Chair In Educ</td>
<td>19,975.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>532.20</td>
<td>19,443.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,499.64</td>
<td>16,943.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>512038-Claude H Everett Jr ’47 End Chair</td>
<td>126.45</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,126.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,126.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>512476-Houston Endowment Chair-Dr Lewis</td>
<td>126.01</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,539.59</td>
<td>8,586.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,009.41</td>
<td>1,577.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>71,014.39</td>
<td>17,613.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,895.60</td>
<td>85,732.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,509.05</td>
<td>76,223.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>653715-Teaching, Learning &amp; Culture</td>
<td>25,128.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11,980.10</td>
<td>13,148.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,148.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schol</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,128.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11,980.10</td>
<td>13,148.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13,148.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLAC - Teaching, Learning And Culture</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,386,423.74</td>
<td>548,740.96</td>
<td>4,323,848.79</td>
<td>617,483.07</td>
<td>5,639,530.42</td>
<td>215,000.00</td>
<td>4,795,018.09</td>
<td>629,512.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College: Education Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,227,812.32</td>
<td>2,997,381.87</td>
<td>22,370,336.00</td>
<td>3,116,334.52</td>
<td>33,479,195.67</td>
<td>2,053,214.00</td>
<td>25,576,944.65</td>
<td>5,849,037.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>9470 Unrestricted - Allocated</td>
<td>9487 Resv - Faculty Reinvestment</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLED-College Of Education - Admin - Dean</td>
<td>131507-00000 Fac Sav-Education</td>
<td>393,221</td>
<td></td>
<td>393,221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158016-00000 Res Dev Education</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>211800-00000 Computer Access Fee - Education</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>213530-00000 Start Up Funds Signature Hires Cled</td>
<td>153,570</td>
<td></td>
<td>153,570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>225180-00000 Instructional Enh/Equip-Educ</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>230054-00000 Indirect Cost - Education</td>
<td>243,723</td>
<td></td>
<td>243,723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>241390-00000 Dean Of Education</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLED-College Of Education - Admin - Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,274,314</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,274,314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAHR-Educational Adm &amp; Human Resource Develop</td>
<td>225590-00000 Instructional Enh/Equip Fee - Eahr</td>
<td>60,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAHR-Educational Adm &amp; Human Resource Develop</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY-Educational Psychology</td>
<td>131504-00000 Educational Psychology</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>230085-00000 Indirect Cost-Educational Psycholog</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>171,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY-Educational Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td>361,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>451,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLKN-Health And Kinesiology</td>
<td>131505-00000 Health &amp; Kinesiology</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLKN-Health And Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLAC-Teaching, Learning And Culture</td>
<td>131501-00000 Teaching, Learning And Culture</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>225750-00000 Distance Instruct Enh/Equip - Tlac</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLAC-Teaching, Learning And Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,963,214.00</td>
<td>90,000.00</td>
<td>2,053,214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Run: 10/5/09  
reports@tamu.edu / 979-845-2017
Appendix 11:

*TLAC-Online*: a proposed management system for online courses and programs.
Inter-office Memo
August 17, 2009

To: Chairs of TLAC Undergraduate & Graduate Committees
From: Valerie Hill-Jackson / Committee of Online Learning and Evaluation (COLE), Chair
CC: Dennie Smith, TLAC Dept. Chair
Yolanda Columbus, Asst. Director Technology Services
COLE Committee
Kerri Smith
ITS, Distance Ed, Communications & Marketing, and Computing & Information Services

Re: TLAC-Online Webpage Proposal

Allow COLE, in cooperation with Technology Services, to introduce TLAC-Online, which is a proposed management system for online courses and programs. Accessed from the TLAC webpage, this new system will give TLAC faculty better tools for making online classes more consistent. The practicality of TLAC-Online is exciting, as it will improve online services and it will serve as a mechanism to improve coordination of online courses and programs. COLE is imagining a centralized online service or a “one stop consortium” that faculty and students can access for online courses and community at Texas A&M. Please review the 1. rationale, 2. coordination and support, 3. next-steps, and 4. TLAC-Online webpage structure (DRAFT) offered within this eight (8) page document for your consideration.

1. **Rationale:** Isn’t it reasonable for colleges and universities to provide an infrastructure for their online courses and programs in order to provide support and consistency for students? Recent surveys conducted by COLE and Technology Services have concluded that students are not receiving consistent online instruction in their courses. What’s more, the results of the COLE report recommended assistance for students and faculty in the following areas:

   • **READINESS:** More front-end readiness and development, i.e. introduction to pre-online course expectations and training, must be required for all students before they matriculate into their first online course.

   • **TRAINING:** An online technology assessment quiz/exam should be a required feature before students’ first online course. Faculty should be made aware of the myriad of training opportunities available in the Texas A&M community.

   • **SUPPORT:** An online resource link, developed for students and faculty, should be made available to better facilitate technology demands. This link needs to be made a mandated feature of the TLAC homepage and every online course syllabus.
2. **Coordination & Support:** It should be noted that much of the content that is needed to support *TLAC-Online* already exists. However, our students and staff may have difficulty identifying the different departments and services who handle various responsibilities for online and technical needs. We propose the following *tentative* list of resources and support to effectively coordinate the creation, implementation, and management of *TLAC-Online*.

   a. Facilitation of Content for new webpage - Technology Services / College of Education
   b. Provide Content - Distance Education; Computing and Information Services; Instructional Tech Services, etc.
   c. Uploading & Management – Communications Group in the College of Education (current TLAC web-page managers) with input from *TLAC-Online* Liaison (to be determined)

3. **Next Steps:** In order to complete the delivery of *TLAC-Online*, the following next steps are needed.

   a. Introduction to TLAC faculty at August meeting for open discussion
   b. Review and approval of proposal by Undergraduate and Graduate committees
   c. Review and feedback of proposal by Graduate Student Organization
   d. Identify other existing content / services, not identified in the site’s structure, to enhance the proposed site
   e. Per approval of *TLAC-Online*, required evaluation / feedback of *TLAC-Online* by students and faculty at the end of Fall ’09 and Spring ’10 semesters; and annually thereafter (Kerri Smith)

The COLE committee seeks the review and approval of the Undergraduate and Graduate committees. Additionally, we welcome any constructive feedback that will benefit the proposed site.

Shared below is a list of the unconfirmed features and content for the structure of *TLAC-Online*; available from the TLAC website. **PLEASE NOTE:** While some sections and content appear repetitive, research shows that having multiple avenues to get to the same destinations (content) increases support, familiarity, and consistency for its users.
### 4. Proposed TLAC-Online Webpage Structure / Draft #4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONTENT PROVIDED BY</th>
<th>EST. COMPLETION DATE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Online Courses &amp; Programs</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Definitions of Face to Face, Hybrid, and Online classes</td>
<td>Tech Services</td>
<td>Aug '09</td>
<td>The Registrar needs same definitions for their catalog. Also, the meeting times for online courses should not be shown as TBA, but online instead. I get a lot of emails from students about this identifier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>List and Links of Online Certifications and Programs</td>
<td>Kerri Smith / Distance Ed</td>
<td>Aug '09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Links to Hybrid and Online Courses</td>
<td>Kerri Smith / Distance Ed</td>
<td>Aug '09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Getting Started for Faculty and Students</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>R U READI ?</td>
<td>Tech Services</td>
<td>Aug '09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Are you READI to Learn?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Log-in Info</td>
<td>Info for logging into the online learning sites and how to get a log-in account or resetting accounts.</td>
<td>Computing and Information Services (same process for eLearning + Moodle)</td>
<td>Aug ‘09</td>
<td>Already exists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Online Info for Students</td>
<td><strong>By the end of the first day of your course</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Log-on to eLearning or Moodle and make sure all the courses you have registered for are listed</td>
<td>Tech Services (Moodle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Troubleshoot technical problems with the help of 24/7 Help Desk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. If your instructor requires it, install the Respondus LockDown Browser.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Recommended operating windows and installed programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Netiquette</td>
<td><strong>Provides customary procedures for interacting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C. Technical Support

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Maintenance</td>
<td><strong>Maintenance Windows</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When can students expect eLearning or Moodle maintenance / repair?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computing and Information Services (eLearning)</td>
<td>Aug ‘09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tech Services (Moodle)</td>
<td>Already exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Help Desk</td>
<td><strong>Texas A&amp;M - Online 24/7 Help Desk</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical FAQS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Online Course Technical Support Request Forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Links from Computing and Information Services (eLearning)</td>
<td>Aug ‘09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tech Services (Moodle)</td>
<td>Already exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Account Management for Faculty &amp; Students</td>
<td><strong>Student Account Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Find your Username / Net ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Know your Password, Want to Change It?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forgot Your Password, Password not Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manual Password Reset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Use this form only if the others do not work. This process may take time so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Links from Computing and Information Services</td>
<td>Aug ‘09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Already exists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Missing Your Class? This is an online form filed w/help desk for students who cannot access or see their online class listed</td>
<td>Tech Services (Moodle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Get Preferred Version of Java</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instructions for Speed Test or Trace Route (This program is available at some colleges and universities so students and self-check their computer systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| D. **Student Support Services** | 1. **Online Tutorial Readiness for Education at a Distance Indicator (READI)** | Are you READI to learn? This is a quick assessment survey for students so they can determine their readiness for online learning. | Tech Services | Aug ‘09 |
| --- | --- | --- | | | |
| | 2. **Student Testimonials** | Students share their personal / value-added experiences with learning online. | | Spring ‘10 |
| | 3. **Glossary of Terms** | This is a DETAILED list of | Tech Services | Aug ‘09 | Should be |
| --- | --- | --- | | | |
terms to help orient students/faculty with online lexicon. Such terms as Java, operating system, posting, whiteboard, etc. are updated annually.

4. Learning Tools
   a. Turn-it-in (It is always important to make sure you have cited all of your sources correctly before you submit an assignment to your professor. Use Turn-it-in.com to check your work before you submit it for grading. Many faculty use this service as well to look for incorrectly cited work or plagiarism).
   b. Second Life
   c. iTunes University
   d. Writing Center
   e. Online Library Services
      - Online Research
      - Media Services

Online Learning Orientation
Introduction + Links to eLearning and Moodle
How to:
1. Send mail
2. Post assignments
3. Assessments – taking online quizzes and exams
4. Chat

Tech Services
Spring ’10

Tech Services
Aug 09
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Faculty Support Services</th>
<th>1. Faculty testimonials</th>
<th>Accolades (short quotes) for teaching online.</th>
<th>Tech Services</th>
<th>Spring ’09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Online Orientation</td>
<td>Introduction + Links to eLearning and Moodle</td>
<td>Tech Services</td>
<td>Aug ’09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Center for Teaching Excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Educational Research for Online Instruction</td>
<td>Latest research and reports in a. online instruction and b. items specific to the field of education + online instruction. c. COLE reports (password protected) will also be available</td>
<td>Tech Services</td>
<td>Begin Aug ’09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. TLAC-Community</th>
<th>1. Faculty, Staff &amp; Student Spotlights</th>
<th>Faculty, staff, and student spotlights – different from testimonials, these are feature stories on faculty and students who are engaging in new and innovative activities in their online classes OR they are using technology (in general) in unique ways.</th>
<th>Instructional Technology Services (ITS)</th>
<th>Spring ‘10</th>
<th>Must be updated monthly or bi-monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Workshops and Conference Calendars</td>
<td>Important links that will take faculty and students to events, workshops, etc. at Texas A&amp;M and the surrounding B/CS community</td>
<td>Carol Henrichs?</td>
<td>Carol Henrichs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Who’s Who in the TAMU Online + Tech Community</td>
<td>List of all tech / computing organizations at A&amp;M and their responsibilities?</td>
<td>HDC / Sally Yang</td>
<td>HDC / Sally Yang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 12:

ERC UPDATE-Educational Research Center Newsletter – June 2009
ERC Receives Evaluation Contract From the IBO: The ERC was recently informed that it will receive a $75,000 grant from the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) to conduct an evaluation of IBO programs in Texas schools. Jackie Stillisano and Hersh Waxman, associate director and director of the ERC, will be co-principal investigators for the grant. Additional ERC researchers involved in the project include Brooke Kandel-Cisco, Judy Hostrup, Beverly Alford, and Kayla Braziel Rollins.

The IBO offers three programs of study: the Primary Years Program (PYP), the Middle Years Program (MYP), and the Diploma Program. This evaluation will focus on primary and middle year programs, examining the impact of IBO programs on students’ reading and mathematics achievement. Specifically, the ERC researchers will study the factors that contribute to the performance of PYP and MYP students on Texas achievement exams and how those factors differentially influence the reading and mathematics achievement of students of varying demographic profiles.

Using a multiple-case research design, ERC researchers will examine eight IBO schools from across the state. Data will be collected through structured interviews with administrators and teachers, classroom observations, examination of historical school and IBO documents, and standardized math and reading assessments.

Rolle & Torres Present at March Seminar Series: The ERC presented the fifth event in its 2008-2009 seminar series on March 30, 2009. Associate Professor Anthony Rolle and Assistant Professor Mario Torres (Department of Educational Administration & Human Resource Development) presented The New Texas Two Step: An Empirical Analysis for Horizontal and Vertical Equity Among the Public Schools of Texas, 1998-2007 for a group of faculty, administrators, and graduate students. Among those attending the presentation were Dennie Smith, chair of TLAC; Roger Goddard of EAHR; and Timothy Gronberg and Dennis Jansen of the Department of Economics.

In their presentation, Rolle and Torres reported on findings from an ERC-supported study conducted by Taylor, based on an ERC-supported study conducted by Taylor, which examines the impact that variations in school facilities have on teacher salaries and on teacher retention. Data were gathered through a survey completed by individual school district superintendents and through insurance records provided by the Texas Association of School Boards. Taylor and her colleagues found that substantial variation exists in educational capital stocks across Texas school districts, which is reflected in wages. However, given wages, variations in the capital stock of a district have no distinguishable impact on teacher retention.

April Seminar Series Event: Dr. Lori Taylor, associate professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service, was the featured speaker for the April 21 ERC seminar series event. Taylor’s presentation, entitled Exploring the Implications of Unequal School Facilities, was based on an ERC-supported study conducted by Taylor, Timothy Gronberg, and Dennis Jansen. Incorporating a series of capital stock indicators for Texas school districts, their research examined the impact that variations in school facilities have on teacher salaries and on teacher retention. Data were gathered through a survey completed by individual school district superintendents and through insurance records provided by the Texas Association of School Boards. Taylor and her colleagues found that substantial variation exists in educational capital stocks across Texas school districts, which is reflected in wages. However, given wages, variations in the capital stock of a district have no distinguishable impact on teacher retention.

ERC Team Welcomes New Intern: Leanne Howell joins the ERC as a 3rd year doctoral student in TLAC, pursuing a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in urban education. Leanne received her undergraduate and graduate degrees from Baylor University, and her professional career includes almost 20 years of working in public schools as a teacher and school counselor. Her primary research interest includes investigating computer-assisted instruction as a tool to close the achievement gap among K-12 students. Leanne is a member of the Graduate Student Association, as well as the honor societies of Kappa Delta Pi and Phi Kappa Phi.
**Lewis to be Co-Director of New Center:** In collaboration with fellow urban education faculty member Norvela Carter, Chance Lewis—associate professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture and ERC program area leader for curriculum and instruction—has assumed codirectorship of the Center for Urban School Partnerships (CUSP) in the College of Education and Human Development. Formerly known as the Center for Collaborative Learning Communities, CUSP will provide rigorous research opportunities for novice scholars; search for external funding opportunities; and conduct local, national, and international outreach efforts. Under the leadership of Carter and Lewis, CUSP will carry out research and offer support to a variety of externally funded research and service projects that focus on collaborative learning communities in urban education environments, with the goal of becoming the preeminent national and international research center in urban education.

**Franco-Fuenmayor, Kandel-Cisco, Padrón Article Published:** Susana Franco-Fuenmayor, Brooke Kandel-Cisco, and Yolanda Padrón published an article entitled “Improving Reading Comprehension in Dual Language Programs” in the winter 2008 edition of the *Texas Association for Bilingual Education (TABE) Journal*. The TABE Journal is a peer-reviewed publication dedicated to improving practice and advancing the knowledge base in bilingual education.

**Jee-Young Shin Selected as Barbara Bush Fellow:** ERC research assistant Jee-Young Shin is among four graduate students who were recently selected as 2009-2010 Barbara Bush Fellows. The fellowships were announced on April 23 at the Celebration of Reading in Houston. As part of the award, Shin received a 1-year, $25,000 grant from the Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy to support her dissertation research and to offset expenses involved in disseminating her work through national and local conferences. Shin, who is a doctoral student in TLAC, plans to examine key issues in literacy patterns and experiences of language-minority families.

**Rolle Appointed to Editorial Advisory Boards:** Anthony Rolle—associate professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development and ERC program area leader for school finance, resources, and facilities—was recently appointed to the Editorial Review Boards of two separate journals. Published quarterly, the *SAM Advanced Management Journal (AMJ)* features articles by business professionals on business in real world settings. The *Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ)* is published five times per year and offers pertinent and precise scholarly work that promotes dialogue among researchers and practitioners across educational disciplines.

**Kandel-Cisco Presents Dissertation Research:** Brooke Kandel-Cisco, senior research associate for the ERC, successfully defended her dissertation (Improving Teaching and Learning for English Language Learners) on March 12, 2009. In her research, Kandel-Cisco examined the cognitive reading strategies that Hispanic middle school English language learners (ELLs) reported using while reading in English and evaluated professional development activities for teachers of ELL students. Results indicated that although Hispanic ELLs have the potential to use their native language as a strategic tool in English reading, in general, ELLs do not consistently adopt a strategic approach to reading in English. Additionally, Kandel-Cisco found that although professional development is one avenue to help teachers improve the instruction they provide to Hispanic ELLs, little of the professional development provided to teachers is connected to instruction for ELLs.

**ERC Researchers Present at 2009 AERA Conference:** The ERC was well-represented at the 2009 annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, held April 13-17, 2009, in San Diego. The following is a list of presentations given by ERC researchers:

- Jacqueline Stillisano, Judy Ann Hostrup, & Hersh C. Waxman. *Evaluating a Systemic Effort to Create a College-Going Culture in Large Urban High Schools.*
- Jee-Young Shin & Blanca G. Quiroz. *Intergenerational Literacy Within Bilingual Families: Conceptual and Methodological Issues Addressing Diversity.*
- Kayla Chez Braziel, Kellie Carpenter Cude, & Dennie L. Smith. *Coming Full Circle: Completing the Link Between Coursework and Classrooms in Teacher Education.*
- Robin A. Rackley, Stephanie L. Knight, & Adalet Baris Gunersel. *Using Classroom Observation to Investigate the Transportability of School-Based Mental Health Programs.*

111 Harrington Tower / College Station, TX 77843-4232 / [http://erc.cehd.tamu.edu](http://erc.cehd.tamu.edu)
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ERC UPDATE-Educational Research Center Newsletter – October 2009
**ERC Kicks-Off 2009-2010 Seminar Series:** The ERC presented the first event of the 2009-2010 seminar series on September 29. Roger Goddard (Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development) presented *The School Leadership Improvement Study: Design and Preliminary Findings of a Large-Scale Randomized Control Trial* for a group of approximately 30 faculty, administrators, and graduate students. Among those attending were James Kracht, executive associate dean for academic affairs in the College of Education and Human Development, and Frederick Nafukho, new head of the Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development.

The presentation was based on work Goddard and his team conducted in the first year of a 3-year project, funded by IES and designed to evaluate the implementation of the Balanced Leadership™ program (a professional development program developed by McREL for school principals) in rural Michigan elementary schools. Tentative conclusions reached thus far by the researchers include: (a) principal leadership is related to teacher collaborations after accounting for the influence of prior achievement and school socio-demographic status, (b) teacher collaboration is related to achievement in mathematics and reading, and (c) principal leadership has an indirect effect on achievement through its relationship to teachers' collaborative practice.

**ERC Receives Grant to Establish A&M Collaborative:** The ERC was recently informed that it will receive a 2-year, $500,000 grant from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) to establish the TAMU Educator Preparation Collaborative for Enhancing College and Career Readiness in Texas Schools (A&M Collaborative). Hersch Waxman and Jackie Stillisano, director and associate director of the ERC; Larry Kelly, director of the Secondary Graduate Certification Program in the College of Education and Human Development; and Dennis Smith, head of the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, will be principal investigators on the project. Faculty from the College of Education and the College of Science will participate in the project, and A&M Collaborative partners will include Blinn College, Bryan ISD, and Cypress-Fairbanks ISD.

The purpose of the A&M Collaborative is to develop and pilot a research-based model designed to prepare P-16 education professionals to assist students in meeting College and Career Readiness Standards and skilled workforce expectations, and the ERC data warehouse will be an important resource in tracking the academic and college success of high school students served in the project. A key component of the project is the development of a self-assessment tool for all teacher education institutions in Texas to evaluate the quality, effectiveness, and alignment to CCR Standards of their educator preparation programs.

**ERC Team Expands Again:** The ERC is happy to welcome a new research associate to our team. Rhonda Goolsby is a 4th year doctoral student in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, pursuing a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in reading.

Goolsby's dissertation research is advised by faculty of the TAMU Health Science Center as well as the College of Education and Human Development and explores making life-saving health information more accessible to low-literate adults. Prior to joining the ERC team, Rhonda worked in Bryan ISD for 8 years in a variety of capacities, including teacher, Instructional Specialist, program coordinator, and master teacher.

**Lewis Publishes 3rd Book:** Chance Lewis recently released a new book targeted to educators working with African American students in our public schools. Entitled *An Educator's Guide to Working With African American Students: Strategies for Promoting Academic Success*, the book provides practical guidance to help teachers increase the academic performance of their African American students. Entitled *Plagiarism: An Addiction of Chinese Students*, the book addresses the frequency of plagiarism incidents and possible ways for educators to address it.

**Upcoming Events**

The second event in the ERC's 2009-2010 seminar series is scheduled for October 22, 2009, from 12-3:30 p.m. in Herrington Tower 301. Jim Van Overschelde, director of Educational Research and Policy for Texas Education Agency's Office of Statewide Policy and Grants, will present *The State of English-Language Learners in Texas*.

The third event in the ERC's 2009-2010 seminar series will be held on November 18, 2009, from 12:30 p.m. - 1:30 p.m. in Herrington Tower 301. Lori L. Taylor, ERC program area leader for school finance, resources, & facilities, will be presenting.

**ERC Staff**
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Director
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Associate Director
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Research Assistant
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Lori Taylor
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Anthony Rolle
School Finance, Resources, & Facilities
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**Barnes & Ortiz Give Invited Presentation at ERC Project Meeting:** The ERC hosted a “kick-off” meeting on October 27 to launch the TAMU Collaborative Demo Sites Project. Meeting attendees represented the various project partners and included administrators, faculty, and staff from the College of Science and the College of Education and Human Development at Texas A&M; administrators and faculty from Blinn Community College; and district and campus administrators and teachers from Bryan High School and Rudder High School in Bryan ISD and from Cy-Lakes High School and Cy-Falls High School in Cypress-Fairbanks ISD.

Special guests Susan Barnes and Araceli Ortiz from the Division of P-16 Educator Quality at the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board gave an invited presentation entitled *Overview of the 116 Initiatives Division and College Career Readiness Initiatives*. In their presentation, Barnes and Ortiz shared information about the College and Career Readiness Initiative—a 3-year project sponsored by TEA and THECB designed to improve alignment between secondary and postsecondary education through the development and implementation of standards for college and career readiness for Texas students (CCR Standards). The implementation of the CCR Standards will help high schools set the challenge level and content necessary for college and career readiness, create a more rigorous senior year, and prepare students for workforce skills and expectations; in addition, it will help institutions of higher education increase course consistency and develop better college placement criteria.

Barnes and Ortiz highlighted four major initiatives supported by the Educator Quality Group at the THECB to encourage implementation of the CCR Standards: (a) The Math, Science, and Technology Preparation Academies (MSTTP Academies); (b) the College and Career Readiness Initiative Faculty Collaboratives (CCRI); (c) Educator Preparation Demonstration Sites (TAMU Collaborative Demo Sites); and (d) the Teacher Quality Grants Program (TQGP).

**ERC to Evaluate Two THECB Educator Quality Projects:** The ERC is pleased to announce that it has received a grant from the Texas Higher Education Board (THECB) to conduct program evaluations of two THECB Educator Quality Projects: (a) the Math, Science, and Technology Teacher Preparation (MSTTP) Academies and (b) the College and Career Readiness Initiatives (CCRI) Faculty Collaboratives. Jackie Stillisano and Hersh Waxman, associate director and director of the ERC, will be the principal investigators on the project. Additional ERC researchers involved include Danielle Brown, Yuan-Hsuan Lee, Kayla Braelin Rollins, and Rhonda Goolsby.

The MSTTP Academies work with teacher education programs to improve the content and pedagogical skills of K-12 teachers in math, science, and technology and to increase K-12 teachers’ knowledge of the College and Career Readiness (CCR) Standards. Researchers from the ERC will develop rubrics and protocols to collect and examine data on the four MSTTPA programs in Cycle II and the nine programs in Cycle III funded by the THECB.

The CCRI Faculty Collaboratives are four centers sponsored by four different institutions of higher education. Their purpose is to provide faculty development opportunities, symposia, mini-grants, and other activities designed to increase college and university faculty knowledge of the CCR Standards and to improve the alignment of the core curriculum at public colleges and university with the CCR Standards. ERC researchers will collect and examine data from each collaborative and from the program overall to determine the effectiveness of the collaboratives in informing faculty about the CCR Standards and in helping teacher educators integrate the standards into teacher education programs.

**ERC Researchers Contribute to TEA Reports:** Two new TEA reports, Governor’s Educator Excellence Grant (GEEG) Program: Year Three Evaluation Report and Texas Educator Excellence Grant (TEEG) Program: Year Three Evaluation Report, were published to the Texas Education Agency’s website on September 1, 2009. Lori L. Taylor, a member of the ERC’s leadership team, is a contributing author on the GEEG report; and Dennis Jansen, Tim Gronberg, and Taylor—all from Texas A&M—are among the team of authors on the TEEG report.

**Upcoming Events:** The ERC will hold its first seminar series for the 2010 year on Wednesday, January 27, from 12:00 noon-1:00 p.m. in Harrington Tower 301. Carol Stuessy, associate professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, will be presenting.

**Student Researcher Joins the ERC:** John Goldgar has joined the ERC as a student researcher, assisting in research projects as a part time work-study student. Originally from Plano, Texas, John is a junior, pursuing a Bachelor of Science in Sport Management with a business minor.
Van Overschelde and his team are currently evaluating the status and growth in number of ELL students in the state, based on students’ elementary TAKS scores and on early intervention initiatives. A variety of interesting findings have accrued from their study, including the fact that different districts have had to create bilingual programs in Spanish, Vietnamese, Arabic, Korean, or Urdu because of the numbers of students in those districts whose first language is one of the above. The researchers also found that pre-kindergarten had a very positive effect on ELL students. Compared to ELL students who did not attend pre-kindergarten, those who did attend pre-kindergarten had a higher rate of staying in Texas public schools, were proficient in English sooner. scored significantly higher on grade 3 Reading and Math TAKS, and had a higher promotion rate.

According to the capstone group’s calculations, the projected dropouts from the class of 2012 will cost Texas between $193 million and $350 million in gross state assessment; attendees include K-12 administrators, teachers, and counselors; higher education faculty; testing specialists; and TEA staff.

**October Seminar Series Event:** The ERC held the second event in its 2009-2010 seminar series on October 20. Dr. James Van Overschelde, from the Educational Research and Policy Division of the Texas Education Agency, presented *The State of English-Language Learners in Texas* to a group of 30+ administrators, faculty, and students. Among those attending were James Kracht, executive associate dean for academic affairs in the College of Education and Human Development; Jan Hughes, professor in the Department of Educational Psychology; and Quentin Dixon, assistant professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture.

Van Overschelde and his team are currently evaluating the status and growth in number of ELL students in the state, based on students’ elementary TAKS scores and on early intervention initiatives. A variety of interesting findings have accrued from their study, including the fact that different districts have had to create bilingual programs in Spanish, Vietnamese, Arabic, Korean, or Urdu because of the numbers of students in those districts whose first language is one of the above. The researchers also found that pre-kindergarten had a very positive effect on ELL students. Compared to ELL students who did not attend pre-kindergarten, those who did attend pre-kindergarten had a higher rate of staying in Texas public schools, were proficient in English sooner. scored significantly higher on grade 3 Reading and Math TAKS, and had a higher promotion rate.

According to the capstone group’s calculations, the projected dropouts from the class of 2012 will cost Texas between $193 million and $350 million in gross state product each year for the rest of their working lives and between $5 billion and $9 billion in potential earnings over their lifetimes. The findings of this study indicate that dropout rates in Texas are high and continuing to increase. Although Taylor and her team evaluated programs currently in place in schools to decrease the dropout rate, they concluded that more high-quality research is needed to assess the effectiveness of different programs.

**ERCs Give Joint Presentation at TAC:** Hersh Waxman and Jackie Stillisano—together with Susan Brown from THECB, James Van Overschelde from TEA, Celeste Alexander from the ERC at UT, and Dan O’Brien from the ERC at UTD—recently gave a presentation entitled *Did It Work? Data Driven Answers From the Texas Education Research Centers* at the 24th annual Texas Assessment Conference (TAC) in Austin, TX. In their talk, the presenters provided a background for the establishment and organization of the three State of Texas ERCs, a description of the research areas upon which each ERC focuses and some of the projects housed in each center, and a discussion of the future direction of the ERCs. TAC is the only statewide conference in Texas specifically devoted to educational assessment; attendees include K-12 administrators, teachers, and counselors; higher education faculty; testing specialists; and TEA staff.

**ERC Team Expands:** We’re happy to welcome two new research associates to the ERC team! Beverly Alford is pursing her Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in early childhood education at Texas A&M University. Alford formerly worked as a graduate research assistant and an assistant lecturer in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture. She was also a research intern for the ERC. Her research interests include the role of play as a vehicle for learning and child inquiry-based learning and parent roles within a children’s museum. Prior to entering the doctoral program, Alford worked as a teacher and as an assistant director in an early childhood program in Houston.

Danielle Bairrington Brown is also a doctoral student in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, pursing a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in science education. Brown previously worked in the Secondary Graduate Certification Program, advising students on graduate school and on becoming a teacher. She was also a research intern for the ERC; and her research interests include instruction in the classroom, teacher preparation, and STEM related subjects. Prior to entering her doctoral program, Brown worked as a secondary science teacher in Houston.

**ERC Welcomes New Research Interns:** Allison Huie is a second-year doctoral student working toward a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in Culture and Curriculum. While completing the first year of her doctoral work, Huie continued to work as secondary English/language arts instructor in Bryan ISD, serving as department head and the school’s English Language Learners’ liaison. Huie currently serves as a graduate teaching assistant in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, working primarily with the Secondary Graduate Certification Program and as a graduate assistant in the Department of Visualization, managing the K-12 teacher education workshops as well as overseeing the development of a youth camp focusing on digital technology and art. Her research interests center on media literacy and teaching and learning with digital technologies. Huie is also involved in TAMU Ensemble, a digital libraries project initiated by the Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering.

Melanie N. Woods is a doctoral student in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, pursing a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in mathematics and urban education. Woods received a B.S. Math Education, an M.S. in Mathematics, and an M.Ed. in Administration and Supervision from Southern University in Baton Rouge. Her research interests include mathematics teacher education, professional development for preservice teachers, and postmodern practices of teacher preparation. Woods currently serves as president of the TLAC Graduate Student Association and as assistant editor of the Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy. She is a member of the steering committee for the Graduate Teaching Academy and a writing consultant for the College of Education POWER Writing services. Prior to entering the doctoral program, Woods worked as a secondary mathematics teacher in Sacramento, CA.

If you would like to see the full document, please visit the following link:

[http://erc.cehd.tamu.edu](http://erc.cehd.tamu.edu)
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(A peer-reviewed article which rates the TLAC Department Reading Program)
INSTITUTIONAL PRODUCTIVITY RATINGS BASED ON PUBLICATIONS IN NINE LITERACY JOURNALS: 1992–2005

TIMOTHY G. MORRISON and BRAD WILCOX
Brigham Young University, Department of Teacher Education, Provo, Utah, USA

This study extended the work of three previous studies that compared the scholarly productivity of faculty members in universities as represented in nine literacy journals. The top 25 universities were identified and this study shows that several institutions have remained consistent through the years as those that produce the largest amount of scholarship. As in previous studies, the University of Georgia ranked first by a substantial margin. This ranking was adjusted according to faculty size, resulting in a reordering of institutions—the University of Georgia remained first. The top 22 universities publishing in two leading literacy research journals—Reading Research Quarterly and Journal of Literacy Research—were also identified. This study also indicates an increase in scholarly work by multiple authors from collaborating institutions, including those from public schools.

University faculty members are expected to contribute professionally in three major areas: teaching, service, and scholarship. Although all three areas are important, Hollingsworth and Reutzel (1994) state what is true at many institutions: “Scholarship is the hard currency of universities” (p. 2). Boyer (1990) recognizes a variety scholarship, but he acknowledges that publication in refereed journals is vital to tenure and promotion at most 4-year schools.

Scholarly productivity of faculty members across institutions has been a focus of investigation for many years (Boyer, 1990; Chan, 1986; Ducharme & Agne, 1989). In the field of literacy, Guthrie, Seifert, and Mosberg (1983) examined topics, audiences, and citation rates in literacy journals, while Knudson, Onofrey, Theurer, and Boyd-Batstone (2002) identified the amount of literacy-focused research in three education journals. The first productivity rating in the field of literacy that compared institutions was completed by Hopkins in 1979. Her work was extended and
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updated by Johns, Ary, and St. John (1986) and by Hollingsworth and Reutzel (1994). The purpose of this study was to determine the scholarly productivity of institutions of higher education as measured by publications in refereed literacy journals for the years 1992 through 2005.

Hopkins (1979) examined publications in seven journals from September 1972 through August 1978. Johns et al. (1986) looked at articles published in the same seven journals but added an additional international journal, Reading Psychology. Their work covered the academic years of 1978 through 1983. Hollingsworth and Reutzel (1994) extended the previous two studies by looking at the same eight journals from the conclusion of 1983 through the end of 1991. The present study examined the same eight journals, with the addition of Scientific Studies of Reading, which began publication in 1997. The current study covers 1992 to the end of the volume year for each journal in 2005.

Clearly, the quality of scholarship at any institution cannot be measured simply by counting the number of publications in selected journals (Dillon, 1986). Individual faculty members may publish in journals beyond those listed here. However, these nine journals are considered to be the leading journals in the field of literacy. Individuals may also demonstrate scholarship in other ways, such as through publishing textbooks, writing invited articles, completing book reviews, preparing electronic presentations, and producing other creative works. Hollingsworth and Reutzel (1994) claim that the “picture of faculty productivity” is “complex” (p. 3). “There are, of course, other issues... that play into any equation used to evaluate the relative scholarly standing of any faculty and institution” (p. 3).

Method

Earlier studies focused on three criteria for including journals in their research: (a) the publications had to be national or international in scope, (b) they were required to have a literacy focus, and (c) the journals had to be refereed, using a blind, peer-review process. The journals included in this study met the same criteria. Information about circulation and acceptance rates was obtained from Web sites or through correspondence with current editors. In this study, hard copies of all issues of each
journal were examined, except for several years of *Reading Research Quarterly*, which was available online. Information about the nine journals selected for this study is provided below.

*Reading Research Quarterly* (RRQ) is published four times a year with a circulation of approximately 15,000 and an acceptance rate of 10–12%. The first issue examined was volume 27, number 1, 1992. The final issue was volume 40, number 4, 2005.

*Reading Research and Instruction* (RRI) is published four times a year with a circulation of approximately 2,000 and an acceptance rate of 10–15%. The first issue examined was volume 32, number 1, 1992. The final issue was volume 44, number 4, 2005.

*The Reading Teacher* (RT) is published eight times a year with a circulation of approximately 56,000 and an acceptance rate of 15–17%. The first issue examined was volume 46, number 1, 1992. The final issue was volume 58, number 8, 2005.

*Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* (JAAL, previously known as *Journal of Reading*, JR) is published eight times a year with a circulation of approximately 16,000 and an acceptance rate of 20%. The first issue examined was volume 36, number 1, 1992. The final issue was volume 49, number 8, 2005.

*Reading Psychology* (RP) was published four times a year until 2005. Now it is published five times a year. It has a circulation of approximately 1,200 and an acceptance rate of 30–40%. The first issue examined was volume 13, number 1, 1992. The final issue was volume 26, numbers 4–5, 2005.

*Journal of Literacy Research* (JLR, previously known as *Journal of Reading Behavior*, JRB) is published four times a year with a circulation of approximately 8,000 and an acceptance rate of 10%. The first issue examined was volume 24, number 1, 1992. The final issue was volume 37, number 4, 2005.

*Reading Horizons* (RH) is published four times a year with a circulation of approximately 1,000 and an acceptance rate of 20–30%. The first issue examined was volume 33, number 1, 1992. The final issue was volume 45, number 4, 2005.

*Reading Improvement* (RI) is published four times a year with a circulation of approximately 1,200 and an acceptance rate of 30–40%. The first issue examined was volume 29, number 1, 1992. The final issue was volume 42, number 2, 2005.

*Scientific Studies of Reading* (SSR) is published four times a year with a circulation of approximately 800 and an acceptance rate of
30%. The first issue examined was volume 1, number 1, 1997 when the journal began. The final issue was volume 9, number 4, 2005. Similar to guidelines used in previous research, the institutional affiliation of each author was noted with no additional information recorded. No distinction was made among the authors regarding their faculty, student, or emeritus status. In the same way, no distinction was made among departments or colleges within universities.

One point was given for each article considered. In the case of multiple authors, the point was divided proportionally among the institutions represented by the authors. For example, if the two authors of a single article were from different institutions, each institution received one half point. If three authors from different universities were listed, one third of a point was given to each institution, and so on. In a few cases, one point was divided among as many as 10 different institutions. Where no affiliation was listed, no point was given. In very few instances, two affiliations for a single author were listed. In these cases, credit was given only to the first institution listed. Most authors represented institutions of higher education; however, many also came from other public and private organizations, including schools and school districts, research institutions, government agencies, and hospitals. Credit was given only for articles. No commissioned work, editorials, commentaries, regular columns, book reviews, test reviews, or letters were considered in this study.

Procedures were also followed to obtain a productivity index for each university. Faculty size at institutions varies, as does the number of faculty assigned to work in literacy. The number of articles published by faculty at each university was divided by the number of full-time, tenured, or tenure-track faculty with literacy teaching and scholarship expectations. Each school provided the average number of faulty at their institution over the range of years of this study through telephone or E-mail contact.

**Results and Discussion**

Table 1 shows the scholarly productivity of the top 25 institutions as measured in nine literacy journals. The table presents the rankings for this study as well as rankings in previous studies. If no rank
### TABLE 1 Institutional Productivity Ranking in Nine Literacy Journals, 1992–2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>RRQ</th>
<th>RRI</th>
<th>RT</th>
<th>JAAL</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>JLR</th>
<th>RH</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>SSR</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rank Order 92–05</th>
<th>Rank Order 83–91</th>
<th>Rank Order 78–83</th>
<th>Rank Order 72–78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Georgia</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>74.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Texas Austin</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young Univ.</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Maryland</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>29.53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Illinois Urbana/Champaign</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>28.64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of South Florida</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>28.54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State Univ.</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois Univ.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M Univ.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>24.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State Univ.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers Univ.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>21.39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State Univ.</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continue on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>RRQ</th>
<th>RRI</th>
<th>RT</th>
<th>JAAL</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>JLR</th>
<th>RH</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>SSR</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rank Order 92–05</th>
<th>Rank Order 83–91</th>
<th>Rank Order 78–83</th>
<th>Rank Order 72–78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>21.17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Nevada Las Vegas</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.99</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. North Carolina Chapel Hill</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State Univ.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Univ.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Michigan</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Univ.</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Alberta</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Texas San Antonio</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State Univ.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Minnesota</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is shown, the school did not appear in the top 25 in previous rankings. Twelve universities that were among the top 25 in 1972–1978 remain among the top 25 in this study. Thirteen universities from the 1978–1983 report and 16 schools from the 1983–1991 study remain among the current top 25. Only 7 universities were included in the top 25 in all four studies. In rank order they are the University of Georgia, University of Maryland, University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign, Northern Illinois University, Purdue University, Kansas State University, and the University of Minnesota. It is noteworthy that the University of Georgia ranked first in all four studies by a substantial margin. Only one university, Arizona State University, ranked in the top 25 in the first three studies but was not listed in this study, although it ranked 26th with a total of 14.65 articles published.

In the first study, only one institution published in all journals under consideration, the University of Georgia. In the next two studies, eight universities published in all journals. In the current study, only one university, the University of Alberta, was represented in all nine journals, although many published in eight of the nine journals.

All of the top 25 institutions are located in the United States, except for two Canadian schools, the University of British Columbia and the University of Alberta. Of the 23 U.S. universities, 14 are Research I Institutions as classified by the Carnegie Foundation. The nine other universities in rank order are Brigham Young University; University of South Florida; Northern Illinois University; Ball State University; San Diego State University; University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Georgia State University; University of Texas, San Antonio; and Kansas State University. Brigham Young University is the only private institution among the top 25.

Following the pattern of the three previous studies, a separate tally was made of articles in Reading Research Quarterly and the Journal of Literacy Research. These two journals continue to be considered the most prestigious literacy research journals. Following the pattern set by Hollingsworth and Reutzel (1994), the top 20 journals were reported. However, because of a tie, the 22 leading institutions in these journals are shown in Table 2.

Thirteen universities in the RRQ/JLR ranking were also listed among the top 25 shown in Table 1. Nine additional institutions appear in this ranking. In order, they are Arizona State University,
TABLE 2 Institutional Productivity Ranking in *Reading Research Quarterly* and *Journal of Literacy Research* Only, 1992–2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>RRQ</th>
<th>JLR</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rank Order 92–05</th>
<th>Rank Order 83–91</th>
<th>Rank Order 78–83</th>
<th>Rank Order 72–78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Georgia</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Illinois Urbana/Champaign</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Texas Austin</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Maryland</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State Univ.</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Michigan</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of North Carolina Chapel Hill</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M Univ.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State Univ.</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. at Albany SUNY</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Nebraska Lincoln</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn. State Univ.</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Univ.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse Univ.</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Utah</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State Univ.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers Univ.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Colorado Boulder</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Iowa</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Univ.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of California Berkeley</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University at Albany (SUNY), University of Nebraska–Lincoln, Syracuse University, University of Utah, University of Colorado–Boulder, University of Iowa, Temple University, and University of California–Berkeley.

The 1983–1991 study ranked the top 20 institutions publishing in *RRQ* and *JLR*. Of that group, 14 appear in the current
Institutional Productivity

ranking. The 1978–1983 study only ranked the top 14, of which seven are listed in this study. The 1972–1978 study listed only the top 12 schools, 4 of which are included in Table 2. Only three universities appear in the RRQ/JLR rankings in all four studies. They are, in rank order, the University of Georgia, the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign, and the University at Albany (SUNY). Two universities appeared in the three previous studies but did not surface in the current study. They were the University of Minnesota with a total of 4.08, and the University of Illinois, Chicago with a total of 0.75. Had the two earliest studies reported 20 institutions, more schools may or may not have been included in the rankings.

The Hopkins (1979) study did not consider size of the faculty at the various institutions, so she was not able calculate the productivity of individual literacy faculty members. This procedure began with the Johns et al. (1986) study in which an institutional productivity index was calculated. They ranked 23 institutions. Hollingsworth and Reutzel (1994) followed that pattern and provided a ranking for the top 25 institutions. In the current study, a similar productivity index was calculated because institutions differ a great deal in the number of literacy faculty members, the time devoted to research, and teaching loads.

All of the top 22 institutions in Table 2 are located in the United States. Of these, all are Research I Institutions except two, University of Albany, SUNY, and Syracuse University. Syracuse is the only private university in the RRQ/JLR ranking.

When comparing results of studies from 1972 to 2005, two other findings are noteworthy. First, the number of articles with multiple authors appears to have increased, and frequency of authors collaborating across institutions also seems to have increased. This was an observation as journals were examined, but no tabulations were made. However, this is apparent when examining the results in the tables. In the first three studies, most of the numbers reported are whole and the decimals are usually .5. But in the current study, a variety of decimals are reported. Second, a high rate of authorship representing public school personnel was observed, both as single authors and as collaborators with university partners. This was true in all journals except Reading Research Quarterly, Journal of Literacy Research, and Studies of Scientific
Research, where public school authors were represented but not to the degree found in other journals. This was observed as journals were reviewed, but exact numbers were not kept. Authorship by public school personnel may reflect current focus on action research (Somekh, 2006) and a trend toward university/public school partnerships (Sirotnik & Goodlad, 1988).

Previous studies have examined scholarly productivity based on the number of faculty members at each institution, resulting in a productivity index. A similar index for the top 25 universities in this study was also calculated (See Table 3).

Ten universities appear in the productivity rankings of all three studies that have included this index. Three universities in this study ranked the same on the productivity index as their ranking in Table 1. They were the University of Georgia, Brigham Young University, and Texas A&M University. Twelve universities ranked higher when faculty size was considered. Two of these universities made double-digit gains: Kansas State University and the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Ten institutions dropped in the rankings, with the largest decreases being shown by Ohio State University, Northern Illinois University, and San Diego State University.

Summary

This study extended the work of three previous studies that compared the scholarly productivity of faculty members in universities as represented in nine literacy journals (Hollingsworth & Reutzel, 1994; Hopkins, 1979; Johns et al., 1986). Articles published in these journals do not represent all of the scholarly work in literacy education, but these are currently the leading journals in the field. The top 25 universities were identified and this study shows that several institutions have remained consistent through the years as those that produce the largest amount of scholarship. The rankings changed when faculty size was considered, but only five institutions’ rankings changed dramatically. The top 22 universities publishing in two leading literacy research journals—Reading Research Quarterly and Journal of Literacy Research—were also identified. As one would expect, the majority of universities that appear in both rankings are Research I Institutions where primary emphasis is placed on research and scholarly productivity. This study also
### TABLE 3 Institutional Productivity Ranking Based on the Number of Faculty Members Assigned to Literacy, 1992–2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Productivity Index</th>
<th>Rank Order 92–05</th>
<th>Rank Order 83–91</th>
<th>Rank Order 78–83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Georgia</td>
<td>74.82</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of North Carolina Chapel Hill</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young Univ.</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State Univ.</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Maryland</td>
<td>29.53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Illinois Urbana/Champaign</td>
<td>28.64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Texas</td>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers Univ.</td>
<td>21.39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M Univ.</td>
<td>24.40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State Univ.</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State Univ.</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of British Columbia</td>
<td>21.17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Nevada Las Vegas</td>
<td>19.99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State Univ.</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of South Florida</td>
<td>28.54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Univ.</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Univ.</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Alberta</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Texas, San Antonio</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Michigan</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State Univ.</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois Univ.</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Minnesota</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State Univ.</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicates an increase in scholarly work by multiple authors from collaborating institutions, including those from public schools.
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Online Accelerated Credential Program –
Lynn Beason, Director
Online Accelerated Credential Program – Lynn Beason, Director

1) How old is program?
   a. The Accelerate Online program was established in January 2003. This is the program’s eighth year.

2) How many students – last five years? 230

3) How does it work? Nature of coursework? Majors? Why is it called “accelerated”? What are criteria for entrance??

**How does it work?**
Once admitted to the program all of the following components of the program must be completed in order to be recommended for standard teaching certification in the state of Texas.
   i. You must attend a program orientation.
   ii. You must take and pass the TExES content exam for your certification area.
   iii. You must complete the online instructional modules.
   iv. You must complete a 40 hour early field experience (2 class periods each day for 4 consecutive weeks).
   v. You must complete the online internship workshop.
   vi. You must take and pass the TExES PPR exam.
   vii. You must successfully complete a year-long paid teaching internship at any public school in the state of Texas. (This can be replaced with a 12 week unpaid student teaching experience coordinated through the student teaching office.)

**Nature of the course work**
The course work consists of online instructional modules that are delivered through the eEmpowerment Zone (A learning management system that was designed in the TLAC department and under the supervision of Dr. Jon Denton).

**Majors**
The major of the students is not one of the data points that we have been collecting. However, we have had students from a wide variety of majors across the campus. The focus for acceptance to the program is on the required teaching field course work rather than the major of the student.

**Why is it called “accelerated”?**
The pre-service portion of the program can be completed in one academic semester. Once the pre-service portion of the program is completed (and the candidate has graduated), they can begin a year-long teaching internship.
During this internship, the participant is hired by the school district and is the teacher of record for the classroom. They are also earning a full, first year teacher salary. This program allows the participant to move into a teaching position at an “accelerated” pace.

Criteria for entrance
The eligibility requirements are listed below.

In addition to the requirements listed below, a candidate provides a writing sample on teacher perceptions that is scored using a rubric. The candidate also participates in a face-to-face interview. This interview includes: a set of interview questions, which are scored with a rubric, and a sample TExES content exam. The interview participants are provided with a list of questions missed on the sample exam and these questions are correlated with the domains and competencies covered on the TExES content exam. This allows the participants who are admitted to the program to use this sample exam as a diagnostic tool as they prepare for the full scale TExES content exam.

Eligibility Requirements

- Applicant holds a baccalaureate degree in a discipline related to the intended certification area (Texas A&M University – College Station students can apply if they are within one semester of completing a baccalaureate degree). Please note that a bachelor's degree is a requirement for certification.

- Graduates of foreign universities must have their transcripts evaluated by an approved agency. A list of foreign credential evaluation services can be found at:

  https://secure.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/certinfo/forcredevalservice.asp.

  When requesting an evaluation, be sure that the agency specifically states that you have received the U.S. equivalent of a bachelor’s degree in your subject area AND provides a detailed course-by-course listing of all course work.

- Applicant must have successfully completed appropriate hours of content area/teaching field course work, as outlined on the Accelerate website. A grade of C or better is required in any course used to meet the teaching field course requirements. 

  http://accelerate.tamu.edu/requirements.html

- Applicant must have at least a 2.5 GPR in their baccalaureate course work attempted.

- Applicant must be a U.S. citizen or legal permanent resident and reside in Texas.

Texas Academic Skills Program Examination (TASP)
Texas Higher Education Assessment (THEA)
Undergraduate Applicants

- Applicant must pass all sections of the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) examination or the Texas Higher Education Assessment or an equivalent examination such as the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST) or be exempt from TASP or THEA. Selected university courses completed with a grade of "A or B" within past five years may be substituted in lieu of a TASP or THEA examination passing score. More information regarding testing dates may be found at:


- Minimum acceptable scores on the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) and Texas Higher Education Assessment (THEA) exam:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or meet one of the following options to establish mastery as defined by the State Board of Educator Certification:

- ACT score from a single sitting in the last five years must equal at least 23 with at least 19 per section.
- SAT scores from a single sitting in the last five years must equal at least 1070 with at least 500 per section.
- TAAS scale scores of TLI X-86 or higher in math, TLI X-89 or higher in reading and 1770 or higher in writing.
- Selected university courses completed with a grade of "A or B" within past five years may be substituted in lieu of a TASP examination passing score.
- ACT and SAT scores may be no more than five years old and exit-level TAAS scores may be no more than three years old.

Graduate Applicants

- The TASP is not an admission requirement for applicants possessing a minimum of a baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution as established by the Accelerate Online policy board.

Background check for criminal activity

- Applicant must pass a background check.
Letters of Recommendation

- The applicant will provide two letters of recommendation indicating the likelihood for success as a teacher.

Language Assessment

- Applicant must meet one of the following at the time of application.
  - Earned a baccalaureate degree in the United States.
  - Earned a baccalaureate degree from an English speaking institution (all transcripts must be in English and must include a letter from the university/evaluation company stating all instruction was in English).
  - Completed the following:
    - Test of English as a Foreign Language Internet-Based Test (TOEFL-iBT – [www.toefl.org](http://www.toefl.org)) with a total score of 90 and the following minimum section requirements:
      - Speaking: 26
      - Writing: 22
      - All other sections: 20

Computer Access

- Applicant has access to an Internet-capable computer (preferably a PC). Some lesson functions do not operate with Apple computers.

4) How does it differ from other cert programs—What is unique

This program involves online instruction and includes a structured early field experience. The early field experience requires that the participant be with a classroom teacher 2 periods each day for 4 consecutive weeks. The assignments completed during this experience include observation forms, lesson planning activities, working with students in the classroom and reflections on their experiences. The program also offers the option for completing certification via a student teaching experience for those participants that cannot find a teaching job.

5) Advantages and disadvantages of this type of program

One advantage is that the interns have supervision and support throughout the whole first year of teaching.

The correlating disadvantage is that the interns do not have as much time in the classroom prior to the internship as students who complete a student teaching experience.
Another advantage is that a significant portion of the pre-service part of the program can be completed while a student is either completing their undergraduate degree or while the student is employed at another job.

6) Current enrollment?

Students in internships – 13  
Students in student teaching placements – 10  
Students in pre-service portion of program – 39  

Total - 62

7) Breakdown of kind of student? Ethnicity? Where from? Typical student??

The majority of students are either completing an undergraduate degree in conjunction with obtaining certification or they are recent graduates. Less than 1% of the students in the program are mid-career changers.

The majority of the students in the program are Caucasian. Hispanic students represent the largest minority group participating in the program. However, less than 1% of the students in the program are from minority groups.

The typical student in the Accelerate Online program is a student who is either currently enrolled at TAMU or a recent graduate from TAMU.

8) Any kind of survey of success/challenges? Data gathered?

We have not been collecting this data in any formal way.

However, a reflection assignment was added this year for the interns. This assignment asks the interns to share their successes. This reflection activity was due at the end of the first semester of the internship (January 2010). These discussion board postings can be provided, if needed.

9) Track % get certified?  
46% (This number reflects years 4-6 since the majority of the year 7 people are in internships at this time.)

10) Track % actually go into teaching?
All participants that complete an internship teach for at least one year. We do not have data for those students who complete a student teaching placement rather than an internship.

11) Track % teach after 3 years? 5 years?

We don’t have this information since the participants are not required to keep in contact with us once they have completed the program. I checked with Kathy May and she said this information would have to come from TEA.

12) Any reports back from the field about success or otherwise?? Result in changes in program?

There are multiple opportunities for evaluation. Supervisors complete evaluations on the interns and these evaluations include information on successes and improvement areas.

Supervisors also contact the program coordinator with suggestions for improvement. These suggestions are evaluated and changes are implemented based on these suggestions. (Example – Supervisors suggested changing the lesson plan format and this change was made.)

At the conclusion of the program, the principal is asked to complete an online evaluation of the intern that was hired at their school.

The intern is asked to complete an online evaluation of the university supervisor at the conclusion of the program.

In addition, students are encouraged to contact the program coordinator with questions. These comments and questions are reviewed and changes are made, if needed.

13) Who teaches these students? What courses? All online? How large are classes? Course evaluations routine? How are they?

The online instructional modules were designed by current and former faculty of TAMU. These instructional modules form the basis of the majority of the instruction in the program.

Additional instruction is provided by:
   1. The program coordinator – at the program orientation, through, in the form of guidance throughout the program and through reflection activities during the internship or student teaching experience
2. The university supervisor – during the internship portion of the program (review of lesson plans, constructive feedback from observations, seminars, etc.)

The program involves cohorts of students rather than classes. The cohorts range in size from 2-3 up to 28-30.

There is no formal course evaluation form. However, students are asked to complete an online self evaluation at the conclusion of the program and this evaluation includes information about how they rate their skills based on the instruction they received in the program. In addition, there is ongoing communication between the students and the program coordinator throughout the program to address problems and concerns.

Another important evaluation of the effectiveness of the instruction provided through the online modules is the performance of the students on the PPR exam. The passing rate for the students in the Accelerate program on the PPR exam is 100%.

The students are also asked to evaluate their university supervisor at the conclusion of the program.

14) What is the biggest challenge of your job??

The biggest challenge of my job is staying on top of everything. The Accelerate program is a complete certification program, so all aspects of certification are handled through my office for this group of students.

We use the number of people that come into the program each year to keep track of program growth. However, we continue to work with these students into the next year because they are completing the year long internship. This means we are working with more students in any one year than just those who enter the program during that calendar year.

Current responsibilities

• Recruitment (career fairs, in-class presentations, informational meetings, drop-ins, online inquiries, referrals from advisors in our college and other colleges)
• Answer student questions regarding all aspects of the program
• Advise students with respect to completing the teaching field requirements for their desired teaching area
• Coordinate application process
• Review applications
• Coordinate interview process and conduct interviews
• Enroll students in the learning management system
• Organize and conduct program orientation meetings
• Coordinate early field placements
• Monitor and assist students as they move through the program
• Provide guidance as students look for teaching jobs to fulfill the internship portion of the program
• Provide assistance and guidance through the testing and certification process to ensure completion of all steps
• Hire and train supervisors for the internship portion of the program
• Provide ongoing assistance to supervisors
• Develop and deliver training sessions for students, interns and supervisors
• Design and coordinate reflection activities for interns
• Coordinate the program’s move from the eZone to Moodle
• Maintain the Aggie Marketplace payment website
• Monitor payments as they come into the Aggie Marketplace and prepare a list of delinquent payments for notification
• Maintain database of program participants
• Prepare reports on program as requested
• Monitor completion of program components and all other requirements to ensure everything is completed before the recommendation for certification is made (assignments, testing, evaluations, certification paperwork, etc.)
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The model of Engaged Scholarship is a central theme to the College of Education and Human Development. The faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) is a learning community committed to scholarship that creates and disseminates new knowledge; improves teaching practices; and serves the department, college, university, profession, and community.

The faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture recognize that within the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, it is important to comply with the University goals of achieving a culture that supports multidisciplinary collaboration, developing a climate and providing experiences that enhance diversity and internationalization, and requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance with university guidelines and regulations.

Approvals:
INTRODUCTION

This document is a guide to enable faculty members and administrators in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture to identify, cite, and evaluate the annual performance of individual tenure-track faculty members in the traditional areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The document identifies categories of performance and ranks their importance, within each of these three areas. Points are assigned to each activity according to its ranked importance within the category. Throughout this Guide, the term “faculty” is used to refer to “tenure-track faculty.”

A. General Assumptions

- While the document describes several categories of performance within each area, it does not attempt to list all possible activities within these categories. Faculty members are responsible for clarifying or justifying the reason for placement of an outlying activity within the appropriate category.
- Value Added points are available for most performance activities. These Value Added points are intended to reflect activities that are valued and important to the department, college, and/or university and are intended to reward faculty members who focus their efforts on activities that benefit or advance the larger academic community.
- The ranking of categories and the assignment of both points and Value Added points are intended to align with the advancement toward tenure and promotion of junior faculty. Generally, active and consistent engagement and productivity in the higher-ranked categories, with special attention given to the area of scholarship, should support promotion and tenure. However, simply attaining the threshold number of points for merit in each area would not be deemed sufficient for either promotion or tenure.

B. Expected and Merit Performance

- Points are awarded to faculty members within each of the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. Expected performance is identified for each area, according to a specified number of points earned (12 points for Scholarship, 12 points for Teaching, and 6 points for Service).
- Points earned above Expected performance levels are Merit points. There is no upper limit to the number of Merit points that can be earned within each of the three areas.

C. Implementation

- Merit need not be requested; it is awarded upon exceeding the threshold number of points for Expected performance. Merit can be earned independently in each of the three areas (Scholarship, Teaching, Service).
- The annual Merit raise pool for tenure-track faculty in the department will be allotted to each of the areas: Scholarship (40%), Teaching (40%) and Service (20%). Each faculty member will receive a share of the merit raise pool, proportional to the number of merit points he/she earned in each area and relative to the total points earned by all TLAC tenure-track faculty members within each of the three areas.
- The Department Head will report to the faculty a summary of the A-1 results, including the frequency distributions, means, and total number of merit points for each of the three areas. These data will allow individual faculty members to calculate their share of the merit raise pools for each area.
FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: TRAINING and SAFETY

Faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) realize the importance of maintaining their own level of awareness and expertise in basic competencies related to ethical, safety, and personnel concerns of the university. Each faculty member must attest to the following statements before the annual A-1 evaluation can be considered.

1. Faculty members should complete all training activities that are required by the university, college, or department.
   ___ I have completed all currently required training requirements.

2. Faculty members should consider the teaching environments they were responsible for and list any safety concerns.
   ___ After consideration of the teaching environments where I was the instructor of record, I believe that all safety concerns that I could mitigate would tend to be of low impact and low frequency.

3. Faculty members should consider the research environments they were responsible for and list any safety concerns.
   ___ After consideration of the research environments where I was the principal or lead investigator for the environment, I believe that all safety concerns that I could mitigate would tend to be of low impact and low frequency.
FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: SCHOLARSHIP (Research and Funding)

The Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture recognizes its status as an integral member of a top-tier research institution where research is defined as the construction, discovery, or integration of knowledge and the communication of this knowledge to an audience of critical peers. Contributing to the professional research literature is acknowledged as an academic priority in the Department. Consistent with College of Education and Human Development and University guidelines, faculty research accomplishments are demonstrated by the generation of products that are: part of a sustained, focused program; conceptual rather than merely technical; significant in their effects on thought and practice; and significant contributions by the individual (where he or she is part of a multidisciplinary activity).

Faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) realize the importance of external support for their research efforts. Faculty members who seek appropriate funding in any of the three major domains of evaluation (research, teaching and service) will be awarded performance points toward fulfillment of expected or meritorious performance. While it is acknowledged that all fields in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture do not have equal access to external funding opportunities, efforts to make the most of available opportunities are required of all faculty members.

Performance evaluation in the area of Scholarship includes both Research and Funding. The evaluation of performance for Scholarship will consist of the combined total productivity for each of these areas. To be considered for merit, the threshold level is 12 points, including at least one publication in Category 1 and participation* in at least one funding activity.

*Participation may include being a PI, Co-PI, or Member of (1) a project that is currently funded, or (2) a group that submits a proposal in any of the six categories for funding. A project must receive approval of funding or approval for continuation in the year of evaluation; a proposal must be submitted in the year of evaluation.
Performance Categories for Research

For the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, six categories of research will be used for faculty evaluation. The guidelines in this document reflect performance in these categories that have been sequenced by level of importance. For evaluation of performance in the area of research as a scholarly activity, authorship with students or by senior faculty with non-tenured colleagues should be considered. “Top-tier” journals are national or international in scope, and are listed in SSCI, ERIC, or Education Index and are recognized as influential in one’s field, with other factors taken into account as defined by the Department. Exhibitions of creative scholarship (artworks and arts-based performances) can be substituted for publications at the appropriate level in any of the categories.

Category 1 - Publications in peer-reviewed professional journals, including on-line journals and other professional formats, at the national or international level. Author of scholarly professional books at the national or international level. Publications contain original findings, reviews, syntheses, and critiques, and the creative application of existing knowledge to educational problems.

Category 2 - Publication of chapters in scholarly professional books at the national and international level. Publication in peer-reviewed conference proceedings at the national or international level. Editor or co-Editor of scholarly professional books at the national or international level. Publications contain original findings, reviews, syntheses, and critiques, and the creative application of existing knowledge to educational problems.

Category 3 - Publications in peer-reviewed professional journals, including on-line and other professional formats; publications in peer-reviewed conference proceedings; author or editor of scholarly professional books; at the regional level or state level. Publications contain original findings, reviews, syntheses, and critiques, and the creative application of existing knowledge to educational problems.

Category 4 - Presentation of research papers at professional conferences at the national or international level. Presentations that result from peer-reviewed proposals, membership presentations, invited addresses, and discussant/discussion panel membership. Presentations must be completed during the evaluation period.

Category 5 - Presentation of research papers at professional conferences at the regional, state, and local level. These presentations should result from peer-reviewed proposals, membership presentations, invited addresses, and discussant/discussion panel membership. Presentations must be completed during the evaluation period.

Category 6 - Articles in non peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings, editorial columns or book reviews in journals, local presentations, and opinion-editorial pieces for newspapers or magazines. These presentations and publications must be in print or completed during the evaluation period.
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Research

The following table outlines the performance points to be awarded for each Research activity. Points are awarded for each article or presentation. Meritorious consideration will be determined by the cumulative number of points. College or University level Research Awards receive Value Added points to be negotiated with the Department Head. The evaluation of performance for Scholarship will consist of the combined total productivity for Research and Funding. To be considered for merit, the threshold level is 12 points, including at least one publication in Category 1 and participation in at least one funding activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value Added Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications must be in press, in print, on-line, or on display (arts-based) during the A-1 evaluation period and may be listed only one time. Presentations must be completed during the evaluation period.</td>
<td>Published or in press, With student(s), AND/OR non-tenured TLAC faculty</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary+ OR Enhances diversity or internationalization+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1 - Publications in peer-reviewed professional journals, including on-line journals and other professional formats, at the national or international level. Author of scholarly professional books at the national or international level.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2 - Publication of chapters in scholarly professional books at the national and international level. Publication in peer-reviewed conference proceedings at the national or international level. Editor or co-Editor of scholarly professional books at the national or international level.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3 - Publications in peer-reviewed professional journals, including on-line and other professional formats; publications in peer-reviewed conference proceedings; author or editor of scholarly professional books; at the regional level or state level.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4 - Presentation of research papers at professional conferences at the national or international level that result from peer-reviewed proposals, membership presentations, invited addresses, and discussant/discussion panel membership.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5 - Presentation of research papers at professional conferences at the regional, state, and local level. These presentations should result from peer-reviewed proposals, membership presentations, invited addresses, and discussant/discussion panel membership.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6 - Articles in non peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings, editorial columns or book reviews in journals, local presentations, and opinion-editorial pieces for newspapers or magazines.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Three Value Added points are awarded for publication in a “top-tier” journal. This should be justified by faculty member using indicators such as citation rating, acceptance rate under 25%, significance, impact, or degree of extending knowledge.. +See University guidelines for definitions and sample activities.
Performance Categories for Funding

The guidelines in this document reflect fund-seeking efforts from the categories below that are listed by type of funding source. While not exhaustive, these six categories represent primary funding sources. In evaluating any fund-seeking effort, the primary indicators are the source, the potential impact of the funding, and the dollar amount.

Category 1 – Federal grants and contracts obtained through a multi-tiered peer review system. These competitive grants support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

Category 2 – State grants and contracts obtained through a multi-tiered peer review system. These competitive grants support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

Category 3 – Foundation grants or contracts that are either peer reviewed or reviewed by the Board of Directors of the Foundation. These grants are competitive and support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

Category 4 – Federal grants and contracts that are reviewed by agency staff. These grants or contracts are reviewed internally by agency staff and support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

Category 5 – State grants and contracts that are reviewed by agency staff. These grants or contracts are reviewed internally by agency staff and support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

Category 6 – Local (system, university, college, and departmental) grants or contracts. These grants are based on peer reviews and support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Funding

The following table outlines the performance points to be awarded for each Funding activity. Points are earned in the year funding is sought, the year funding is granted, and each year of continuing funding. For funded proposals, additional points can be awarded for generating salary savings, as negotiated with the Department Head.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Funded Proposals* (year funded)</th>
<th>Submitted Proposals/Continuing Grants</th>
<th>Value added Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI or Co-PI</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1 – Federal grants and contracts obtained through a multi-tiered peer review system.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2 – State grants and contracts obtained through a multi-tiered peer review system.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3 – Foundation grants and contracts that are either peer reviewed or reviewed by the Board of Directors of the Foundation.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4 – Federal grants and contracts that are reviewed by agency staff.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5 – State grants and contracts that are reviewed by agency staff.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6 – Local (system, university, college and departmental) grants and contracts.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For funded proposals, additional Value Added points are awarded to the PI and Co-PIs each year for grant amounts as follows: Up to $49K – 1 point, $50K to $99K – 2 points, $100 to $149K – 3 points, $150K to $199K – 4 points, $200K to $249K - 5 points, over $250K – 6 points. Additional points are awarded to the PI, Co-PIs, or Members for each TLAC student supported by external grant funds: 4 points for each full-time (20 hours per week) student, and 2 points for each half-time student for each academic year of support. Projects will decide who will receive points for each student.

+See University guidelines for definitions and sample activities
FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: TEACHING (Instruction and Advising)

The Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture fully accepts its valuable role in the preparation of pre-service teachers and graduate students for the enhancement of teaching and learning. Each faculty member is expected to make significant contributions in areas such as quality classroom instruction, mentorship, effective instructional program development, and outreach and partnership initiatives. The Department recognizes that the scholarship of teaching takes many forms and includes classroom teaching, supervising field-based experiences, working with students on their individual projects, advising and mentoring students, developing learning materials (textbooks, computer programs, web-based courses), providing continuing education experiences for professional educators or other professional audiences, and developing new courses and programs.

For the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, six categories of teaching will be used for faculty evaluation. The guidelines in this document reflect performance in these categories, with Category 1 being most fundamental and advising graduate students also of high importance (see the separate table for this category).

Meritorious consideration will be determined by the cumulative number of points for Teaching and for Advising Graduate Students. To be considered for merit, the threshold level is 12 points, including at least 6 points in Category 1.

Performance Categories for Instruction

Category 1 - Quality and effectiveness of teaching: Delivery and impact of classroom, laboratory, and field-based instruction. Teaching should be evaluated using the PICA student evaluation system. In addition, evaluation can include one or more of: (1) Peer review of classroom teaching and instructional innovations, using a valid and reliable measure, (2) Preparation of a teaching portfolio, or (3) Self-evaluation and development of an improvement plan.

Category 2 - Contribution to the development of the curriculum: Development and implementation of new courses or appropriate and substantial revisions of existing courses

Category 3 - Scholarship within the broader context of instruction: Writing textbooks and developing instructional materials: enhancement of instruction in the faculty member’s field of study through production of various teaching publications.

Category 4 - Use of appropriate technologies in instruction and curriculum development: Demonstrate sound, effective, and creative uses of technology.

Category 5 - Work in a mentoring role with individual students: Direct work with students, mentoring undergraduate and graduate students.

Category 6 - Provision of continuing education experiences for professional educators or other professional audiences: Contributing to the improvement of comprehensive educational programs through workshops and presentations for inservice teachers.
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Instruction

The following table outlines the performance points to be awarded for each Teaching activity. College or University level Teaching Awards receive Value added points to be negotiated with the Department Head. **Meritous consideration will be determined by the cumulative number of points for Teaching and for Advising Graduate Students. To be considered for merit, the threshold level is 12 points, including at least 6 points in Category 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value added Points#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1: Quality and effectiveness of teaching. Delivery and impact of classroom, laboratory, and field-based instruction as indicated by average PICA student rating at or above 4.0 for undergraduate courses or 4.5 for graduate courses.*</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2: Contribution to the development of the curriculum itself. Development and implementation of new courses or appropriate and substantial revisions of existing courses, including extending the course for Web or online enrollment.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3: Scholarship within the broader context of instruction. Enhancement of instruction in the faculty member’s field of study through production of various teaching publications; writing textbooks and developing instructional materials.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4: Use of appropriate technologies in instruction and curriculum development. Sound, effective, and creative uses of technology.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5: Work in a mentoring role with individual students. Work with individual undergraduate or graduate students. (See the following table for points awarded for chairing and membership on graduate committees.)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6: Provision of professional development experiences for professional educators or other professional audiences. Contributing to the improvement of comprehensive educational programs through workshops and presentations for inservice teachers</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PICA average ratings must include at least 50% of the students enrolled. **Points are awarded for each course meeting the criterion.** Additional points can be used to meet the 6 point Category 1 requirement by completing a Peer Review, Teaching Portfolio, or Self-Evaluation (3 points per course). **#Value added points are awarded for participation in professional development activities to improve teaching effectiveness or for teaching large sections of 40 or more undergraduate or 20 or more graduate students (3 points per activity).**

+See [University guidelines for definitions and sample activities](#)
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Advising Graduate Students

The following table summarizes merit performance points for advising graduate students. **Points are awarded for each student and added to the merit points for Teaching.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories#</th>
<th>Points per Student Graduated*</th>
<th>Points per Student Continuing+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1 – PhD Dissertation/EdD Record of Study committee Chair or Co-chair</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2 – MS Thesis committee Chair or Co-chair</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3 – PhD Dissertation/EdD Record of Study committee Member</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4 – M Ed committee Chair</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5 – MS Thesis committee Member</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6 – M Ed committee Member</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Student must have an approved degree plan and be currently enrolled for at least one semester or summer session during the year. Points are awarded both for committees inside and outside the TLAC department.

*Value Added points are awarded for students who are placed in a position at a Research I university upon graduation (3 points per student).

+ Points can only be awarded for a maximum of three continuing years before graduating.
FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: SERVICE

For the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, five categories of service for organizational citizenship and scholarship and application are addressed in these guidelines. With regard to service, a claim for higher ranking in any category must be justified in terms of significance, time commitment, and degree of importance. To be considered for merit, the threshold level is 6 points.

Performance Categories for Service

Category 1: Service to the profession at the national or international level - At the national or international level, serving as: an officer of an organization; chair or committee member of a prominent committee; Editor or co-Editor of a journal, special issue, or proceedings; presenter of a service-related talk or paper; grant or conference paper reviewer; newsletter editor; or mentor a student receiving an award.

Category 2: Service to the Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture - Developing new programs, serving as chair or member of standing and ad-hoc committees; serving as advisor of student organizations; mentoring new faculty. Organizing or presenting at department or program area seminars.

Category 3: Service to the College of Education and Human Development or Texas A&M University - Serving as a chair or member of college or university committee; organizing or presenting at seminars sponsored by the university or college. Service related presentation at a college or university-wide meeting; writing an article in a university or college publication.

Category 4: Service to the profession at the regional or state level – At the regional or state level, serving as: an officer of an organization; chair or committee member of a prominent committee; Editor or co-Editor of a journal, book, special issue or proceedings; presenter of a service-related talk or paper; grant or conference paper reviewer; newsletter editor; or mentor a student receiving an award.

Category 5: Service to the community through efforts to support children and families - Lecturing to non-professional groups; serving as a committee or board member for district or community agencies; serving on school-based committees; providing professional development in-services for school personnel; or providing classroom presentations or model teaching lessons to school-age children. Editing community newsletters; providing support for community grant writing projects; applying for seed grants related to community issues; creating web page for community agency.
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Service

The following table outlines the performance points to be awarded for each Service activity. Points are awarded for each activity. College or University level Service Awards receive Value added points to be negotiated with the Department Head. **To be considered for merit, the threshold level is 6 points.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value added Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1: Service to the profession at the national or international level - At the national or international level, serving as: an officer of an organization; chair or committee member of a prominent committee; Editor or co-Editor of a journal, special journal issue, or proceedings; presenter of a service-related talk or paper; grant or conference paper reviewer or newsletter editor; or mentor of a student receiving an award.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2: Service to the Department of Teaching, Learning &amp; Culture - Developing new programs, serving as chair or member of standing or ad-hoc committee; serving as advisor of student organization; mentoring new faculty; organizing or presenting at department or program area seminars.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3: Service to the College of Education and Human Development or Texas A&amp;M University - Serving as a chair or member of college or university committee; organizing or presenting at seminars sponsored by the university or college. Service-related presentation at a college or university-wide meeting; writing an article in a university or college publication.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4: Service to the profession at the regional or state level – At the regional or state level, serving as: an officer of an organization; chair or committee member of a prominent committee; Editor or co-Editor of a journal, special issue, or proceedings; presenter of a service-related talk or paper; grant or conference paper reviewer; newsletter editor; or mentor of a student receiving an award.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5: Service to the community through efforts to support children and families - Lecturing to non-professional groups; serving as a committee or board member for district or community agencies; serving on school-based committees; providing professional development in-services for school personnel; or providing classroom presentations or model teaching lessons to school school-age children. Editing community newsletters; providing support for community grant writing projects; applying for seed grants related to community issues; creating web page for community agency.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+See [University guidelines for definitions and sample activities](#)
Appendix 18:

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION GUIDE
For LECTURAL AND CLINICAL FACULTY
Approved October 2009
The model of Engaged Scholarship is a central theme to the College of Education and Human Development. The faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) is a learning community committed to scholarship that creates and disseminates new knowledge; improves teaching practices; and serves the department, college, university, profession, and community.

The faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture recognize that within the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, it is important to comply with the University goals of achieving a culture that supports multidisciplinary collaboration, developing a climate and providing experiences that enhance diversity and internationalization, and requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance with university guidelines and regulations.

Approved by TLAC Faculty
October 2009

Approved by Department Head
October 2009

Approved by Dean of College
November 2009

Approved by Dean of Faculty
February 2, 2010
INTRODUCTION

This document is a guide to enable faculty members and administrators in the Teaching, Learning, and Culture department to identify, cite, and evaluate the annual performance of individual tenure-track faculty members in the three traditional areas of teaching, service, and scholarship. Throughout this Guide, the term “faculty” is used to refer to “lecturer or clinical faculty.” The document identifies categories of performance and ranks their importance, within each of these three areas. Points are assigned to each activity according to the ranked importance of the category.

A. General Assumptions
   • While the document describes several categories of performance within each area, it does not attempt to list all possible activities within these categories. Faculty members are responsible for clarifying or justifying the reason for placing an outlying activity within the appropriate category.
   • Value Added points are available for most performance activities. These Value Added points are intended to reflect activities that are valued and important to the department, college, and/or university and are intended to reward faculty members who focus their efforts on activities that benefit the students, the department, and the larger academic community.
   • The ranking of categories and the assignment of points and Value Added points are intended to align with the advancement toward promotion of junior faculty. Generally, active and consistent engagement and productivity in the higher-ranked categories, with special attention given to the area of teaching, should lead to promotion. However, simply attaining the threshold number of points for merit in each area would not be deemed sufficient for promotion.

B. Expected and Merit Performance
   • Points are awarded to faculty members within each of the three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. Expected performance is identified for each area, according to a specified number of points earned (7 points for Teaching, 3 points for Service, and 2 points for Scholarship).
   • Points earned above Expected performance levels are Merit points. There is no upper limit to the number of Merit points that can be earned within each of the three areas.

C. Implementation
   • The annual Merit raise pool for lecturer and clinical faculty in the department will be allotted to the three areas of Teaching (80%), Service (10%), and Scholarship (10%). Each faculty member will receive a share of the merit raise pool, proportional to the number of merit points they earn in each area and relative to the total points earned by all TLAC tenure-track faculty members within each of the three areas.
   • The Department Head will report to the faculty a summary of the A-1 results, including the frequency distributions, means, and total number of merit points for each of the three areas. These data will allow individual faculty members to calculate their share of the merit raise pools for each area..
FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: TRAINING and SAFETY

Faculty in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture (TLAC) realize the importance of maintaining their own level of awareness and expertise in basic competencies related to ethical, safety, and personnel concerns of the university. Each faculty member must attest to the following statements before the annual A-1 evaluation can be considered.

1. Faculty members should complete all training activities that are required by the university, college, or department.
   
   ____ I have completed all currently required training requirements.

2. Faculty members should consider the teaching environments they were responsible for and list any safety concerns.
   
   ____ After consideration of the teaching environments where I was the instructor of record, I believe that all safety concerns that I could mitigate would tend to be of low impact and low frequency.

3. Faculty members should consider the research environments they were responsible for and list any safety concerns.
   
   ____ After consideration of the teaching environments where I was the principal or lead investigator for the environment, I believe that all safety concerns that I could mitigate would tend to be of low impact and low frequency.
FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: TEACHING (Instruction and Advising)

The Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture fully accepts its important role in the preparation of pre-service teachers and graduate students for the enhancement of teaching and learning. All faculty members are expected to make significant contributions through high-quality classroom instruction and mentoring, the development of effective instructional programs, and their efforts in the outreach and partnership programs, however the primary responsibility for teaching undergraduate students remains with the clinical and lecturer faculty. The Department recognizes that the scholarship of teaching takes many forms and includes classroom-based teaching, supervising field-based experiences, working with students on their individual projects, advising and mentoring students, developing learning materials (textbooks, computer programs, web-based courses), providing continuing education experiences for professional educators or other professional audiences, and developing new courses and programs.

For the clinical and lecturer faculty of the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, six categories of teaching will be used for faculty evaluation. The guidelines in this document reflect performance on these categories, all of which are important, with Category 1 being most fundamental. The other categories vary in importance depending on the faculty member’s percent of effort.

Category 1: Quality and effectiveness of teaching: Delivery and impact of classroom, laboratory, and field-based instruction. Teaching should be evaluated using the PICA student evaluation system. In addition, evaluation can include one or more of: (1) Peer review of classroom teaching and instructional innovations, using a valid and reliable measure, (2) Preparation of a teaching portfolio, or (3) Self-evaluation and development of an improvement plan.

Category 2: Contribution to the development of the curriculum: Development and implementation of new courses or appropriate and substantial revisions of existing courses.

Category 3: Participation in continuing education experiences for professional educators or other professional audiences: Contributing to the improvement of comprehensive educational programs through workshops and presentations with pre-service teachers, and attending continuing education experiences to enhance one's own expertise in the field of teaching.

Category 4: Use of appropriate technologies in instruction and curriculum development: Integration of technology beyond PowerPoint, and incorporating syllabus and other support materials into Blackboard Vista or Moogle.

Category 5: Work in a mentoring role with individual students: Direct work with students, mentoring undergraduate and graduate students.

Category 6: Scholarship within the broader context of instruction: Enhancement of instruction in the faculty member’s field of study through production of various teaching publications; writing textbooks and developing instructional materials.
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Instruction

The following table outlines the performance points to be awarded for each Teaching activity. College or University level Teaching Awards receive Value Added points to be negotiated with the Department Head. Meritorious consideration will be determined by the cumulative number of points for Teaching and for Advising Graduate Students. To be considered for merit, all 7 expected points from the table below must be completed.

### Expected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaches courses according to contractual agreement.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Completes PICA on-line evaluations each semester with overall average score of 3 or better (on departmental selected questions).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provides an up-to-date syllabus for all courses to department as per university requirements which contain current references, current state and national standards and appropriate and continuous evaluations.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Creates an improvement plan based upon course evaluations. Identifies problems/strengths, proposed actions, and expected responses.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uses grade book function and posts syllabus and handbook (if applicable) in Blackboard Vista and/or Moodle.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Incorporates scholarship and research into teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Successfully completes all university mandatory training requirements.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Merit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value added Points#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1:</strong> Quality and effectiveness of teaching. Delivery and impact of classroom, laboratory, and field-based instruction as indicated by average PICA student rating at or above 4.0 for undergraduate courses or 4.5 for graduate courses.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 2:</strong> Contribution to the development of the curriculum itself. Development and implementation of new courses or appropriate and substantial revisions of existing courses, including extending the course for Web or online enrollment.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 3:</strong> Provision of professional development experiences for professional educators or other professional audiences. Contributing to the improvement of comprehensive educational programs through workshops and presentations for pre-service teachers</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 4:</strong> Use of appropriate technologies in instruction and curriculum development. Sound, effective, and creative uses of technology.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 5:</strong> Work in a mentoring role with individual students. Work with individual undergraduate or graduate students. (See the following table for points awarded for chairing and membership on graduate committees.)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 6:</strong> Scholarship within the broader context of instruction. Enhancement of instruction in the faculty member’s field of study through production of various teaching publications; writing textbooks and developing instructional materials.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Points are awarded for each course meeting the criterion. Additional points are awarded for Peer Review or Teaching Portfolio. (3 points per course).

#Value Added points are awarded for participation in professional development activities to improve teaching effectiveness and for teaching experiences that require exceptional effort including but not limited to teaching large sections (40 or more undergraduate or 20 or more graduate students), field-based courses, study abroad courses, writing-intensive courses, etc. (3 points per activities) and for teaching large sections of 40 or more undergraduate or 20 or more graduate students (3 points per activity).

+See University guidelines for definitions and sample activities.
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Advising Graduate Students

The following table summarizes merit performance points for advising graduate students. **Points are awarded for each student and added to the merit points for Teaching.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Points per Student Graduated*</th>
<th>Points per Student Continuing+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1: PhD Dissertation/EdD Record of Study committee Chair or Co-chair</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2: MS Thesis committee Chair or Co-chair</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4: M Ed committee Chair</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3: PhD Dissertation/EdD Record of Study committee Member</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5: MS Thesis committee Member</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6: M Ed committee Member</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 7: Mentoring graduate student teaching undergraduate courses.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#Points are awarded both for committees inside and outside the TLAC department.

*Value Added points are awarded for students who are placed in a position at a Research I university upon graduation (3 points per student).

+Student must have an approved degree plan and be currently enrolled for at least one semester or summer session during the year. Points can only be awarded for a maximum of three continuing years before graduating.
FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: SERVICE

For the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture, five categories of service for organizational citizenship and scholarship and application are addressed in these guidelines. With regard to service, a claim for higher ranking in any category must be justified in terms of significance, time commitment, and degree of importance.

Category 1: Service to the Department of Teaching, Learning & Culture - Developing new programs, serving as chair or member of standing and ad-hoc committees; serving as advisor of student organizations; mentoring new faculty. Organizing or presenting at department or program area seminars.

Category 2: Service to the College of Education and Human Development or Texas A&M University - Serving as a chair or member of college or university committee; organizing or presenting at seminars sponsored by the university or college; service-related presentation at a college or university-wide meeting; writing an article in a university or college publication.

Category 3: Service to the profession at the regional or state level - Serving as officer in state or regional organization or chair or committee member of regional/state committee. Serving as Editor or member of editorial staff of a journal, book, or proceedings for regional/state distribution; service-related presentation at regional/state meeting, serving as grant reviewer or newsletter editor at the regional/state level, supervising student receiving regional/state award.

Category 4: Service to the profession at the national or international level - Officer in national/international organization, president of a regional organization, chair or committee member of prominent national/international committee. Serving as Editor or member of editorial staff of a journal, book, or proceedings for national/international distribution, service-related presentation at a national/international meeting; serving as grant reviewer or newsletter editor at the national/international level; supervising student receiving national/international award.

Category 5: Service to the community through efforts to support children and families - Lecturing to non-professional groups; serving as a committee or board member for district or community agencies; serving on school-based committees; providing professional development in-services for school personnel; or providing classroom presentations or model teaching lessons to school school-age children. Editing community newsletters; providing support for community grant writing projects; applying for seed grants related to community issues; creating web page for community agency.
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Service

The following table outlines the performance points to be awarded for each Service activity. Points are awarded for each activity. College or University level Service Awards receive Value added points to be negotiated with the Department Head. **To be considered for merit, all 3 expected points from the table below must be completed.**

### Expected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attends meetings at both the department and program area.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Models TLAC values.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Successfully completes all university mandatory training requirements.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Merit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value added Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1: Service to the Department of Teaching, Learning &amp; Culture -</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new programs, serving as chair or member of standing and ad-hoc</td>
<td></td>
<td>OR Enhances diversity or internationalization+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committees; serving as advisor of student organizations; mentoring new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty. Organizing or presenting at department or program area seminars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2: Service to the College of Education and Human Development or</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University - Serving as a chair or member of college or university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee; organizing or presenting at seminars sponsored by the university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or college. Service-related presentation at a college or university-wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting; writing an article in a university or college publication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Category 3: Service to the profession at the regional or state level
- Serving as officer in state or regional organization or chair or committee member of regional/state committee.
- Serving as Editor or member of editorial staff of a journal, book, or proceedings for regional/state distribution; service-related presentation at regional/state meeting, serving as grant reviewer or newsletter editor at the regional/state level, supervising student receiving regional/state award.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Category 4: Service to the profession at the national or international level
- Officer in national/international organization, president of a regional organization, chair or committee member of prominent national/international committee.
- Serving as Editor or member of editorial staff of a journal, book, or proceedings for national/international distribution, service-related presentation at a national/international meeting; serving as grant reviewer or newsletter editor at the national/international level; supervising student receiving national/international award.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Category 5: Service to the community through efforts to support children and families
- Lecturing to non-professional groups; serving as a committee or board member for district or community agencies; serving on school-based committees; providing professional development in-services for school personnel; or providing classroom presentations or model teaching lessons to school school-age children.
- Editing community newsletters; providing support for community grant writing projects; applying for seed grants related to community issues; creating web page for community agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

+ See [University guidelines for definitions and sample activities](#)
FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: SCHOLARSHIP (Research and Funding)

The Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture recognizes its status as an integral member of a top-tier research institution where research is defined as the construction, discovery, or integration of knowledge and the communication of this knowledge to an audience of critical peers. Contributing to the professional research literature is acknowledged as an academic responsibility of the tenure-line faculty in the Department.

For lecturer faculty (100% effort in teaching) and clinical faculty (10% effort in scholarly research) responsibility lies in the use of research and scholarly activity rather than in the generation of new knowledge. While it is acknowledged that lecturer and clinical faculty do conduct action research; present at state, national and international conferences; and publish in refereed journals; their first and primary focus must be to provide exemplary teaching to the students at Texas A&M University.

Performance evaluation in the area of Scholarship includes both Research and Funding. The evaluation of performance for Scholarship will consist of the combined total productivity for each of these areas.

Performance Categories for Research

For the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture, six categories of research will be used for faculty evaluation. The guidelines in this document reflect performance in these categories that have been sequenced by level of importance. For evaluation of performance in the area of research as a scholarly activity, authorship with students or by senior faculty with non-tenured colleagues should be considered. “Top-tier” journals are national or international in scope, and are listed in SSCI, ERIC, or Education Index and are recognized as influential in one’s field, with other factors taken into account as defined by the Department.

Category 1: Presentation of research papers at professional conferences at the national or international level. These presentations should result from peer-reviewed proposals, membership presentations, invited addresses, and discussant/discussion panel membership. Presentations must be completed during the evaluation period.

Category 2: Presentation of research papers at professional conferences at the regional, state, and local level. These presentations should result from peer-reviewed proposals, membership presentations, invited addresses, and discussant/discussion panel membership. Presentations must be completed during the evaluation period.

Category 3: Publications in blind-reviewed, peer-reviewed professional journals, including on-line journals and other professional formats, at the national and international level. Author of scholarly professional books at the national and international level. Publications contain original findings, reviews, syntheses, and critiques, and the creative application of existing knowledge to educational problems.
Category 4: Publication of chapters in scholarly professional books at the national and international level. Editor of a scholarly professional book at the national level; author or editor of scholarly books, at the regional level. Publications should contain original findings, reviews, syntheses, and critiques, and the creative application of existing knowledge to educational problems.

Category 5: Publications in blind-reviewed, peer-reviewed professional journals, including on-line and other professional formats, at the regional and state level. Publications should contain original findings, reviews, syntheses, and critiques, and the creative application of existing knowledge to educational problems.

Category 6: Articles in non peer-reviewed journals, editorial columns in journals, local presentations, opinion-editorial pieces for newspapers or magazines. These presentations and publications must be in print or completed during the evaluation period.
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Scholarship

The following table outlines the performance points to be awarded for each Research activity. Points are awarded for each article or presentation. Meritorious consideration will be determined by the cumulative number of points. College or University level Research Awards receive Value added points to be negotiated with the Department Head. The evaluation of performance for Scholarship will consist of the combined total productivity for Research and Funding. To be considered for merit, all 2 expected points from the table below must be completed.

Expected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Presentation at one state or regional conference.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Successfully complete all university mandatory training requirements.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Merit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Value Added Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publications must be in press, in print, on-line, or on display (art-based) during the A-1 evaluation period and may be listed only one time. Presentations must be completed during the evaluation period.</strong></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1: Presentation of research papers at professional conferences at the national or international level that result from peer-reviewed proposals, membership presentations, invited addresses, and</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-disciplinary+ OR Enhances diversity or internationalization+
| Category 2: | Presentation of research papers at professional conferences at the regional, state, and local level. These presentations should result from peer-reviewed proposals, membership presentations, invited addresses, and discussant/discussion panel membership. | 5.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Category 3: | Publications in blind-reviewed, peer-reviewed professional journals, including on-line journals and other professional formats, at the national and international level. Author of scholarly professional books at the national and international level.* | 4.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Category 4: | Publication of chapters in scholarly professional books at the national and international level. Editor of a scholarly professional book at the national level; author or editor of scholarly books, at the regional level. | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Category 5: | Publications in blind-reviewed, peer-reviewed professional journals, including on-line and other professional formats, at the regional and state level. | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Category 6: | Articles in non peer-reviewed journals, editorial columns in journals, local presentations, op-ed pieces for newspapers and magazines. | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |

* Three Value Added points are awarded for publication in a “top-rated” journal. This should be justified by faculty member using indicators such as citation rating, acceptance rate under 25%, significance, impact, or degree of extending knowledge.
+See [University guidelines for definitions and sample activities](#)
Performance Categories for Funding

The guidelines in this document reflect fund-seeking efforts from the categories below that are listed by type of funding source. While not exhaustive, these six categories represent primary funding sources. In evaluating any fund-seeking effort, the primary indicators are the source, the potential impact of the funding, and the dollar amount.

**Category 1:** Federal Grants obtained through a multi-tiered peer review system. These competitive grants support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

**Category 2:** State competitive grants obtained through a multi-tiered peer review system. These competitive grants support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

**Category 3:** Foundation awards that are either peer reviewed or reviewed by the Board of Directors of the Foundation. These awards are competitive and support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

**Category 4:** Federal grants and contracts that are reviewed by agency staff. Congressional Initiatives that provide funds to the system and university that are reviewed by agency staff. These grants/contracts support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

**Category 5:** State grants and contracts that are reviewed by agency staff. These grants/contracts support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.

**Category 6:** Local (system, university, college, and departmental) competitive awards. These awards are based on peer reviews and support applications of construction, discovery, integration, teaching and application of scholarship practiced by TLAC faculty.
A-1 Merit Worksheet for Funding

The following table outlines the performance points to be awarded for each Funding activity. Points are earned in the year funding is sought, the year funding is granted, and each year of continuing funding. For funded proposals, additional points can be awarded for generating salary savings, as negotiated with the Department Head.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Funded Proposals* (year funded)</th>
<th>Submitted Proposals/Continuing Grants</th>
<th>Value added Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI or Co-PI</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OR Enhances diversity or internationalization+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1: Federal Grants obtained through a multi-tiered peer review system.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2: State competitive grants obtained through a multi-tiered peer review system.</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3: Foundation awards that are either peer reviewed or reviewed by the Board of Directors of the Foundation.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4: Federal grants and contracts that are reviewed by agency staff.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5: State grants and contracts that are reviewed by agency staff.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6: Local (system, university, college and departmental) competitive awards.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For funded proposals, additional Value Added points are awarded to the PI each year for grant amounts as follows: Up to $49K – 1 point, $50K to $99K – 2 points, $100 to $149K – 3 points, $150K to $199K – 4 points, $200K to $249K - 5 points, over $250K – 6 points. Additional points are awarded for each student supported by external grant funds: 4 points for each full-time (20 hours per week) student, and 2 points for each half-time student for each academic year of support.

+See [University guidelines for definitions and sample activities](#)
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INTRODUCTION
The University, the College and the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture have as their goals the achievement of excellence and national prominence through the teaching, research, and service conducted by members of the faculty. Attainment of these goals requires the development and retention of faculty capable of contribution to these goals. It is the purpose of this document, therefore, to set forth the guidelines for promotion and tenure in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture. The departmental policies in regard to promotion and tenure must be subservient to and congruent with the existing Texas A&M University and Texas A&M System policies and procedures related to promotion and tenure. Any questions not addressed by departmental procedures will be deferred to College and University policies.

ROLE DESCRIPTIONS AND PROMOTION QUALIFICATIONS
Assistant Professor
The role of assistant professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture is characterized by the expectation that individuals at this rank will place a priority on developing competence in instruction as well as establishing a pattern of research and publication in refereed journals, presentations to professional societies appropriate to their area of emphasis and engaged in seeking extramural funds to support their research. While important, service contributions to the Department, College, professional societies, and public schools receive less emphasis as instructional and inquiry competencies become well developed. Although emphasis will be given to the dimensions of instruction and research, it is expected that the individual will exhibit at least professional performance in the service dimension.

Promotion to the rank of associate professor will be based on a cumulative assessment of achievement in teaching, research and service as judged by departmental peers and supported by external scholars representing the person’s area of emphasis. Further, promotion will be contingent upon the perceived readiness of the individual to assume the role of associate professor. Consideration will be made of any special role responsibilities assumed by the faculty member with the concurrence of the department head during the review process.

Associate Professor
The role of the associate professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture is characterized by continued emphasis on competent and effective instruction as well as the continued development of sustained pattern of inquiry and publication in refereed journals and other scholarly products. Persons holding the rank of associate professor will make demonstrable contributions to their field of study. In addition,
associate professors as compared to assistant professors will exhibit increased contributions in service to the Department, College, public schools and professional societies.

Promotion to the rank of associate professor will be based on cumulative assessment of teaching, research and publications in refereed journals, and engagement in seeking extramural funds to support their research, and service as judged by both departmental peers and external scholars representing the person’s area of emphasis. Persons will demonstrate excellence which has earned them national and perhaps international recognition. Further, promotion will be contingent upon the perceived readiness of the individual to assume the role of full professor. Consideration will be made of any special role responsibilities assumed by the faculty member with the concurrence of the department head during the review period. Non-tenured faculty with the rank of associate professor, can apply for tenure based on a cumulative assessment of achievement in teaching, research, and service. A non-tenured associate professor must meet the same standards as an assistant professor for tenure as well as demonstrate leadership in an academic area.

Full Professor
The rank of full professor is based on cumulative assessment (since last promotion) of teaching, mentoring junior faculty and graduate students, research and publications in refereed journals, publishing scholarly books and chapters, and/or curriculum materials, engaging in seeking extramural support for research [when appropriate for the field of study] and service as judged by both departmental peers and external scholars representing the person’s area of emphasis. Faculty may choose to demonstrate excellence in one of the areas of research, teaching, or service, however, they must also meet the minimum standards in the other areas. The role of full professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture holds the expectation of leadership through continued contribution to the body of professional knowledge, leadership in instructional program development and innovative approaches to instruction, leadership in the professional groups, public schools, and units within the University. The cumulative experience resulting from several years of service at the university level would also suggest involvement in faculty development efforts, especially mentoring assistant and associate professors.

A PROFILE OF ACTIVITIES WITHIN ROLE DIMENSIONS
The following profile of activities are not intended to be either definitive or exhaustive. However, the use of these activities and the departmental evaluation guidelines should help assure the availability of significant information to persons responsible for making such judgments. Most importantly, the candidate needs to compile the documentation as prescribed by the university and college.

Teaching Performance may be evidenced by the following:
Course evaluations / peer evaluations / self evaluations
Courses taught
Courses developed/major course revision
Graduate student advisory committee membership/chairperson
Undergraduate student advisory activities
Program development activities
Awards, honors, certificates
Record of teaching effectiveness
Mentoring students
Teaching Portfolios

**Research Performance may be evidenced by the following:**

**Research articles**
Scholarly articles
Sponsored research
International, national, regional and state conference presentations
Editor
Authorship of scholarly texts
Authorship of technical papers, monographs and reviews
Awards, honors, certificates
Planned efforts to increase one’s competency in inquiry

**Service Performance may be evidenced by the following:**
Consulting activities
Workshop presentations
Participation in University and System committees
Participation in College and Department committees
Chairperson of active committees
Campus administrative duties
Sponsorship of student organizations
Committee member/chair or officer in professional organizations
Membership in professional organizations
Conferences attended/chaired
Awards, honors, certificates
Planned efforts to assist colleagues in improving instructional or inquiry competencies
Editorial Board Member
Reviewer for journals and other scholarly publications

* Note: These lists are suggestive and not exhaustive. See TLAC’s Evaluation Guidelines document for complete information.

**PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES**

*Time Perspective*
Promotion and tenure evaluations will be based on cumulative contributions and expected continued contributions. The probationary period for tenure is seven years; normally, up to three years credit may be given to tenure track experience at another university.
An annual review of performance of all tenure track faculty is conducted by the
Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee as well as the Department Head to assess progress is an essential process toward promotion and/or tenure. Non Tenured faculty received feedback in writing concerning their progress toward promotion and tenure.

New non-tenured professors shall have the opportunity to have a full professor mentor who will advise them and provide assistance with professional development. New non-tenured professors may choose an advocate or have the option of requesting that an advocate be appointed by the department head. During the third year at Texas A&M, the non-tenured assistant professor’s progress toward tenure and promotion shall have a formal review at the departmental level. The procedural guidelines for this third year review will be similar to those for regular promotion and tenure and will include outside review as per college and university guidelines.

During the Spring semester of each year, the department head will issue a memorandum requesting faculty who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure to make an appointment to discuss the feasibility of promotion and/or tenure during the following academic year. If a faculty member wishes to pursue promotion and/or tenure after the conference has been held, documentation procedures will be initiated. The faculty member ultimately makes the decision to apply for promotion and/or tenure.

**Documentation**

Procedural guidelines and schedules for promotion and tenure review are issued annually by the University and College. The guidelines for submitting documentation for promotion and/or tenure are determined by the University and College.

Other Sources:
University Rules, 12.01.99.M2 – University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion,

The department will solicit outside review letters based on recommendation of the candidate, the tenure and promotion committee, and the department head. The external review letters should be obtained from individuals at comparable institutions. This is essential for credibility of the individuals’ national impact. The candidate will supply the names of at least five outside reviewers. The department tenure and promotion committee will also supply the names of at least five outside reviewers. The candidate can review the list to veto any names that are not appropriate. The department head and the chair of the department tenure and promotion committee will work in consultation to attain more than three external reviewers and insure that there is representation from the candidate’s list. The external evaluation letters from nationally prominent scholars in the candidate’s area of specialty will be placed in the candidate’s folio.

**Review Process Guidelines**
1. The TLAC Promotion and Tenure Committee will consist of tenured full professors [tenured associate and full]. The same committee membership will be used for either tenure or promotion to ensure consistency in the applications of standards. This committee will also review all non-tenured, tenure track faculty.

2. The TLAC Promotion and Tenure Committee will follow the university and college guidelines for promotion and tenure.

3. Materials for promotion and/or tenure will be available in the TLAC Department office for review by committee members; sufficient time for a thorough review of such materials is to be provided committee members. A sign-in sheet will be used to document access to files.

4. One member of the committee will be assigned primary responsibility for presenting the materials of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure: the presenter is to be selected on the basis of familiarity with the candidate’s professional work whenever possible. A second member of the committee less closely associated with the candidate’s area is to be a second presenter. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the candidate will provide input for the Department Head to make the assignments.

5. All promotion and/or tenure deliberations and decisions made by the Promotion and Tenure Committee must remain in confidence and under no circumstances should any member reveal how he or she or any other member of the committee voted or repeat any statements of committee members that occurred during deliberations.

6. Committee members must understand that their role is advisory only and that it is still the department head who makes a recommendation for his/her department.

7. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will report the vote (pro and con) to the Department Head immediately following deliberations. The Department Head will notify the candidate of the Committee’s vote.

8. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will assign various committee members to draft for approval by the committee of the whole separate statements for research, teaching and service. The Department Head will provide a copy of the statements to the candidate immediately upon receiving them.

9. The chair of the department tenure and promotion committee will be elected by all tenure line faculty during the department’s spring elections.

10. The Department Head will develop a recommendation for the candidate and submit to the Dean and College Committee. A copy of this recommendation will be provided to the candidate at the same time it is submitted to the College.