

**Learning, Teaching, and Educational Transformation (non-licensure) track
of the general Teacher Education M.Ed. Program
Annual report to Graduate Studies, 2010-11**

Program Co-Coordinators, Mary Brady and Peter Taylor, June 15, 2011

Contents:

- Overarching Goals
- Numbers
- Objectives and Developments
- Relationship of Goals, Objectives, and Developments to UMB Strategic Goals
- Other Items of Interest to Graduate Studies

Overarching Goals

- A. Attract and serve individuals who do not wish to be certified in Massachusetts (or who are already certified), but want to work in a broad range of education-related professions including those outside of classroom teaching, such as adult- and community-based education, educational research, policy analysis, philanthropy, and advocacy.
- B. Through teaching, advising, and a reliable, coherent program of offerings, allow students to design a sequence of education-related courses to support their specific interests.
- C. To establish sustainable, non-exploitative operations and planning, given that all LTET faculty have primary advising and administrative commitments in other programs.

Numbers

For Fall 2010, 12 students matriculated into the program and for Spring 2011, 6 students matriculated. In addition, 18 transferred from other programs or M.Ed. Tracks.

As of May 2011, our records show 58 active students, of whom 26 are on track to graduate in June or August 2011. In addition, 5 graduated in December 2010.

(Compared with last year, this represents a 16% increase in the number of new students, a 9% increase in total student numbers, and a 14% decline in the number of graduates.)

Objectives and Developments for 2010-11

[including objectives added in light of Deans' response to AQUAD review]

Specific Objectives	Developments	Possible Steps Ahead
A.1 Increase visibility within Graduate Bulletin	Expanded text for LTET appeared in new Graduate Catalog (but still embedded among other Teacher Education tracks).	Increase visibility from CEHD webpage.

A.2 Plan larger more ambitious changes	Still stalled. LTET track coordinator(s) stretched by their other program leadership commitments.	Revisit if more support becomes available and/or a newcomer steps up to give additional push to the track.
A.3 Highlight the ways students develop through the LTET program of studies	Profiles included in the AQUAD self-study.	Highlight these profiles on the LTET wikispaces
A.4 Higher quality of students through stricter admission and transfer review [AQUAD]	Reviews conducted by LTET faculty (not OSS). Enhanced review sheet developed	Implement and fine-tune the new system (to be implemented with the move to web-based admissions review)
B.1 Make what we already do more accessible to students and to prospective students in the "feeder" tracks (ABA, CCT, BWP...), including second Capstone option for a paper and presentation.	Waited for the new Graduate catalog to appear. Updated wikispaces (see http://candi.wikispaces.com/LTET_track and linked pages & forms). Communicate to incoming students (new & transfers) that the wikispaces provide important and up-to-date information. Promote the second capstone option via Wikispaces.	Continue to do this updating (with assistance of GA for LTET).
B.2. In light of B.1, assign LTET advisors to match student's interests.	Not achieved.	Continuing discussion among LTET faculty of how to sustain advising (see C)
B.3. Increase number of courses available within the required urban and social justice education core category [AQUAD]	---	Add specific course options to Social Justice core areas from Applied Linguistics courses.
B.4 Better record-keeping and advising to ensure student choice of core courses and electives produces a coherent curriculum [AQUAD]	Enhanced database for the track allows advisors to record and review course plans (as well as data needed for periodic reviews)	
B.5 Promote second capstone option of a "Written paper with oral presentation" [Also responds to Deans' AQUAD request for evidence of student success and curricular coherence]	Two students undertook this, and their efforts were rated as Pass With Distinction. Promoted this option especially for 11-12, because two of the faculty will be on sabbatical. (The instructor serves as one of the two required readers, so only one	Continue to promote this option, drawing attention to the description with the proposal form and rubric on the wiki. Post examples of successful Capstone Option 2

	LTET faculty member is needed to review each of these capstones.)	presentations.
B.6 Review the possible trade-off between flexibility and coherence and substance in LTET studies [AQUAD] (LTET has four categories for required core courses and 7 electives for students to shape into a coherent focus in consultation with their advisor.)	LTET faculty have agreed to recommend, but not require, that students include in their 7 electives 1 course from each of two of the four additional categories: Organizational Change; SPED/ELL expertise; Content Knowledge (depending on content specialty); and Technologically mediated learning design	Wikipage and advisors to bring this to students' attention. LTET faculty to monitor the outcomes and review core requirement areas re: appropriateness and scope.
C.1. Complete AQUAD review to focus attention on LTET quality, opportunities for development, and resource needs.	Survey of students who were current, graduated or withdrawn from the program was conducted. Student data charts were compiled, and the self-study written. Site visit arranged, with faculty and students meeting with the review team on 3/23/11. Reviewers' report ¹ received and responded to; Deans' response received and	Continue to address objectives set by Deans.

¹ The review team reported substantial strengths, evident particularly in:

- Expertise & commitment of faculty
- High degree of student engagement and learning
- Centrality of LTET Program and its curriculum to campus and college mission of “education for a diverse democracy”
- Relevant and current curriculum, with important and purposeful emphasis on reflection and critical thinking and on the larger societal and organizational contexts for educational reform and transformation.

Evidence gathered by the Review Committee found that LTET did not replicate or overlap substantially with other licensure or non-licensure programs at the University, but rather served the needs of a specific population of students whose curricular needs were not met by other programs.

Most significant area of need was that program lacks adequate resources. (No faculty member are assigned primarily to the program. LTET coordinator(s) do not receive a stipend or course reduction. This has resulted in overworked faculty and fewer opportunities for students, given that all the faculty members have primary commitments to other programs.)

The Deans' response stated that: LTET is “uniquely and significantly aligned with the campus mission and strategic priorities, particularly through its capacity to integrate and support civic engagement in teaching and learning, and for the way the program prepares graduates to analyze and address ‘big picture’ issues in education.” A set of improvements was noted in their response and during the subsequent meeting with the Provost.

	<p>responded to; Meeting with Provost completed.</p> <p>No new resources to be provided and a set of objectives set by Deans.</p> <p>Faculty discussion of this outcome concluded that we're not ready to close up shop (but see C.2).</p>	<p>Ongoing faculty discussion of lack of resources.</p>
<p>C.2 Given that all LTET faculty have primary advising and administrative commitments in other programs, LTET faculty check in from time to time to make sure that we are clear about:</p> <p>a. each other's limits of involvement in LTET;</p> <p>b. the support we need from each other and the staff to counteract the common pattern that, unless one provokes a crisis by "quitting," one is left to exploit oneself (i.e., to allow other life and work commitments to suffer);</p> <p>c. the agreed-upon scope (perhaps limited) of efforts to build the track beyond its present state; and</p> <p>d. the backup/successional plans for anyone who takes on the coordinator role.</p>	<p>Checking-in about sharing workload eclipsed by preparation of AQUAD review.</p> <p>Mary Brady continued as coordinator and Peter Taylor joined her to get LTET through AQUAD.</p> <p>GA assigned by the Department to serve the track.</p> <p>One of the 5 LTET track faculty no longer able to advise LTET students. Two of the remaining four on sabbatical in 2011-12.</p> <p>Post-AQUAD discussion of these issues inconclusive.</p>	<p>Ongoing faculty discussion of options, if any, for operations and planning that prevent continued exploitation of some faculty.</p> <p>Establish a system and agreement with Teacher Education faculty to continue advising their students who transfer from a licensure program to LTET.</p>
<p>C.3 Involve the Department Chair in creating an apprenticeship/successional plan for LTET coordination, e.g., to ensure that the co-ordinator can take a real leave when s/he gets it.</p>	<p>Chair postponed action pending the AQUAD review and decided not to allocate ESS funds or savings from sabbaticals to cover LTET coordination and advising needs.</p> <p>The one remaining faculty willing to continue in the administrative role during sabbaticals of two LTET faculty is no longer permitted to serve as program coordinator.</p>	<p>Chair as nominal LTET coordinator for 2011-12.</p> <p>Expect not to have a faculty member for whom LTET is their primary responsibility.</p>

Relationship of Goals, Objectives, and Developments to UMB Strategic Goals

Increase student access, engagement, and success.

- 16% increase in the number of new students; a 9% increase in total student numbers
- Completed AQUAD process. Review team reported substantial strengths, evident particularly in: Expertise & commitment of faculty; High degree of student engagement and learning; Centrality of LTET Program and its curriculum to campus and college mission of “education for a diverse democracy”; Relevant and current curriculum, with important and purposeful emphasis on reflection and critical thinking and on the larger societal and organizational contexts for educational reform and transformation. Deans’ response sought: Higher quality of students through stricter admission and transfer review; Better record-keeping and advising to ensure student choice of core courses and electives produces a coherent curriculum; More prescription and less flexibility in curricular choices. No new resources or sabbatical coverage to be provided.

Attract, develop and sustain highly effective faculty

- See bullet point on AQUAD review above
- Involve the Department Chair in creating an apprenticeship/successional plan for LTET coordination—not successful.
- Operations and planning that prevent continued exploitation of some faculty—4.5 hour/week GA provided to assist with LTET administrative support. Otherwise, no improvements.

Create a physical environment that sustains teaching, learning and research

- LTET has no physical location or resources other than the Department offices

Improve campus-community engagement through improved organizational structures

- Nothing to report

UMB Strategic Goals 2011

Advance student success and development.

- See bullet point on AQUAD review above

Enrich and expand academic programs and research

Improve the learning, teaching and working environment

Establish a financial resource model consistent with the university’s vision statement

Develop an infrastructure supportive of preceding goals

- See bullet point on AQUAD review above.
- No plans for expansion given that no new resources or sabbatical coverage to be provided.
- Wikipage and databases to support advising developed with help from 4.5 hour/week GA and contributions of faculty whose primary commitments lie elsewhere.

Other Items of Interest to Graduate Studies

1. Goals (Overarching and Specific): See above.
2. Program development: See above and footnote on AQUAD review. Possible governance actions: none.
3. Faculty Achievements related to LTET: Not reported on here because LTET faculty members have primary affiliation in other programs.
4. Program Strengths: Advising and graduating LTET students, even though LTET faculty work in this role is above and beyond duties in each faculty member's primary program.
5. Weaknesses: LTET is not able to meet the overarching goal of establishing sustainable, non-exploitative operations and planning. See specific objectives C.1, C.2, C.3 above.
6. Collaborations: Faculty contributions above and beyond duties in each LTET faculty member's primary programs and track.
7. Student support outside OGS: Not known.
8. OGS stipends: 4.5 hour/week GAship.
9. Additional services needed from OGS: Response to these annual reports; Informative notes from GPD meetings; initiation of a practice of minutes and/or timely informative feedback from GSC on proposals; and negotiation with Deans to arrive at equitable CLR's for GPDs (or track coordinators) based on workload after allowing for staff support (or lack thereof).