

17 October 2012

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

**Elementary Education Program
Secondary Education Program
Multicultural Teacher and Childhood Education Program**

**RESPONSE TO EXTERNAL TEAM
REPORT
AND
ACTION PLAN**

Fall 1997-Fall 2011

**Prepared by
Faculty and Staff of the
Teacher Education Department**

Fall 2012

Introduction

Faculty members of the Teacher Education Department wish to thank the members of the External Review Team who conducted the Academic Program Review of department programs in fall 2011. The Self-Study submitted by the Teacher Education Department was a complex enterprise, describing three programs within the department: Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and the Multicultural Teacher and Childhood Education program.

Within the brief time frame allowed for the site visit and assessment of the materials provided in our self-study report, the External Review Team carefully examined and discussed both the broad, inter-programmatic elements of our degrees, as well as the individual characteristics of each program. We appreciate their thoughtful recommendations for “more productive” program design and delivery, and identification of resources needed to support excellence in teacher education within a research-extensive institution. Altogether, their recommendations have provided substantive direction in designing the Action Plan presented in this response.

This response addresses the components of the External Review Team’s Final Report of December 1, 2011: Program Strengths, Program Concerns, and Recommendations. Specific steps for implementation of future program refinements are presented in the Action Plan.

College of Education Programs Review Framework and Implications for Program Improvement

The TED response to the recommendations of the External Review Team is framed within a newly implemented, comprehensive review framework for all programs within the COE. The results of this comprehensive program review will have immediate and long-term implications for future work within all departments in the College.

According to Dean Richard Howell (January 2012), this process is important because the College must position itself strategically for the future. It can only do this if it completely understands how its programs are performing, by maximizing program strengths, and addressing weaknesses. We have to position ourselves for a future that is based on outcomes, as well as inputs; with candidates who have the required skills of our professions, and who are well-versed in assessment and evaluation. Further, we have to be able to prove, through objective evidence, that we are producing quality educators who are making a positive impact in their professions. Finally, resource allocation to programs must be informed by this strategic process. The process as a whole will be grounded in alignment of all program elements to the COE Core Values and will extend over several semesters.

Components and Timeline of COE Programs Review

1. Program Review (Spring 2012)
 - Includes all 38 degree programs in the COE

- Focuses on three critical areas: core data, program context, projective outlook
- Develops current and future status information
- Provides complete data to COE faculty and leadership for strategic planning purposes, including hiring, resource allocation, and workload

1. Curriculum Review (To be determined)

- Investigate all degree, certificate, and endorsement curricula for relevance to student learning outcomes and alignment with COE's Core Values
- Investigate and minimize substitutions, boutique, and other non-core courses from curricular process
- Identify faculty workload as it pertains to core and non-core courses as well as online offerings
- Increase opportunities for interdisciplinary courses and teaching among college faculty in order to strengthen the quality of degrees, certificates and endorsements

3. Enrollment Review (To be determined)

- Investigate enrollment patterns to determine existing and potential capacity in both undergraduate and graduate programs
- Investigate all program delivery modalities and implications for main campus and virtual programs
- Maximize student enrollment to program goals, the State's priorities, and COE's Core Values
- Set enrollment patterns and schedules for a 3-year rolling process to determine effectiveness in relation to program goals

Our Academic Program Review Self-Study has provided us with data that will be used to complete much of our report for comprehensive COE review of programs. The strengths, areas of concern, and recommendations of the APR External Review Team will be helpful to us in completing all components of the comprehensive review. The timeline included in the Action Plan submitted with this response is aligned with the timeline of the COE comprehensive review process.

Summary of Program Strengths (Reviewers' Report, 12/1/2011 and Departmental Response)

Student Enrollment Characteristics

- Robust enrollment in degree programs;
- Consistently higher admission scores on ACT/SAT, NMTA, and cumulative GPAs than teacher candidates at other New Mexico institutions;
- Student demographics similar to statewide demographics, indicating application of values of diversity and equal representation in admission process.

Department Response

TED faculty are continually working to refine and improve our admissions process to build on and expand these strengths of our student population. Our goal is to produce high quality teachers for New Mexico schools. Our efforts to meet this goal include continued recruitment of candidates from culturally and linguistically groups.

***“Preparation of a large fraction of beginning teachers in New Mexico, perhaps as large as 45%. This is both a strength and a source of problems in the department”
(Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.3)***

Department Response

We do prepare a significant numbers of teachers each year; however, it is worth noting that UNM prepares less than 25% of all New Mexico teachers. The majority of New Mexico teachers received their teacher preparation out-of-state. The External Review Team’s recognition of this strength confirms our conclusion that the size of our licensure programs, while a strength, poses problems for us as well. For example, through our numbers we have benefited programs in the university as a whole and the COE in particular. In fact, the contribution of our student enrollment to COE programs is illustrated in the COE Comprehensive Program Review, Part I, Spring 2012. (We discussed this aspect in more detail in the APR Self-Study.) However, the majority of our resources goes into our undergraduate and graduate licensure programs and creates an imbalance for our capacity to (1) serve in-service teachers and teacher educators enrolled in master’s and doctoral programs effectively and efficiently, and (2) devote adequate time and resources to conduct associated research on the effectiveness of our efforts. Any changes we design for addressing the imbalance in our resources must be considered within the COE context to minimize negative impact of enrollment in other programs within the COE which might be dependent on student enrollment in our programs for their own viability. We would welcome a broader COE plan that, over the course of several years, seeks to reduce the reliance of other COE programs on our licensure programs.

Because of the numbers of students in our programs, the challenges for resources exist in every part of our program and have had an impact on our ability to make changes for program improvement and refinement since department reorganization in 2004. In our APR Self-Study we identified specific needs for more faculty and administrative support staff to meet the needs of all our students.

Since 2004, there have been numerous external events that have forced significant changes in the resources we have for program implementation. First, termination of the partnership programs in 2006 abruptly removed a robust fiscal and program support base for supervision of our student teachers in the schools. The burden of this type of support now rests with the COE, not only for students in our department but also for all the licensure programs in the College. During the past seven years the COE has had to address this challenge in an environment of shrinking fiscal resources at the state and national levels.

Changes in statutory regulations at the national and state levels have had an impact on our ability to place students in schools with high-need populations, particularly in the Albuquerque Public Schools. The changes have particularly had an effect on our capacity to ensure that students have the opportunity to work with students from diverse populations. At the same time, we are competing with a number of licensure programs from other institutions in the state for school placements. As restrictions tighten for school districts, these circumstances have the potential to impact our ability to access placements for the number of students we currently serve and so might curtail our recruitment and enrollment.

Some of the challenges we identify above affect other licensure programs in the COE as well. Current college-level efforts are in process to centralize key aspects of all field experience programs including placements through the Field Service Portal and in which schools we are allowed to place our students. The competition now existing among multiple licensure programs has created the need for creative, research-based approaches to field experiences.

In the response to *Recommendation 1 of the Final Report* (December 2011), we address the recommendation to “right-size” our programs in order to redistribute resources more responsively for teachers and teacher educators across the career continuum. We recognize, however, that moving toward this model will necessitate further discussion and study within the COE about potential impacts on other programs.

“Development and testing of “innovative solutions to the problem of supervising students in their extensive field experiences” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.3)

Department Response

In discussing this strength, the review team notes pilot projects at Bandelier Elementary and Amy Biehl High School “are based on accepted best practice in the field and if successful promise to lead change in the field”(Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.3). We agree with this assessment and are eager to move forward in developing these pilots into formal program delivery at the completion of the COE Comprehensive Review and other related work at the College level. Specifically, COE faculty and staff are engaged in efforts to align field experiences across programs and the related work of updating agreements with school districts in the Albuquerque area. TED faculty are participating in COE field experience committees on policy and fiscal matters related to this alignment effort. Department programs also have had representation on a joint committee of staff from the Albuquerque Public Schools and the College who were charged with crafting the Memorandum of Understanding between APS and the COE regarding field placements in APS schools. This memorandum will become the prototype for similar memoranda of understanding with other school districts in which we place our teacher candidates.

“Development of a “cutting edge program for experienced teachers seeking advancement,”(p.3) the Masters of Arts in Elementary or Secondary Education with a specialization in reflective practice, that draws “from experience and knowledge gained from the Teacher Enhancement Program”(p.3). The APR External Review Team (2011) further notes that this specialization “represents research-based best practices and aligned with COE mission and values and NCATE expectations and is aligned with COE Mission and values and NCATE expectations. Graduates of this program can be a resource to their districts, to the state, and to the College of Education” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.3)

Department Response

Part of the purpose for developing this specialized focus (MARP) for our masters’ degrees was to alleviate another devastating impact of the demise of the partnership masters’ programs. Three of the five partnership programs in our department included elementary and secondary licensed teachers who chose to pursue a master’s degree in a research-based sequence of courses focused on improvement and refinement of their teaching. The Teacher Enhancement Program alluded to by the External Review Team was especially designed for experienced teachers seeking degrees to study their practice.

In spite of the loss of the partnership cohorts, a mediating factor in rethinking how to recruit students for our programs is the flexibility of our master’s degrees. Both the Elementary and Secondary Education master’s degrees have a common set of core courses that are combined with specialized or focused elective courses chosen by each student in consultation with the faculty advisor. The structured sequence of the general core and specialized elective courses in MARP allows students who share an interest in reflective practice to complete their degrees in a self-selected cohort. This new delivery model was built on principles of reflective practice and course sequencing developed in the Teacher Enhancement Program. The goal of the specialization in reflective practice is to infuse a strong theme of connecting effective teaching and student learning throughout the coursework, resulting in a clear understanding of the concepts and practices of continuous professional improvement.

Enrollment data for the MARP cohort, as well as program data presented in the Department’s Academic Program Review Self-Study, suggests that this elective specialization area for the master’s degree strongly resonates with experienced teachers in the field. The External Review Team further writes that “students in this program see it as helping them to mature as teacher leaders and that participating has helped them to avoid the early career burnout that causes almost half of new teachers to leave the profession within the first five years” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.3).

TED faculty committed to the delivery model of the MARP specialization will continue to refine assessments and outcomes of this carefully crafted program of studies for the masters’ degrees. Faculty will also engage in ongoing consideration of implications for program resources and implementation, as well as impact on teaching in the schools and the state, and make adjustments accordingly.

“Responsiveness of the faculty to a statewide study of curriculum and delivery of reading courses by moving to a standardized syllabus and consistent delivery across campuses through online offerings from main campus” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.3)

Department Response

Consistency is an important area of curricular work and program coherence at this time in view of the increased accountability at the university, state and national levels, including NCATE accreditation requirements. The “responsiveness of our [reading] faculty in taking an active role in creating a model for consistency and coherence in a critical area of the curriculum” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.3) reflects TED faculty’s proactive engagement in state initiatives related to teacher preparation.

TED faculty members are working toward consistency and coherence in other areas of the curriculum as well, to ensure consistent delivery of curriculum across campuses. For example, faculty of methods courses have begun meeting regularly to align content in their specific areas. Faculty also review syllabi of part-time instructors at branch campuses and field centers for consistency in content. Program-wide assessments for each methods course are being developed and implemented to enable faculty to assess student learning outcomes. Some main campus faculty members are teaching methods and graduate core courses at distance sites. In addition, when appropriate and needed, courses have been developed for online or ITV delivery and taught by main campus faculty.

“Strong group of tenure-line faculty (assistant professors) with ‘substantial’ research agendas and success in publication and securing external funds” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.3)

Department Response

All of the current tenure-line faculty have been hired since the creation of the Department in 2004-2005. Since that time, we have worked diligently to hire new faculty who demonstrate an emerging scholarship agenda in teacher education and/or the potential for publication and securing external funding. We appreciate the acknowledgment of the quality of these faculty members and their potential to strengthen the overall quality of our scholarship productivity, including funded research. One assistant professor achieved tenure and promotion to associate professor, effective Fall 2011, and two faculty achieved tenure and promotion to associate professor effective Fall 2012. The addition of three faculty members at the senior level will have a significant impact on the record and quality of scholarship within the Department.

“Mission, values and conceptual framework appropriate to teacher education in New Mexico, with attention to alignment of assessments, coursework and research to those values” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.3)

Department Response

Since the current Teacher Education Department was restructured in 2004-2005, we have made every effort to embed the mission, core values and conceptual framework of the COE into all aspect of our programs. The COE Conceptual Framework for Professional Education is well aligned with the COE Core Values, the New Mexico Teacher Competencies, the Core Beliefs of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and teaching dispositions for effective practice, as indicated by NCATE, our accrediting agency. We have also developed a mission and vision statement for the Department that is aligned with these policies as well. Over time, we have developed assessment frameworks for both the Elementary and Secondary Education programs that weave together these elements. We are currently engaged in designing and implementing updated assessments that will meet all the requirements for student learning outcomes at the time of the next NCATE site assessment.

“Effective use of the Field Services portal to match student teachers and cooperating teachers” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.4)

Department Response

Faculty in the Teacher Education Department took the lead in piloting the Portal at the inception of this information management system and have collaborated with Field Service staff in refining and updating the portal over time. At this time all TED students in field experience courses at all UNM campus locations and participatory school personnel at the sites must enroll at the Field Services Portal. On the whole, the Portal has streamlined and improved the time in completing placements, efficiency and accuracy in payments to master teachers and cooperating teachers, and accurate information management related to comprehensive field placement data. The end result is positive movement towards consistent data management about TED licensure students and their field placements at all campus sites.

“Evidence of participation and ‘exemplary’ leadership in state reading initiatives, education accountability and reporting, and educational reform trends” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.4)

Department Response

This recognition of participation and “exemplary” leadership in state priorities for teacher education programs affirms the hard work of TED faculty in addressing curricular and reporting requirements, particularly in reading. As accountability requirements have increased at both the national and state levels, participation and leadership in education accountability and reporting, as well as educational reform trends, are a characteristic of faculty work in all COE programs. TED faculty have benefited from the support of COE research and information management staff in providing accurate and complete data when we need it for reporting purposes.

Summary of Program Concerns (Reviewers' Report, 12/1/2011 and Departmental Response)

In spring 2012, Teacher Education Department faculty met in an all-day retreat to review and consider the APR External Review Team's Final Report (2011). Their focus was particularly on the concerns and recommendations expressed by the External Review Team. Faculty chose to participate in work-groups to examine general concerns in the following areas: quality of advisement in the master's degree programs, communication and cohesion, field experiences across programs, doctoral program issues, and research productivity. Each subgroup included representatives from all programs in the department. The work groups met again during the semester to complete their initial conclusions. There were many areas of agreement and overlap among the workgroup results. Recommendations from this work will continue to be considered and adapted as needed as the programs move forward with program improvement. Results of this work are integrated into discussion of areas for future improvement throughout department responses to concerns and recommendations of the External Review Team.

“Weaknesses in conceptualization of the doctoral program in Multicultural Teacher and Childhood Education for a research-based teacher education program” (Final Reviewer's Report, 2011, p.4)

Department Response

The MCTC doctoral programs were revitalized with the restructuring of the Teacher Education Department that occurred in 2004. TED faculty have been working on both re-stimulating enrollment in the doctoral programs and updating the curriculum for the 21st century. The faculty acknowledge that we have a need for a more consistent and long-range plan for program re-visioning and improvement. We began this important work in spring 2012. We describe our design for this process in our response to Recommendation 6 and the Action Plan of this report.

“Weak communication and cohesion among department programs, particularly between the elementary and secondary teacher licensure programs, where the committee noted ‘silos of information and practice that seemed unproductive in a faculty with shared goals’ (p.4). They conjectured that ‘this may be partly an artifact of the extremely heavy workloads imposed by the very large numbers of teacher candidates in these programs’ (Final Reviewer's Report, 2011, p.4)

Department Response

We certainly agree that TED faculty's focus on workloads in their primary programs has not allowed much time for meaningful communication among or attempts towards cohesion of common core curriculum and shared goals. However, this is an area for department and program improvement that we began to work on in Fall 2011. The department faculty has also begun discussions regarding departmental reorganization with a view towards shared knowledge and distributed workload and with a view towards stronger NCATE alignment. Our responses to other concerns, recommendations, and the

action plan of the External Review Team's final report include elements of communication and cohesion throughout our commentaries.

“Weak scholarly productivity of senior faculty and impact on support and mentoring of junior faculty” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.4)

Department Response

Regretfully, we have to admit that this is a serious concern that has resulted from a change in the culture of teacher education and expectations for post-tenure. Most current senior faculty members were hired in a time period extending from the 1970s to 2001 into a teacher education environment and culture that focused mostly on teaching, predominantly in licensure programs. This culture did not particularly encourage or require scholarly productivity in peer-reviewed publication beyond tenure, although faculty were often encouraged to be active in presentations at national conferences and were active in other forms of the scholarship of teaching. From 1995 until 2004, there was no focus on general teacher education as a field of research when the programs were divided into two larger departments with a variety of programmatic responsibilities. As a result, our current assistant professors, who were hired in 2005 or later, have often had to look beyond the programs for role models in scholarship and mentoring in research. A faculty workgroup has begun exploring new approaches to research, as well as encouraging tenured faculty to take advantage of new incentives to participate in COE summer research opportunities.

We are also in the process of refining and articulating what we believe about teacher education and the scholarship of teaching and learning. This includes drawing upon perspectives of the *scholarship of engagement*, a term coined by Ernest L. Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, (Boyer, 1990, 1996). Community or public engagement-- a notion that was provoked in part in response to criticisms that institutions of higher education were not applying their resources to solve local and national problems-- is reinforced by funding agencies such as the National Science Foundation, which includes "broader impacts" in its review criteria. The Carnegie Foundation provides a description of community engagement as part of an elective classification; ***“Community Engagement*** describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching). Engagement has variably been called service-learning, civic engagement, and application (Ward & Carrigan, 2011).

However, it is noted that community engagement, in and of itself, is not the *scholarship of engagement*, which must also seek means of dissemination. According to a recent publication synthesizing work to define the *scholarship of engagement*, three elements are needed: “to include practitioner voices as cogenerators of knowledge” (Giles Jr, 2010, p. 104); to set research agendas in an interactive, collaborative manner; and to broadly disseminate findings beyond research journals.

While there can be no doubt that the TED faculty are engaged as scholars in the community, much of this work is reported as service, and indeed, without a plan for dissemination, rightly so. One of the obvious hurdles for dissemination of these activities is getting IRB permission for these activities to be considered as data. With the recent approval of the MOU between UNM and Albuquerque Public Schools, and with the adoption of TK20, we see a potential avenue for streamlining the consent process. By developing a broad research proposal that includes the TED faculty and faculty in APS, research foci can emerge collaboratively.

We want to form small collaborative research groups that allow senior as well as junior faculty to work together on research; this will also serve to acquaint each other with our work. Finally, to support pre-tenured faculty, we are in the process of establishing a mentored writing group, which includes junior faculty across the College of Education and will seek mentors with a range of experience, including those who have recently been tenured. We present in more detail our plans for meeting this concern in our response to Recommendation 4 and the Action Plan timeline.

“Inability of program faculty to maintain supervision of students at student teaching sites” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.4)

Department Response

We agree that faculty supervision has been an ongoing challenge for TED faculty since the demise of the UNM/APS Partnership programs in 2006, which had supported field supervision costs in Elementary and Secondary education for over 20 years. As the review team points out, we need to update our supervision model to include direct program oversight of student teaching and the presence of more faculty and field supervisors in the schools. We have been engaged in studying effective practices in this area and implications for our own program improvement in supervision over the past two years and have begun to implement potential models of faculty supervision of students in a school-based design. We address this issue in more detail in our response to Recommendation 1 and 2 and the Action Plan.

“Inadequate data on student learning outcomes” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.5)

Department Response

We acknowledge the External Review Team’s feedback detail about the program and student outcome data that is inadequate at this time. Since our last accreditation visit our energies have been devoted to strengthening and refining our program components and integrating program assessments as we proceed through this process. However, we are in the process of developing more systematized procedures for data collection, analysis and reporting purposes, and aligning assessments across all our programs. We will need to critically examine each element in respect to alignment with our vision, mission, and COE values and the conceptual framework for Professional Education. We are also identifying key assessment areas. To support our work in this area, there are now information management systems and centralized structures in place at the COE level that will help us with collecting and managing program data that were difficult to locate and

access in the past. As of Fall 2012, the Department also has a half-time assessment/accountability coordinator whose charge includes strengthening Student Learning Outcome instruments and alignment of Departmental assessment systems with those of the College and the University. Our Action Plan addresses specific program data recommendations included in the External Review Team's comments regarding gaps in our assessment frameworks.

“Weak and inconsistent advisement of graduate students in the MA with alternative licensure programs” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.5)

Department Response

Feedback from students in the graduate licensure programs have helped us clarify the weaknesses in this area, understand a key area of improvement of graduate advisement, and identify implications for our overall advisement structure. In early Spring 2012, a department faculty committee reviewed and developed a list of proposed changes in the ways in which advisement has been conducted for all our graduate students.

In Fall 2012 TED faculty in both the Elementary and Secondary Education programs have begun to examine and discuss these proposals in a more formal way. Some of the areas that will be explored include orientation and ongoing professional development for faculty advisors across programs, more in-depth mentoring and support of new faculty in effective graduate advisement, and regular review and revision if needed of advisement documents, including information on the COE and Department websites.

In addition, new curricular forms with updated, improved program information will begin the university curricular approval process in Fall 2012 and will be published in the UNM Catalog in 2013. Also, the COE is planning to conduct student evaluation surveys of graduate advisement each year beginning in Spring 2013, in order to assess the overall quality of advisement. The timeline for implementation of these efforts to improve graduate advisement are included in the Action Plan of this report.

“Lack of designated instructional materials center for the New Mexico Public Education Department” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.5)

Department Response

The designated instructional materials center for the New Mexico Public Education Department was formerly housed in the COE Tireman Library, but was a general College of Education support facility rather than a unit under the management of the Teacher Education Department. The Tireman Library was closed in 2009. In response to the concern about the center included in our APR External Review Team Final Report, Dean Howell commissioned the establishment of the COE Curriculum Review Area in December 2011. This work was carried out by the COE Design & Production Studio, part of the Center for Student Success. The COE Curriculum Review Area is now located in Building 85, Room B80, with designated staff and published hours of business operation. Information about the facility is available for students and the public at the COE website, as well as physical locations in Travelstead Hall.

Compliance and Accreditation Concerns

The External Review Team noted specific concerns for both Elementary and Secondary Education licensure requirements related to 1) compliance issues for New Mexico alternative licensure regulations, 2) the transfer compact between 4- and 2-year institutions in New Mexico, and 3) NCATE accreditation requirements for field experiences (Final Reviewer's Report, 2011, pp.5-6).

1. Compliance with alternative licensure requirements. (Final Reviewer's Report, 2011, p.5)

Department Response

The reviewers raised a concern that our alternative licensure program, which is included in the M.A. with Licensure in Elementary and Secondary Education programs, may be out of compliance with state law and regulation governing licensure. The specific regulatory language referred to in the external review team's final report is in NMAC 6.60.3.8.B.(4) that "implies employment of candidates under an internship licensure completing alternative licensure programs" in this statement,

Under no circumstance shall an individual be recommended for licensure by a local school district unless that person has passed all sections of the current PED-required New Mexico teacher tests and serve as the teacher for at least one year.

Further investigation into the alternative licensure regulation revealed that 6.60.3.8.B. "Professional Teacher Education Requirements" includes four sections describing program routes to alternative licensure for a person who has earned at least a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited college or university but has never completed an educator preparation program. Each section includes a specified number of credit hours in a program or other requirements approved by the PED that must meet the following criteria for a specific licensure area: PED-specified number of hours in reading; PED competencies for entry-level teachers that correspond to the level being taught; and a student teaching or field-based component, or evidence of a specified teaching experience. The sections describe the following program routes:

Section (1). Early childhood birth-grade 3, elementary K-8, special education preK-12 licensure candidates seeking licensure through a regionally accredited college or university with a PED-approved alternative licensure program containing no less than 12 nor more than 21 semester credit hours (including six hours of teaching of reading courses).

Section (2). Middle level 5-9, secondary 7-12 or specialty area preK-12 licensure candidates seeking licensure through a regionally accredited college or university with a PED-approved alternative licensure program containing no less than 12 and no more than 18 semester credit hours (including three hours of the teaching of reading).

Section (3). Candidates seeking licensure through the PED-approved internet web-based online portfolio as specified in detail in further paragraphs of section 3. These

candidates must complete the reading course requirements for their selected school level of license and submit documentation from a school district, or charter or private school that they have served as teacher of record for one full year.

Section (4) Candidates seeking licensure by way of evaluations conducted by a local school district over a period of at least two full school years as the teacher of record “as part of a PED-approved school-based or statewide teacher preparation program that provides the professional development that is required to support a highly qualified teacher candidate as defined in this rule.” The professional development program must be developed in collaboration with a college, university, or other professional development provider. Each candidate must also complete required reading courses, meet other PED requirements for all pathways (including the PED-required NM teacher test), and serve as teacher of record for at least one year.

Alternative licensure programs in both the Elementary and Secondary Education programs were approved by the state according to requirements for Section 1 (Elementary Education K-8) and Section 2 (Secondary Education 7-12). We believe that our program requirements are in full compliance with all requirements for alternative licensure through an accredited college or university, as described in these two sections. All students who complete our state-approved licensure program are recommended for licensure by our institution, not by a school district, charter or private school. The language in Section 4 requiring service as teacher of record pertains only to candidates seeking licensure by way of evaluations conducted by a school district according to criteria as described in this section.

2. *Compliance with state transfer compact requirements (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.6)*

Department Response

A second concern raised by the external review team was that course requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education programs do not uphold the statewide transfer compact of 4- and 2- year institutions.

The UNM and COE website pages for admissions both provide links to current information under “UNM Institutional Equivalencies” about transfer courses accepted from 4- and 2- year institutions in the state and other locations in the country. In all cases at each institution’s website, information to students about the transfer compact clearly includes the following explanation:

Please note that course transferability does not ensure meeting specific degree requirements. Where applicable, courses are cross-listed with their UNM equivalent. In most situations where more than one course is required to meet the UNM equivalent, the excess hours will be applied to general university electives. If there is no equivalent UNM course number listed, the class may or not be applied toward core requirements or as elective credit in a degree program.

Because this information is available for all students from their 4- or 2- year institution as well as at our site, we believe that our Department and College are in compliance with the statewide transfer compact. However, we will continue our investigation into more detail regarding specific courses in our pre-professional and professional study sequences. In our research regarding this issue, we noticed that not all 4- and 2- year institutions have UNM equivalencies for courses in Elementary and Secondary Education programs named by the APR External Review Team in its report. For example, Central Community College of New Mexico (CNM) has a course equivalent for integration of technology, but Eastern New Mexico University does not have a course equivalent for this course. At UNM, the integration of technology course is listed as MSET 365, but sometimes has an Education or similar prefix at other institutions. That difference may have caused some confusion about this one course example. In order to help students and faculty be fully informed at all levels, we will update our Department catalog information to include a statement about compliance with the transfer policy indicated above to clarify this issue for our students.

3. NCATE: Diversity in student teaching placements. (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.6)

Department Response

The APR External Review Team’s Final Report states that “the NCATE standard three expects each teacher education candidate to have a diversity of experience by grade level, ethnicity, students with exceptionalities, and demographics important to the institution’s public school partners. While the field portal provides a unique process for placement and the co-teaching placements are exemplary models, they do not ensure the optimal opportunities for a variety of placements during the two semesters of student teaching” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.6)

Our investigation into NCATE standard three (2008) revealed the following statement regarding this area of concern:

Candidates are expected to study and practice in settings that include diverse populations, students with exceptionalities, and students of different ages. They are placed in clinical settings at grade levels and in the subjects or school roles (e.g., counselor) for which they are preparing. Candidate learning is integrated into the clinical setting (NCATE, 2008, p. 33).

We respectfully contend that this direct quote from NCATE standard three could be open to wider interpretation of the requirement of student teaching required by each Teacher Education Department program than the interpretation of the APR Review Team in their statement above. For example, the Elementary Education program has been moving to a model where students will be at the same school for their student teaching. The Secondary Education program already places their teacher candidates at the same school for clinical preparation. TED faculty feel very strongly that this is an appropriate choice because students learn the classroom and school culture and they build community within one school. As a result, we believe (and need to assess) that this assists in their learning,

particularly after the first semester, because they are able to focus more deeply on their teaching of diverse students in a specific school population and less on learning a new school culture each semester. Additionally, teacher candidates are able to contribute more substantially to the school culture because they become integral members of that community. These program elements are well aligned with Standard 3 as described in the “Supporting Explanation”:

Clinical practice includes student teaching and internships that provide candidates with full immersion in the learning community so that candidates are able to demonstrate proficiencies in the professional roles for which they are preparing. (NCATE, 2008, p.32)

However, despite the fact that we believe our choice is appropriate for our students and programs, this belief does not negate the importance of providing our students with a diversity of experience, and we will continue to refine our programs so that there is no question of alignment with NCATE requirements in this regard. As a result, we are planning to be very deliberate in our choices of school sites in the future. We provide more detail about this refinement of field experiences in our response to Recommendations 1 and 2 and the Action Plan. While final implementation of school placements will be determined in the context of field experience requirements at the college level and the terms of the Memoranda of Understanding with school districts, we hope to be able to use the following criteria to inform school selection:

- School selection will be chosen based on the diversity of students in that school, their approach to inclusion of students with exceptionalities, and opportunities to work with second language learners.
- Currently we require that all cooperating teachers must be Level II teachers. We are concerned that looking for schools with large numbers of Level II teachers may have the unintended consequence of limiting our access to more diverse schools. We will have to watch carefully to ensure this does not happen.
- We will provide diverse experiences within the school. For example, visiting/working with other classes, especially bilingual classes and special education classes. We also can work to shape the stewardship project that is included in the student teaching semester to ensure that it provides students with diverse experiences within their school sites.
- As a point of process, once information on potential school sites has been collected, the schools will be presented to and voted on by program faculty, as indicated in NCATE strand 3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners,” under the *Acceptable* category: “The unit and its school partners jointly determine the specific placement of student teachers... to provide appropriate learning experiences” (NCATE, 2008, p. 29)

Recommendations: Strategic Directions for Growth and Change (Reviewers' Report, 12/1/2011 and Departmental Response)

The External Review Team begins this section of their report with a discussion of the underlying assumption of their report, which is that “as a research extensive university, UNM should have teacher education programs that reflect that ranking and research orientation” (Final Reviewer’s Report, 2011, p.6). They then identify six actions that our Department needs to address in order to meet this assumption.

1. creation of smaller and more selective undergraduate programs to prepare teachers for licensure at the K-8 and secondary (7-12) levels,
2. utilization of and funding for graduate students as clinical supervisors,
3. expansion of the Master of Arts in Elementary or Secondary Education with a focus on Reflective Practice and marketing it across the state and region,
4. focused attention on hiring senior faculty,
5. development of a clinical team approach using MARP graduates as cooperating teachers,
6. development of a research-oriented PhD program that supports the undergraduate licensure programs while preparing the next generation of teacher educators.

Review Team Recommendation 1 Part 1

“The Teacher Education Department’s self-study concludes that the existing elementary and secondary education programs are too large and need to be ‘right-sized’ and that the existing model for supervising methods students and student teachers is dysfunctional and needs to be changed. We agree with this conclusion and recommend the following:

The faculty in TED need to reconceptualize the program to extend the existing co-teaching pilot program at Bandelier Elementary School across both the Elementary and Secondary Education programs. This will require 8 to 10 sites (could be individual buildings or across several buildings in a district or geographical area) across both programs with each site having approximately 20-25 students at any one time. This will ‘right-size’ the programs to around 200-250 students across both programs using the co-teaching model which has a strong research and best practice-based structure. It is also consistent with models highly recommended by NCATE and AACTE.” (Final Reviewers’ Report, 2011, p.7)

Department Response

The faculty is committed to program renewal for preparing New Mexico's teachers that is reflective of the New Mexico context and current best practices in the field of Teacher Education. In addition by working to develop a coherent program that works to address the on-going challenges in teacher education in the United States, i.e. clinical supervision, program coherence, and simultaneous renewal (Goodlad, 1993, 2004), the TED faculty

recognize the opportunity to make contributions to the field of teacher education, in particular in the area of preparing teachers to work with diverse student populations. We are committed to program renewal and development in order to better prepare New Mexico's teachers to ensure New Mexico's students have rigorous and effective learning opportunities. In addition, as we look forward to our upcoming NCATE review, we recognize the importance of clinical practices in our program (AACTE, 2010).

The Department aims to explore further development of the co-teaching model that has been piloted at two schools in the Albuquerque area, Bandelier (Elementary) and Amy Biehl (Secondary). The faculty realize that developing clinical practices such as co-teaching between cooperating teachers and teacher candidates and embedding faculty in collaborative schools calls for more focused placements in fewer schools. It calls for the development of a *3rd Space* in which academic, practitioner, and community knowledge and practices are developed to support teacher candidates' and K-12 students' learning (Zeichner, 2010). Additionally, groupings of teacher candidates at K-12 schools, for clinical preparation, in which faculty are also embedded would allow more interaction between the university and the schools, marrying theory and practice (Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009). This model may look slightly different depending on the program and the collaborations.

Because the External Review team made recommendations for Elementary and Secondary education separately, our responses are organized by program.

Elementary Education Response: We greatly appreciate the external review team's suggestion to "right-size" our licensure programs and restructure our field experience model. We have already begun to plan for expanding the model that has been well-received at Bandelier Elementary School to other schools, as recommended by the external review team above. Dr. Cheryl Torrez, the lead faculty member at the Bandelier site, was invited to and has met with the instructional coaches in the district to present nascent findings from Bandelier. As we move forward, however, we must align our plans for future school collaboration and site choices for placement with the Memorandum of Agreement with the Albuquerque Public Schools regarding school placements for all programs in the College of Education. In addition, our work towards the best fit between resources and program size must be conducted within the frame of the College Comprehensive Review.

As recommended by the External Review team, in January 2012, Elementary Education faculty began discussing the process by which additional collaborative co-teaching schools might be identified and developed. This model of clinical preparation has strong support among the faculty. The ideal plan of action would be to add additional co-teaching collaborative schools in the next several years across the Albuquerque metro area. However, these types of collaborations take significant development time and necessitate formal agreements between UNM and school districts.

The Elementary Education program is implementing plans to place larger groups of teacher candidates at school sites, in accordance with the formalized agreement with

Albuquerque Public Schools. It is most likely that a hybrid model of clinical preparation will exist in the foreseeable future. The development of one or two additional co-teaching collaborative schools will begin in 2012-2013 and the larger groupings of teacher candidates in all K-8 schools will simultaneously occur in conjunction with school district/COE agreements.

To more specifically address the concerns expressed in the External Review Team's report, the Elementary Education program is proposing to split observation/evaluation responsibilities between the UNM faculty and the site-based professionals. Roughly half of the observations of the teacher candidates will be completed by the UNM faculty member; half by the site based professional. As part of the changes in these responsibilities, faculty will closely align this new configuration with NCATE standards regarding field experiences and related policies established at the COE level for all programs.

In order to recognize the need for more elementary teachers with strengths in math and science and bilingual/TESOL, the Elementary Education program has revised their applicant screening tool to award extra points for applicants demonstrating those strengths.

The Elementary Education program faculty appreciate the Review Team's recommendation to "right-size". The faculty are mindful of broader UNM and COE issues that influence admissions. At this juncture, no implementation of "right-sizing" is planned or anticipated. The numbers of Elementary Education applicants, and therefore student enrollments, have significantly decreased over the past several years. For example, the number of undergraduate students (BSED-ELED) registered and enrolled in Fall 2009 was 416, in Fall 2012 the number was 347 (COE Research and Information Management, 10-08-2012). We believe this is due to various external factors such as economics, perceptions of the teaching profession, and fading out of 'pipeline' students.

Secondary Education Response: Secondary Education program faculty and leadership have been working with administrators in the Albuquerque Public Schools to identify teacher candidate placements. We will continue this work, in accordance with the APS/COE MOU, to identify possible collaborative schools for placement of teacher candidates. One suggestion was to place teacher candidates with cooperating teachers working in the district-wide Advancement via Individual Determination (AVID) program. AVID is a college readiness system that is implemented by K-12 school districts (http://www.avid.org/abo_whatisavid.html). We are trying to incorporate the AVID schools as teacher candidate placements sites as we can. District personnel are working closely with us in this work.

In order to more closely embed program faculty in the schools so that we have better supervision of our teacher candidates in their schools, we hope to include three additional Secondary faculty members interested in working in the schools. For tenure track faculty in particular, we must ensure that they are able to participate in these collaborations while still being able to teach MA and PhD classes. To ensure this, there must be a plan for

rotating school responsibilities. This would also ensure that more faculty participate and have a deep understanding of our students' progress. As will occur in the Elementary Education program, faculty will also collaborate in the observation and evaluation load with the cooperating teachers. Implementation of this began in Fall 2012.

This concludes the general plan for changes in clinical supervision that will ensure we are in full compliance with NCATE regulations.

***Review Team Recommendation 1
Part 2***

“The secondary program should focus more on preparing math and science teachers for schools in New Mexico and less on language arts and social studies since the market for teachers in those content areas is weak. Enrollment in those content areas should be based on solid market analysis and not tradition since most program completers appear to stay in the state and/or region and the need for excellent math and science teachers is high. The program is currently under-producing teachers for math and science by a significant margin.”(Final Reviewers' Report, 2011, p.7)

Department Response

Recruiting math and science students in Secondary Education has become problematic in recent years, not just in New Mexico, but across the nation as well. Historically, a more robust number of mathematics and science teaching candidates were recruited into our program through the partnership program for mathematics and science teacher licensure that no longer exists. Currently, mathematics and science faculty in the secondary education are working hard on recruitment for 2012-2013 and beyond in several ways. For example, the deadline for admissions was extended and more effort will be put into advertising for and recruiting professionals in these fields who are seeking career changes. In addition, program faculty will seek closer connections with STEM faculty in other academic units to promote teaching as a career. The faculty plan to continue to work on this important need to increase the number of teaching candidates in these areas. The faculty also recognize that retention of math and science teachers is a persistent challenge throughout the nation and beyond the scope of a teacher preparation program (Ingersoll, 2011).

Review Team Recommendation 2

“As noted above, the model currently being used for supervising students in the field is inadequate, inefficient, and unnecessarily expensive. The liaisons in the field sites appear to the students to inhibit communication between the cooperating teachers and the program faculty. This is not intentional but appears to be indigenous to the model which has the cooperating teachers communicating to the liaisons who then communicate to the methods faculty and vice-versa. This model is fairly expensive since it costs about \$67,000 for stipends per year for the

nine liaisons. The individuals hired to do the actual evaluations on site as the university supervisors consume a significant portion of the college's budget for supervision, and we believe this cost is proportionally higher than the costs for supervision in other programs.

We recommend that the department negotiate an increase in doctoral level teaching assistants from the Provost to cover a significant portion of the field supervision using the clinical supervision model inherent in the pilot co-teaching project at Bandelier. This will require approximately 10 new full time assistantships so that each of the proposed field sites has a doctoral level teaching assistant assigned to it. This could be financed as a cost share with the department by using the \$67,000 currently earmarked for the liaisons to fund four \$16,000 doctoral stipends with the remaining funding coming from the Provost's office. The return on investment from these new assistantships should be fairly high since they will generate state subsidy for coursework they take as full time graduate students." (Final Reviewers' Report, 2011, p.7)

Department Response

Department faculty appreciate the level of detail in this recommendation regarding the use of a new model that will include more faculty members at specific school sites. However, at this point in time, we will proceed with the plan we have described in response to Recommendation 1. In addition, we will continue planning and refining the plans for field supervision now in place that will use a combination of faculty, university supervisors, and doctoral students when appropriate. The proposal about doctoral assistantships above is a recommendation we could consider as we begin to develop the new model. However, the request for these assistantships will have to be aligned with results of the current COE Comprehensive Review timeline and the policies regarding assistantship allocation within the College.

Review Team Recommendation 3

"Move the highly successful MARP masters degree program to an online delivery system that is marketed across the state and region as a program that can be tailored to districts' or schools' individual needs. These school or district wide on line programs could be set up as cohorts of 20-25 students at each site, and the reflective practice model adapted to the specific professional development and curricular needs of the cohort group. Our interviews with past and current MARP students suggested to us that these students found the program to be demanding yet professionally rewarding. Given the need for teachers in New Mexico to obtain a masters degree, this would seem to be a large, generally untapped market. This could also be a significant source of revenue for the College and department if the Dean and department chair could create a formula that would return a percentage of revenue generated from the tuition paid by students in the on line program back to the college and department. The current stipend of \$5,000 paid to the faculty who teach on line classes is excellent, but the return of \$1,000 to the department for each class taught seems low given that a 3 semester hour class of

20-25 students would generate between \$15,000 and \$19,000 in tuition per class.”
(Final Reviewers’ Report, 2011, p.8)

Department Response

We acknowledge that the MARP specialization has been successful in recruiting and retaining students through completion of their programs of study. Formal discussions are underway for making an MA online program and using the MARP model could give professional development opportunities for cohorts at the school or district level. At the current time, our main goal in completing development of the MARP specialization for our masters’ degrees is to finalize curricular forms for new elective courses that have been developed over the past two years. There is also some interest in adding another level of curricular approval for a formal concentration. Because of these considerations as well as a need to analyze the need for additional resources (e.g., instructors for both face-to-face and online instruction), moving this program to online delivery would be unfeasible for immediate implementation.

Review Team Recommendation 4

“The faculty distribution across ranks in the Teacher Education Department is heavily skewed to the assistant and associate level with only one full time and one joint appointment faculty member at the full professor level. We strongly recommend that, when appropriate, future searches for faculty in TED be advertised as “open rank” positions with preference given to senior level associate (i.e. those likely to be promoted to full professor within a 2-3 year period) or full professors. The department has made some excellent hires over the past several years, and that group is forming a strong cadre of assistant and early level associate professors. However, those faculty need significant mentoring and support from senior faculty, and the lack of faculty at the senior, full professor level is alarming. If the research productivity and program development and management is to grow in the department, the presence of senior level faculty who will conduct the research and develop and manage the programs is critical.”
(Final Reviewers’ Report, 2011, p.8)

Department Response

The faculty in the Department of Teacher Education understand the limitations of a Department devoid of senior-level faculty (Full Professors) to serve as mentors for Assistant and Associate rank faculty. This recognition comes with an acknowledgement of two distinct realities: first, that many Associate level faculty members in the Department are active in a variety of scholarly endeavors that are not as clearly recognized in the promotion system, and second, that Associate faculty members have been entrenched in continuous program development. That being mentioned, the faculty in the Department are eager to bolster the recognized scholarship and research status of the Department through formalized and recognized scholarly pursuits including publications, grant initiatives, and presentations that advance and disseminate the knowledge base related to teacher education, the various content and interest areas, and

scholarship on teaching and learning, to a constituency of fellow scholars in academia, policy makers, local school districts, and surrounding communities. The impact range of a Teacher Education faculty engaged in research with broad dissemination avenues will be significant, in terms of contributions to our fields, as well as to education in New Mexico.

In order to achieve this goal, faculty will engage in 2012-2013, and beyond, in planning for and implementing a wide range of research promoting activities. These activities will directly and indirectly address the concerns of the APR team regarding the mentoring of junior faculty, the need for more senior faculty members, and the scholarly commitment of all faculty members, at every level in the Department of Teacher Education. Two overarching themes suggested by the faculty workgroup who identified this agenda in Spring 2012 include “Developing a Research Culture” and “Collaborative Models of Research with a Visionary Faculty Willing to Take Risks.”

Review Team Recommendation 5

“Utilize the current MARP students and recent MARP graduates more extensively as cooperating teachers and on site mentors at the co-teaching sites. It would appear that these students are being prepared exactly for these roles. The elementary and secondary programs might also want to consider using the Albuquerque Public School’s on site instructional coaches as part of the supervisory team at the co-teaching sites. Our recommendation #2 describes a potential clinical supervision model that the department might consider using. More specifically, the faculty might consider a team approach involving the methods instructor, a MARP teacher serving as mentor, a doctoral level teaching assistant serving as a field instructor and research coordinator on site, and an instructional coach from APS serving as an on-site supervisor. This would renew the former partnerships with APS somewhat, but, more importantly, it would incorporate a team of professionals in the teacher preparation process and more closely mirror the clinical model used in medical schools. We believe that this model of supervision using a clinical team approach would make the UNM teacher preparation program unique in the state and the region and represent the kind of ‘leading edge’ model one would expect to see at the flagship, research extensive institution in the state.” (Final Reviewers’ Report, 2011, pp.8-9)

Department Response

The model described above for the use of MARP teachers serving as master teachers and cooperating teachers in our student teaching programs is aligned well in many aspects with the school-based model that both Elementary and Secondary Education programs are planning to implement as soon as they receive approval for implementation. However, selection of master/cooperating teachers and school placements are determined by the district and school administrator as well as faculty.

We will continue to discuss this recommendation as we move forward to the formal structure of field placements for the COE as a whole.

Review Team Recommendation 6

“Build the PhD program into a truly research-oriented program that is designed to develop the next generation of teacher educators for the state and region. We would recommend suspending admission to the EdD program and “mothballing” it for 3-5 years to see if it is even necessary to maintain the program. We believe that a teacher education program at a research extensive institution should be a PhD program and not an EdD program. The cadre of 8-10 new, full time doctoral students we recommend in #2 should be recruited from the population of highly qualified teachers in the state who hold the masters degree and have been recognized as National Board certified teachers, Golden Apple Award recipients, and/or Outstanding Teacher or Teacher of the Year recipients from across the state and region. The doctoral students should feel honored to be selected for study in this program and see themselves as future teacher educators who will take faculty positions at strong teacher preparation institutions” (Final Reviewers’ Report, 2011, p.9)

Department Response

In addressing these concerns, the Department faculty will begin the College and University process to change the title of the doctoral program to clearly reflect the vision and curriculum expectations of doctoral students wishing to pursue a PhD in Teacher Education. The process will follow university policy and procedures for Departmental faculty approval and will move the curriculum workflow process forward for College faculty approval before submission to Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee.

The development of an EdD with a focus on professional practice has been placed on hold. It is important, however, that the Department continues to serve the needs of New Mexico and our students, and maintenance of the EdD is an important component of this mission. The Departmental resources will be spent on the development of a comprehensive PhD that truly reflects the vision of a research extensive doctoral program as suggested by the members of the external review team.

The building of a strong research-oriented doctoral program has been taken seriously by the Department faculty; therefore, actions will be taken to assess the existing curriculum required of doctoral students to make sure the curriculum meets the expectations of the doctoral program competencies developed in 2009. The faculty will refine and update the courses and sequence required of all doctoral students, plus assess the required core and research courses that prepare students to learn the critical and analytical research skills necessary to be successful teacher educators and researchers.

While the PhD in Multicultural Teacher and Childhood Education has been in existence for many years, the current delivery of the curriculum is relatively new. Faculty members have been in the process of designing and implementing a research-oriented program that provides students an opportunity to study with faculty who are highly committed educators. The faculty has a distinct approach to educational issues that combines inquiry with close connections to professional practice. The program over the past four and a half years has been designed with flexibility to encourage inquiry tailored to student particular

scholarly and research interests. The program faculty are committed to developing leadership among teachers, curriculum leaders, policy educators, researchers, and others in the field of education. The faculty strives to provide a high-quality, equitable education, while generating a sense of professional responsibility for the improvement of education in its multiple dimensions.

The faculty is steadfast in its commitment to create a diverse community of learners across all academic programs in the Department. We believe that diversity of background, experience, expertise, and perspective enriches faculty scholarship. We continue to seek, attract, and recruit the best faculty and graduate students possible, even though it is challenging due to fiscal constraints, such as having limited graduate assistantships or fellowships to offer graduate students. However, the faculty continues to seek internal and external funds to enhance programmatic concerns. Also, the doctoral program faculty through courses, seminars, colloquia, joint projects, and other formal and informal interactions with those inside and outside the University continue to draw on the diversity to inform their research, teaching, service, and outreach.

The faculty will consider collaborative efforts with other departments to strengthen the doctoral program by encouraging research methods and elective coursework to complement the doctoral degree in teacher education. It will be important to recruit excellent students into the doctoral program who wish to enhance their research experiences and knowledge base as professional educators. Various strategies are being explored to help recruit excellent students into the doctoral program, including outstanding educators from within the state as the external review team specifically recommends, but also promising educators from other locations -- regional, national and international.

The improvement of communication, especially addressing policies and procedural guidelines for recruiting, admitting, and advising students appropriately is an important ingredient for a successful graduate program. Therefore, the governance structure for the oversight of the doctoral program will be an important area considered by TED faculty as it applies to the day-to-day responsibilities of the doctoral program. Therefore, a focused action plan will be developed with consultation and direct input from program faculty on actions to enhance communication regarding responsibilities of faculty affiliated with the doctoral program.

Faculty will articulate the role and responsibilities of oversight, advisement, and instruction in the doctoral program as they pertain to recruitment efforts, the application process, student admissions, program and student assessments, student advising, program planning, course scheduling, and teaching responsibilities. In carrying out these program responsibilities, we will consider the recruitment pool of outstanding New Mexico teachers and teacher leaders recommended by the External Review Team, but also recruit potential applicants from a national pool as well.

In the improvement of the doctoral program, faculty recognize that is important to move beyond analysis and promote education renewal, seeking to improve the conditions of

teaching and learning for students and educators alike. This means looking beyond the technical concern of teaching and learning to a broader social responsibility we as educators bear for promoting social equity in and through education.

As we pursue the redesign of the doctoral program and enhance the curriculum of study, we will also continue to develop a culture that creates a strong sense of investment and accountability for the doctoral program, which will be very important for its success over the next five years.

Final Comments of the External Review Team (Reviewers' Report, 12/1/2011 and Departmental Response)

“We realize that these recommendations are bold, ambitious, and far-reaching, but we also believe that the University, College and Department of Teacher Education have the will and resources to achieve these recommendations. The faculty and the department and college leadership have exhibited a commitment to new, innovative ideas, programs, technology, etc., but we are concerned about the sustainability of these ideas, programs, technology, etc. because they tend to be personality-driven rather than institutionalized. We believe that if the department's programs are to move to the leading edge, they must be institutionalized and supported across the university.” (Final Reviewers' Report, 2011, p.9)

Department Response

We appreciate the recommendations of the External Review Team, their understanding of our commitment to improve our programs for all our students, and their concerns about sustainability. We believe that the detail and substance of these recommendations will prove helpful to us as we continue to move our programs to the level of excellence we envision.

References

- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 49(7), 18-33.
- Giles Jr, D. E. (2010). Understanding an emerging field of scholarship: Toward a research agenda for engaged, public scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(2), 97-106.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2011). Do we produce enough math and science teachers? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(6), 37-41.
- The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved 08/2012, from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php

Ward, C., & Carrigan, M. (2011). Are all forms Of scholarship considered equal?
Contemporary Issues in Education Research (CIER), 2(2), 45-50.