



Date: April 29, 2011

To: Rodney A. Erickson

From: David H. Monk 

Re: Responses to the Core Council's Recommendations

I appreciate having this opportunity to report on the actions we have taken and the progress we have made in response to the recommendations the College of Education received last August from the Core Council. I have organized this memorandum around the nine recommendations that were made in the Council's August 4, 2010 communication to the College. As you will see, there is progress to report for each of the nine recommendations. In a number of areas, additional steps need to be taken, and in these cases, I describe the next steps we are planning to pursue.

For the purpose of keeping the entire College aware of our progress, we established a web site where updates and reports can be readily found in chronological order. This web site is located at: <http://www.ed.psu.edu/educ/for-current-faculty-and-staff/college-response-to-core-council>

In this memorandum, I have tried to keep our responses short and focused. If additional information would be helpful to the Council, I would be pleased to build upon the summary that I provide here.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Department Merger/Reorganization

We have proceeded to merge the Department of Counselor Education, Counseling Psychology, and Rehabilitation Services with the Department of Educational and School Psychology, and Special Education. A proposal for the merger was submitted on February 15, 2011, and, in accordance with the relevant Penn State policies, the proposal was forwarded to the University Faculty Senate for review. The proposal was endorsed by the University Faculty Senate Council on April 12, 2011. The proposal will next be taken to the University's Board of Trustees for action at its May 2011 meeting. The name for the proposed new department is the Department of Educational Psychology, Counseling, and Special Education (EPCSE). Dr. Spencer Niles has agreed to serve as the initial Department Head for the new department, and we expect the new department to begin to operate on July 1, 2011.

We have also taken seriously the Core Council's admonition to be sure the merger is not simply a combination of the two existing departments. I appointed a Re-Design Advisory Team

with a focused charge to build on the considerable successes of the two component departments and to take a careful look at what would be required to streamline offerings in this area of the College. We included an outside member on this re-design team, as the Council suggested. Dr. Mark Greenberg from the College of Health and Human Development graciously agreed to serve in this role.

The Re-Design Team framed a number of options for streamlining operations and conducted extensive reviews of our Educational Psychology, School Psychology, and Counseling Psychology graduate programs. The Team provided the information I needed to make the difficult decision to recommend closing our Counseling Psychology doctoral program. The decision was difficult because the Counseling Psychology program has a long history at Penn State and is of high quality. However, it became clear to me that we cannot afford to offer two doctoral programs in counseling (one in Counselor Education and one in Counseling Psychology). By closing Counseling Psychology and by streamlining delivery of the remaining programs in Educational Psychology, School Psychology, Counselor Education, and Special Education, we will be able to realize savings and strengthen the remaining areas of the merged department. While the reorganization will generate some initial savings (e.g., the elimination of a department head position, the elimination of graduate assistantships that have been earmarked for incoming students in Counseling Psychology, and the realignment of staff assistant assignments), the major savings from these changes will accrue over time as we will not be replacing tenure-line faculty members in Counseling Psychology.

We also see the potential for the re-designed programs to generate additional revenues for the University, particularly at the professional master's degree level. For example, it may be desirable to expand the existing master's degree in School Psychology in a way that would lead to certification as a School Psychologist. We sense a strong market for a master's degree in School Psychology, and we will be actively exploring the possibilities. It may also be possible for a portion of this degree to be offered through distance education. The Counselor Education program has already taken steps to expand its master's degree offering, and enrollments along with tuition revenues are increasing.

We have closed admission to the Counseling Psychology Ph.D. program and a proposal to close the program has been submitted to the Graduate School. We are in conversation with the four tenure-line faculty members who are directly affiliated with the Counseling Psychology program about their evolving responsibilities.

During the spring 2011 semester a new faculty planning group, the Interim Vision and Design Committee, began to function with the goal of building a common core curriculum that can serve the needs of students in Educational Psychology (including the learning and the measurement and assessment strands), School Psychology, and other programs in the department. The next step is to create a standing curriculum committee that will build on these efforts. The new curriculum committee will include faculty representatives from all graduate programs in the new department: Educational Psychology, School Psychology, Counselor Education, and Special Education. I recently distributed a charge for the new curriculum committee, and this can be found on the web site described above.

This has been a challenging period in the history of the two component departments, but I think the changes build on our strengths and that we will emerge with stronger and more coherent programs.

RECOMMENDATION 2: IUG Program Development

Curriculum proposals for IUGs that bridge undergraduate majors in mathematics, chemistry, biology, and physics with a master's degree (M.Ed.) in Curriculum and Instruction and teacher certification are moving through the curricular approval process. The prospectuses for these IUG's are scheduled to be discussed at ACUE on May 6, 2011 and the next step will be for them to be reviewed by the relevant curricular affairs committees in the College and Graduate School. A proposal for an Earth and Space Science IUG is also being developed. This one has taken some extra time because there is no existing undergraduate degree that encompasses both earth and space science.

The Learning and Performance Systems Department is currently engaging the Schreyer Honors College in the creation of an IUG in Instructional Systems for honors students with interests in instructional design and technology. This IUG will be tailored to meeting the needs of the individual honors student and will engage undergraduate students in the research apprenticeship program in INSYS. Schreyer Honors Scholars would earn an undergraduate degree in their home discipline with a designation of Honors in Instructional Systems along with a M.Ed. in Instructional Systems.

Faculty members in the Education Policy Studies Department are currently working to develop a proposal for an IUG that would link the undergraduate program in Education and Public Policy (EPP) with a master's degree in Education Theory and Policy.

Faculty members in the College of Education continue to work closely with colleagues at campus locations, and campus-location faculty are involved in regular discussions related to the programs they offer. Several mechanisms are in place to ensure this communication and consultation occurs regularly: (1) the annual meeting of Education Representatives (one faculty member from each campus location), typically held in the spring; (2) monthly faculty meetings of all campuses offering the undergraduate elementary education degree; (3) bi-annual faculty retreats for faculty involved in the undergraduate teacher education programs, organized by degree program (such as Elementary Education) and/or by courses taught (such as CI 280); and (4) listservs and Angel groups to facilitate dissemination of undergraduate program information. These efforts facilitate the integration of campuses into the undergraduate portion of the IUGs that will be offered.

RECOMMENDATION 3: On-line Program Development

I am pleased to confirm that the revised master's degree in teacher leadership will be offered through the World Campus and will begin to operate in the fall of 2011. We have made significant progress toward building a truly collaborative program that will draw upon faculty expertise from the College of Education at University Park, Penn State Harrisburg, and Penn State Great Valley. Both Harrisburg and Great Valley have responsibility for at least one course

within the teacher leadership program, and we are in conversation with these two campuses about developing complementary collaborative hybrid approaches through the World Campus for both our principal certification and superintendent letter of eligibility programs. These are significant developments for Penn State that should help the University enhance its state-wide impact on administrator preparation in Pennsylvania. There have been some preliminary conversations about adding a western campus base to help cover the entire Commonwealth. Both Chancellors Kulkarni and Edelbrock have been very helpful in this effort, and we have also benefited from the assistance of our colleagues in the World Campus and Graduate School.

In addition, the Workforce Education and Development faculty has developed an online master's degree proposal in Organizational Development. The World Campus is currently conducting a market analysis. If the market analysis results are favorable, we plan to refine the proposal and have it reviewed by the relevant committees in the College and Graduate School.

We are also actively exploring a number of professional master's degrees in some new areas that seem well-suited for distance education and the World Campus. For example, our Higher Education graduate program historically has been oriented around a small, high quality Ph.D. program. We believe the Penn State "brand" in Higher Education could attract a sizeable number of students into an on-line master's degree program in Higher Education. We see this as a promising new endeavor that has the potential to generate needed revenues for the program, and we share additional information toward the end of this memorandum.

At the doctoral level, we are moving forward with plans in a number of areas for professional doctoral programs with significant and in some cases exclusive reliance on distance education technology. The following three graduate programs are actively exploring the possibilities:

Counselor Education. The Counselor Education faculty is working to re-design and adapt its D.Ed. in Counselor Education to reach an audience in the southeastern part of Pennsylvania. We are developing an innovative delivery method that, if implemented, would involve the use of remote sites, distance technology, and traditional instruction based at University Park. We have more to say about the D.Ed. in Counselor Education in response to recommendation #6 below.

Learning and Performance Systems. The Department of Learning and Performance Systems is proposing an online D.Ed. for students with interests in the design, development, delivery, and evaluation of learning systems. These learning systems can exist in many settings, including workforce settings where the focus is on professional development and on-the-job training for mature learners. Learning systems also exist within more conventional K-12 school settings. One of the features that will distinguish this proposed degree is an emphasis on instructional technology which is fitting given the heavy reliance the program will place on the use of distance technology to deliver the program. We are in conversation with our colleagues at Penn State Harrisburg and Penn State Great Valley about collaboration possibilities. We are also currently working with the World Campus to assess the market viability for a program with this kind of focus.

Educational Leadership. The Educational Leadership faculty at University Park is working in collaboration with faculty members at Penn State Harrisburg and Penn State Great Valley to develop a hybrid professional doctorate (D.Ed.) in Educational Leadership. As mentioned earlier, this is part of an on-going collaborative effort that involves teacher leadership, certification for the principalship, and the letter of eligibility for the superintendency. While we see the professional doctorate as something that would follow logically after the development of the principalship and superintendency programs, planning for the doctorate is underway now and can proceed in parallel with the development of these complementary offerings.

The market analysis for a professional doctorate in Educational Leadership has already been completed by the World Campus, and the results are quite positive. The University Park faculty members in Educational Leadership recognize the academic merit of this kind of program and are actively developing a proposal in collaboration with our colleagues at Penn State Harrisburg and Penn State Great Valley. A planning committee has been appointed jointly by me and the two Chancellors. I see this program moving along a fast track toward design and implementation.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Closure of Small Graduate Programs

We have initiated the process for closing six small graduate programs. The following programs are in the process of being closed (in addition to the Counseling Psychology Ph.D. program closure): the D.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction, the D.Ed. in Workforce Education, the M.S. in Instructional Systems, the D.Ed. in Instructional Systems, the M.S. in Educational Leadership, and the M.S. in Counselor Education.

All graduate programs in the College of Education will be reviewed internally on a regular basis and will be held accountable for the six elements I identified in an earlier memorandum that was distributed throughout the College. In that memorandum I stipulated that all graduate programs in the College need to a) have a strong connection with schools and/or other educational settings; b) engage in a significant way with the College's undergraduate education mission; c) eliminate under-enrolled classes; d) develop successful research and outreach programs that include major funded projects from IES and other external sources; e) attract strong graduate students who finish in timely ways to pursue careers as academic or educational professionals; and f) demonstrate their commitment to recruiting and retaining high quality students who will enhance the diversity of the University.

Our elected Faculty Council held a town meeting earlier in the spring semester to discuss the six elements. The discussion was positive, and my sense is that the faculty understands the relevance and importance of the six elements.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Review of Graduate Programs in Workforce Education and Instructional Systems

The D.Ed. degree in Workforce Education and Development and the M.S. and D.Ed. degrees in Instructional Systems are scheduled to close.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Review of Graduate Programs in Counselor Education, Adult Education, and Curriculum and Instruction

Counselor Education. As we indicated in our response to Recommendation #3, we are planning to rejuvenate the D.Ed. in Counselor Education through a re-design of the curriculum and the utilization of a new delivery mechanism that will permit us to reach students in the southeastern part of Pennsylvania and the Philadelphia and Washington D.C. corridor. We routinely receive requests for programming from students in that area and have confidence that the program will attract students and will be successful.

The re-design of the program was approved by the Graduate School's Subcommittee on New and Revised Programs and Courses and is now being reviewed by the Graduate School's Committee on Programs and Courses. We expect it to be considered at a May meeting of the Graduate Council.

In a separate action, we are also proposing to introduce a new delivery mechanism (a combination of the use of remote sites, distance education technology, and traditional instruction based at University Park) for the revised D.Ed. program. This proposal has now been reviewed by all of the relevant committees and administrators within the College of Education and has been submitted to the Graduate School's Subcommittee on New and Revised Programs and Courses for further review.

Adult Education. We have also been actively engaged in making comparisons between our Adult Education program and similar programs at peer institutions. Specifically, we have been examining programs at the University of Toronto (the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education), the University of Georgia, and the University of British Columbia. These universities operate larger programs than the program at Penn State and include related areas like indigenous education, workforce education, and human resource development. We will continue these benchmarking efforts and take advantage of what we learn as we make further refinements.

Ties with the Adult Education program at Penn State Harrisburg have been strengthened through joint faculty meetings, support for Harrisburg's development of a joint MD/MEd with Hershey Medical School, involvement of Harrisburg faculty members in the Adult Education doctoral handbook revision, involvement of Harrisburg faculty members in brown bag presentations of research, and the active participation of Harrisburg faculty members on doctoral committees. Faculty members at both locations are committed to a continued exploration of collaboration opportunities.

Curriculum and Instruction (C&I). The Core Council raised concerns about variability in the academic qualifications of entering students in the graduate program in Curriculum & Instruction and suggested that admissions become more selective. We take this opportunity to point out several features of the graduate program in C&I that may not be well understood.

The C&I graduate program pursues a holistic approach to the assessment of academic qualifications for admission into the program and considers conventional metrics like GRE scores to be one of several important indicators of competence and promise. C&I is a complex

field that joins theory with problems of practice. Given the importance of practice within the field, we seek experienced students and many of the applicants for the program are returning adult students. Students seeking admission to the doctoral program undergo a rigorous admissions review that involves an in-person, multi-day interview (whenever possible) in addition to innovative screening devices. For example, each applicant is asked to prepare a critique of a journal article. We have found the resulting written responses to be quite revealing about the readiness of an applicant to succeed with doctoral level studies. In some cases these alternative metrics have convinced us that a candidate with relatively low GRE scores is worthy of admission. We monitor cases like this carefully and believe we have made good admission decisions given the subsequent successes of these students.

The program also attracts applicants who do very well with indicators like GRE scores. During the most recent admission cycle, two of the program's applicants were offered University Graduate Fellowships and two others were offered Dean's Graduate Assistantships. These students competed successfully with the top applicants throughout the College and posted impressive GRE scores.

In addition, C&I programs are nationally recognized for their excellence. One source of evidence for this claim is that our graduate program in C&I as well as our programs in Secondary Education and Elementary Education are highly ranked each year in the *U.S. News and World Report* national rankings. In the most recent rankings, these programs were ranked 12th, 12th, and 14th respectively out of 279 Colleges of Education for 2012. Graduates of the Ph.D. program go on to faculty positions at major universities throughout the United States and beyond.

With these points in mind, we accept the Core Council's recommendation to "target selected areas of potential excellence." We recently reorganized separate emphasis areas in Language and Literacy Education and Social Studies Education into a single and more comprehensive focus on Language, Culture, and Society. The C&I program has also been very active and cooperative in the development of IUG programs in collaboration with the Eberly College of Science and the Special Education program. We see these as important targets of opportunity and the faculty in the program remains committed to finding opportunities like these to continue strengthening the program.

RECOMMENDATION 7: Status of the Associate Degree in Workforce Education and Development Proposal and Review of the Baccalaureate Degree in Workforce Education and Development

For the sake of providing context, I comment first on the baccalaureate degree in Workforce Education and Development and then turn to where we are in our thinking about the associate degree.

The Baccalaureate Degree. The baccalaureate degree in Workforce Education and Development is an integral part of a significant funded project from the Pennsylvania Department of Education through a \$1.2 million annual contract with Penn State for the

Professional Personnel Development Center (PPDC). The program has been at Penn State for the past 35 years and serves a large number of students. In the fall of 2010, a total of 797 undergraduate students were being served by the program. The majority of these are part-time students who are located off-campus and who are pursuing certification only programs as part of the Commonwealth's effort to prepare vocational and technical teachers. The Commonwealth does not currently require a baccalaureate degree for vocational and technical teachers.

It is important to realize that having the opportunity to pursue a baccalaureate degree is one of the requirements for Penn State to receive the PPDC contract. The PPDC contract underwrites the costs of all of the relevant Workforce Education and Development courses and services provided to traditional and non-traditional undergraduate students being served by the program. The contract covers the costs of the baccalaureate program and enables Penn State to serve the Commonwealth in an important way. While the baccalaureate program is small, we see it serving an important larger purpose and plan to retain it and do what we can to strengthen its design.

The Associate Degree. We understand and appreciate the concern the Core Council expressed about adding an associate degree program in this area, and we are willing to abandon our plan for establishing this degree if necessary. However, we continue to see advantages to an associate degree offering in Workforce Education and Development, and we would welcome the opportunity to explore these ideas further. In the following paragraphs I provide a sketch of the reasons along with some additional information about the kind of degree we envision and its rationale.

While it is true that University Park Colleges are scaling back their associate degree offerings, Continuing Education and the World Campus continue to be actively offering these degrees, particularly in regions where there are no community colleges. These programs are helping Penn State do a better job at reaching adult learners, an important University priority.

We see an associate degree in Workforce Education and Development as a program that would be offered exclusively for adult learners by the College of Education in partnership with Academic Outreach. We have been in conversation with our colleagues in Academic Outreach and they are highly supportive of the proposal and see it as a way to make effective use of the new Video Learning Network (VLN) to reach an underserved segment of the Pennsylvania adult population – namely, frontline supervisors and occupational specialists. They have conducted a market analysis of the identified audience and the results are quite favorable. According to this analysis, there are 235,050 front-line supervisors working in Pennsylvania's business and industry segments and more than 58% of them do not hold post-secondary degrees. Today's frontline supervisors require more education and higher levels of skill to stay competitive in the economy. This program would serve these needs and contribute to workforce development within the Commonwealth and perhaps beyond.

In collaboration with the Workforce Education and Development program, Academic Outreach would offer the core courses in a distance education programming format at times and locations convenient for the intended audience. These offerings would be supplemented by more traditional programming offered at campus locations across the state making use of the VLN technology. The associate degree would also provide a pathway for adult learners to pursue future step-up opportunities such as the baccalaureate degree in Workforce Education and Development. We do not expect to see large jumps in the numbers of students earning a baccalaureate in Workforce Education and Development as a consequence of this associate degree program, but there should be some increase, and the associate degree would also serve an important workforce need in the Commonwealth. Moreover, these would be tuition paying students and the marginal costs to the College of Education would be quite small.

We realize we are swimming a bit upstream here given the current emphasis on scaling back programs, but we want to be careful and make sure we are not turning away an opportunity that would generate revenue for the University and help serve an important educational mission. We have placed our plans for an associate degree “on hold” since receiving the August memorandum from the Core Council. We hope this additional information is helpful, and we would welcome an opportunity to discuss the matter further.

RECOMMENDATION 8: Reorganization of Support Staff

We continue to look for ways to streamline staff support within the College and to gain efficiencies. In these reviews, we have been mindful of technological gains that have made changes in the nature of staff assistant duties as well as the need to achieve equity in the level of support being offered in different parts of the College.

We are working to clarify responsibilities, increase the sense of ownership, minimize conflicts, and reduce ambiguities and duplications. Whenever a vacancy occurs in the College, we take a careful look at the need for the position and the options for a re-design that will enhance our operation. Since August, we have developed and have begun to implement a new staffing model. This new model consolidates functionality and moves away from the previous model where each unit operated with a relatively high level of autonomy. For example, instead of each academic program within a department having an administrative support assistant, the new model calls for each department to have one person for all undergraduate education (where appropriate), one for all graduate education (covering multiple graduate programs), one for finance/budget support, and 1 to 2 additional support people depending on the number of faculty within the department. The reorganization of the two departments in the same building has also helped us consolidate function.

By implementing this model and by making the necessary consolidations, we estimate we will be eliminating 10 support staff positions. Five of these 10 reductions will be achieved by June 30, 2011.

RECOMMENDATION 9: Clinic Operations in CEDAR and Moore Building

Faculty members from Counselor Education (Drs. Liz Mellin, Richard Hazler, Spencer Niles) and School Psychology (Dr. Jim DiPerna) met with the Director (Dr. Brian Rabian) and Assistant Director (Dr. Michael Wolfe) of the Psychology Clinic (Moore Building) and the Director of Training for the Clinical Psychology program (Dr. Peter Arnett) to discuss potential collaborations regarding the operation of the CEDAR Clinic and the Psychology Clinic in Moore Building.

A number of issues (licensure, fee for service, clientele, the supervision of practitioners, liability, etc.) were considered. Of primary interest in the meeting were the nature of the counseling provided (i.e., what sort of treatments were typically delivered to clients) and the nature of the clients served (e.g., age, presenting concerns). Although some of these areas of focus would seem to limit collaboration (for example, the severity of the disorders experienced by some clients in the Psychology Clinic are beyond what the counselors in the CEDAR Clinic are trained to address, and School Psychology services are directed almost exclusively toward assessments related to learning problems for school-aged learners), there are areas of overlap as well as complementarity that offer promising opportunities for mutually beneficial collaborations that could strengthen the services provided by both clinics.

For instance, CEDAR Clinic counselors address more typical developmental issues (especially in the area of career development) that School Psychology and Clinical Psychology practitioners do not address. Once clients have received treatment for more severe disorders, and/or learning problems have been identified as well as addressed, clients can be referred to the CEDAR Clinic to develop educational and career plans.

These faculty members also discussed the organizational structure of each clinic. Possibilities for sharing resources, how resources would be distributed, responsibilities, and how responsibilities would be shared were also topics covered in this initial meeting.

The consensus of the group is that there are ways for the two clinics to achieve better results by working more collaboratively. A sub-group of those attending the initial meeting (Drs. Wolfe, Mellin, and DiPerna) has agreed to continue exploring possibilities to support our joint efforts with a goal toward developing a plan of action in the fall semester.

Additional Initiatives

I note here several additional initiatives we are pursuing which were not recommended explicitly by the Core Council but are in the spirit of the ongoing effort to streamline operations and direct resources toward the highest priorities. I describe these briefly in the following paragraphs and would be happy to provide additional information.

The Interface Between CSA and Higher Education. Our Higher Education graduate program is highly regarded and historically has focused its efforts on doctoral education, awarding Ph.D. and D.Ed. degrees to students who have gone on to become leading figures in the field. We also offer a master's degree in higher education, but it is small

and operates in the background. More recently, we developed a College Student Affairs (CSA) master's degree program that has become quite successful and has emerged as one of the leading College Student Affairs programs in the nation. Admission to this master's degree program is highly competitive. This year, we received over 100 applications for an entering class of 10 students.

We are interested in building on the success of the College Student Affairs master's degree to stimulate growth in the Higher Education master's degree. The faculty is committed to re-designing the master's degree in Higher Education in order to better integrate the curricula of the two master's degree programs. We are also currently investigating making significant use of distance education through the World Campus.

Re-Design of the Instructional Systems Graduate Program. Penn State's Instructional Systems graduate program has a long and distinguished history and is focused on questions of learning design often with an emphasis on the utilization of technology. There is a strong connection between Instructional Systems and the World Campus at Penn State, and many of the individuals serving as instructional designers around the University are graduates of the Instructional Systems graduate program.

Instructional systems as a field (other major programs can be found at the University of Georgia, Syracuse University, Florida State University, and Indiana University) is evolving, and increasing attention is being paid to what has become known as the Learning Sciences. The term "learning sciences" has many meanings but generally refers to a combination of interests in learning, design, technology, and cognitive science. We are taking an active interest in developing the Learning Sciences at Penn State and see the College of Education playing a significant role in developing a Learning Sciences initiative at Penn State. Within the College of Education, we see logical points of contact with our Instructional Systems graduate program, our work in STEM Education, our work in the Measurement and Assessment of Learning, and our work with Language and Discourse.

Learning Sciences endeavors are inherently inter-disciplinary, and we also see numerous logical points of contact with other colleges. Examples include the College of Information Sciences and Technology, the College of Health and Human Development, the College of Engineering, and the College of the Liberal Arts, and no doubt others. Faculty members in Instructional Systems have taken an active interest in pursuing this agenda and, as part of this effort, wish to redesign their program and become identified by a new name. The re-design is progressing, and we will soon be proposing to call the re-designed program the graduate program in Learning, Design, and Technology.

Program and Policy Evaluation Center. Plans are also being developed for a new center that will be focused on conducting state of the art, arms-length evaluations of program and policy initiatives. We are increasingly mindful of how many times we are out-sourcing significant program evaluation work and believe we can build a center that will provide a useful service to PI's in the College of Education as well as in other colleges and campuses at Penn State. We see the existing Survey Research Center as a relevant

model, and we will be seeking to pursue a combined research and service mission with the new center. We have hired a new faculty member in our Educational Leadership program with expertise in this area, and he will be arriving in the fall of 2011. We plan to accelerate planning for the new center over the next year.

Re-Design of the Undergraduate Advising Center. We are dealing with numerous changes in teacher and administrator certification requirements from the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and we are increasingly realizing that the traditional advising model in the College where we have depended significantly upon faculty members to keep up with certification requirements is not viable. We are making the necessary adjustments, and we are finding that a redesign of our Advising Center will allow us to better serve our students without requiring additional resources. We relied upon the Management Engineering unit within Penn State's Office of Human Resources to assist us in developing the new design, and we are in the process of making the necessary changes.

Closing Thoughts

In closing, I note that this has been a challenging, but productive period for the College. The University has approached the program review process in a thoughtful way, and there have been numerous welcome opportunities to provide feedback and to clarify the sometimes complicated realities lying behind the data. I also wish to thank the University's Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment (OPIA) in general and its Director, Louise Sandmeyer, in particular for valued insights and wise counsel throughout the process. The OPIA Office provides invaluable ongoing support, and we are all stronger because of this resource.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide this update. I trust you will be in touch if there are any follow up questions or concerns.

xc.: College Listserv
Student Advisory Forum