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Executive Summary

Introduction

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

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

Dear Review Team:

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

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

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

Best Regards,

Dennie L. Smith, Professor
Department Head

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

External Review of Graduate Programs, 2001

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A brief report of two additional external reviews is included in this study—our last NCATE review and a Texas Education Agency review. See Volume V, Programs.
Section 1: History

History of the University

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**History of the TLAC Department**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vision 2020: Creating a Culture of Excellence

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

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

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

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

**OUR CORE VALUES**

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

**OUR MISSION**

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

**OUR VISION**

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

**THE TWELVE IMPERATIVES**

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

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

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

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

3 **Enhance the Undergraduate Academic Experience**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 **Increase Access to Knowledge Resources**

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

8 **Enrich Our Campus**

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

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

10 **Demand Enlightened Governance and Leadership**

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

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

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

**12 Meet Our Commitment to Texas**

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

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

Mission, Vision, and Values

Texas A&M University

Mission

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

**Purpose**

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

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

**Vision**

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

College of Education and Human Development

Mission

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

Vision

Our work transforms lives.

Strategic Initiatives and Goals

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

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

Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture

Mission

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

Vision

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

Strategic Initiatives and Goals

More specifically, the department is responsible for

- preparing entry and advanced level professionals in Curriculum and Instruction for teaching and teacher preparation
- offering concentrations within the graduate program for Mathematics Education, Science Education, Urban Education, ESL, Early Childhood, Literacy and Reading and Culture and Curriculum
- developing and disseminating applied and basic knowledge in the areas of specialization; and
- providing service activities to the public, private, and professional sectors.
College Goals

**CEHD Leadership Retreat Follow Up**

**SCHOLARLY DOMAIN: Undergraduate Education**

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

*Teaching, Learning and Culture*

*External Review*
### External Review

**Evaluate current retention efforts**
- Retention rate of freshmen to sophomore year
- Graduation rate 4 and 6 year
- Retention of students once they are admitted into programs
- Evaluate retention of students involved in learning communities

**Identification of available (monetary) resources**
- Monitor distribution of scholarship funds
- Monitor # of students with financial aid by major

**Retain through engagement and connections**
- Student survey of college/department engagement

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Goal 3: Ensure Students have Adequate Technology and Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop scope and sequence for technology knowledge and skills for each undergraduate program in the CEHD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

### SCHOLARLY DOMAIN: Graduate Education

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Provide college level assistance with proposal development | • # of submissions  
• External funding dollars *(FY08 $19.9 million)*  
• # of faculty involved as PIs *(FY08 68% of research faculty, 55% of TTR)*  
• # of collaborative grants – experienced grant faculty team with faculty with little or no grant experience | Already collected  
Already collected  
Already collected  
Need to do |
| Staff mentor staff in proposal development and grant/contract management | • # of new awards | Already collected |
| Improved and/or automatic routing of RFPs based on research interests | | |
| Reward faculty who engage in extramural funding proposal submissions as PI | • % of faculty that are PIs | Already collected |

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

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

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

### Priority Goal 3: Increase Research Faculty Dissemination of Findings in Top Tier Publications

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Goals for 2009-2010

August 26, 2009

Department

• Complete the development of a revised faculty evaluation system (Tenure and Clinical) with more specific expectations for merit (Faculty Initiative)

• Continue to establish and post on web site procedures, policies and systems for efficient operations

• Continue to implement distributed and participatory leadership model for departmental operations with leaders of the various concentration areas

• Provide student representation on department committees especially the graduate and undergraduate committee. (Currently the search committees have student representation)

• Reward faculty members for mentoring faculty seeking promotion and tenure

• Initiate conversations about strategy to select the next department head (2010-2011)

• Continue to establish and promote a diverse academic community

• Hire an Associate/Full Professor in Early Childhood Education

• Implement Learning Studio (former Verizon Lab) to assist students and faculty with digital projects

• Expand Reads and Counts Program to include a summer programs in local schools

• Expand and manage study abroad opportunities and international student teaching opportunities

• Increase the number of faculty involved in submitting and securing external grants
• Maintain Accelerated Online Certification Program enrollment (32) and move the course management system to Moodle

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

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

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

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

**Graduate Education**

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

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

• Increase the number of national presentations with faculty and students

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

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

• Implement online annual review system for all graduate students

• Implement online assessment of Graduate Assistants

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

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

• Develop systematic orientation for Graduate Assistant orientation and training

**Undergraduate Education**

• Implement the new PreK-6 program for teacher preparation

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

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

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

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

### Departmental Goals merged with College Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Domains</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) Support Meeting CEHD Strategic Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a) Undergraduate Education | Does not meet expectations | 1.1 Enrollment Management  
Math and Science majors can enroll at any time in the middle school program with Social Studies and Language Arts at a designated time. This strategy has already impacted (10-15% increase) the number of math and science teachers that will enroll Fall 09. Undergraduate advisors are emphasizing math and science opportunities in group and individual sessions with undergraduates. Submit a petition for departmental undergraduate programs to become designated as high impact due to enrollment increases without appropriate funding. |
| b) Graduate Education | Does not meet expectations | 1.3 Preparation of Professoriate |

(Note: Challenges listed at the end of this document)
Meets expectations
Exceeds expectations
Outstanding

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

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

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

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

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

| c) Research | Does not meet expectations | 1.3 All research faculty acquire extra- mural funding  
Action: Twenty faculty members in TLAC are serving as PI’s or Co-PI’s on grants (according to the College Report, Windy Hollis). Major grants in TLAC are under the direction of the following faculty members: Carol Stuessy, Cathy Loving, Chance Lewis, Trina Davis, Hersh Waxman, and Scott Slough. The importance of securing extramural funds has been discussed many times in department meetings and in other individual content area meetings and will continue to be a focus of the department’s overall mission. The Department incorporates an incentive for securing extramural funding in the faculty evaluation process and when possible, provides extra funding for travel or resources that might be required for securing grants. The current climate would make it difficult to emphasize more weighting for securing external funds in the faculty evaluation process; however, this will continue to be a priority issue for discussion with faculty, and I will continue to investigate the possibility of providing additional travel funds and time incentives for writing and submitting proposals for funding. In addition, I will explore the possibility of offering one month summer salary for any faculty member securing funds that generate salary savings and supports graduate students. Also, I will investigate the possibility of providing additional travel funds for writing and submitting for funding. The culture in the department does not reflect as much action as is needed to secure extramural funds. One faculty member recently secured state funding after five years advocating that external funds were not available in his area. The Department rewards extramural funding in the annual evaluation, but probably is not weighted enough in the overall context of what is important. |
| | Meets expectations | |
| | Exceeds expectations | |
| | Outstanding | 1.4 All research faculty disseminate findings in top-tier publications  
Action: Twenty one of twenty five (84%) research faculty disseminated findings in top tier publications. Three Assistant Professors and one Associate Professor did not meet the requirement of two journal publications this year. |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7 Targeted dissemination of research findings that impact practice and policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action: The 8 journal editorships in TLAC may impact practice and /or policy but this is difficult to assess. One could submit, as they do, that the publications and research by faculty have national and international impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Service/Engagement</td>
<td>Does not meet expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Synergy Across Scholarship Domains</td>
<td>Does not meet expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standards, and ISTE Technology Standards to continue to prepare teachers for future classrooms. Determining the impact of our teachers in follow-up years is hampered due to not having access to individual student and teacher achievement data in Texas.

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

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

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

3.1 Create a work climate that fosters and supports development of students and faculty of diverse backgrounds through a) research initiatives and b) instruction
A participatory management process occurs by using a committee structure to refine curriculum and present program recommendations to the faculty for approval. The Graduate and Undergraduate Committees study
Outstanding and make recommendations concerning academic matters. The Leadership Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Department Head and makes recommendations for the department as a whole. The diversity and/or different intellectual frames among the faculty requires considerable time and opportunity for discussion in order to facilitate the decision making process and to bring about specific courses of action. The TLAC faculty is respectful and highly professional in presenting differing points of view with other faculty and with the department head. Some committees, such as the Faculty Evaluation Committee, are formulated to deal with special issues. Faculty participate in elections for all college and departmental standing committees. The Graduate Student Association has input on graduate issues and is currently active with the department’s program review scheduled for review in Spring 2010. The overall departmental climate could perhaps be improved by including graduate and undergraduate students on most departmental committees and this issue merits future discussion.

The TLAC Staff practices effective client relations in their interactions with students, faculty and each other. Their effective client relations are predicated on a commitment to take care of requests and to carry out their responsibilities in a positive and constructive manner. They function as a team, serving as a backup to each other in accomplishing the various functions of the department. The phone is answered professionally with the department’s name and/or function along with the identity of the person. In addition, a monthly staff meeting is conducted to deal with administrative matters along with any specific problem areas.

The department has been using a process and a communication mechanism called the “Concern Opportunity Form” (COF) for over 4 years to resolve student issues with a course or faculty member. The COF is attached to the syllabus provided by each class taught by TLAC faculty. The form requests that the student put his/her concerns in writing and submit to the Department Head. It also encourages students to try to resolve issues with the specific faculty member before bringing it to the Department Head. Faculty are aware of the process and are informed of any issues related to their teaching responsibilities that are brought to the Department Head.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet expectations</td>
<td>4.1 Partnerships to support renovations and construction of quality research and teaching facilities</td>
<td>The Classroom for the Future (CFF) and Learning Studio is envisioned as a place for faculty and students to develop knowledge and skills along with conducting research related to the use and impact of technology for teaching and learning. The Department has been actively working to increase the knowledge and skills throughout the preparation of undergraduate teachers. Also, graduate students are pursuing more research related to these new technologies. The Verizon Laboratory will be renamed and converted to the Classroom for the Future with the help of the Dean’s office’s technology funding. Undergraduate and graduate students will have support to develop new technology products and conduct research. A media resource staff member and work-study students will provide support in the learning studio. Also, the College will help to expand the concept over the next two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

4.3 Extramural funding support for 100% of Ph.D. students

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

4.4 Allocation of discretionary resources to support
| External Review |  
|---|---|
| research initiatives of faculty | The department has supported two assistant professors for research training in data analysis during the EPSY Summer Workshops and national data base training for two assistant professors in Washington D.C. Plans are being made to sponsor faculty to participate in a Washington, D.C. trip related to the upcoming Teacher Quality grant. |
| 4.5 Interdisciplinary partnerships with corporate, state and federal entities – None to report | |
| 4.6 Recruit outstanding full-time faculty and staff | The department was not successful in recruiting for the Associate Professor position in Early Childhood Education due to the criteria of “experience in grant activity.” Only one staff member has been hired due to a vacant position created from a promotion. The collaborative, team atmosphere of the current faculty and staff contributes to a supportive work environment. The College has been receptive to equity pay adjustments to maintain a competitive pay structure for both faculty and staff. |
| 4.7 Retain 95% of full-time faculty and staff | The retention of full-time faculty has been 100% this year (2009) with one retirement. |

<p>| Complete review of undergraduate and graduate program | Appoint an Associate Department Head to facilitate the program review and gradually accept responsibility for coordinating the graduate program. (Cathleen Loving, Associate Professor was hired – Jan 09) |
| Complete the development of a revised faculty evaluation system (Tenure and Clinical) with more specific expectations for merit (Faculty Initiative) | Faculty, Department Head and Dean have approved new faculty evaluation criteria that has been aligned with university, college and department goals. The evaluation guidelines will be implemented for 2010 cycle. |
| Provide student representation on department committees (Currently the search committees have student representation) | Student representatives have been appointed to the Leadership Group, Graduate and Undergraduate Committees (differing degrees of access depending on committee). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiate conversations about strategy to select the next department head in two years</td>
<td>Faculty is aware that the eight year term of the current department head ends August 2011. The dean has announced that the next department head will be appointed from within.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit 2nd online Executive Ed.D. cohort</td>
<td>The invitations to 15 students have been made to begin the 2nd cohort in January 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement online assessment of graduate students</td>
<td>Online portfolio system has been developed and will be used Spring 10. (Some delay due to new campus-wide “Compass” system being employed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more opportunities for funding graduate students to make presentations at national conferences.</td>
<td>Now allow doctoral students to be provided with $500 to attend national or international conferences; $300 for regional—encourages paper presentation, but not required for first-timers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended and was granted approval to implement Clinical Faculty’s Role for Chairing Master and EdD Committees</td>
<td>Approved by the College GIC committee in September 09. (Currently under consideration in Office of Graduate Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the new Pre K-6 program as required by TEA to include state and national standards.</td>
<td>Program implemented Fall 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase opportunities for students to complete internships and student teaching with school systems throughout Texas</td>
<td>Kim Parish, Student Teaching Director is in charge of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit a higher percentage of students to middle grades certification with an emphasis on science and math</td>
<td>Cindy Boettcher, Associate Department Head for Undergraduate Programs has successfully implemented such recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Implementation Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement new APP for clinical professors to use for Walkthroughs</td>
<td>APP Developed Summer 09 Implemented Fall 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Reads and Counts Tutoring Program to include summer programs in local schools.</td>
<td>Implemented Summer 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Study Abroad opportunities for student teaching</td>
<td>Study abroad programs to Mexico, Italy, Costa Rica and China are currently active or being planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement Classroom of the Future and Learning Studio to support the development of new educational technologies</td>
<td>Space converted to Classroom of the Future and Learning Studio. Digital Technology Consultant hired to support student video projects. Equipment purchased to support technology standards. Faculty orientation for Classroom of the Future and Learning Studio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish school based sites to demonstrate the use of new technologies such as the Smartboard and itouch technology.</td>
<td>Forest Ridge has become the first site to provide demonstrations via SKYPE related to use of technology in classrooms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Challenges**

- Undergraduate enrollment will need to be managed/reduced due to available instructional resources.
- Managing enrollment at the undergraduate level is difficult due to university admission policies.
- Recruitment and...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention of more diversity in teacher education, especially males.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of students for teaching in shortage areas such as science and math.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining access to achievement data to measure impact of TAMU’s teachers on student achievement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More emphasis on developing professional dispositions during the early teacher education classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission standards need to be revised, better defined and used to admit graduate students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Connection to Vision 2020 Goals**

The guiding document of Texas A&M, Vision 2020, is the standard upon which goals are set within the colleges and departments of the University. Goals which are set on the departmental level are guided by Vision 2020 in all aspects. In this way, all department and college goals are aligned with the University goals, creating a unified effort across the University to meet the guiding principles of Vision 2020.

A major focus of Vision 2020 is a Reinvestment of Faculty, which will be discussed further in Volume 2. Since the beginning of the focus on 2020, twelve (12) faculty members have been hired in the department, allowing for an expansion of the types of programs offered and enhancement in all specializations. Most of the seven concentration areas have been strengthened by the addition of carefully selected faculty members.
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Evolution of the Undergraduate Program

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

ESL Endorsed

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

Math/Science Teachers

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

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

TLAC Graduate Programs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Faculty and Student Technology Use**

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

**International Teaching and Learning Opportunities**

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

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

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

**Departmental Attributes**

• Prepare teachers for the 21st Century
• Prepare educational researchers
• Prepare curriculum leaders
• Pre-service teachers are certified in ESL
• TAMU produces one of the highest numbers of mathematics/science teachers in the State of Texas
• Large enrollment of Regents’ Scholars – first generation college students
• College Learning Community for first year students
• Study Abroad experiences in international schools
• Diverse settings for field-based placement for undergraduate students

• Most diverse college on TAMU campus

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**University Faculty Governance Representation**

**University Faculty Senate**

*Teaching, Learning and Culture*

*External Review*
The Department of TLAC has one elected representative who serves on the Faculty Senate.

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

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

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

## Undergraduate Enrollment Census

### Fall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>03C</th>
<th>04C</th>
<th>05C</th>
<th>06C</th>
<th>07C</th>
<th>08C</th>
<th>09C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLAC</td>
<td>EDIS/INST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-K through 4th</td>
<td>PK-4</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School ELA &amp; SS</td>
<td>ENS</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Sch Math &amp; Sci</td>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECR</td>
<td></td>
<td>PK4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misc Options</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring

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

## Graduate Enrollment Census

### Fall

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Number of current undergraduate majors-Fall 2009 1,392
2. Number of current undergraduate majors-Fall 2003 2,043
3. Number of graduate degrees offered 4
4. Number of students in graduate degree programs (88 male, 327 female; Master’s 202, Doctoral 213) 415
5. Number of undergraduate credit hours produced per year
   Academic Year 2008-2009 65,447
   Fall 2009 18,484
6. Number of graduate credit hours produced per year
   Academic Year 2008-2009 31,175
   Fall 2009 12,075
7. Number of tenure or tenure-track faculty 28
8. Number of clinical faculty 14
9. Number of full-time Lecturers and Assistant Lecturers 4

10. Number of graduate assistant teacher (GAT) positions 24

10. Number of graduate assistant non-teaching (GANT) positions 17

11. Number of graduate assistant research positions (GAR) 18

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

---

**Resources**

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

---

**Comparison of Instructional load**

14. Average course credits taught per academic year per full-time employee (FTE), by classification

   Tenure or tenure-track faculty 12 hours plus
   Clinical faculty 24 hours
   Graduate Teaching Assistants 3 or 6 hours per semester

---

**Scholarly Activity 2009**

15. Total number of full peer-reviewed journal publications by tenure or tenure-track faculty 2009 86

16. Total number of external grant dollar expenditures from grants of tenure-track faculty to date 2010 2009 $1,868,787.00

   $1,676,411

---

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

Texas A&M University

This is data gathered for the State of Texas.

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Profile</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employed in Academia</strong></td>
<td>55.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed as Post-Doctorates</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in Industry/Professional</td>
<td>23.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in Government</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>22.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admissions Criteria</th>
<th>Description of admission factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Teaching, Learning and Culture
External Review
Admission is based on Verbal and Quantitative GRE scores, GPR, Professional experience including publications, presentations, and grants, recommendations, written essay about a significant issue related to the field. (TLAC suspended use of the GRE for the Summer and Fall, 2010 admissions while an Admissions Committee designs (for faculty approval) an improved metric to be ready for Spring, 2011 admissions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage Full-time Students (FTS) with Financial Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In the prior year, the percentage of FTS (≥ 18 SCH) with support/the number of FTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Financial Support Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>For those receiving financial support, the average financial support provided per full-time graduate student (including tuition rebate) for the prior year, including research assistantships, teaching assistantships, fellowships, tuition, benefits, etc. that is “out-of-pocket”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student-Core Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rolling three-year average of full-time student equivalent (FTSE) /rolling three-year average of full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE) of core faculty. Core Faculty: Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who teach 50 percent or more in the doctoral program or other individuals integral to the doctoral program who can direct dissertation research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Core Faculty Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rolling three-year average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, juried creative/performances accomplishments, book chapters, notices of discoveries filed/patents issued, and books per year per core faculty member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Core Faculty External Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rolling three-year average of the number of core faculty receiving external funds, average external grant $ per faculty, and total external grant $ per program per academic year. All external funds received from any source including research grants, training grants, gifts from foundations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average of the Number of Core Faculty receiving external funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average External Grant $ per Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$74,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total External Grant $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,007,949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage Full-Time Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rolling three-year average of the FTS (≥ 9 SCH)/number students enrolled (headcount) for last three fall semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Core Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Number of core faculty in the prior year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty Teaching Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Total number of semester credit hours in organized teaching courses taught per academic year by core faculty divided by the number of core faculty in the prior year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Diversity

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

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

### Student Diversity

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

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

### Date of Last External Review

Date of last formal external review, updated when changed

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External Program Accreditation

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

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

### Student Publications/Presentations

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

|       | 1.92 |

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