

UW Bothell M.Ed. Program Graduate School Review

Overall evaluation

Logistics of Review: The Review Committee consisted of David Allen (Chair), Timothy Standal, John Edwards, Kathleen DeMarrais (External: Northern Arizona University) and Christine Sleeter (External: California State University, Monterey Bay). The Committee had superb staff support from Augustine McCaffery.

Calendar of Events:

March 16, 1998: Committee members from UW met with Marsh Landolt, Dean of Graduate School; John Slattery, Associate Dean for Academic Programs; Norm Rose, Dean UW Bothell and Augustine McCaffery to initiate the review process (summary letter from John Slattery attached)

May 5, 1998: Committee representatives met with Dean Allen Glenn and Associate Dean Rick Neel (interview guide attached)

May 15, 1998: Committee representatives met with Associate Dean Debra Friedman.(interview guide attached)

May 27 and 28: Site Visit (agenda attached)

Context: This is the first review of a Branch Campus graduate program. Thus it inevitably raised issues concerning relationships between the Branches and UW generally and the M.Ed. programs at UWB and the College of Education in particular. We do not believe it possible to review the program without considering a number of factors related to this context.

Mission: The M.Ed. Graduate Program (hereafter UWB) “prepares innovative, ethical practitioners who are grounded in intellectual and professional communities and who are dedicated to educating diverse students.”

Executive Summary: The review committee found that UWB was accomplishing its mission with respect to the quality of programs, intensive student supervision and excellent relationships with its regional school systems. The faculty are of the highest caliber—well respected in their

field, active in scholarship and dedicated to the success of the program. Students and alumni speak in glowing terms of how UWB has influenced their personal and professional lives. Some system problems need to be resolved: a) the program was developed to target currently employed teachers. Virtually everyone we spoke to believed this entails a commitment to part-time learners, yet funding is tied to full-time equivalents. The committee questions whether the level of faculty energy required to engage the large numbers of students needed to meet full-time enrollment projections is sustainable; b) there is no effective governing or decision making process for issues that cross Branch-Seattle boundaries; c) there has been minimal collaboration between UWB and the College of Education.

Evaluation:

The review committee is unanimously enthusiastic about the M.Ed. program at UW Bothell. The program is rigorous, demanding, innovative and non-traditional. Current students and recent alumni had only highest praise for the value of the program to them as practicing teachers. Their perceptions of benefits to their professional skills accords closely with the stated objectives of the program. Graduates take with them not only specific expertise but also an openness to leadership for constructive change in their respective schools, capacity for critical thinking and well-honed skills in expository writing. Using their own words and with multiple examples, students reiterated UWB's mission statement lives in their daily lives: UWB offers a truly "student-centered" program that is well-theorized and systematically implemented. The external members found the curriculum and individual courses well theorized, grounded in both scholarship and current practice and reflecting a highly expert faculty. Although the phrase is much over-used, there is consensus this is a 'cutting-edge' program and care should be taken to sustain its quality and cohesion.

There are easier paths to the M.Ed. degree. The participants we met were attracted by the quality of the training it offered. They were aware of the high level of time and intellectual commitment needed to complete the program, and they were aware of some attrition among their peers arising from the demands of the program on working teachers. Competition from regional private schools offering shorter, easier, routes to a degree were acknowledged by all students and alumni: Clearly the quality of this program and its association with UW were determining factors in selecting

UWB. The programs' emphasis on critical analysis and excellent, extensive writing were seen as strengths. Students strongly endorsed this program with their most able colleagues, while recognizing it is too rigorous to serve everyone.

The self-study and initial conversations with administrators, faculty and staff had foregrounded the larger-than-expected numbers of part-time students. We anticipated this would be reflected in student complaints of lack of access to faculty, impersonal interactions and the usual litany of over-burdened systems. Nothing could be further from the truth. Despite persistent probing, all but one of the students had nothing but praise for the accessibility and quality of time they received from faculty (including the Director). The one exception was a student who described herself as a very weak writer and needing extensive support from faculty. Nevertheless, we do not believe this is level of quality student-faculty interactions is sustainable without significant faculty attrition: Fewer student bodies or more faculty positions are needed.

The positive student responses also altered our initial perception that the number of course offerings were excessive in relation to faculty strength and seemingly redundant in places; students insisted that the courses were usefully cumulative rather than repetitive. Further, recent program revisions led to curricular changes and course developments. Hopefully this is now stabilized and the massive course development responsibilities reduced.

Support services and student-oriented resources are remarkably good for such a young campus. Students especially praised the librarians but felt some additional, more experienced support for their writing skills (at the graduate level) would be helpful.

All this has been achieved against a background of extraordinarily rapid program building, of changed state expectations concerning Masters requirements for teachers, and altered perceptions of the relationship between Seattle and branch campuses. Although enrollments have failed to meet the expected 35 FTE, students believe there is a substantial demand for such a program. They volunteered to help recruit and suggested marketing efforts be extended to Canada. The recent (time-limited) addition of a staff person seems to be making the program more visible to prospective students although competing programs have more extensive marketing efforts.

This program could only have been achieved through the energies and vision of the Director, and through the commitment of participating faculty far beyond the call of duty.

Accordingly we enthusiastically support the continuation and further development of the M.Ed. program at UW Bothell.

Issues in need of attention

The quality of the program notwithstanding, there are issues that arose in various contexts during our discussions with administrators, faculty and students. Most of these issues are already familiar to the participants. All are in need of attention, some of them urgently, even though solution to some problems may be difficult.

1. The clientele of a program directed at working teachers must be largely part-time. Formulae relating the investment of faculty effort with part-time students must be realistically related to standard FTE's.

2. Junior faculty are much concerned about the criteria for advancement. We understand that formal discussion of the issue by the faculty organization at Bothell is currently in limbo. It is essential that directives concerning expectations be generated as soon as possible. It is agreed by this committee that scholarship directed to program development during the early transient organization phase be recognized, consistent with the Boyer Model. The same criteria may not be relevant as the program moves on to a more or less steady state.

The work loads have been heavy as a result of new course development, and student advising. This puts, especially, untenured faculty at risk.

3. There is a critical need to overcome organizational resistance to collaboration and cooperation between campuses, consistent with the concept of *strategic complementarity*. This concept currently seems to exist largely at the level of rhetoric. A process for identifying shared, overlapping and distinct program goals and faculty needs would help prioritize areas for potential collaboration (e.g. scholarship, access to graduate students, innovative teaching opportunities). Implementation of the Tri-Council in

fall may help if the allocation of authority and decision making processes are clear. Nonetheless, more formal and informal communications between UWB and the College of Education are also needed. Potential interactions range from informal personal contacts to course and committee assignments. Impediments can arise from reluctance to change, particularly on the part of established programs, from administrative barriers such as salary lines, and from personality conflicts.

We believe that all of these barriers are surmountable and should be addressed on a continuing basis. Specific examples of potential interactions would be the sharing of informational e-mail such as notices of visiting speakers etc., possible adjunct appointments and provision of courses - the Bothell campus course offerings are rich in qualitative approaches but there is a need noted by students for quantitative methodology that is abundantly available on the Seattle campus. Recent state requirements for professional development courses may provide a mechanism for collaboration, but goals and incentives (especially from the perspective of the College of Education) still need to be addressed.

4. A generic issue in Education schools is the relationship of certification to graduate programs. There is widespread perceptions that workload is not equitable and that assistant professors do not have adequate opportunities to teach in graduate programs. The committee believes the new Director and Branch Campus dean will need to address the distribution and equitable allocation of teaching assignments across all faculty.

Recommendations

The following recommendations relate to the topics discussed above.

1. Formulae relating part time to FTE units should be adjusted to recognize the actual faculty effort, particularly as it relates to the Practicum.
2. It is urgent that criteria for promotion and tenure be made explicit. The transient requirements for scholarship in curricular development should be recognized using a Boyer model.

3. Goals, processes and incentives for intercampus cooperation and collaboration should be generated. Administrative barriers such as salary lines should be removed.
4. Flexibility of teaching assignments between Certification and Graduate programs should be encouraged.

The following recommendations apply across the program.

5. Advising takes a heavy toll of faculty time. This should be relieved by the appointment of a staff advisor for initial M.Ed. students.
6. Recruitment of students to the M.Ed. program is at present largely by word of mouth. An aggressive promotion campaign, at least comparable to that of competing schools, should be implemented to bring the program to full strength.

The function of advisor noted in (5) above and publicist/recruiter might be combined in one staff appointment.

We wish to conclude with an expression of appreciation for the excellent support we received from the Graduate School and Augustine McCaffery in particular. The Review Committee is grateful for the opportunity to examine this genuinely innovative, student-centered and academically rigorous program. The quality of the faculty is truly outstanding and the programs they have developed are in the forefront of graduate education of teachers. This was an inspiring and motivating experience for all of us.

Interview Questions for Deans Glenn and Neel

1. What is your understanding of the distinct and overlapping nature of CoE and UWB education programs? Do they have different target audiences (e.g., employers, potential students, geographic regions, roles?)
2. What relationship among the three programs (branches and seattle) would you see as optimum? Do you see a future of entirely separate operations? Shared curriculum? Shared courses by distance learning?
3. What is your prediction concerning whether teachers will continue to have raises pegged to master's degrees?
4. If the relationship between salary and degrees weakens, how would or should that affect UWB?
5. What additional benefits would teachers gain from holding master's degrees?
6. Has the CoE encountered the high part-time student ratio UWB is experiencing? Do you have a view of how this might be taken into consideration in terms of budget and workload?

Interview Questions for Debra Friedman

- 1. The accreditation issue: From a cross campus perspective, what is the significance of NCATE accrediting or not accrediting UWB?**
- 2. The cross-campus collaboration issue: What do you see as the rationale for interest in collaboration from each participant's perspective? From the system's perspective?**
- 3. What are the barriers and incentives for supporting such collaboration? How are conflicting interests (e.g. competing funding proposals) to be resolved?**
- 4. FTE-based funding and part-time students: What ways around this do you see?**



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY MONTEREY BAY

The Center for Collaborative Education and Professional Studies

100 Campus Center Seaside, California 93955-8001

June 16, 1998

Marsha Landolt, Dean,
Graduate School
200 Gerberding Hall
Box 351240
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-1240

Dear Dean Landolt:

It is with pleasure that I submit the following observations about the M.Ed. Program at the University of Washington, Bothell, based on my site visit May 28-29, 1998.

Quality of program

I will comment on the quality of the program in relationship to the quality of the faculty, the written material that describes the curriculum, and student evaluations of the program.

In my view, UW Bothell has an outstanding faculty, which is a necessary component of an innovative and strong program. The three senior faculty are scholars with established reputations; they are well-published with very strong scholarly work, and visible in national conferences. I was familiar with work of all three of them before visiting the program, since my own professional interests overlap with theirs. The junior faculty appear to have the potential to develop national reputations also; the vitas as well as our talks with the junior faculty suggest to me that they are very talented. As I will note below, I believe that the strong academic quality of the program depends on the quality of the faculty. UW Bothell is fortunate to have attracted such a strong faculty, whose interests and strengths appear to complement each other in this program.

I was intrigued by the curriculum, even before the interviews during the site visit. I would describe the program as aiming to help practicing educators become active leaders who can contextualize school issues within broader cultural, political, and social relationships; who can analyze the professional literature in relationship to practical issues in their own settings; and who can take constructive action to address problems, issues and needs. This was roughly how I would have described the program's goals based on my reading of the materials that were supplied; as it turns out, it is also very similar to the way the Director and the students described its goals in interviews. I found a very high level of congruence between student, faculty, and print descriptions of the main focus of the program.

The curriculum is rooted in social and cultural foundations of education, and current thinking about teacher professional development. The program is designed to help educators who have classroom experience to reflect carefully on their experience, and to

connect that reflection to theory and research in education. The Professional Seminars engage students in “big” ideas and a considerable amount of current literature, in order to help them frame questions about teaching and connect their questions to social, cultural, and ethical issues. The seminars introduce them to analysis of educational research, and prepare them to write the practicum proposal. The program also provides for individual programs of study, within the range of areas of expertise of the faculty. Much of the nature of instruction within the program is constructivist, meaning that the faculty help the students to construct understandings that connect their own knowledge and experience with research and theory.

I was especially intrigued by the focus and curricular design of the program because I coordinate the M.A. in Education at California State University Monterey Bay, which is about three years newer than UW Bothell. We have created a program that is very similar in focus and design, although we have far less of our own program actually worked out. We approached our task as one of creating an innovative program to prepare teacher leaders for culturally and linguistically diverse schools, using constructivist teaching approaches, helping teachers analyze educational literature in terms of diverse epistemological perspectives, and helping them develop their own professional voice and practice to serve in leadership rolls. Our M.A. in Education curriculum is receiving many kudos as it proceeds through the approval system. I had anticipated that it was unique, and was pleasantly surprised to discover many similarities between it and the UW Bothell program.

The student evaluations of the UW Bothell program have been spectacular. (Students we spoke with experienced the program before it was revised; I can’t comment on their reactions to the revised program.) The telephone survey in the self-study reports very positive and confirming results. But the interviews we had with students in the program, and with some of its graduates, were overwhelmingly and enthusiastically supportive of it. My notes are full of comments such as the following:

- The classes are very applicable, helpful, and address current issues
- The program has a very strong intellectual base, which the students love
- The professors are very well-read, and bring a great deal of what they know into their teaching; they are outstanding, very professional, and highly approachable
- The faculty, and everyone else associated with the program, is very responsive to students
- The curriculum builds and connects; content from different courses does not overlap and repeat
- Faculty teaching styles vary; different students appear to respond well to different styles of teaching, most students appear to find teaching styles they are comfortable with
- The amount of writing is enormous; some students who enter the program as poor writers have difficulty, but most improve their writing immensely
- Students leave the program with a good deal of confidence
- The theory-practice balance in the program is reasonable; students expect research and theory from the program, and they get that

I would like to reiterate that the program seems to be of high quality, and the quality is dependent on the faculty. As UW Bothell addresses various issues that need attention, care must be taken not to compromise the program’s quality in the process.

Program Demand and Clientele

I cannot comment specifically on demand in the region of north Seattle. The students and graduates confirmed my supposition that teachers will continue to want a graduate degree if for no other reason than the fact that it results in a salary increase, which for some teachers is fairly substantial (one graduate mentioned that her pay went up \$6,000 per year). The students agreed that many teachers would prefer an easier program, but also felt that a good many of their colleagues would be attracted to this program, if they had more information about it. They felt that the program treats teachers as serious learners, and valued the intellectual seriousness of the program. Some noted that they had recruited colleagues in their own buildings.

It appears that there are two significant reasons why the program is under-enrolled at present: 1) the graduate program was started before a credential program, and normally credential programs provide a pipeline into graduate programs, and 2) the north Seattle region is not a cohesive community (comparisons were frequently made in interviews with Tacoma), and many people simply do not know that much about what happens at UW Bothell. Many interviews recommended that a recruiter be hired to promote this program. I would also recommend that recruitment be extended into Seattle Public Schools, since they are much more diverse than the suburban districts generally are, and I would imagine this program would appeal to many teachers there. We were given a report by a recruiter who has worked with the Education programs for a half year, and the work this person did looks valuable. The report concluded with the comment: "As I continue to talk about UWB, I am stunned at the amount of misinformation that exists in the public domain about this campus and its programs."

I would also urge the university to take into consideration that this program will always attract a great majority of part-time students, given its mission of serving practicing educators. It will never build up a significant full-time student population, and should not be expected to do so. Its funding needs to reflect the part-time nature of the students for whom it was designed.

My vision for the program over the next few years

We were asked to comment on our vision for the program. I do not recommend significant change it in, and would urge the university not to try to make this a comprehensive, diversified program that caters to a wide variety of student needs and interests. While future hires may broaden the range of areas that the program addresses, I believe that it should continue to retain and build on its current focus. We were asked to suggest future faculty hires; perhaps they might be in Literacy, and in Human Development or Educational Psychology. If possible, the next hire should be at the associate or full professor level, and should have the expertise to work in both the certification and the M.Ed. program. The hiring process seems to have brought in relatively senior people to build the M.Ed. program, then junior people to build the certification program, which has left the certification program short on senior leadership. Whatever their area of disciplinary expertise, I would recommend hiring people to fit philosophically with the direction of the program.


I would recommend that there be on-going dialog about teacher professional development for diverse populations, that connects the certification program and the M.Ed. program. The M.Ed. program currently serves teachers who have been teaching for a few years, and I believe it should retain this focus. It may be that the certification program will emphasize teaching methodology more, and the graduate program will emphasize theory and research more, in response to the kinds of concerns teachers have at differing stages of their professional development. As nearly as I could discern, these two programs currently have these emphases.

The faculty have been working extremely hard to create these two programs, and to design all of the courses and procedures that go with them. Faculty have also been working to attempt to maintain their own scholarly lives. Over the next few years, as these two programs are stabilized, I would recommend supporting opportunities for the faculty to engage in scholarship. The students commented on the intellectual quality of the program, and it would be a mistake to lose this by burning out the faculty. There should be a stronger relationship between UW Seattle and UW Bothell that can support the development of a culture of scholarly activity on the Bothell campus (such as in sharing resources, sharing opportunities to work in each other's programs, extending opportunities to work with doctoral students). This could help to invigorate the faculty intellectually and contribute to the program. I gathered that formal relationships between the two campuses that encourage scholarly exchange are piecemeal, and that strengthening such relationships is desired by UW Bothell faculty.

Finally, I would recommend investing in support services for the program. I have already mentioned the need for a recruiter. There also appears to be a need for an academic advisor, to shoulder pre-practicum advising responsibilities. I recognize that advising is a very time-consuming faculty activity, given the number of students in the program and the small number of faculty teaching in it. Hiring someone to do academic advising would help; one of the interviewees suggested combining advising and recruiting into one position. The practicum may also need to be embedded in coursework more than it already is. The practicum seems to be one of the strengths of the program, but it is time-consuming for faculty. UW Bothell might explore hiring graduate students from UW Seattle to help with some of the load.

I hope that these observations and recommendations are of use to you. I appreciated the opportunity to review the program.

Sincerely,



Christine Sleeter
Professor



CENTER FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION

July 2, 1998

Marsha Landolt, Dean
John Slattery, Associate Dean for Academic Programs
The Graduate School, University of Washington
200 Gerberding Hall
Box 351240
Seattle, WA 98195-1240

Dear Dean Landolt and Associate Dean Slattery:

I appreciate the opportunity to visit the Master's of Education Program at the University of Washington Bothell campus. It was an engaging learning experience for me to hear from colleagues and students who are constructing innovative programs and engaging in rigorous intellectual work as they change the landscape of their worklives. I am pleased to submit the following evaluation of the Master's of Education Program at the University of Washington, Bothell. My comments below are based on my site visit of May 28-29, 1998 as well as careful consideration of the materials supplied by the UW Bothell faculty. In the following pages, I comment on the quality of the program as related to its faculty, curriculum, and student services. Where appropriate I have included direct quotes from students and faculty that support and provide evidence for my comments. I conclude this evaluation with my view of future possibilities for the M.Ed. program.

Quality of the UW Bothell Master's of Education Program

Faculty

I am extremely impressed with the high quality of the faculty at UW Bothell. The senior faculty who developed the program are all well-respected scholars in the national arena. I have been acquainted with their scholarship for years through national publications and presentations at the leading educational conferences. Prior to your invitation to serve as an external member of this committee, I was slightly familiar with the Master's Program at Bothell, but was unfamiliar with the history and scope of the program. Now, with a more thorough understanding of the history and development of the program, I am pleased that education faculty at the University of Washington had the vision to pull together three fine Social Foundations scholars --Professors Jane Van Galen, Cherry McGee Banks, and Patricia Phelan--as its developers. The strength of the program is a reflection of the hard work of these three individuals.

*...preparing education professionals
to create the schools of tomorrow*

The junior faculty more recently hired seem to be fine teachers and promising scholars. I will address issues of their scholarship and ways to nurture them in comments later in this letter.

All the Bothell faculty are clearly committed to working in professional and positive ways with their students at both the certification and Master's level. The student-centered nature of the programs were clearly evident in students' comments as they described their experiences:

"They listened and they changed it!"

"[The faculty provide] handles to navigate through lots of information."

"[Faculty are] wonderfully approachable--highly professional."

Program/Curriculum

The curriculum in the Bothell Master's program is at the cutting edge in the field of education in its approach. There are few Master's programs in the U.S. that are built on a solid base of Social Foundations in Education. Historically, Social Foundations of Education (anthropology, sociology, history, and philosophy of education as well as comparative education, and multicultural education) has been at the margins of teacher education at both the certification and Master's levels. Today, for a variety of reasons that I will not discuss here, both pre-service and in-service education students have limited opportunities to explore the Social Foundations of Education. Usually a course or two at the most in Foundations serves to introduce students to the context of teaching and learning. Most degrees in education are solidly in the methodology of teaching.

I would like to briefly describe my own work in Social Foundations of Education to help to set the UW Bothell M.Ed. Program in the national context. I have been involved in networks of Colleges of Education across the country where faculty came together to discuss and plan new programs designed to be sensitive to the contexts in which teachers and students work and learn. In one particular network, The Urban Network for the Improvement of Teacher Education, I was particularly surprised at the lack of a Social Foundations voice or knowledge base. This group consisted of teams of faculty from the following institutions: Ohio State, University of Toronto, Simon Fraser, Indiana State, Teachers College Columbia, University of Florida, University of Louisville, and the University of Tennessee. Throughout three years of working together, I saw much in the way of educational innovation, but little that compared to the work accomplished by the small, committed faculty group at UW Bothell. Only one program that

emerged from that Network developed an initial-certification/Master's Program that was based in a Social Foundations model and utilized many of the same components of the program developed by Professors VanGalen, Banks, and Phelan. In my opinion, the Master's Program developed by the Bothell faculty stands out as a bright star in comparison with other programs in the U.S. It is intellectually rigorous, critical, and takes a unique approach to teacher education. This program would not be possible without such an outstanding faculty.

I have enclosed a copy of the *Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies* presented by The Council of Learned Societies in Education that specify the Social Foundations content for education professional programs. The M. Ed. program at UW Bothell far exceeds the standards set by this group of Learned Societies.

Since this program is centered in the foundational studies, it pushes students to take a rigorously intellectual and critical stance as they analyze key educational issues. The program boldly encourages its students to be change agents and leaders in their schools. The program's organizing theme--*UWB prepares innovative, ethical practitioners who are grounded in intellectual and professional communities and who are dedicated to educating diverse students*--was clearly and regularly articulated by faculty, staff and students as they discussed all aspects of the program.

The descriptions of the M. Ed. program as well as the course outlines that were sent prior to our visit, led me to believe that there might be a considerable amount of overlap in the content of the courses offered. However, after talking with faculty and students, I realized the courses complemented one another and reinforced student learning from course to course. The whole program, informed by both constructivist and critical perspectives, is built solidly around three core components:

- critical analyses of issues in education based in the perspectives of Social Foundations;
- reflection on one's own experience in light of current research and scholarly perspectives--reflection within a community of scholars;
- development of leadership abilities that enable students to take active roles as change agents in their workplaces.

I found the curriculum of the M.Ed. program to be both rigorous and exciting. Students were clearly engaged in their own learning process. The following quotes are evidence of their engagement:

"This program is good for people who are asking the tough questions--good for people with several years of experience."

"You've got to have these questions."

"This program is not for the faint-hearted."

"I admire the attempt [on the part of the faculty] to balance theory and practice."

"Anytime a program pushes, forces you to examine what you do in education, that's powerful."

"I was missing the theory base. I was attracted to the program because of the integrated curriculum. It's given me a lot more confidence. I do a lot more staff development."

"I was caught by the course description in the pamphlet. I was really hooked from the first class on the intellectual level that I was allowed in discussing my profession. "

"It [the program] changed my life in a way that it would not have been changed otherwise--personally and professionally."

"It provided good practice at thinking through the practical. I felt I had a lot of clarity in who I was, what my part was."

"I'm not the same classroom teacher I was 5 or 6 years ago. "

One student described the program as "a real academic institution--real meaningful work."

"Students here are empowered. The program produces different people from when they entered--that's a powerful thing."

I will mention two additional, essential aspects of the M.Ed. Program that I found extremely valuable. The first was the amount and nature of writing required of students. Students were expected to engage in rigorous, intellectual writing about educational issues. They were expected to develop in their writing and were supported in these efforts by faculty and a fine support staff. During our interviews with current and former students, many students spoke positively of the writing-intensive nature of the program and the heavy amount of required writing. The following quotes are examples:

"I became a better editor of my own writing."

"I see the difference in how clear my writing is now. It was a personal victory for me--the development of my writing ability."

The second, related aspect of the program that I found to be an essential element was the culminating practicum project. Although this project is extremely time-consuming for faculty, it enables students to integrate their learning experiences through the development and implementation of a research project within their own schools and communities. This action research approach is an effective way for students to struggle with real problems, review related literature and develop change strategies within particular contexts. My review of the listing of practicum projects, as well as my brief review of the projects available during our site visit, indicate high quality, innovative, and important work. The practicum project requirement is a true capstone experience for your M.Ed. students. As one faculty member remarked, "Students are able to be agents of change in schools, particularly by the time they do their practicum experiences."

In summary, I found the curriculum well-designed and tightly-integrated. The program offers students small classes, the ability to construct their own programs with extensive support from the faculty, the convenience of attending an institution close to their homes, and the prestige of obtaining a degree from the University of Washington. As one student noted, "I'm happy to have that UW on my certificate."

Support Services

The support services offered to students are quite good. Both faculty and students commented often about the excellent support staff involved in the program. Students commented that they received exemplary customer service from both faculty and staff. For the most part, they felt that the library, computer lab and writing center were open and accessible to students. The library holdings were certainly adequate for the scholarly needs of faculty and students. I was especially impressed with the large number of high quality educational journals available on campus.

My Visions for the Master's of Education Program at UW Bothell

In this portion of my review, I address both the tensions I see in the program as well as my visions for possible solutions to ameliorate these tensions.

1. The M.Ed. and now the new initial certification teacher education program has relied heavily on the hard work of assistant professors. Institution/program building are intensive and exhausting efforts. I found

that the professors are working so hard to build this high quality program that little time or energy is left for documenting the scholarship that is clearly evident in the development of the programs. There was concern expressed on the part of the senior faculty that the junior faculty have not had the time to reflect and write about their teaching and research efforts. As one faculty mentioned, "We ourselves hardly get a change to breathe and think about our programs. " This is ironic given the central place reflection holds in the M.Ed. program.

In your next hire, I urge you consider hiring a senior faculty member who could contribute to both the M.Ed. and the initial certification programs. I would expect a portion of this person's responsibility would be to mentor to junior faculty in their research and writing. You may consider a scholar in language and literacy who shares a commitment to Social Foundations of Education. It is imperative that any new faculty, even those more steeped in areas of Curriculum and Instruction, are committed to the infusion of these perspectives throughout the curriculum. If this focus is maintained, the initial credential program as well as the M.Ed. program will be two of just a handful of quality programs in the U.S. that are able to successfully build on a Social Foundations base. Consequently, UW Bothell will have two integrated programs that educate pre-service and in-service teachers who are knowledgeable about school and community contexts in which they work, can critically analyze educational issues and practices, and are able to work as leaders/change agents in their school communities. It is essential that we begin to prepare teachers who can develop these areas of expertise to work effectively across a broad range of contexts where children learn and grow. I envision the initial certification program to be a model program much like the M.Ed. program.

2. There is a concern that the small enrollment in the M.Ed. program necessitates larger classes in the initial certification programs so as to support both programs. The faculty has no time to do the necessary recruitment that would build a self-sustaining M. Ed. program. I would like to see an additional support person hired who could serve as a recruiter and advisor for the M. Ed. students. There was evidence from the recent initial efforts of a part-time recruiter that putting efforts into visiting schools and talking with teachers and administrators would be invaluable in helping to advertise and build the program. As the initial certification program grows, that program will be the feeder program for the M. Ed. program.

3. I would like to see more opportunities for junior faculty to teach and advise in the M.Ed. program in addition to their work in the initial certification program. This should help to infuse the theoretical framework of the M. Ed.

program throughout the initial certification program as well as to provide more balance in the number of students they see. Junior and senior faculty working together in both programs should result in two exceptional programs that are consistent in their philosophies and seamless in their delivery from one level to the other.

I appreciate the opportunity to reflect on an exemplary Master's of Education program. I look forward to learning of your future accomplishments as you set new goals for a growing program.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kathleen Bennett deMarrais". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'K'.

Kathleen Bennett deMarrais
Professor
520/523-8226
Kathleen.deMarrais@nau.edu