THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Educational Specialist in School Psychology; MAE in Educational Psychology, emphasis in Context and Techniques of Assessment

2b. List date(s) of program review: Completed Spring 2008

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes ______ No X

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No X

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No _____

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

See attached.
## University of Northern Iowa
### School Psychology Program Review

### Recommendations from the Self Study and External Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Implementation Plan</th>
<th>Progress toward Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve regular use of SOA data (self study)</td>
<td>Discuss aggregated data for previous academic year each September. (School psych committee and advisory board). Generate list of strengths and needs for improvement. Generate annual goals, 5 year goals, and action plan</td>
<td>Aggregated SOA data from the 2007-2008 academic year were presented and discussed at fall advisory board and committee meetings. Recommendations included: 1. Discuss ways to expedite scholarship notification for new admits 2. Collect evidence/artifacts for each program standard and include these in the portfolio. 3. Collaborate with AEAs regarding professional development training 4. Maintain ongoing communication between faculty and students about thesis requirements and explore alternative options 5. Increase training in mental health issues 6. Collaborate with other departments and programs on campus, e.g. early childhood 7. Utilize the experience and expertise of school psychologists in the field. Consider starting a seminar. 8. Establish annual and five year at the first school psychology committee meeting in September 2009. Goals will be based on aggregated program SOA data, advisory board recommendations and the program review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move Educational Research course to first semester (external reviewers)</td>
<td>Talked with instructors of 250:205 and 200:214</td>
<td>Implemented fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish an annual budget for equipment (self study; external reviewers)</td>
<td>Work with department head to establish budget.</td>
<td>An annual budget has not been established due to lack of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicate space in SEC to graduate students (self study; external reviewers)</td>
<td>Open up the room previously used by COE doctoral students</td>
<td>Although it was intended that a room be dedicated to school psychology students, the room was allocated for another use beginning fall 2008. Students have access to a lounge area in SEC and we are still seeking a more private space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Progress toward Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Explore options for thesis or other research completion (self study, external reviewers) | Discuss at fall committee meeting  
Discuss at faculty meeting  
Increase collaboration with department faculty | The school psychology committee discussed options. A recommendation that more students be included in work groups has been implemented with success. Advisors have encouraged students to choose thesis chairs from outside the school psychology faculty. |
| Increase collaboration among programs, departments, colleges (self study; external reviewers) | Discuss opportunities with other program coordinators and faculty  
Provide opportunities for students to interact outside the classroom.  
Consider ways to increase communication/collaboration of students in the classrooms  
Increase research/service collaboration opportunities for faculty | 1. The program coordinator has approached the counseling program coordinator to discuss collaboration. Discussions will continue spring/summer 2009.  
2. Individual instructors recognize that school psychology students need experience in collaborating with professionals from other disciplines. Each instructor works to increase communication and collaboration within their own classroom.  
3. School psychology faculty collaborate with faculty from other departments within COE and from other colleges, as well as U of I faculty. |
<p>| EPF has two competing missions; make an effort to communicate with other faculty about school psychology activities, especially the workload associated with teaching and advising graduate students (external review) | Regular updates at faculty meetings | School psychology faculty members have communicated with other faculty about activities. However, we have not discussed workload, as everyone in the department has taken on extra duties. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Implementation Plan</strong></th>
<th><strong>Progress toward Goal</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Explore ways to expand the existing program. (self study, external reviewers) | Explore research options to decrease thesis supervision load  
Alleviate shortages of practicum sites/ driving distance by placing students in pairs in practicum sites/ form a professional development team with local psychologist  
Improve admissions of best students by offering GA/tuition scholarships earlier in the process  
Explore new faculty line(s) to support mentoring and practicum needs; make sure we are competitive in recruiting and hiring | 1. MAE paper and thesis supervision load has been decreased somewhat by encouraging students to work in groups and recommending chairs from outside the program.  
2. Although GA/tuition scholarships cannot be formally awarded early in the process, we are allowed to tell students if they have been recommended.  
3. Faculty lines are not being added to the department at this time. |
| Make sure current faculty have adequate time to conduct research and write grant proposals (external review) | Maintain a reasonable course load  
Decrease demands of student research supervision  
Make sure course releases are maintained for program coordination and provision of services at lab school | 1. School psychology faculty members are productive despite a shortage of time.  
2. Student research demands have been decreased somewhat by developing teams.  
3. Course loads are large for faculty members who provide an intense graduate program.  
4. The faculty member who provides services at the lab school receives a course release. Starting in the fall of 2009, the program coordinator will have no course release and has been assigned an 11-hour teaching load. |
| Increase recruitment, especially recruitment of minority applicants (self study) | Increase recruiting activities  
Tie into graduate college initiatives | Although the program ties into graduate college initiatives, we have been unable to recruit many minority students and have not been able to admit any in the last five years. |
| Prepare students to work with diverse populations, especially ELL (self study) | Include more coverage of ELL issues in existing courses  
Seek grant funding to improve training opportunities  
Review course objectives to determine most effective delivery | 1. Existing courses have expanded ELL coverage.  
2. Students have attended conferences and workshops that provide training in ELL issues. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Implementation Plan</th>
<th>Progress toward Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include a course in early childhood assessment and interventions (self study; external reviewers)</td>
<td>Involve department faculty in discussion of options</td>
<td>Faculty discussed development of an early childhood course that school psychology students will begin to take spring 2010. We have not yet planned how to incorporate the human relations component into other coursework, but don't anticipate any problems as many course objectives already address human relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop/ find early childhood course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate human relations component into other coursework and seek DE approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become a leader in professional development for Iowa school psychologists (self study)</td>
<td>Collaborate with AEAs, ISPA, DE, NASP</td>
<td>1. Two faculty and four students currently collaborate with AEA267 to evaluate behavioral assessments and interventions, autism training, and transition plans. The results of these evaluations will inform inservice needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Two faculty members and two students serve on the board of ISPA and assist with conference planning. Faculty often present at the ISPA conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Two faculty members are collaborating with the U of I school psychology program and the assistive technology center to conduct research on providing preservice and inservice opportunities to school psychologists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution ___University of Northern Iowa___________________________________________

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Elementary Education

2b. List date(s) of program review: __________________Fall 2007—May 2008

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes _____ No X

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No X____

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No ______

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
Coherence of course content, standards, and assessments

Current faculty continue to work toward the completion of the project to map the curriculum. Additional standards-based assessments are being developed and attention given to the integration of Students Outcomes Assessment and teacher work sample data.

One method for accomplishing this is to articulate the elementary education major from the first semester through the final student teaching experience. This was the major Elementary Education recommendation that grew out of the Teacher Education Summit held on February 29th, 2008. The Elementary Division of Curriculum & Instruction has begun discussions related to this articulation. A website is being developed as a foundation for articulation of the program. The first draft of this articulation can be found by going to http://www.uni.edu/icss/articulation/index.html

Recruitment and Diversity

Efforts to recruit faculty and students from diverse populations continue. Additional faculty lines are advertised widely and attention is given to advertising in those venues that may attract applicants from diverse populations. Recent additions to the elementary education undergraduate faculty have received terminal degrees from institutions other than UNI. Work continues within the department to meet the goal of the strategic plan that calls for a 25% increase in the diverse population at the undergraduate level, particularly males and minorities. Brochures to support this effort are currently being finalized. In addition, specific plans are underway at the college level regarding student recruitment from diverse populations.

Increase communication between all faculty

Division meetings are held to discuss pressing issues regarding elementary education. Involved faculty members are aware of the need for better communication. The curriculum mapping process has crossed some of the division, department and college boundaries and methods for enhancing communication between all vested groups are currently being discussed. The Elementary Division of C&I has begun discussions related to this communication and program articulation. A website is being developed as a foundation for articulation of the program. The first draft of this articulation can be found by going to http://www.uni.edu/icss/articulation/index.html

WAYS IN WHICH SELF-STUDY AND EXTERNAL REVIEW HAVE RATIFIED OR CHANGED PROGRAM'S USE OF OUTCOME ASSESSMENTS/MEASURES.

The components of outcome assessment are in place but must be articulated to a higher degree. This articulation must include better communication between all groups involved with elementary education undergraduate students. Because such a small number of classes required for the major are under the control of the Elementary Education Division, this task is daunting. Division, department and college lines must be crossed for this communication to yield effective results. The Elementary Division of C&I has begun discussions related to this level of communication and articulation. A website is being developed as a foundation for articulation of the program. The first draft of this articulation can be found by going to http://www.uni.edu/icss/articulation/index.html
Board of Regents, State of Iowa  
Summary Report on Academic Program Review

1. Institution: University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed:

   Department of English Language and Literature
   *Undergraduate Program in English, English Teaching, and TESOL
   *Graduate Program in English, English Teaching, and TESOL

2b. List date(s) of program review:

   *On-campus process involved period from spring 2007 through December of 2008
   *External reviewers on campus March 6 and March 7 2008

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators?  

   Yes

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators:  Three, as follows:

   Tom Gage, Professor Emeritus, Humboldt State University
   Ethan Krase, Assistant Professor, Winona State University
   Gerald Savage, Professor, Illinois State University

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years?  

   No

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.  

   N/A

5. Is this the first time this program has been reviewed since initial approval?  

   No. Programs at UNI are reviewed every seven years.

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents?  

   N/A (not a new program)

6b. If not, why not?  

   Again, N/A (not a new program).

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessment.  

   NOTE: These are as follows:
Faculty

1). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended that no additional hiring take place until the Department has crafted a mission statement to guide future planning.
Actions: The Department crafted and then approved a departmental mission statement (Fall 2008).
2). Recommendation: Fill a minimum of five full-time positions (in addition to those of faculty who resign or retire) in support of mission (2008-2010).
Actions: Our one faculty search this year was closed, due to budget considerations, January 2009.

Students

1). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended programmatic actions to appeal to a more diverse pool of potential students.
Actions: Review curricular diversity offerings: Department Curriculum Committee (Fall 2008).
Note: This review was completed Fall 2008 and curricular revisions suggested.
2). Recommendation: Reviewers recommended arranging a meeting of the English Senate with Admissions Office (and other appropriate UNI offices) to discuss both curricular and non-curricular means of outreach to diverse populations of potential students (Spring 2009).
Actions: This was accomplished Spring 2009.
3). Recommendation: Reviewers recommended the Department work with Student Services and CHFA on collaborative outreach efforts.
Actions: This effort is ongoing.
4) Recommendation: Explore (or formalize) liaison connects between the Department and UNI programs that support student diversity (UNI-CUE, CME, McNair Scholars Program, Upward Bound, etc.).
Actions: This effort is ongoing.

Facilities and Resources

1). Recommendation: Reviewers suggested discussion/consideration of a complete renovation of Baker Hall.
Actions: English Department will support University plans to renovate or replace Baker Hall (discussion ongoing). Department is also proactively developing departmentally-approved list for Baker renovation/replacement.
2). Recommendation: Reviewers suggested a location be provided for faculty to have privacy during long-distance telephone calls.
Actions: Pursue establishment of private location for faculty long-distance phone calling or alternatives such as Departmental calling card. Discussion ongoing.
3). Recommendation: Have Department Head and other offices on campus increase amount of funds available for faculty travel to professional conferences.
Actions: Draft resolution for administrative support at all levels (Department, College, University) for funding of faculty travel to international conferences (Spring 2009).
   Note: The University instituted a moratorium on non-essential out-of-state travel for the upcoming 2009-2010 academic year.

Institutional and Local Community Contexts

1). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended a reexamination of the existing departmental committee structure, to eliminate overlap.
Actions: Streamline committee structure (ACCOMPLISHED: three fewer committees in place for Fall 2008). Seek opportunities for additional committee synthesis and/or elimination Discussion ongoing.
2). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended adding student outcome assessment procedures that either worked with existing courses or established new “capstone” type experiences for students.
Actions: Implement short-term SOA plans (Fall 2008). Continue development of long-term SOA plans for major programs including design of any requisite capstone course(s) and, where needed, restatement of major requirements (Fall 2008, Spring 2009). Discussion ongoing.

3). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended a greater connection between the Department and UNI’s Writing Center.

Action: Response: Since the Writing Center is located in Academic Services, the Department has no administrative connection to the Center. However, a series of non-administrative connections exists, cultivated by individual faculty members, and this is not reflected in the review.

4). Recommendation: The Department should increase role in determining University reciprocity agreements with community colleges.

Actions: Discussion is ongoing. Department will work with UNI offices and community colleges to improve quality control.

Undergraduate Programs

Recommendations:
1). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended future hires in British literature and young adult literature.

Actions: Our one faculty search was closed, due to budget reasons, in January 2009.

2). Recommendation: Reviewers expressed concern that a large proportion of introductory writing classes were staffed by what was perceived to be an unstable pool of adjunct faculty.

Actions: Explore conversion of select adjunct lines to new clinical instructor positions (pending final approval). Note: These have been approved by the University; however, in the current budget climate, none of these positions will be filled in the coming year.

3). Recommendation: Reviewers recommended additional writing courses (specifically in New Media and Rhetoric).

Actions: Enhance offerings by adding appropriate 100(g)-level courses in writing studies, contingent on additional support and funding (Fall 2008, Spring 2009). (completed)

4). Recommendation: Reviewers recommended creating a program of internships for all English majors.

Actions: Suggestion not practical. No action to be taken.

5). Recommendation: Reviewers recommended reviewing all enrollment data for all programs.

Actions: Completed as part of the Academic Program Assessment report, Spring 2009.

6). Recommendation: Reviewers recommended changing the name of the TESOL Major to Applied Linguistics.

Actions: Department did not find this recommendation to be desirable. No action will be taken.

Graduate Programs

1). Recommendation: Reviewers suggested a reexamination of the semester-by-semester funding opportunities for assistantships.

Actions: The Department is committed to improving funding options. Discussion ongoing.

2). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended additional 200-level courses for English Literature graduate students, some of whom, they claim, enroll in independent studies to compensate for limited course offerings.

Actions: The reviewers were incorrect in their assumption that graduate faculty are working with students in independent studies in order to compensate limited graduate course offerings.

3). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended closure of the TESS program, one of the three emphases within the MA Major in English, until it could be removed from the auspices of Continuing Education.

Actions: The reviewers did not understand the structure of UNI Continuing Education or our relationship with it. The recommendation will not be acted upon.
1. Institution: University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed:

   Department of English Language and Literature
   *Undergraduate Program in English, English Teaching, and TESOL
   *Graduate Program in English, English Teaching, and TESOL

2b. List date(s) of program review:

   *On-campus process involved period from spring 2007 through December of 2008
   *External reviewers on campus March 6 and March 7 2008

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators?  
   Yes

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: Three, as follows:

   Tom Gage, Professor Emeritus, Humboldt State University
   Ethan Krase, Assistant Professor, Winona State University
   Gerald Savage, Professor, Illinois State University

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years?  
   No

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.  
   N/A

5. Is this the first time this program has been reviewed since initial approval?  
   No. Programs at UNI are reviewed every seven years.

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents?  
   N/A (not a new program)

6b. If not, why not? Again, N/A (not a new program).

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessment.

   NOTE: These are as follows:
Faculty

1). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended that no additional hiring take place until the Department has crafted a mission statement to guide future planning.
Actions: The Department crafted and then approved a departmental mission statement (Fall 2008).
2). Recommendation: Fill a minimum of five full-time positions (in addition to those of faculty who resign or retire) in support of mission (2008-2010).
Actions: Our one faculty search this year was closed, due to budget considerations, January 2009.

Students

1). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended programmatic actions to appeal to a more diverse pool of potential students.
Actions: Review curricular diversity offerings: Department Curriculum Committee (Fall 2008).
Note: This review was completed Fall 2008 and curricular revisions suggested.
2). Recommendation: Reviewers recommended arranging a meeting of the English Senate with Admissions Office (and other appropriate UNI offices) to discuss both curricular and non-curricular means of outreach to diverse populations of potential students (Spring 2009).
Actions: This was accomplished Spring 2009.
3). Recommendation: Reviewers recommended the Department work with Student Services and CHFA on collaborative outreach efforts.
Actions: This effort is ongoing.
4) Recommendation: Explore (or formalize) liaison connects between the Department and UNI programs that support student diversity (UNI-CUE, CME, McNair Scholars Program, Upward Bound, etc.).
Actions: This effort is ongoing.

Facilities and Resources

1). Recommendation: Reviewers suggested discussion/consideration of a complete renovation of Baker Hall.
Actions: English Department will support University plans to renovate or replace Baker Hall (discussion ongoing).
Department is also proactively developing departmentally-approved list for Baker renovation/replacement.
2). Recommendation: Reviewers suggested a location be provided for faculty to have privacy during long-distance telephone calls.
Actions: Pursue establishment of private location for faculty long-distance phone calling or alternatives such as Departmental calling card. Discussion ongoing.
3). Recommendation: Have Department Head and other offices on campus increase amount of funds available for faculty travel to professional conferences.
Actions: Draft resolution for administrative support at all levels (Department, College, University) for funding of faculty travel to international conferences (Spring 2009).
Note: The University instituted a moratorium on non-essential out-of-state travel for the upcoming 2009-2010 academic year.

Institutional and Local Community Contexts

1). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended a reexamination of the existing departmental committee structure, to eliminate overlap.
Actions: Streamline committee structure (ACCOMPLISHED: three fewer committees in place for Fall 2008). Seek opportunities for additional committee synthesis and/or elimination. Discussion ongoing.
2). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended adding student outcome assessment procedures that either worked with existing courses or established new “capstone” type experiences for students.
Actions: Implement short-term SOA plans (Fall 2008). Continue development of long-term SOA plans for major programs including design of any requisite capstone course(s) and, where needed, restatement of major requirements (Fall 2008, Spring 2009). Discussion ongoing.

3). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended a greater connection between the Department and UNI’s Writing Center.
Action: Response: Since the Writing Center is located in Academic Services, the Department has no administrative connection to the Center. However, a series of non-administrative connections exists, cultivated by individual faculty members, and this is not reflected in the review.

4). Recommendation: The Department should increase role in determining University reciprocity agreements with community colleges.
Actions: Discussion is ongoing. Department will work with UNI offices and community colleges to improve quality control.

Undergraduate Programs

Recommendations:
1). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended future hires in British literature and young adult literature.
Actions: Our one faculty search was closed, due to budget reasons, in January 2009.
2). Recommendation: Reviewers expressed concern that a large proportion of introductory writing classes were staffed by what was perceived to be an unstable pool of adjunct faculty.
Actions: Explore conversion of select adjunct lines to new clinical instructor positions (pending final approval).
Note: These have been approved by the University; however, in the current budget climate, none of these positions will be filled in the coming year.
3). Recommendation: Reviewers recommended additional writing courses (specifically in New Media and Rhetoric).
Actions: Enhance offerings by adding appropriate 100(g)-level courses in writing studies, contingent on additional support and funding (Fall 2008, Spring 2009). (completed)
4). Recommendation: Reviewers recommended creating a program of internships for all English majors.
Actions: Suggestion not practical. No action to be taken.
5). Recommendation: Reviewers recommended reviewing all enrollment data for all programs.
Actions: Completed as part of the Academic Program Assessment report, Spring 2009.
6). Recommendation: Reviewers recommended changing the name of the TESOL Major to Applied Linguistics.
Actions: Department did not find this recommendation to be desirable. No action will be taken.

Graduate Programs

1). Recommendation: Reviewers suggested a reexamination of the semester-by-semester funding opportunities for assistantships.
Actions: The Department is committed to improving funding options. Discussion ongoing.
2). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended additional 200-level courses for English Literature graduate students, some of whom, they claim, enroll in independent studies to compensate for limited course offerings.
Actions: The reviewers were incorrect in their assumption that graduate faculty are working with students in independent studies in order to compensate limited graduate course offerings.
3). Recommendation: The reviewers recommended closure of the TESS program, one of the three emphases within the MA Major in English, until it could be removed from the auspices of Continuing Education.
Actions: The reviewers did not understand the structure of UNI Continuing Education or our relationship with it. The recommendation will not be acted upon.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution ______University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Middle Level Education Program – Graduate

2b. List date(s) of program review: 2007

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___X___ No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes ___X___ No _____

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

In 2000, the Department of Curriculum & Instruction merged most of their masters’ programs into a “UNified” MAE with 15 hours of general education coursework. Due to the No Child Left Behind legislation, the generalist approach to middle level education was not being supported by school district professional development plans. Students reported that they needed a subject-area concentration in order to meet the “highly qualified teacher” designation. The new Iowa Middle School Endorsement supports a blended approach: 1) Pedagogy – competency and expertise in characteristics of young adolescents, middle level programs and best practices, reading in the content areas, and a broad and interdisciplinary understanding of middle level curriculum; 2) Content – competency and expertise in two subject areas with a minimum of 12 semester hours in each subject area. Low enrollment in the first course of the 2007-2009 cohort confirmed the need to formulate a curriculum change. A curriculum proposal was recently approved by the College of Education Senate and the COE Graduate Curriculum Committee. This proposal will be reviewed by the University Graduate Curriculum Committee in Fall 2009. The proposal provides a significant revision to the program and will focus on pedagogy, research strategies, and content specialization. Program faculty made a conscientious choice put admissions to the program on hold until this revision could be realized. Due to a number of inquiries over the past year, it is anticipated that Fall of 2010 – 2012 cohort will be viable.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No ___X____

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No _____

6b. If not, why not?
7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments. **See Chart below.**

**Middle Level Graduate Program Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. ML Program Student Outcomes Assessment Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (C&amp;I uses these too)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Align NBPT Standards with Iowa 8 Professional Standards (SEPT 09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Model Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) and Student Outcomes Assessment (SOA) Plan in format of El Ed to fit “unified” image of Dept (SEPT 09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Post Grad SLO on Assessment Website by SEPT 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Post Grad SOA on assessment website by Jan 2010, due to program revisions &amp; approval process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Begin development of new ML Programs website with Robin, patterned after EL ED (SUMMER 09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meet with Donna Vinton prior to posting for final revision (post by JAN 2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Met with Donna Vinton – SOA in place – not clear to others
  - Curriculum mapping using NBPT standards to guide (SEPT 09)
  - Faculty share their perspectives – compare ML Faculty’s to those teaching courses – meeting to determine accuracy & decide points to gather assessment data (DEC 09)
  - Work with Barry to develop system to disseminate results for ML (FALL 09)
  - Revised MAE Program with content area specialization – to COE Senate by SPRING 09 (consultations completed in content areas) – DONE

- Program Assessment System must build on Elementary education’s foundation to present consistent format. The two graduate programs share 3 or more courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. ML Courses and Programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommendation to revise the graduate program to align with the new Iowa Middle School Endorsement was accepted. Revised program was written, consulted, and approved by C&amp; I and College of Education for the curriculum process for the 2010-2012 catalog.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Recommendation to follow NMSA/NCATE Standards rejected – we are not NCATE affiliated

- Iowa 8 Standards to be aligned to NBPTS (SEPT 09)

- Advisory board of stakeholders to meet 2x per year beginning in Fall 2009
  - Meet periodically with those teaching in the content areas — at least 1x per year (have met with more than 14 faculty in other colleges, Spring 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Qualified ML Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jean became coordinator – Fall 08 - DONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will NOT add another faculty member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Graduate students via ICN (starting Fall 2010 with revised MAE Program that correlates to new Iowa Middle School Endorsement)
Jean 2+2 + middle level + gifted
Donna 2+2 + middle level + Elementary Ed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. ML Professional Roles and Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Travel Funds recommended at $500 AND 70th Anniversary support – DONE (only $300 budget per faculty member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National Research Study on Common Planning Time – training DONE – data collection will begin Fall 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mini-Grant – granted –bought equipment for research project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Complete IRB (May 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Article accepted for the Middle School Journal – regarding leadership and diversity for preservice teachers and 8th grade student leaders (Spring 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Research study to compare ML Majors to Elementary Majors &amp; Early Childhood Majors (IRB Complete June 2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution  **University of Northern Iowa**

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: **Middle Level Education Program – Undergraduate**

2b. List date(s) of program review:  **2007**

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators?  **Yes X  No ____**

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators:  **2**

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years?  **Yes ______  No X**

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval?  **Yes ______  No X**

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents?  **Not applicable**

6b. If not, why not?

List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments. **See chart below.**

**Middle Level Undergraduate Program Assessment**

1. ML Program Recommendations

   **Steps:**
   - Use INTASC + 1 Standards (C&I, too) for SOA Plan – Chart aligned with NMSA Program Standards (June 09)
   - Model SLO & SOA Plans after El Ed – pattern (Most El/ML Majors) – Elementary done in May 2009 – will finish Middle Level Fall 2009
   - SOA Plan focuses on INTASC + 1 Standards
   - Develop new ML Programs [website](http://www.example.com) with Robin, patterned after EL ED (SUMMER 09) – have met; have access to website
   - Follow-up meeting with Donna Vinton prior to posting for final revision (Fall 09)
   - Met with Donna Vinton – SOA in place – not clear to others
   - Asked to meet and met with Elementary Ed Division during discussion on SLO and SOA plans – attended meetings when possible
   - Curriculum mapping to use as guidance (Summer 09)
   - Survey ML Majors – Which INTASC Standards in which classes? (Fall 09)
   - Possible survey among ML Majors: connect INTASC Standards to classes – their perspectives – via googlesites.com or monkeysurvey & R. Galloway
2. ML Courses and Field Experiences
Steps:
- Reject idea to align cadre with NMSA Program Standards
- Iowa Endorsement requirements has changed + field exp. Requirements – revisions in place for 21V Majors (who will need to fulfill the new requirements)
- Current ML Major will sunset on July 1, 2010 (21D Majors)
- Option B in 2008 – 2010 catalog articulates ML Major with State Approval for Endorsement
- Reinstate cadre of ML stakeholders, focused on INTASC Standards – will form database & send letters to ML majors in Level III and Level IV.
- Advisory Board of stakeholders 2x per year
- Meet with those teaching ML courses 1x per month
- Meet with those teaching in content areas – 1x per year – to raise awareness
- Options A & B in 2008 – 2010 catalog articulate ML Major with State Approval for Endorsement
- Done – emails to 21D & 21V students – have list; need to collaborate (Current enrollment as of May 2009 – 21D Majors (n=105) – 21V Majors (n=126)
- Since – met with advisory center’s personnel – misunderstanding of new endorsement in the area of specialization – problem alleviated

3. Qualified ML Faculty
Steps:
- Jean Schneider became Coordinator Fall 08
- Reject recommendation to add faculty member

4. ML Curriculum & Assessment
Steps:
- Incorporate the Portfolio Performance Assessment into SOA Plan & continue to work on developing quality of students’ reflective writing (Fall 2009)
- Work on inter-rater reliability in scoring portfolio reflections. Invite Barry Wilson to share expertise to aid faculty in developing a more cohesive, reliable scoring system (Summer 2009)
- More clearly articulate alignment of key assessments with standards
- More pre-assessment & assessment practice has been incorporated into classes

5. ML Professional Roles
Steps:
- $500 travel monies paid to Jean Schneider for travel, presentation, publication at “7th International Castle Conference” in East Sussex, England in August 2008. Agree that financial support for scholarship continue.
- Schneider & Douglas will include their own research questions into national study to enable shared publication
- Sent in revised article to Middle School Journal following tentative acceptance
- Working on developing an on-line survey to compare characteristics of early childhood, elementary, and middle level majors. (May 2009 – Dec 2009)
- Outstanding support of ML 70th anniversary
- Service:
  - SAMLE coadvisement
  - Grant from Community Foundation
  - ML Leadership Conference set for March 27 – by SAMLE
  - Wellness Evening at Bremwood (Nov. 4, 2008)
  - Central Celebrates
- People to People Partnership – 10 went from UNI during week of April 21 – asked Dr. Callahan in Nov. to upgrade partnership to “school-sponsored event” & Interviewed 15 applicants for Fall 2009 (submission in process)
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution _University of Northern Iowa_ 

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed:   Economics major, BA 

2b. List date(s) of program review:   2007-08 

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes __X___ No _____ 

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2 

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes ______ No __X__ 

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change. 
   NA 

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes ______ No ____X____ 

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ______ No ______ 

6b. If not, why not? 

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments. 

1. Improve recruitment of majors: This has already begun. Number of majors has increased 25%. 

2. Consider offering a forecasting course: Postponed because of budget cuts. 

3. Increase writing requirements in lower division courses: Postponed. Budget cuts have forced us to increase class size beyond maximum writing-intensive size. 


5. Create joint program with mathematics department: Created and approved by College of Business Administration Senate and is now awaiting approval by University Curriculum Committee. 

6. Establish department head succession: Low priority. Current head has at least four more years until retirement. 

7. Review and update mission statement: Completed and approved.
8. More closely align community college align economics courses with UNI’s: Held a conference with community college teachers in April of 2008 with another planned in Spring, 2010. Good progress has been made.

THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution ___University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Electrical Information and Engineering Technology (EIET), B.S. Degree

2b. List date(s) of program review: Report submitted: November, 2007 (Revised 1-31-08)
   Reviewers visited UNI: March 30 – April 1, 2008

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes ___ X No____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes _____ No ___ X

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No ___ X

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No ___

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
RESPONSES TO THE EXTERNAL REVIEWER’S REPORT

ELECTRICAL INFORMATION ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY (EIET)

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR EIET FACULTY
A response regarding the professional development plan for the EIET faculty has been developed.

ABET ACCREDITATION
The department has initiated the preliminary stages to be evaluated for ABET accreditation. One important step in the process is the renaming of the EIET program as proposed to become Electrical Engineering Technology (EET). This change has been proposed and accepted through the administrative hierarchy to the Provost’s Office. Preliminary queries with the other regent’s institutions met with objections. However, with further clarification the objections have been removed. It is therefore anticipated that the name change will soon be approved by the Board of Regents. Another need for this program is a licensed electronics technician to suitably repair, operate, and calibrate the equipment regularly. The Department Chair has discussed this need with the CNS Dean and various means toward this end are being considered regarding this problem.

RESOURCES FOR ATTENDANCE AT CONFERENCES
The current level of funding for travel to conferences and professional development is meager compared to the costs of such participation. Recently, the departmental faculty has been the beneficiary of funds from an external benefactor to support activities related to scholarly activity by the faculty. While not large, this resource includes funds for relevant travel. Future internal budget review will also be undertaken to exam the possibilities of directing more funds for this need.

ROUTINE MAINTENANCE FOR INSTRUMENTS
This question is related to an earlier item. Instruments need routine maintenance and there is a big need for a trained person to remain in this position. Past experience with able student help is found wanting as they leave in one to two years and new people need to be trained continually. It would be possible to operate with a part time person that might share in other duties.

SURVEYS FOR CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT
Surveys are needed to assist in improving the curriculum. Since we have used web-based surveys for previous departmental purposes (both in-house generated formats as well as the commercial SurveyMonkey instrument format), we will use this proven methodology to seek feedback from current students and alumni for their recommendations. During the past two departmental Industrial Advisory Board Meetings (Fall and Spring) we have had feedback sessions with discipline-specific board members in order to identify constructive changes.

COURSES, CONTENTS, PREREQUISITES, AND COREQUISITES
Course contents, prerequisites, and co-requisites are already listed in the UNI catalog and on departmental course syllabi. We are reviewing use of our departmental web site for this purpose; such a move would be enhanced by more consistent syllabi in the department.

SUMMER CLASS OFFERINGS AND STUDENT SUMMER WORK
Presently we do not have the demand or resources to offer any summer EIET classes. So there is no conflict with student summer employment.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent’s Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Elementary Education—MAE Graduate Program

2b. List date(s) of program review: Fall 2007 – May 2008

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes _____ No X

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes _____ No X

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes _____ No _____

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
Coherence of course content, standards, and assessments

As a result of the self study we are developing an articulation plan for the MAE in Elementary Education. This is being developed in conjunction with faculty teaching courses in the program. We are using a website as the basis for this program articulation. The URL for this program articulation is http://www.uni.edu/icss/maeeled/index.html

The standards being used as a basis for this program articulation are the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards found at http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/standards_by_cert?ID=27&x=59&y=9

The Elementary division faculty has nearly completed the graduate program articulation during spring 2009 semester. This work will continue into fall 2009.

Use of teacher work sample as a Student Outcomes Assessment; standards-based assessment; and data on the non-thesis option, literature review

It is the opinion of the faculty teaching in the MAE in Elementary Education that the teacher work sample is not the best instrument for Student Outcomes Assessment in this program. Instead we are using the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards found at http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/standards_by_cert?ID=27&x=59&y=9. As such, the National Board standards have been adopted department wide as the basis for graduate programs.

The faculty fully agree that standards-based assessment is vital. We are adopting the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards found at http://www.nbpts.org/the_standards/standards_by_cert?ID=27&x=59&y=9 as the assessment standards for this program as well as department wide. This is currently underway.

As part of the articulation plan for the MAE in Elementary Education we are identifying “Critical Performances” which will include a description of the research paper requirement and a rubric identifying standards for this critical performance.

The Curriculum and Instruction Department Strategic Plan, developed in spring semester 2009 includes a goal directed at broadening the advisory recommendations to include projects and research beyond the typical review of literature.

Require a course in ‘Research and Writing’ and ‘Statistics’

Regarding the evaluator recommendation that the program include an additional course in ‘Statistics’, the program faculty believe that 1) the program already includes adequate coursework in ‘Research and Writing’ and 2) the purposes of the program do not dictate an additional course focusing on statistics. As such, no work is planned toward these two new courses.
Recruitment of faculty with terminal degrees and from institutions other than UNI

We are planning to conduct a search in the fall of 2009 to hire an additional terminal degreed person for the Elementary Education Division of Curriculum & Instruction. Future searches will focus on increasing diversity among faculty and for faculty degreed outside UNI.

Increase communication and collaboration of graduate faculty

The Elementary Education Division faculty agree that this is an important recommendation and one that needs to be implemented under the leadership of the Department Graduate Coordinator and program coordinator. The articulation plan for the program [http://www.uni.edu/icss/maeled/index.html](http://www.uni.edu/icss/maeled/index.html) will provide a platform for such communication and collaboration.

Involve faculty in the decision making and data collection

Under the articulation plan for the MAE in Elementary Education, [http://www.uni.edu/icss/maeled/index.html](http://www.uni.edu/icss/maeled/index.html) a section devoted to “Program Assessment and Data Collection” is being included. This is clearly an area that needs to be systematized and made integral to the program.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution __Department of Geography, University of Northern Iowa____________________________

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: __B.A. in Geography________________________
2b. List date(s) of program review: __November, 2007 – November, 2008____________________________

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators?  Yes __X__ No _____
3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: __2__

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years?  Yes __X__ No ______
4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.
   Enrollments have increased by more than a third since 2006. The department has engaged more actively in student recruitment and made curricular changes to make the program more attractive.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval?  Yes ______ No ___X__

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents?  Yes ______ No ______
6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

**Recommendation 1:** Reconsider the current emphases and develop more targeted programs to attract student interest.  Source of recommendation: Self-study pgs 7-8, external reviewer report.

Proposed Action: A lack of coherency in our human and environmental geography programs was recognized in the self-study as well as in our 2007 strategic plan. The current Geography emphasis provides a great deal of flexibility for students interested in customizing their degree, but the curriculum lacks the scope and sequence of courses that provide an identity and focus desired by many other students.

- The department developed an applied emphasis within our BA program that provides the structure needed to prepare students for careers in regional economic development and planning. This concentration is designed to give students a solid grounding in geographic principles with an option to focus in select areas of expertise such as planning, regional development, business geographics, and environmental management. These changes are pending the completion of the curriculum cycle.
We evaluated our current Environmental Geography emphasis and proposed course and sequence changes needed for students in the current career market. These changes are pending the completion of the curriculum cycle.


Geographic Information Science and Geospatial Technologies have proven to be the primary market strength of our graduates and this reflects a larger national trend highlighted by the U.S. Department of Labor. It is established that demand in the diverse field of GISc is growing fast. A degree program will not only help build an Iowa Geospatial workforce, but also create or strengthen interdisciplinary connections among Geography and other departments. A degree, over an emphasis, will raise the profile of the program as well as allow for more rigorous standards.

**Proposed Action:** During the 2008-09 curricular cycle we developed and propose a BS degree in Geographic Information Science. If realized, this will be an applied degree including a strong GISc core that is closely linked with application content that is already developed as a departmental strength. This new program will also create or strengthen interdisciplinary connections among Geography and other departments, as well as recruit more undergraduates from elsewhere on campus. We also think a degree program may help us create stronger links with community colleges, several of whom have developed GISc courses and small programs and high schools which are increasingly aware of career opportunities in GISc.

**Recommendation 3:** The department should investigate whether classes in our programs that are taught by faculty from other departments can be better integrated to provide more geography-based applications. *Source of recommendation: external reviewer report.*

**Proposed Action:** Although we do not have direct control over the content of these courses and they are not exclusively enrolled by geography students the department plans to open a dialog with the instructors regarding content to determine if there are possibilities to adjust curriculum to better serve our students needs while still meeting the needs of other students in the courses. If this is not possible, we will consider offering the most critical versions of these classes ourselves, but only after we pursue other options.

**Recommendation 4:** College-wide professional advisors should be brought into conversation with departmental advisors to further improve advising and recruitment. *Source of recommendation: external reviewer report.*

**Proposed Action:** The department has joined the freshman-advising program with UNI Academic Advising. We have also provided the university advisors with updated materials and will pursue innovative outreach options like podcasts to inform existing majors and attract new students.

**Recommendation 5:** The department should make improvements to undergraduate recruitment efforts including investigation of ways to showcase the programs to high school students. *Source of recommendation: Self-study pg 14, external reviewer report.*

**Proposed Action:**
- We will develop a comprehensive recruitment strategy focused around the redesigned curriculum that will be proposed over the next few years. This will include improved print materials, improved webpage information and review of gateway courses.
- We will attempt to establish targeted, on-site visits to community colleges with related programs to establish articulation arrangements for transfer students.
- We will attempt to market to high school students though contacts with Geography teachers made through the Geographic Alliance of Iowa and guidance counselors.
- We will pursue the option of in-class visits to Geography AP classes in the state.
Recommendation 6: The department should hire a full-time GIS lab technician, with primary responsibility as a hardware and software maintenance specialist. This will be needed if an expansion in the Geographic Information Sciences program is realized. **Source of recommendation: external reviewer report.**

**Proposed Action:** We agree this is a useful strategy to maintain our three teaching and research laboratories which require specialized experience in geospatial-based software and hardware. We currently support such a position with split funds from the college and a grant. Without this person our teaching facilities would routinely be inoperable; however, we believe the use of grant funds to sustain teaching facilities is unsustainable as a permanent solution. We have had conversations with the college regarding creative solutions, but we have no direct control of the funding required for such a line. We appreciate the current support given to us by the college and recognize that further contributions would be a substantial burden on the college. The department will pursue the opportunity if funding options do become available.

Recommendation 7: The department should re-examine teaching assignments, in the context of potential curriculum changes to determine if there is a teaching imbalance, and if so can it be relieved by reconfiguring the major. **Source of recommendation: Self-study pg 17, external reviewer report.**

**Proposed Action:** There are perceived and real differences in teaching loads. The primary inequity is associated with an historical pattern of only two people routinely teaching large LAC classes; although those instructors volunteered for the large sections. The second issue relates to some instructors buying themselves out of classes with grants.

- We have changed our policy so that large classes are more regularly rotated among several people which will allow the extra workload to be more evenly distributed.
- The department head does not intend to restrict course buyouts so long as the frequency does not impact course offerings. All faculty members are equally eligible to pursue this option should they generate the financial resources.

Recommendation 8: The department should consider developing a mechanism to recognize and reward excellent teaching of general education classes, as well as academic advising. **Source of recommendation: external reviewer report.**

**Proposed Action:** The department head has instituted reward measures for large LAC classes as well as meritorious advising in the annual merit evaluation. We will also look for additional opportunities to nominate deserving faculty members for college and university awards.

Recommendation 9: The department should consider producing some discipline-related imagery or signage that better identifies our building space as the Department of Geography. **Source of recommendation: external reviewer report.**

**Proposed Action:** Geography is housed in the Innovative Teaching & Technology Center. This building was renovated and we moved in 2006. The new space has been stark as no interior design in the corridors existed. This has created a lack of identity and an unimpressive appearance.

- The department has installed and filled four display cases with discipline-related materials. We have also invested in some artwork on the main corridor walls. Bulletin boards have been filled with various displays.
- Additional effort toward interior decoration are planned, however, this will progress slowly as we have no budget for such activates.

Recommendation 10: The College of Social and Behavioral Science should intervene to resolve the acoustics problems in the ITTC. **Source of recommendation: external reviewer report.**

**Proposed Action:** The renovation of the ITTC resulted in unacceptable acoustical conditions in classrooms and offices and represents a substantial flaw in the design of the building. The quality of the classroom environment is severely impacted by excessive ambient noise from the HVAC system, along with reverberation from hard surfaces. Students frequently complain about the echo and the roar of the air vents in classrooms and faculty have become disheartened by what is preserved as a lack of concern for learning environments by the facilities division of the university.

- We initially sought improvements while the building job was still open. Facilities Planning chose not to pursue remediation at that time even though the flaws have already been noted. Since the
renovation job was closed, we have twice requested funds through facilities improvement programs. The most recent request was made in Fall 2008 and our understanding is that it was identified as the most critical update in the academic affairs division. The state of the request is not known at this time.

**Recommendation 11:** The department should consider charging a minor lab fee of General Education students in order to maintain supplies and consumables in the large physical geography lab sections. *Source of recommendation: external reviewer report.*

**Proposed Action:** Specific support funds for lab classes in our department do not exist and the costs are currently absorbed into the department’s general operating budget. This does create financial difficulties on occasion and we would welcome more support; however, we do not wish to add additional costs to students at this time.

**Recommendation 12:** The department should receive an increase in its budget for supplies and travel. *Source of recommendation: external reviewer report.*

**Proposed Action:** We have a single supplies and services budget for all departmental/faculty/teaching expenses. Although the department would put additional resources to good use, this recommendation is outside of our control and probably ill timed with current financial conditions. We recognize that the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences is progressive and supportive and will address individual department needs to the extent that it can and with equity.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution _______________________________ Department of Geography, University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: __M.A. in Geography________________________

2b. List date(s) of program review: __November, 2007 – November, 2008__________

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes __X__ No _____

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: __2__

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes ______ No ___X__

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes ______ No ___X__

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ______ No ______

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.

Recommendation 1: The Department should consider revising the current description of program emphases in order to stress links between GIS and other subfields of geography. Source of recommendation: external reviewer report.

Proposed Action: This recommendation calls for a semantic change in the way the program is marketed. We will look at all published descriptions of the graduate program and consider updating those materials this summer and Fall in the spirit of the recommendation.

Recommendation 2: The department should develop a clear set of written guidelines for incoming graduate students that outline expectations for students and provide them with critical dates and tasks for matriculating through the program. Source of recommendation: external reviewer report.

Proposed Action: We concur with this recommendation and the department’s new graduate coordinator has been charged with this task. We expect this to be available both in hard copy and as a searchable and downloadable document from our web page during the Fall 2009 semester.
**Recommendation 3:** The two-year graduation rates should continue to be improved through changes that progress students more efficiently through the program. *2007 self-study report (page 10).*

**Proposed Action:** The matriculation rate of students has improved substantially since the last program review as a result of implementations of suggestions at that time. We agree that additional efforts might continue to improve the graduation rates.

- We have moved the required research methodology class (970:294) to the spring semester (second semester for students) and now use it to require all students to develop a defensible research proposal by the end of their first year. Currently students are required to present a proposal no later than the third week of the third semester but this often gets pushed well into the third semester or later. Although this action is to recent to assess, we believe it will encourage students to begin work on their research projects sooner and help keep them on track for a 2-year graduation.

- Along with the restructuring of the research methodology class, we now get students connected with advisors earlier in their program. They were expected to identify an advisor by the time of their proposal in the third semester. We now require students to have a research advisor by the end of their first semester. This is accomplished through policy changes with the Graduate Coordinator and policed in the second semester required class.

**Recommendation 4:** The department should increase recruitment efforts to retain students from the region, including Iowa, to make the program less reliant on international students. Funds or other resources should be made available to the Graduate Coordinator or other faculty to travel to regional geography meetings or other locations to recruit. Additionally, literature, brochures, and multi-media materials that highlight Department activities should be available. *Source of recommendation: external reviewer report, 2007 self-study report (page 10).*

**Proposed Action:** The department has recently seen more success in international recruitment than in local/regional recruitment. This is in part a response to the strong job market for undergraduates, but we still wish to strengthen our local student base.

- The department will update and create new media material for student recruitment.
- We will also attempt to fund faculty members and students to attend meetings to set up recruitment booths and talk with potential students.
- Another option we will pursue is to conduct visits to undergraduate departments around the region who are likely to have quality graduates looking for graduate programs.
- A key proposal raised by faculty members is the need to increase graduate stipends to remain competitive. The department will look at whatever options are available to us over the next year to determine if we can make adjustments.

These actions will be limited by available resources. We only have funds available from our supplies and services budget which will not allow for extensive recruitment efforts off campus. To offset this limitation, the department head and graduate coordinator will seek assistance from the Graduate College and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences once comprehensive plans are in place.

**Recommendation 5:** The college and department should discuss options for funding a full-time, dedicated GIS laboratory technician familiar with the unique needs of GIS/GIT software and hardware. *Source of recommendation: external reviewer report.*

**Proposed Action:** We agree this is a useful strategy to maintain our teaching and research laboratories which require specialized experience. We currently support such a position with split funds from the college and a grant. Without this person our teaching facilities would routinely be inoperable; however, we believe the use of grant funds to sustain teaching facilities is unsustainable as a permanent solution. We have had conversations with the college regarding creative solutions, but we have no direct control of the funding required for such a line. We appreciate the current support given to us by the college and recognize that further contributions would be a substantial burden on the college. The department will pursue the opportunity if funding options do become available.
Recommendation 6: The functionality of the building as a learning environment should be improved by addition of acoustic tiles or other measures deemed appropriate. Source of recommendation: external reviewer report.

Proposed Action: The renovation of the ITTC resulted in unacceptable acoustical conditions in classrooms and offices and represents a substantial flaw in the design of the building. The quality of the classroom environment is severely impacted by excessive ambient noise from the HVAC system, along with reverberation from hard surfaces. Students frequently complain about the echo and the roar of the air vents in classrooms and faculty have become disheartened by what is preserved as a lack of concern for learning environments by the facilities division of the university.

- We initially sought improvements while the building job was still open. Facilities Planning choose not to pursue remediation at that time even though the flaws has already been noted. Since the renovation job was closed, we have twice requested funds through facilities improvement programs. The most recent request was made in Fall 2008 and our understanding is that it was identified as the most critical update in the academic affairs division. The state of the request is not known at this time.

Recommendation 7: The graduate school should provide another graduate assistantship to the Department to allow for a more stable and diverse graduate student population and continue to support of a quality program. Source of recommendation: external reviewer report.

Proposed Action: This recommendation is outside the control of the department. Although we would welcome additional assistantship support, it is important to note that the Graduate College has traditionally been generous and supportive of the Geography M.A. program. We have been aggressive in seeking external funding for graduate students and we will continue to do so. The concern with such a strong focus on external funding is that it has tended to create a narrow focus of interest among the graduate students. We will attempt to support and encourage more faculty members to write grants to diversity the student research emphases.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution's mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: Graduate Programs in Industrial Technology MA/MS and DIT

2b. List date(s) of program review: January, 2009

3a. Was the program reviewed by non-institutional evaluators? Yes X No

3b. Number of non-institutional evaluators: 2

4a. Has there been a change in enrollment in the program of more than a third in the last three years? Yes No X

4b. If yes, please explain the reasons for this change.

5. Is this the first time that this program has been reviewed since initial approval? Yes No X

6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes No

6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
RESPONSES TO THE GRADUATE PROGRAM
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS’ REPORT

These specific concerns or recommendations were each discussed by the departmental faculty as a whole and the resulting responses, pro or con, were recorded. These records then served as the basis for assembly of this document.

LOW STUDENT ENROLLMENT:

Several proposed ideas as well as changes are already in process. More graduate assistantships for the graduate program will boost enrollment. The stipends should be competitive with the rest of the country. Working with more industrial partners and distance learning will boost enrollment beyond what we currently do with ICN classes. The new program brochures have already helped the program numbers and the developing John Deere M.S. program has stimulated more graduate applications.

In addition, international students are not notified in a timely manner of their acceptance into our programs. In addition, it was noted that there would be merit in having the department be directly responsible for admissions. In addition, we need more faculty involvement as graduate advisors to foster the graduate student and research “climate” in the department.

STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS:

We are in the process of conducting additional student outcomes assessments for the graduate program. This is being done in the manner that was formerly used to assess undergraduates. We will use web-based responses to relevant questions and plan to request participation of graduate students going back 10 years for M.A. and 15 years for D.I.T.

NEED FOR MORE/UPDATED LABORATORY RESOURCES AND EQUIPMENT:

There is a definite need for updated laboratory resources and equipment. We have requested a sizable number of items from any available “end of the year” funds through the CNS Dean’s office. We have also initiated significant purchases to replace both older equipment as well as procuring some newer technology based equipment. We will utilize the existing funds from the university and a donated “Fund of Excellence” as possible. The equipment needs in technology are large and change as technology changes so we have needs well beyond current resources. We will continue to seek infrastructural support from multiple sources.

PEDAGOGICAL COURSE OFFERINGS IN THE D.I.T.:

Previously the majority of D.I.T. graduates went into academia. However, there are recent trends toward a position with industry. Because of the interest in academia as a career outcome, the reviewers brought attention to the pedagogical course offerings within Industrial Technology and those that might relate from the College of Education. Future course offerings for Industrial Technology students may incorporate more from the College of Education. Currently, D.I.T. students already take 12-15 hours of course work from the College of Education; they have the flexibility to take more courses as desired in collaboration with their graduate committee.

Discussion of the “Professional Curriculum Development Plan” (PCDP) also known as the “Plan of Study” needs to be clarified to graduate students, perhaps as part of a “To Do List” for students. This nomenclatural congruity needs to be clarified with the Registrar and Graduate College.

UPDATING CORE CURRICULUM FOR D.I.T. TO INCLUDE MORE PEDAGOGY AND RESEARCH EXPERIENCES:

This question overlaps with the previous question. A research class has been added for a total of three research classes. The PCDP should be done the first semester of the program. It appears that the external reviewers’ perception of our research, as related to the students PCDP, was not clearly understood. Because of the needed “steps” for the DIT students, we plan to put the progression list online; there is a sequence of graduate students’ classes. This will be enhanced by the planned Graduate Committee’s effort to update the handbook/list for the students.

There is a graduate student meeting held before classes start in the fall for all graduate students, but attendance is insufficient. We need to adopt a more focused and designation of importance to graduate students; they should be held accountable as participants in the program. Graduate assistants (GA) should not assume they will
automatically continue being a GA, as continuation is dependent upon satisfactory academic and duty performance.

More grant support for graduate assistantships is necessary, as possible, relative to the funding sources. Collectively a model that enables greater recognition and support of graduate education at UNI is needed as it pertains throughout graduate education at UNI.

INCLUDE OTHER FORMS OF D.I.T. INTERNSHIPS OUTSIDE INDUSTRY AND A VARIETY OF LOCAL INDUSTRIES:

The external reviewers must have misunderstood or not been adequately informed as this is already part of the D.I.T. experience; we routinely have student internships placed with John Deere and other local companies.

NEW GRADUATE PROGRAM LINKED TO PSM PROGRAMS TO INTEGRATE NATURAL SCIENCES WITH TECHNOLOGY; MORE SUBJECT INTEGRATION ACROSS DEPARTMENTS:

The external reviewers commented on the merit of linking a new or revised graduate program to other Professional Science Masters (PSM) degrees on campus. The existing PSM programs are relatively new on campus and there was some discussion of having such degree programs in each of the College of Natural Science’s (CNS) departments, including Industrial Technology. Since the department’s graduate degree programs already include significant external business/industry practical contact, the need for a new PSM degree program, following the pattern of the others on campus, was not viewed as prudent. Because we already offered some course work that could logically benefit the PSM programs, as they were developed in the other CNS departments, the Industrial Technology Department asked other departments to integrate their PSM programs with existing Industrial Technology courses and programs. However, these offers were declined. Apparently, the reviewers simply did not know our history.

COLLABORATION WITH CORE RESEARCH COURSES IN THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION:

The nature of core research courses in Industrial Technology is not congruent with those in the College of Education. Therefore, this suggestion does not apply.

MORE FACULTY COLLABORATION WITHIN AND ACROSS DEPARTMENTS:

This is a good idea as it will strengthen our research efforts and open the avenues of cross-disciplinary research for expanded funding and knowledge gain. In fact, collaboration already exists with Chemistry, Physics, Math and Computer Science. Previously there has also been collaborative work with Biology. In summary, the execution of cross-disciplinary research is encouraged and appreciated within the department. To this end, there is ongoing work toward development of “The School of Technology” (SOT) that will foster and support course work and research across disciplines both within CNS and with other academic units outside the college. A beginning step in developing the SOT will be the offering of three new cross-disciplinary courses in the fall of 2009.

CHANGE TITLE OF D.I.T. TO DOCTORATE OF TECHNOLOGY (DT) WITH UMBRELLA APPROACH TO INCLUSION OF DEPARTMENTAL AND UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS:

Our D.I.T. degree was approved by the Iowa legislature in 1978 as well as the Board of Regents. Earlier this academic year the Department of Industrial Technology voted to inquire as to the feasibility of changing the existing D.I.T. degree to a Ph.D. degree. Some view it as a step backward to take away the word “Industrial” from the Industrial Technology department. Others see a change of name and orientation to the Ph.D. or alternatively to the Doctor of Technology (DT), that would foster cross-disciplinary research, as a positive move. Such a change is not without concern and disagreement on its merits, but there appears to be a departmental consensus that a constructive revision would have merit as a way to reinvigorate the doctoral level program.

MARKETING AND DELIVERY THROUGH DISTANCE TECHNOLOGIES:

It was suggested that our doctoral program needs to be doing more marketing and delivery through distance technologies. Such distance delivery might have four semesters physically on campus before students would be allowed to take online courses. Appropriate options for the implementation of distance delivery are now under consideration and will require considerable discussion.
COMBINE EFFORTS OF M.S. SEVEN AREAS INTO TWO E.G., MANUFACTURING AND CONSTRUCTION:

It was noted that the department just revised the master’s degree curriculum to encompass seven M.S. areas. This started in the fall of 2008. Since the M.S. program is brand new, the department will have a review process to examine the student numbers/demand in each of the seven areas in two years and reduce the number of M.S. areas down to two or three as warranted.

COLLABORATE WITH COLLEGE OF EDUCATION FOR A DEGREE IN TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION AND TRAINING.

We already collaborate with the College of Education in technology education and training at the undergraduate level and are one of the options in the new M.S. degree program. We do not anticipate a new graduate degree with such a focus. It appears that the reviewers missed the mark on this one.

MARKET THE GRADUATE PROGRAM AND PROMOTE TWO DEGREES AS ONE.

After discussion, the consensus was that, in practice, foreign students are more likely to continue through the two degrees, but domestic students do not. The option to obtain the two degrees sequentially should be strongly marketed by the department, graduate school and university as a whole.

REDUCE THE GRADUATE COORDINATORS LOAD.

Some UNI departments do rotating course release time; this would be very suitable for non-teaching load activities, like the graduate coordinator. Another option would be to provide an honorarium to support the extra duties of the graduate coordinator. After discussion, consensus was that this will be difficult to accomplish and is not feasible at this time due to economic considerations.

INCREASE GRANT WRITING AND OUTSIDE FUNDING (RESEARCH ASSISTANTSHIPS). CHANGE THE CULTURE OF THE DEPARTMENT TO BE MORE RESEARCH ORIENTED.

Wherever permitted the faculty are encouraged to include budget funds for graduate assistantships when writing grants. As a result of some discussion, consensus was that because Industrial Technology programs are very “applied” the nature of related external funding sources usually does not provide GA support. The areas of Manufacturing and Electrical Information Engineering Technology fit best for grant writing that would support GA positions. Faculty members from those areas are working with OSP to identify grant-writing opportunities. In addition, most Industrial Technology majors work with industry partners and can seek outside funding opportunities there.

MANAGE AND USE GRADUATE STUDENTS IN TEACHING AND RESEARCH FOR PUBLICATION WITH FACULTY.

Faculty expressed the need to evaluate incoming graduate students during the admission process to determine where incoming GAs would best fit into the areas of the department as teaching and research assistants. It was also noted that as part of this process rotating GA assignments among faculty members would benefit both GAs and faculty. New incoming graduate students, that have received assistantship assignments, were matched to areas that best fit their existing background and expertise.

JUNIOR FACULTY SHOULD HAVE A MORE ACTIVE ROLE IN GRADUATE EDUCATION.

There is a need to involve younger faculty and include them in rotating faculty assigned to teach graduate classes. This need is recognized by the departmental administration.

The PAC views both senior and junior faculty publications co-authored with graduate students as positive. While faculty should be managers’ of graduate student research, for PAC purposes there is no difference in assessing which is listed as the first author, graduate student or faculty member.

WORK TO HAVE ORGANIZED AND CLEAN LABS.

To achieve this we all need to act collaboratively to maintain clean labs. This is especially true in the Metal Casting Center and the Solar Boat project area. As we all benefit from organized and clean labs, we need to collaborate with UNI custodial staff to clarify what cleaning and custodial duties are their responsibility as differentiated from that of the faculty, students and staff.
REVIEW CORE COURSE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE M.S. AND D.I.T. PROGRAMS FOR RELEVANCY AND CURRENCY OF CONTENT.

It is recognized that technology is ever changing and therefore the Industrial Technology Graduate Committee was charged with reviewing both graduate programs and making recommendations on desirable updates.
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regents Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.

1. Institution: University of Northern Iowa

2a. List title and degree level(s) of the program reviewed: B.A. in Graphic Communications  
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Review by the visiting team for the National Association of Industrial Technology (NAIT), April, 2008
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6a. If new, has the program met all the goals and objectives planned at the time it received planning approval by the Board of Regents? Yes ______ No ______
6b. If not, why not?

7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
Industrial Technology Responses to the NAIT External Review of Undergraduate Programs in Construction Management, Graphic Communications, Manufacturing Technology and Technology Management

6.3.16 Program Publicity – Adequate and Accurate Public Disclosure: Institutions shall broadly and accurately publicize, particularly to prospective students: (a) Industrial Technology program goals and objectives, (b) preadmission testing or evaluation requirements and standards, (c) assessment measures used to advance students through the program(s), (d) educational achievement rates of graduates, and (e) fees and other charges.

Item c above: We have done outcomes assessments and this has some value in advising our students of backgrounds related to job opportunities. In addition the university has specific GPA requirements for students to continue in good standing in the university. This information is generally available and is shared with students as needed through our departmental advising. We have a dedicated office/person for student advising and assistance. We will make this information available to our students prior to experiencing difficulties as it may serve as a stimulus to engender greater academic efforts. Making prospective students aware of the standards would also clarify university expectations. Our departmental advising office is also updating our website and will include the type of information related to item c. Specifically, our advising staff will be reviewing and revising our web sites this coming summer.

We currently advertise the fact that the departmental programs noted above are Accredited by the National Association of Industrial Technology (NAIT), now called The Association of Technology, Management, and Applied Engineering (ATMAE). This accreditation based on assessment by this external organization supports the credibility of our programs.

6.5.1 Full-Time Faculty: Each major program and program option shall have an adequate number of appropriately qualified full-time faculty. Faculty qualifications shall include emphasis upon extent, recency, and pertinence of: (a) academic preparation, (b) industrial professional level experience (such as technical supervision or management), (c) applied industrial experience (such as technical applications), (d) membership and participation in appropriate Industrial Technology professional organizations, and (e) scholarly activities.

Items b and c above. Consultation with the faculty members found that the external reviewers did not see the full vitae of the faculty members, only an abbreviated version as requested. Therefore, this item did not appear to need further attention.

Item e above. This is an area needing improvement. As a result of this external review, this need for development has been and will continue to be stressed to the faculty. As new leadership has recently come into this department, increased scholarship activities are being stressed to the faculty. In keeping with this need, we have begun a new faculty seminar series that highlights existing scholarly success and shines light on the need for expansion in this area. Incentives for more scholarly activities will also be evident as merit funds are dispersed. Such increased focus on scholarship will become apparent in the next academic year.

6.6.3 Placement of Graduates: The initial placement, job titles, job descriptions, and salaries of graduates shall be consistent with the program(s) goals and objectives. The advancement of graduates within organizations shall be tracked to ensure advancement to positions of increasing responsibility. Industry’s reaction to graduates as employees must be favorable. Follow-up studies of graduates shall be conducted every two to five years. Summary statistics related to follow-up studies of graduates shall be made available to prospective students. These statistics shall include placement rates as well as salary levels of program graduates.

There is a need to provide statistics related to placement rates and salary levels to prospective students. Broad information on placement and salaries is made available from the UNI placement office. Related information regarding professional salaries is available on the internet. In addition, we are in the process of developing an internet-based survey of our graduates that will provide examples of key businesses that hire our graduates and the generic salary levels received by our graduates. The results of this survey will be made available on our web site with the planned revisions in the site this coming summer (as noted above in item 6.3.16 c).
THE PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW: Board of Regent's Policy (§6.05B) requires that each Regent university review each academic program once every seven years to help ensure that the program being reviewed is still relevant, of the highest quality and consistent with the institution’s mission and strategic plan. A special focus of the reviews is on assessing the teaching and learning processes, and on the collection and utilization of student outcomes assessment results for programmatic improvement.
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7. List the recommendations, conclusions, and program improvements resulting from this review, especially those resulting from student outcomes assessments.
RESPONSES TO THE EXTERNAL REVIEWER’S REPORT

TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

STUDENT RECRUITMENT FROM PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES
This coming summer, our Technology Education Program Coordinator will work with our Student Advisor/Recruiter and the office staff to prepare a recruiting packet for the fall 2009 semester. Additional recruitment is also planned for the next Industrial Technology and Training Education (ITTE) Conference.

COURSE AVAILABILITY AND SCHEDULING
As we are operating with only one faculty member fully focused on Technology Education. We have to rely on the use of adjuncts and one other Industrial Technology faculty member as part time support of Technology Education. Therefore, we have increased our need to use more adjunct faculty. This means that more courses are offered at night because of adjunct availability. We have discussed the need for an additional faculty person focused in Technology Education with the CNS Dean.

FEMALE AND MINORITY RECRUITMENT
The Technology Education Program Coordinator is working on a research project with STEM to recruit females. There are only 20 female faculty members out of 700 technology education teachers in the state of Iowa. Work on surveys to enhance recruitment of more females into the technology education area is underway. It was suggested that interested junior high or high school students could come to UNI and the Department of Industrial Technology for a day to observe the department.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL HANDS-ON ACTIVITIES
Existing activities are hands-on and maybe the reviewers just did not see the actual activities when they were here visiting. However, it was noted that the reviewers would like the technology education activities to mirror the public classrooms. Admittedly, we have equipment limitations and technology education teaching limitations as our courses as a whole in the department are more industrial. One suggestion from the faculty was to provide mini-courses with presentations and participation. This may be a good way to fill key skills and is under consideration for fall offerings. The reviewers commented on this point because the actual “shop” projects were removed nationwide from much of the curriculum in the 1960’s. It is recognized that we need more hands-on projects; Technology Education students need more hands-on skills inherent to the field.

INCLUDE MEDICAL AND AGRICULTURAL/BIO-RELATED TECHNOLOGY STANDARDS
Currently there are 20 standards with IITEA and 7 emphases rather than the original 5. There is no justification to add more and we do not have the resources to do it.

SUBMIT A FOLIO TO NCAT/CTTE/ITEA STANDARDS BOARD
A curriculum plan was submitted to the Association for Career and Technical Education (ACTE) and the Department of Industrial Technology won the Outstanding Program for Academic Excellence Award for our Technology Education Program. ACTE did not review us, only ITEA. ITEA standards are more liberal arts oriented, whereas, ACTE is career oriented. The UNI Department of Industrial Technology was one of the first to be accredited by NCATE (in 1990). Then, UNI dropped the NCATE accreditation.

TAKE ADVANTAGE OF FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES WITH NSF AND NAE
These and other funding avenues are being promoted within the department and through the UNI Office of Sponsored Programs.

DEVELOP A MODULAR TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY
Industrial Technology already has a modular lab. The modular technology laboratory equipment is only about six years old but some other equipment in the building is much older. In practice, the Technology Education Laboratory is too small. There has been repeated discussion of pushing through the wall into Room 4 as currently there is no available space and no resources available for more than two
pieces of equipment. The department anticipates a major remodeling of the building infrastructure, but this has been delayed due to funding. Such changes will be a major help to the space needs of all entities in the department.

NEED FOR ELEMENTARY TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION EMPHASIS
Currently, there are no elementary technology education classes in Iowa, but this will be discussed with the director of science education.

MORE PUBLIC RELATIONS NEEDED FOR TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION ACROSS CAMPUS
There is a definite distinction between education technology and technology education. They are often confused with each other. There is a need for more public relations for technology education across campus and beyond. The current efforts of our faculty and advising staff should help to address this need.
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Attached as requested are reports summarizing academic program reviews conducted at the University of Northern Iowa. These reports are for programs reviewed during the 2007-08 academic year including programs in:
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