



UNLV | College of
EDUCATION

Leadership - Innovation - Impact
Forging A Path To Tier 1
A Report to the UNLV College of Education
Faculty and Administration



CEB

by the

Task Force Alignment Committee

August 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Table of Contents</i>	1
<i>Executive Summary</i>	3
<i>Introduction and Background to the Report</i>	4
<i>Introduction to Analysis</i>	7
Goal 1: Increase External Dollars Generated for Research	9
Goal 2: Increase Number of Ph.D. Graduates	12
Goal 3: Increase External Development Dollars Generated	14
Goal 4: Increase Scholarly Productivity	17
Goal 5: Dramatically Increase the Production of New Teachers	20
<i>Cross-Cutting Themes</i>	22
<i>Recommendations</i>	23
<i>Next Steps</i>	26
<i>Task Force Groups</i>	27
Ensuring Support and Engagement in Research Productivity.....	27
Expanding Initial Licensure Programs.....	27
Quality Assurance, Accountability, and SPA Accreditation	27
Expanding the Reach, Visibility, and Impact of the College	27
Aligning P&T, Merit, and Goals	27
Strengthening Doctoral Programs.....	28
Differentiated Staffing, Equity, & Tier I Productivity	28
Task Force Alignment Committee	28

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In July 2013 Dr. Kim Metcalf became Dean of the UNLV College of Education with a clear charge from the University leadership to establish for the College a greater state and national presence and to engage the COE in exerting greater leadership and influence on education. Almost immediately, Dean Metcalf initiated a fact-finding mission, talking with faculty, staff, campus leaders, educational leaders in Clark County and the state, influential members of the business community, legislators and other policy makers, and COE alumni.

With these conversations in mind, the Dean crafted a vision for the COE, one that has the support of the UNLV leadership, reflects the interests and needs of the College's stakeholders and is supported by the COE faculty.

The College of Education will achieve prominence locally, nationally, and internationally as a leading source of significant knowledge and innovative models to inform and affect policy, practice, and research.

To achieve the vision, the Dean created seven faculty-led Task Forces, each with a specific charge and chaired by a senior faculty member. The Task Forces were:

- Aligning Promotion & Tenure and Merit Criteria with Tier 1 Goals
- Balancing Differentiated Staffing, Equity, and Tier 1 Productivity
- Expanding Initial Licensure Programs
- Ensuring Support and Engagement in Research Productivity
- Growing Doctoral Programs
- Expanding the Reach, Visibility, and Impact of the College
- Quality Assurance, Accountability, and SPA Accreditation

In order to promote creativity in developing recommendations, each Task Force was asked to work independently of and without information about recommendations being crafted by other Task Forces. Each of the seven Task Forces presented its distinct recommendations to the full faculty and invited guests in a Symposium held on May 15, 2014.

A Task Force Alignment Committee (TFAC) consisting of one representative of each Task Force was formed during Summer 2014. This committee's charge was to develop a comprehensive and integrated set of recommendations for the COE from across the seven Task Forces.

The TFAC began by extrapolating from the seven Task Force reports five major goals for achieving the vision of the COE.

- Goal 1: Increase external dollars generated for research
- Goal 2: Increase the number of Ph.D. graduates
- Goal 3: Increase external development dollars generated
- Goal 4: Increase scholarly productivity
- Goal 5: Dramatically increase the production of new teachers

The Task Force Alignment Committee then analyzed the seven Task Force Reports for: Lag Measures Strategies for what needs to be done; Lead Measures to chart progress; and

suggested Action Plans that define who is responsible for doing what. Engaging in this process brought to light nine cross-cutting themes that permeated the work of the Task Forces and which are presented in this Report.

The TFAC completed the final stage of its work by achieving consensus on eleven recommendations for actions that the members believed to be necessary to achieve the COE vision and goals.

Recommendation 1: Charge the COE Associate Dean for Research and Sponsored Projects with establishing baseline metrics for research funding and Ph.D. graduate student completion (the top two key metrics for Tier 1 status).

Recommendation 2: Seek a position and funding from UNLV administration for a Director of Assessment for the COE charged with to creating a comprehensive system for tracking student success from acceptance to completion to employment and beyond.

Recommendation 3: The COE Dean, working with the College's Development Officer and others, will develop a systematic plan for increasing development dollars.

Recommendation 4: The COE Marketing Director will create a marketing plan to increase the visibility of the college.

Recommendation 5: Explore and develop innovative ways for dramatically increasing the number of quality teacher candidates selected, prepared, and hired into teaching positions in Clark County and Nevada.

Recommendation 6: Charge the COE Promotion and Tenure Committee and the COE Merit Committee with the task of addressing external funding, doctoral student advising, scholarship, and differentiated staffing in the P & T bylaws and merit process.

Recommendation 7: Immediately recognize funding applications, funding successes, and outstanding scholarly productivity, while also working to institutionalize such incentives and recognitions to stimulate ongoing efforts in these two areas.

Recommendation 8: Charge the Executive Associate Dean with developing a list of key partners, internal and/or external, who can assist with achieving the five major goals for the College.

Recommendation 9: Charge the Director of Assessment with creating a dashboard on the website for all Lag and Lead indicators.

Recommendation 10: The Office of the Associate Dean for Research and Sponsored Projects should propose hiring both an administrative assistant for grant development and administration and a grant writer and should develop and regularly disseminate information about funding opportunities and potential collaborators.

Recommendation 11: Develop a comprehensive diversity plan for the COE.

Next Steps

- ❑ The Fall 2014 opening (Back-to-School) COE faculty/staff meeting serves as the starting point for implementation of the report. It begins with an invitation to the faculty and staff to read the report and address comments to the Dean or any member of the Task Force Alignment Committee. Everyone is invited to have a voice in critique and reaction.
- ❑ During 2014-15, specific action plans for implementing and using the recommendations will be developed at the College, Department, and program levels. At the same time, any recommendations that require consideration or approval through faculty committees or other governance bodies will be processed by the appropriate committees.
- ❑ The effectiveness of the plans and the ongoing appropriateness of the recommendations will be revisited at least once each year.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT

In July 2013 Dr. Kim Metcalf became Dean of the UNLV College of Education. The University leadership, in hiring Dr. Metcalf, made clear their expectations of him and the College of Education (COE): He was to establish for the College a greater state and national presence and engage the COE in exerting greater leadership and influence on education. During the first two months of his tenure, Dean Metcalf conducted a fact-finding mission, talking with faculty, staff, campus leaders, educational leaders in Clark County and the state, influential members of the business community, legislators and other policy makers, and COE alumni – conversations that continue.

Out of these meetings and conversations, several issues quickly emerged, both externally and internally. Externally, there is a great need for qualified education professionals to meet the annual demand for new teachers in CCSD. While some negative perceptions about the COE and the quality of its graduates persist, despite data to the contrary, there is strong statewide pressure for COE engagement in education, coupled with a dearth of higher education leadership. Internally, there is recognition of the visibility, impact, and strength that come from envisioning and achieving Tier 1 status as a University and as a College. Yet, to seek this elevated status will likely require additional change within the COE, a unit that has undergone significant upheavals and where skepticism over more change is understandably high.

The possibility for responding effectively to these needs and expectations, even in the face of the challenges, appears promising for several important reasons:

- ✓ the UNLV PRESIDENT is committed to enhancing the prestige and impact of the institution and of the COE;
- ✓ there is high DEMAND for COE graduates, who are considered strong;
- ✓ there is EAGERNESS for COE engagement and leadership in addressing educational issues in Clark County and across the state;
- ✓ the senior faculty has recruited a growing cohort of early career colleagues with considerable PROMISE;
- ✓ there is great OPPORTUNITY for contributions in research and practice.

With these possibilities in mind, the Dean crafted a vision for the COE, one that embraces the opportunities he heard for expanded *leadership*, increased *innovation*, and a broader *impact* for the UNLV College of Education.

The College of Education will achieve prominence locally, nationally, and internationally as a leading source of significant knowledge and innovative models to inform and affect policy, practice, and research.

Achieving this vision will require the College to focus attention and resources in at least four key areas:

- ✓ Improve the reputation and expand reach of College
- ✓ Improve College performance on Tier 1 measures:
 - Academic quality of students
 - Doctorates, Post-Doctorates granted

- Research expenditures
- National ranking
- ✓ Increase enrollments and completion rates at all levels, particularly in initial licensure programs
- ✓ Increase substantive capital gifts

Interwoven with these four areas is the synergy that may be generated by using the increased instructional demand needed to increase enrollments (particularly at the initial licensure levels) as a basis for resources that will support recruitment of greater numbers of high quality doctoral students. The increased availability of doctoral students and intentional focus of tenure-track faculty on upper division and graduate teaching and research activity should lead to greater research productivity and expanded visibility. However, this approach presents a series of tactical or procedural issues that must be thoughtfully addressed.

An essential strategy lay in gaining clarity, depth, and buy-in from the faculty on how to address these tactical issues and to realize the larger vision. To achieve these ends, the Dean created seven faculty-led Task Forces, each with a specific charge and chaired by a senior faculty member.¹

The seven Task Forces and charges were:

TF 1: Aligning Promotion & Tenure and Merit Criteria with Tier 1 Goals and College Expectations

Charge: Develop specific recommendations for aligning departmental and college criteria and processes to ensure that they consistently encourage and support the types of activity and levels of productivity that are required to achieve and maintain Tier 1 status.

TF 2: Balancing Differentiated Staffing, Equity, and Tier 1 Productivity

Charge: Develop specific recommendations for the design and implementation of a system of instructional staffing that optimizes instructional capacity and quality while supporting research productivity among faculty.

TF 3: Expanding Initial Licensure Programs

Charge: Develop specific recommendations to support the expansion and dramatic growth of initial licensure programs by which the College and its respective departments meet at least 80% of anticipated/projected market need.

TF 4: Ensuring Support and Engagement in Research Productivity

Charge: Develop specific recommendations for improving the research capacity and productivity of all members of the College, but particularly doctoral students and tenure-track faculty members.

TF 5: Growing Doctoral Programs

Charge: Develop specific recommendations for effectively increasing the quantity, quality, diversity, and success of full-time doctoral students.

¹ Task Force members and reports are posted in Google Docs and accessible from the COE website.

TF 6: Expanding the Reach, Visibility, and Impact of the College

Charge: Develop specific recommendations for expanding the reach, visibility, and impact of the College in ways that raise awareness of the College's contributions and promote progress toward the important goals of the College.

TF 7: Quality Assurance, Accountability, and SPA Accreditation

Charge: Explore options and make recommendations for ensuring rigorous program accountability and transparency to all stakeholders regarding the specific SPA accreditations that the College and its constituent programs should pursue in order to ensure quality and highlight academic and programmatic integrity.

Process/Timeline

- November and December 2013 were used to form each Task Force, identify Task Force facilitators, and prepare materials to support the work of each Task Force.
- Every tenure-track faculty member was asked to participate in at least one Task Force; all Faculty-in-Residence and Directors who serve in relevant roles were also invited to serve on appropriate Task Forces.
- Each Task Force was constituted to reflect a balance of faculty ranks, programs, and departments.
- Each Task Force was led by a facilitator, identified by the Dean from those expressing interest in serving in this capacity, whose responsibility was to coordinate the work of the group.
- The Dean engaged an external consultant to assist in supporting and facilitating the process from January to the completion of the final report.
- The COE January 2014 "Back-to-School" meeting was organized as a retreat during which the Task Forces began their work.
- Task Forces met at least monthly from January through April including time for cross-group sharing of progress; at the discretion of each group, some additional meetings were held, and outside guests (e.g., CCSD representatives, non-tenure-track faculty members) were invited as appropriate.
- During this period, each Task Force was asked to work independently and without knowledge of the recommendations being developed by other Task Forces. The intent was to allow each Task Force to create recommendations that it believed were most promising.
- Each Task Force presented its report and recommendations at a Faculty Symposium and reception on May 15, which was also attended by numerous invited guests from the education, political, and community sectors in Nevada.
- During summer 2014 Task Force facilitators or their designees were engaged as the Task Force Alignment Committee (TFAC) in formulating a comprehensive and integrated set of recommendations, measures, and suggested actions from the distinct recommendations made by the seven Task Forces. Each member of the TFAC received a Letter of Appointment for the equivalent of one course during summer 2014 to support this work.
- The final report of the Task Force Alignment Committee was submitted to the Dean on August 1st for his consideration and will be officially unveiled at the first COE faculty meeting of the 2014-15 academic year.

INTRODUCTION TO ANALYSIS

The analysis is divided into five sections, each corresponding to a major College goal. Organizing the analysis by the goals is a logical approach that the Task Force Alignment Committee (TFAC) agreed upon, since the College is ultimately measured on and accountable for these goals. In this sense, all departments, faculty, and staff in the COE have a stake in the movement toward and achievement of these goals.

Various data sources informed the analysis for each section. The reports from the seven Task Forces that met throughout the 2014 Spring semester provided a primary source of input into the TFAC's deliberations. Using this input as a foundation, the TFAC also generated additional ideas to inform the analysis. The TFAC took into consideration the Dean's responses to the emerging work but retained autonomy throughout the process. Finally, strategic work is enhanced by an external perspective, and the COE's external consultant not only guided the process but provided insights and ideas as well.

It should be noted that the TFAC was respectful of the history of the COE even as it embraced the challenge to help chart its path forward. The members concurred that understanding the history of the COE is essential to envisioning its future.

Each section of this analysis is organized around a summary table. Each summary table has four columns:

1. **Lag Measures.** In management and administration literature, a major goal is often referred to as a "Lag Measure" and we adopt that nomenclature here.
2. **Strategies.** The strategies are general statements that inform subsequent action plans (which are more specific) and related measures. Strategies often communicate "What needs to be done."
3. **Lead Measures.** Lead Measures are indicators or activities that help an organization move toward the Lag Measure. Lead Measures may **a)** capture data that define dimensions of the Lag Measure and the organization's status on those dimensions, or **b)** define activities that should result in movement toward the Lag Measure. The Lead Measures are a gauge of progress recommended by strategies and action plans. Lead Measures should correlate to the Lag Measures.
4. **Action Plans.** Action plans emerge from the examination of Lag Measures, strategies, and Lead Measures. Action plans might identify who is responsible for a specific action or sketch the timeline in which that action should take place. The more specific the action plan, the more likely there will be tangible movement toward actualizing strategies and moving the needle on the Lag and Lead Measures. Action plans often communicate, "How we need to act on the strategies to start improving the measures."

A one to two page narrative follows each summary table to explicate main points of the analysis for each Lag Measure. The TFAC did not suggest timelines for the action plans at this stage. The Associate Dean, who should oversee progress toward increasing the number of Ph.D. graduates, should assign timelines at the beginning of the Fall 2014 semester.

The first measurable goal is to increase the amount of external dollars generated for research, in alignment with the push for Tier 1 status as a College and University. In order to meet this goal, a number of strategies with Lead Measures and suggested actions to implement those strategies are presented. Additionally, TFAC members working on this goal examined recent reforms within the College of Education and Human Development at Washington State University (WSU), an institution also aspiring to Tier 1 status. WSU based its reform model on that of the University of Washington (recently the highest grossing university in the nation in terms of external research dollars).

Goal 1 Strategies

The first set of strategies is intended to encourage faculty to seek external funding for research through the adjustment of faculty workload to better reflect a priority on research and external funding. This includes aligning merit, tenure, and promotion criteria to expectations for external funding and a change in how workloads are officially determined. Specifically, this would involve adjusting guidelines for promotion and tenure, as well as merit, to reflect a focus on scholarship, for example a 40/40/20 or 40/30/30 load (Research/Teaching/Service, respectively).

In order to better support faculty pursuit of external funding for research and to ease the process of administering grants once awarded, the second set of strategies focuses on development of infrastructure and support at the college level, particularly in the Office of the Associate Dean for Research and Sponsored Projects. Improvements to infrastructure include personnel needed to streamline the administration of funded projects and the electronic and physical resources needed to foster a culture in which applying for external funding is a priority.

The third and final set of strategies for increasing the generation of external dollars for research is the strategic utilization of doctoral students. Involving doctoral students in all parts of the research cycle should have wide-ranging effects on the success of funded projects, the success of doctoral programs and thus graduates, and the visibility of the University as a whole.

Goal 1 Lead Measures

Implementation of adjustments to merit, promotion, and tenure criteria, following the assessment of the current situation, will require annual faculty documentation and reporting of the number of proposals they have submitted, the number funded, external dollars generated, external dollars per funded project, and level of involvement (member, co-Principal Investigator, Principal Investigator). Lead Measures necessary to begin the process of adjusting faculty workload are 1) determining the percentage of faculty teaching three or more courses as compared to those teaching two or fewer courses per semester, and 2) documentation of faculty advising loads at the master's and doctoral levels, in order to determine how time is being allocated for scholarship and research. This will need to be paired with an analysis of the time committed by faculty to committee work and other service outlets and the analysis of potential redundancies within those committees in order to gain a more complete picture of how faculty spend their time.

The Lead Measures associated with the actions suggested for the Office of the Associate Dean for Research are largely binary in nature (i.e., Y/N). Progress towards the overall strategies can be measured in terms of whether or not the suggested actions listed in the

GOAL 1: INCREASE EXTERNAL DOLLARS GENERATED FOR RESEARCH

Table 1

Lag Measure	Suggested Strategies	Lead Measures	Suggested Actions
<p>Increase external dollars generated for research</p>	Encourage seeking of external \$	# of proposals submitted	Program/ Departments/ COE collect funding data for suggested metrics
	Tie P&T and merit to external funding	# of funded proposals	
	Adjust P&T and merit guidelines to focus on scholarship (e.g., 40/40/20, 40/30/30) (T1/T4; long-term).	External \$ generated	Create database of funding sources and faculty interest
	Reorganize time to focus on research.	\$/funded project	
	Adjust teaching and service loads to enhance productivity (T2).	Document funding sources per grant	P&T meets to address external funding.
	-----	Document level of involvement (member, Co-PI, PI)	
	Use doctoral students strategically	Faculty discuss workload policy (Y/N)	COE bylaws committee address workload and faculty adopt policy (Fall 2014).
	-----	Percentage of faculty teaching 3+ courses/ percentage of faculty teaching 2 or less.	
	Create a centralized resource for grant support.	Advising load across faculty and departments	Establish criteria/policies for use of reassigned time.
	Incentivize faculty/PI proposals (indirect costs).	Doc student teaching loads	
	Advertise funding opportunities	Doctoral dissertation grant \$	
		COE\$ for grant support	
		AA for budget/admin Y/N	
	Grant writer Y/N		
	Create newsletter for RFPs, etc, Y/N		

following section have been taken. However, another means of measuring a baseline and progress towards the strategies is the total number of COE dollars spent for research support.

Strategic utilization of doctoral students begins with examining doctoral student teaching loads and increasing their involvement in substantive research, specifically externally funded projects. Lead Measures for this strategy should include the number of funded GAs, with funding sources (e.g., state-funds, external funds, etc.), and the amount of their funded time actually devoted to teaching and research. An additional set of Lead Measures for the strategic use of doctoral students should include the number of applications for external dissertation grants, and the number of dollars received from those applications.

Goal 1 Action Plans

None of the actions suggested below is feasible without an accurate baseline. As a result, the first action that should be taken is to collect all relevant baseline data associated with the Lead Measures described above, in a timely manner, before beginning any further actions as a faculty.

The Promotion and Tenure and Bylaws Committees should meet to discuss and enact the changes to both processes necessary to reward faculty for receiving and to a lesser extent pursuing external funding. The Committees should then submit those changes for the approval of the faculty. The Bylaws Committee will also need to meet to address faculty workload, once those measures are reported in full. Finally, the faculty should establish and enforce criteria and policies to enhance productivity relative to staffing and for the use of reassigned time.

The Office of the Associate Dean for Research (ADR) should create a newsletter of funding opportunities, including RFPs as they are released and upcoming deadlines, as well as a database of funding sources and faculty with their research interests, to foster collaboration among faculty members in seeking funding. Additionally, the office of the ADR should propose hiring an administrative assistant for budget development and project administration and a grant writer to assist with proposals. Lastly, the ADR office should be involved in negotiating off-campus rates for Facilities and Administration with the Office of Sponsored Programs when appropriate and assist in incentivizing external funding by standardizing rates of return of indirect costs (F&A) to departments and Principal Investigators.

In line with the reassessment of teaching and advising loads, it is suggested that advising a set (to be determined) number of graduate students (particularly doctoral students) be considered a course for teaching load purposes. Pairing this suggestion with evaluations of advising by doctoral students may serve to increase doctoral student productivity and success, which in turn benefits the College when applying for external funding. Finally, advisors of doctoral students should encourage their students to seek external funding for dissertation studies.

Goal 2 Strategies

The ten strategies in Table 2 naturally group together into three sets. The groupings represent potential themes that tie the strategies together. The first four strategies all suggest an imperative for a needs assessment. Key words such as Identify, Understand, Improve, and Re-Evaluate all suggest that the COE and its three departments require a baseline understanding of their programs and students, as a starting point for increasing doctoral student production.

The second set—strategies five, six, and seven—all capture the realities of investment and infrastructure that are necessary to achieve the goal. The COE and its departments offer a number of programs, and decisions will have to be made as to what programs merit additional investment related to the Lag Measure of increasing Ph.D. graduates. In a similar vein, P&T and Merit policies should reward faculty who contribute to this goal. At the student level, external support to fund graduate assistantships will certainly contribute to an ongoing pool of qualified applicants, but this too is a resource issue. Perhaps the most immediate method of increasing funding for graduate students is linked to the increased instructional demand that will result as enrollments in initial licensure programs are expanded. Because these assistantships are allocated and funded on the basis of tuition generated through courses taught by GAs, this provides a direct source of increased support for doctoral students that should be optimized. This set of strategies may be more long-term in nature, as securing external funds or changing policies through the P&T committee is a product of time. Still, it may be possible to embark on some short-term actions that begin to actualize the strategies.

The last set of strategies in the table above relate to marketing and awareness building. Recruitment and alumni engagement may require different marketing and visibility approaches, but they both fall under this theme. Similarly, the departments may take different avenues to increase the visibility of their doctoral programs, but specific attention to such a strategy seems essential.

Goal 2 Lead Measures

Notes from all seven Task Forces indicated a need to gather data and understand current metrics. Accordingly, the first four Lead Measures in Table 2 would establish a common starting point across all programs and departments. The TFAC believes that the data necessary to construct these measures are available, but there is a need to establish and implement them formally across the College.

All but one of the second set of Lead Measures in Table 2 are qualitative in nature. Most of these measures define whether or not departments and programs have taken certain steps to improve recruitment and advising. It is quite common for measures that are not quantifiable to be designated as a “Yes/No.”

The last Lead Measure asks whether doctoral programs have examined aspirational or existing Tier 1 programs for ideas and best practices that may be applicable to UNLV. Examining one’s program against aspirational examples might be considered benchmarking.

Goal 2 Action Plans

Action plans may relate to the strategies and/or the measures. For example, the idea that an administrator or faculty leader be identified to work with the COE’s technology specialist to make current doctoral students and alumni more visible on the web directly relates to the strategy of increasing the visibility of the COE’s doctoral programs.

On the other hand, the action plan that recommends the Associate Dean for Research and Sponsored Projects work with chairs on collecting and implementing all quantitative and qualitative Lead Measures and the Lag Measure is a specific role assignment recommendation. All of the action plans map to one or more of the strategies or Lead Measures and therefore should influence the Lag Measure in a positive direction.

GOAL 2: INCREASE NUMBER OF PH.D. GRADUATES

Table 2

Lag Measure	Strategies	Lead Measures	Action Plans
Increase Number of Ph.D. Graduates	Identify high need programs	# of applicants by dept/program for doc programs	Assoc. Dean work with chairs to collect data on all metrics
	Understand the doctoral student experience	# of doctoral completions by dept/program last 3 years	Identify person responsible to work with COE tech specialist on doctoral student info for website, to include current students and alumni for every dept, (student experience model)
	Improve doctoral advising	Doc student demographics (full/part time; int/domestic)	Identify person or group to review dept advising and recruitment best practices and disseminate document of best practices
	Re-evaluate doctoral programs (re: timeliness, focus, and length)	# doc students on ext \$ GA by dept	Dept considers threshold number of doc advisees considered a course (and if advising in #'s is considered a course)
	----- Recognize doctoral student work in P & T and merit	Recruitment plans developed by dept (Y/N)?	Dept chair requests doc program alignment reports from programs.
	External funds for doc student support (GA)	Advising feedback by depts (Y/N)?	Interview/solicit information on doc programs from aspiring/model institutions.
	Invest in high need programs	Best practices for advising and recruitment captured and shared (Y/N)?	Create database of doc students with CVs, interests, and desire for GA (funding status)
	----- Intensify recruitment	Dept/program considered bulk doc advising as a course (Y/N)?	
	Engage alumni	Created database of doc students with interests and CVs (Y/N)?	
	Increase visibility of doctoral programs	# of doc students advised/faculty member	
		----- -- Doctoral programs evaluated for alignment with Tier 1 programs at aspiring institutions (Y/N)?	

Goal 3 Strategies

Increase in the development dollars received in the College of Education is the primary responsibility of the Dean. However, several strategies were crafted based on the work of the Task Forces related to increasing the visibility and presence of the COE to support the Dean in lobbying for additional development dollars. With this in mind, Goal 3 strategies were focused in two main areas: 1) methods for increasing the number of development dollars generated within the College; and 2) strategies and techniques for increasing the visibility of the College and its activities to obtain opportunities for development dollars.

The TFAC indicated that the Dean's Office should engage in activities related to identifying techniques for increasing the number of dollars generated and finding new ways to secure additional funding streams. Since this is not a faculty responsibility, the TFAC did not make specific recommendations related to procedures for increasing this amount. Relative to increasing the visibility of the College, the TFAC developed a number of strategies focused on publicly disseminating the work of the COE and on strengthening partnerships within the community. Three of the strategies focus on highlighting and marketing the activities of the College and the work of the faculty. The final recommendation focuses on building strategic partnerships within the community, region, and state to generate increased possibilities for development dollars as they relate to the shared vision and mission of strategically partnered organizations. Alignment of COE faculty with strategic partners should lead to natural alliances with possible development funders.

Goal 3 Lead Measures

The TFAC recommended a number of Lead Measures that will provide baseline information related to the amount of development dollars generated, as well as the current visibility of the College within the community. First, baseline information on the amount of development dollars secured by the College and the types of projects or programs for which they are being used is important to determining a strategy for moving forward. Additionally, the TFAC recommended a number of Lead Measures about the visibility of the COE within the community, including the number of faculty members in the speakers' database, the impact of the College on the community, current partnerships engaged throughout the community, number of local print and non-print media citations from College faculty. The TFAC also recommended collecting information on the presence of the College in a variety of marketing venues and analyzing the impact of these marketing venues on their targeted audience. These measures would lead the College in determining where marketing changes should be made to best showcase the work of faculty.

Goal 3 Action Plans

Members of the TFAC felt it was imperative for the Dean's Office to secure a full-time, experienced development officer to work on this goal. Since this is not a function of faculty, it is important that someone with the skillset needed to generate development dollars be hired. Once this person is secured, she or he could engage faculty through information sessions about the types of development dollar opportunities that exist within the community and how faculty can be involved with this process. The TFAC also felt that it was important that a person be identified to collect data on the current visibility and marketing plan of the College and to provide information about where the faculty needs to focus their energy and resources in the cultivation of partnerships. The TFAC also recommended that the College and faculty engage more actively with the Alumni Association and find ways to communicate information about the College in the media using the data collected through the assessment process.

GOAL 3: INCREASE EXTERNAL DEVELOPMENT DOLLARS GENERATED

Table 3

Lag Measure	Strategies	Lead Measures	Action Plans
<p>Increase external development dollars generated</p>	<p>Increase the amount of development dollars generated across the COE.</p> <p>Showcase faculty expertise and capacity that could be advanced with external development dollars, as well as the work of the COE.</p> <p>Take strategic advantage of community and state partnerships (and beyond) to generate more development dollars specific to the COE vision.</p> <p>Increase the overall visibility of the COE.</p> <p>Develop strategic marketing plan to highlight the work of the COE within the community.</p>	<p>Collect data on 2011-2013 development dollars generated by Departments and COE to support scholarships, project activities, service activities, special programs.</p> <p>Collect data on: -Local, state, and national media recognition -Current methods for showcasing faculty expertise and capacity -Impact of the COE on the community (e.g., number of students graduated, grant dollars secured).</p> <p>Collect data on current partnerships that could lead to development dollar opportunities.</p> <p>Conduct needs assessment to identify potential areas for generating funds.</p> <p>Collect data on 2011-2013: -Citations of COE in print/non-print media. -Professional visibility (e.g., grant panels, editorships, presentations, officer in professional organizations).</p> <p>-Faculty and community views of the social media presence of the College.</p>	<p>Secure a full-time, experienced development officer to identify development dollar opportunities within the community.</p> <p>Conduct faculty development related to development dollar opportunities.</p> <p>Dean's Office identifies individual responsible for supporting the showcasing of COE and faculty expertise.</p> <p>-Dean's Office identify individual who could determine current partnerships within the college.</p> <p>Dean's Office identify individual to conduct a needs assessment to determine possible areas for generating funding.</p> <p>Increase citations of COE work in print/non-print media.</p>

GOAL 3: INCREASE EXTERNAL DEVELOPMENT DOLLARS GENERATED

Table 3

Lag Measure	Strategies	Lead Measures	Action Plans
		<p>Develop recommendations for increasing the social media presence of the college.</p> <p>Identify current marketing strategies and conduct a gap analysis related to how marketing is being done and how to reach the highest number of people.</p>	<p>Increase the social media presence of the College.</p> <p>Market data from data collection and management system.</p> <p>Engage with the alumni association.</p> <p>Communicate information about the success of the college through the media.</p>



Goal 4 Strategies

Increasing scholarly productivity is aligned with the overall goal of attaining Tier 1 status and is closely intertwined with both Goal 1 (Increase External Dollars Generated for Research) and Goal 2 (Increase Ph.D. Graduates). External funding for grants presupposes that faculty will disseminate results through both conference presentations and scholarly publications. Granting agencies are typically concerned with the academic record of applicants to ensure expertise and future success. In relation to doctoral students, the COE has a strong record of graduating students; however, as part of the Tier 1 initiative an increase in doctoral graduates is expected for all colleges. One of the ways that applicants determine which graduate schools they wish to attend is through the academic standing of faculty, programs, departments and colleges. Additionally, Tier 1 institutions draw doctoral students both from around the nation and internationally, again on the basis of academic visibility.

Doctoral students in Tier 1 universities usually expect to be involved in some capacity in a research cycle – designing a study, collecting data, presenting results, and/or writing and publishing an article. Faculty participation in this process is crucial not only in order to guide and mentor students (teaching), but to increase scholarly productivity as well. Moreover, the success that doctoral students find at the time of graduation owing to scholarly collaborations with faculty is another feature of Tier 1 status and, of course, encourages potential students (marketing). New COE faculty should have the opportunity to participate in research with established UNLV faculty in addition to colleagues at local entities such as Nevada State College, CSN and CCSD.

Goal 4 Lead Measures

Because division of faculty workload is closely related to differentiated staffing (Task Force 2), all faculty should have the opportunity to discuss the relevant issues in various forums before making policy. Examining past publication records for individuals, departments, and doctoral program areas should provide data concerning strengths, but also weaknesses, and how they can be addressed.

Since journal publications are such an important component of establishing Tier 1 scholarship, each department should investigate journal rankings (impact factor, acceptance rate and other measures) within the relevant areas of faculty research. Data should be collected on the inclusion of doctoral students in faculty research, or the inclusion of faculty in student-generated research and subsequent presentations and publications as part of the overall measure of scholarly productivity. Data should be collected on the inclusion of new faculty in research projects with existing faculty, other new faculty, and academic colleagues in the local community, as these are all avenues for increasing faculty scholarly productivity.

Finally, there is a need to provide data on faculty teaching and advising loads at each of the three academic levels (undergraduate, master's, and doctoral) to help both in relation to reaching Tier 1 status and in educating a large number of teachers (Goal 5). Again, the appropriate and strategic use of differentiated staffing will be necessary to meet the need to maintain faculty workloads that encourage research productivity with the potentially competing need to increase enrollments at all levels.

GOAL 4: INCREASE SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY

Table 4

Lag Measure	Strategies	Lead Measures	Action Plans
<p>Increase scholarly productivity.</p>	<p>Adjust P & T and merit guidelines to focus on scholarship (e.g., 40/40/20, 40/30/30).</p> <p>Address quality and quantity of publications by COE and department.</p> <p>Increase the inclusion of doctoral students in scholarly productivity.</p> <p>Increase the inclusion of new faculty involvement in scholarly productivity.</p> <p>Adjust teaching and service loads to enhance productivity.</p>	<p>Faculty discuss workload policy.</p> <p>Collect data on: -2011-2013: Publications by department -2011-2013: Impact factor by department -2011-2013: Journal ranking by department -2011-2013: SSCI by department</p> <p>Collect data on: -2011-2013 Doctoral student inclusion in presentations, publications, grants and funding.</p> <p>Collect data on: -2011-2013 New faculty inclusion in presentations, publications, grants and funding.</p> <p>Percentage of faculty teaching 3+ courses/ percentage of faculty teaching 2 or less. Advising load across faculty and departments.</p>	<p>COE Bylaws Committee address workload and faculty adopt policy (Fall 2014)</p> <p>Establish criteria for publication data across fields (Departments/COE)</p> <p>Establish criteria to increase doctoral student inclusion (Departments).</p> <p>Establish process to support doctoral student inclusion (Departments)</p> <p>Establish criteria to increase new faculty inclusion (Departments).</p> <p>Establish process to support new faculty inclusion (Departments)</p> <p>Establish criteria/policies to enhance productivity relative to staffing.</p> <p>Establish criteria/policies for use of reassigned time.</p>

Goal 4 Action Plans

To incentivize an increase in scholarly productivity, Goal 4 should be reflected in the process of promotion and tenure and the awarding of merit. In order to achieve this, change will be needed in the allocation of time spent on task for tenure-track faculty pursuing research. The current system requires such faculty to divide their time equally among scholarship, teaching, and service (i.e., 33.3/33.3/33.3). To accommodate a focus on scholarly activity, a move toward a 40/40/20 or 40/30/30 division of labor should be implemented. This revision would offer faculty the necessary time to spend on research and to be accountable for scholarly activity. Both the quality and quantity of scholarly publications should also increase, although impact should be the most important consideration. Scholarship needs to be assessed through a variety of metrics to be determined by the COE and departments. Criteria are likely to include such elements as journal acceptance rate and impact factor, number of citations, and order of authorship, as appropriate to rank and field. P&T bylaws will need to accommodate these changes once determined.

The inclusion of doctoral students in research is central to the overall goal of increasing scholarly output. Doctoral students, especially those intending to enter faculty positions, typically look for opportunities to become involved in research; facilitating this desire should be considered at COE, department and program levels. This same desire also holds true for new faculty, who may not have established colleagues with whom to collaborate. Such engagement of doctoral students and new faculty can help the COE in increasing scholarship through participating in projects with COE faculty and other colleagues in the local educational community.

Goal 5 relates to the role of the College of Education in impacting policy, practice, and research in the area of the production of at least 1,200 new teachers per year. At the same time, the College and University vision of reaching Tier 1 status was seen as interrelated with this goal.

Goal 5 Strategies

The strategies were designed to increase the number of teacher candidates by creating innovative programs that will attract non-traditional and out-of state candidates with special emphasis on candidates from underrepresented populations. Since it is unlikely that the needs of the school district can be met with candidates from within the state alone, recruitment efforts should be designed that reach out to other states where not all teacher candidates are hired. Strategies for generating MOU's with community colleges or teacher preparation programs in other states should be developed. At the same time, the COE should reach out to local candidates and UNLV students with majors other than education.

Clinical faculty and doctoral student teaching and research GA's will be needed to staff new and existing programs to handle both the large numbers of students and the need for program and student assessment. In order to increase scholarly productivity, faculty and doctoral students should engage in research and publication about the teacher preparation programs.

Such a dramatic increase in teacher candidates will necessitate bold solutions that manage to retain integrity of preparation with innovative delivery systems. Creative ARL programs along with work with such programs as Troops to Teachers and Teach for America are some interventions that can be developed and maintained.

A companion strategy is to design support programs for program completers to help them through their first few years of teaching by offering formal and informal resources such as seminars, teas, hands-on mentoring and coursework.

Goal 5 Lead Measures

Lead Measures include taking stock of existing programs and numbers of teacher candidates produced by each program annually. Do most students begin at UNLV as freshmen? Are they transfer students, ARL students, Master's students? What percentage of teacher candidates currently come from out of state? Data on the number of faculty, adjuncts, and doctoral students currently working in the teacher education program must also be collected. Are any of these people engaged in program research and evaluation? Are they making presentations and writing scholarly articles? Are they securing external funding for program development or research? The necessity for baseline data to drive the action plans and gap analyses is critical to the success of any interventions. As programs are implemented, data must be collected on effectiveness and efficiency in working toward the goal.

Goal 5 Action Plans

The action plans were designed to implement the developed strategies. These are recommendations for action based on the data collection and analyses conducted by the Task Forces. The development of recruiting strategies and development activities must focus on those with the highest potential yield. The Advising Center, the Development Officer, the Departments, the Director of Marketing, and the Dean's Management Team must prioritize these efforts. The Associate Dean for Academic and Professional Programs should work with the school district to develop projections of future vacancies and areas of need. A gap analysis should be conducted by a Director of Assessment to identify what the needs are versus what the current resources are to help achieve the goal.



GOAL 5: DRAMATICALLY INCREASE THE PRODUCTION OF NEW TEACHERS

Table 5

Lag Measure	Strategies	Lead Measures	Action Plans
<p>Dramatically increase the production of new teachers</p>	<p>Develop a comprehensive recruitment strategy that encompasses CA and other states where there are currently teacher surpluses.</p> <p>Create clinical faculty lines for the implementation of new teacher licensure programs.</p> <p>Develop recruitment plan that targets underrepresented populations.</p> <p>Provide support and mentoring for new teachers.</p> <p>Assess needs in specific licensure areas within CCSD.</p> <p>Develop targeted Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) programs in partnership with CCSD.</p> <p>Increase the strategic use of doctoral GAs to teach lower division and high enrollment entry-level courses.</p>	<p>Collect data on 2011-2013 programs on the books and productivity of those programs.</p> <p>Collect data on current full-time, part-time, adjunct/clinical, doctoral students teaching in teacher preparation.</p> <p>Collect data on 2011-2013 trend vacancy data.</p> <p>Collect data on 2014-2015 projected trend data.</p> <p>Collect data on current ARL production and the interest CCSD has in partnering with UNLV.</p>	<p>Prioritize recruitment and development activities for highest potential yield.</p> <p>Identify areas where new programs are needed.</p> <p>Conduct a gap analysis of what is needed versus what is currently available to achieve this goal.</p> <p>Develop plan for filling identified gaps.</p> <p>Associate Dean for Academic and Professional Programs works with CCSD HR to determine annual projections of vacancies to best match needs.</p> <p>Gear recruitment and production towards those vacancies.</p> <p>Develop plan for implementing expanded ARL programs over time.</p> <p>Recruit ARL candidates from outgoing UNLV degree programs.</p> <p>Secure development dollars for ARL scholarships as well as scholarships for candidates from underrepresented populations.</p> <p>Enhance and develop relationships with Troops to Teachers and Teach for America.</p>

A comprehensive recruiting plan should be developed at once. This can be accomplished by a committee established by the Dean that consists of representatives of key stakeholders, including personnel from the school district.

A resource development and allocation plan should be created that addresses the infrastructure needs for such rapid growth. Based on the priority areas identified above, the appropriate people should be tasked with finding and allocating these resources. Especially critical will be funding for scholarships or aid packages for teacher candidates.

Data must also be collected on the effectiveness of COE teacher candidates once they are in the field. The assessment director should develop systematic data analysis plans to track teachers during their first five years in the classroom. This is critical to program evaluation.



CROSS-CUTTING THEMES

The above analysis was broken down by goal. A detailed analysis of each major goal is necessary in order to allow the College to move closer toward realizing the vision. At the same time, the committee recognized that there could be common themes among the strategies, Lead Measures, and action plans that relate to two or more goals. Such common themes may be used to inform subsequent actions and recommendations. These common themes, which the TFAC identified and has called “cross-cutting themes,” are documented below.

After analyzing all five goals along with their accompanying Strategies, Lead Measures, and Action Plans, the TFAC identified nine cross-cutting themes. These themes represent a synthesis of ideas that seemed prominent in multiple goals and/or their component parts. The cross-cutting themes were developed during a face-to-face group process by TFAC members. Team members examined hard copies of all five tables above, along with minutes and final reports of their representative task force, as an additional avenue by which to integrate task force work into the cross-cutting themes.

The nine themes are listed below.

1. Create a culture of evidence and accountability.
 - a. Place a premium on collecting data for establishing baselines across all goals.
 - b. Conduct assessments and gap analysis.
2. Enact changes to P&T and faculty merit bylaws.
3. Create a supportive infrastructure to achieve the goals and recommendations.
4. Develop differentiated staffing models.
5. Maintain existing and cultivate new internal and external partnerships.
6. Mentor new faculty, doctoral students, teacher candidates, and program completers.
7. Make doctoral programs a COE priority.
8. Strengthen the visibility and impact of the COE.
9. Strengthen the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students.

The TFAC sees the cross-cutting themes as a vehicle to inform the recommendations and stimulate conversation across the college. The themes, along with the analysis, feed into the recommendations, as described in the next section.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Equipped with major goals, analysis of the goals, and the collaboratively developed cross-cutting themes, TFAC members engaged in a face-to-face dialogue. The objective of the dialogue was to develop a set of recommendations to help the COE achieve its vision and meet the goals. The recommendations represent TFAC's best effort to bridge broad concepts (e.g. evidence and accountability in cross cutting theme #1) with more specific strategies and metrics (e.g. various lead metrics and strategies in the analysis) that relate to the major goals.

Faculty voices are represented through the minutes and reports of the seven Task Forces. TFAC members were careful to represent faculty voice by reviewing their respective Task Force reports and integrating the spirit of that work into TFAC analysis and discussions. Still, it should be noted that any omissions are the responsibility of the committee. The Dean's Office and individual TFAC members invite feedback that might strengthen the recommendations or correct any oversights.

Finally, each recommendation has an associated set of suggestions for implementation and a suggested timeline to create a level of accountability in moving towards achieving the goals of the COE. The suggestions for implementation and the suggested timelines are intended to be flexible in the face of changing circumstances, but the notion of accountability they embody should not be. The ultimate success or failure of change within the College of Education will rest with the faculty and the administration and their willingness to commit to and hold one another accountable for a plan to implement these changes.

Recommendation 1: Charge the Associate Dean for Research and Sponsored Projects with Establishing Baseline Metrics for Research Funding and Ph.D. Graduate Student Completion (the top two key metrics for Tier 1)

Supporting Suggestions for Implementation:

1. Establish metrics as indicated in the Analysis of the TFAC Report.
2. Hire a capable individual to help collect data and establish metrics, working with the Associate Dean, COE leaders, and the Office of Institutional Research.

Suggested Timeline: End of Fall 2014

Recommendation 2: Seek a position and funding from UNLV administration for a Director of Assessment for the COE with the charge to create a comprehensive system for tracking student success from acceptance to completion to employment and beyond.

Supporting Suggestions for Implementation:

1. Seek a position and funding.
2. Work with the Associate Deans to establish the baseline metrics commensurate with the five goals.

Suggested Timeline: End of Spring 2015.

Recommendation 3: COE Dean works with the COE development officer and others to create a systematic plan for increasing development dollars.

Supporting Suggestions for Implementation:

1. Establish Baseline metrics of giving, source of funds, etc.
2. Charge the external advisory board with the task of helping to create a strategic plan for development and giving for the College.

3. Dean and Executive Associate Dean spearhead initial efforts to develop plan and short-term strategy for targeted sources to increase development dollars.
4. Plan should also correlate high priority needs for the College and its stakeholders with development plan, such as in the area of producing more teachers to meet CCSD needs.

Suggested Timeline: Responsibility of Dean's Office

Recommendation 4: COE Marketing Director will create a marketing plan to increase the visibility of the College.

Supporting Suggestions for Implementation:

1. Work with Dean's internal advisory group and external advisory board to create ideas for a marketing plan.
2. Work with marketing director at the UNLV Foundation.
3. Enhance COE website to showcase marketing effort results from last year, along with other areas of targeted importance (e.g. doctoral student profiles, alumni profiles, etc.).
4. Consider enfolded plan for increasing development dollars (Recommendation 2) into an overall marketing plan.

Suggested Timeline: End of Fall 2014 to be implemented in the Spring of 2015.

Recommendation 5: Explore and develop innovative ways for dramatically increasing the number of quality teacher candidates selected, prepared, and hired into teaching positions in Clark County and Nevada.

Supporting Suggestions for Implementation:

1. Create a "teacher productivity" task force to craft a comprehensive plan. Task force should be composed of COE faculty, Clark County Schools personnel, local Teach for America staff, Troops to Teachers staff, community college representatives, and others as needed.

Suggested Timeline: Task force formed by October 2014, plan completed by end of Fall 2014, implementation begun prior to 2015-2016 academic year.

Recommendation 6: Charge the COE Promotion and Tenure Committee and the COE Merit Committee with the task of addressing external funding, doctoral student advising, scholarship, and differentiated staffing in the P&T bylaws and merit process.

Supporting Suggestions for Implementation:

1. Consider and implement appropriate Lead Measures from goals one through five.

Suggested Timeline:

1. Ask both committees for recommendations at the end of Fall 2014 term.
2. Bring any proposed changes to a vote in early Spring 2015.

Recommendation 7: Immediately recognize funding applications, funding successes, and outstanding scholarly productivity, while also working to institutionalize such incentives and recognitions to stimulate ongoing efforts in these two areas.

Supporting Suggestions for Implementation:

1. Create financial incentives for the first year of funding of multi-year grants.
2. Create time or financial incentives for grant submissions.

Suggested Timeline: Fall 2014

Recommendation 8: Executive Associate Dean will create a list of key partners, internal and external, who can assist with achieving the five major goals for the College.

Supporting Suggestions for Implementation:

1. Create a list of partners who are key to increasing external funding.
2. Create a list of partners who are key to increasing the number of Ph.D. graduates.
3. Create a list of partners who are key to increasing development dollars.
4. Create a list of partners who are key to increasing production of teachers (CCSD is key here, so the priority may be figuring out *how* to partner with them).

Suggested Timeline: Draft list by end of October 2014

Recommendation 9: Director of Assessment will create a dashboard on the COE website for all Lag and Lead Measures.

Supporting Suggestions for Implementation:

1. Create an internal comprehensive dashboard of all metrics.
2. Create a more focused external dashboard to advertise successes.

Suggested Timeline:

1. Technology template created by Spring 2015.
2. Internal dashboard created by the beginning of Fall 2015.
3. External dashboard created by end of 2015-2016 academic year.

Recommendation 10: The Office of the Associate Dean for Research and Sponsored Projects should propose the hiring of an administrative assistant for grant development and administration, propose the hiring of a grant writer, and develop and regularly disseminate materials that disclose funding opportunities and potential collaborators.

Supporting Suggestions for Implementation:

1. Obtain approval for and hire an Administrative Assistant for grant development, budgets, and grant administration.
2. Create a regular newsletter to faculty that discloses open RFP's with application deadlines.
3. Create a database of faculty with their research interests and areas of expertise.
4. Create a database of doctoral students with areas of interest and current CV's.
5. Hire discipline specific grant writers.

Suggested Timeline: Grant AA Fall 2014. Newsletter generated at least monthly beginning in September 2014. Faculty database created by end of Fall 2014. Doctoral student database created by end of 2015 and updated each semester. Discipline specific grant writers to be hired as funding allows.

Recommendation 11: Develop a comprehensive diversity plan for the College.

Supporting Suggestions for Implementation:

1. Charge the Executive Associate Dean with convening a committee composed of representatives from every academic department in the college, from CCSD, from relevant community organizations, and from the Dean's external Advisory Board.
2. Focus the plan on increasing the numbers of faculty, staff, and students from historically underrepresented groups.
3. Graduate education professionals who better reflect the diversity of the school population.

Suggested Timeline: End of Fall 2014

NEXT STEPS

- ❑ The Fall 2014 opening COE faculty/staff meeting serves as the starting point for implementation of the Report. It begins with an invitation to the faculty and staff to read and comment on the report to the Dean or any member of the Task Force Alignment Committee. Everyone is invited to have a voice in critique and reaction.
- ❑ During 2014-15, specific action plans for implementing and using the recommendations will be developed at the College, Department, and program levels. At the same time, any recommendations that require consideration or approval through faculty committees or other governance bodies will be processed by the appropriate committees.
- ❑ The effectiveness of the plans and the ongoing appropriateness of the recommendations will be revisited at least once each year.



TASK FORCE GROUPS

ENSURING SUPPORT AND ENGAGEMENT IN RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY

Facilitator, Dr. P.G. Schrader, Associate Professor, T&L

- Dr. Hasan Deniz, Associate Professor, T&L
- Dr. Eunsook Hong, Professor, EPHE
- Dr. Gwen Marchand, Assistant Professor, EPHE
- Dr. Michael Nussbaum, Professor, EPHE
- Dr. Shannon Smith, Associate Professor, ECS
- Dr. David Vallett, Assistant Professor, T&L
- Dr. Shaoan Zhang, Associate Professor, T&L

EXPANDING INITIAL LICENSURE PROGRAMS

Facilitator, Dr. Jane McCarthy, Lincy Professor of Education, T&L

- Dr. Danielle Brown, Assistant Professor, T&L
- Dr. Nancy Brown, Faculty-in-Residence, ECS
- Dr. Alice Corkill, Associate Professor, EPHE
- Dr. Karen Grove, Associate Professor-in-Residence, T&L
- Dr. Travis Olson, Assistant Professor, T&L
- Dr. Linda Quinn, Professor, T&L
- Dr. Maria Ramirez, Associate Professor, ECS
- Mr. Ed Ronca, Director, Advising Center

QUALITY ASSURANCE, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SPA ACCREDITATION

Facilitator, Dr. Liz Spalding, Professor, T&L

- Dr. Josh Baker, Assistant Professor, ECS
- Dr. Joe Crank, Associate Professor, EPHE
- Dr. Jeffrey Gelfer, Professor, ECS
- Dr. Sherri Strawser, Associate Professor, ECS
- Dr. Neal Strudler, Professor, T&L

EXPANDING THE REACH, VISIBILITY, AND IMPACT OF THE COLLEGE

Facilitator, Dr. Nancy Lough, Professor, EPHE

- Dr. Christine Clark, Professor, T&L
- Dr. Katrina Harris, Internship Coordinator, ECS
- Dr. Wendy Hoskins, Associate Professor, ECS
- Dr. Greg Levitt, Professor, T&L
- Dr. Marilyn McKinney, Professor, T&L
- Ms. Lois Parette, Field Experience Coordinator, T&L
- Dr. Tara C. Raines, Assistant Professor, EPHE
- Dr. Micah Stohlmann, Assistant Professor, T&L

ALIGNING P&T, MERIT, AND GOALS

Facilitator, Dr. Steven G. McCafferty, Professor, EPHE

- Dr. Randall L. Astramovich, Associate Professor, ECS
- Dr. Cynthia Carruthers, Professor, ECS
- Dr. CarolAnne Kardash, Professor, EPHE
- Dr. Cori More, Assistant Professor, ECS

- Dr. Vicki Rosser, Professor, EPHE
- Dr. Chyllis Scott, Assistant Professor, T&L
- Dr. Rebecca Nathanson, Associate Professor, EPHE
- Dr. Jesus Garcia, Professor, T&L

STRENGTHENING DOCTORAL PROGRAMS

Facilitator, Dr. Doris L. Watson, Professor, EPHE

- Dr. Matt Bernacki, Assistant Professor, EPHE
- Dr. Howard Gordon, Professor, T&L
- Dr. Kyle Higgins, Professor, ECS
- Dr. Jared Lau, Assistant Professor, ECS
- Dr. Mario Martinez, Professor, EPHS
- Dr. Jeff Shih, Associate Professor, T&L
- Dr. Tracy Spies, Assistant Professor, ECS

DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING, EQUITY, AND TIER I PRODUCTIVITY

Facilitator, Dr. John Filler, Professor, ECS

- Dr. Jesse Brinson, Professor, ECS
- Dr. Steve Grubaugh, Professor, T&L
- Dr. Paul Jones, Professor, EPHE
- Dr. Scott Loe, Associate Professor, ECS
- Dr. Catherine Lyons, Assistant Professor, ECS
- Dr. Joe Morgan, Assistant Professor, ECS
- Dr. Michelle Paul, Director, The PRACTICE
- Dr. Stefani Relles, Assistant Professor, EPHE

TASK FORCE ALIGNMENT COMMITTEE

Facilitator, Dr. Charles Coble, Co-founder & Partner, Third Mile Group

- Dr. Mario Martinez, Professor, ECS (Strengthening Doctoral Programs)
- Dr. Steven G. McCafferty, Professor, EPHE (Aligning T&P, Merit, and Goals)
- Dr. Jane McCarthy, Lincy Professor of Education, T&L (Expanding Licensure Programs)
- Dr. Joe Morgan, Assistant Professor, ECS (Differentiated Staffing and Tier I Productivity)
- Ms. Lois Paretti, Field Experiences Coordinator, T&L (Reach, Visibility, & Impact)
- Dr. Liz Spalding, Professor, T&L (Quality Assurance, Accountability, and SPA Accreditation)
- Dr. David Vallett, Assistant Professor, T&L (Research Productivity)

