

CSU FRESNO ACCREDITATION CYCLE

California Accreditation Cycle

Year	Date of Year	Key Activity
	2006-2007	Data Collection Only
1	2007-2008	Biennial Report
2	2008-2009	Data Collection Only
3	2009-2010	Biennial Report
4	2010-2011	Resubmit Program Documents
5	2011-2012	Biennial Report
6	2012-2013	Resubmit Common Standards – SITE VISIT
7	2013-2014	Respond to issues raised in the site visit

BIENNIAL REPORT

Section A - Each Program develops (10 pages each) SEE BELOW

Section B - Unit/Institution - Summary and Plan of Action

SECTION A

(This report does not have to be narrative – please use charts, tables, lists...)

1. **TEMPLATE (1 PG)**

2. **CANDIDATE/ASSESSMENT (Pgs. ?? 4-5)**
 They suggest that this is 6-8 assessments that are described and implemented
 Descriptive statistics of candidate performance (competence and deficiencies) and program effectiveness

3. **ANALYSIS OF CANDIDATE DATA (Pgs. 1-3)**
 Candidate and program strengths and areas for improvement

4. **USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS (Pgs. 1-2)**
 List program's modifications and how they will affect the program.
PLAN OF ACTION
 Improve Candidate Performance
 Improve Program Performance

DUE 9/15/10

02/04

California State University, Fresno (2009-2010)
Section A-1
Contextual Information

M.A. in Education–Curriculum and Instruction Option

California State University, Fresno is one of 23 universities in the California State University system. Fresno State began as a normal school in 1911 and has a strong history of service and preparation of education professionals. Fresno State's last joint visit (NCATE/CCTC) was in March 2006. The Dean of the Kremen School of Education and Human Development is the Unit Head that oversees 16 programs.

The M.A. in Education (Curriculum and Instruction Option) degree program is designed to provide professional and specialized preparation for the candidate interested in acquiring knowledge and skills essential for the design and development of curriculum and related instructional practices. Although the program does not require applicants to hold a teaching credential, over 80% of applicants are classroom teachers in grades PreK-12. The program is unique in that candidates can personalize the program with at least 14 units of electives from one or more areas of desired specialization (e.g., areas such as mathematics, computer science, and business administration outside the School of Education). This flexibility and personalization is attractive to individuals from a variety of areas. This diversity creates both great opportunities for students and great challenges in advising/scheduling/tracking for the Program Coordinator, who serves as program advisor for all of the students in the program. Students entering the program during the same semester have unique course trajectories (different core courses, instructors, and electives), and students can take from 1.5 to 5 years to complete the program.

All students in the program take the following core courses: CI 250 (Advanced Curriculum Theory and Analysis), CI 275 (Advanced Instructional Theories and Strategies), CI 285 (Seminar in Advanced Educational Psychology or ERA 288 (Educational Measurement and Program Evaluation), ERA 220 (Research in Education), and CI 298 (Project) or CI 299 (Thesis). ERA 153 is a prerequisite to ERA 220, so many students use that course as a program elective.

During the 2006-07 and 2007-08 academic years, the C&I program was in a period of transition (new program coordinator), stabilization/organization (development of a database/ communication system to track and regularly advise/mentor all C&I students in order to improve student retention and student perception of program success/satisfaction), and expansion (active recruitment of strong students through Provost's scholarships, communication with partnership districts about new opportunities for cohort development). As a result of active recruitment, 2008-2010 was a busy period during which two cohorts of students (teachers from the Sanger and Central Unified School Districts), in addition to the on-campus C&I students, successfully took coursework and completed the program. Most graduated during Spring 2010, the largest graduating class in MAE-C&I history! Budget and admissions restrictions limited program admissions to only 10 during 2009-2010.

Curriculum & Instruction Program Candidate Information		
Year	Number of Candidates Admitted <small>(100% of applicants)</small>	Number of Completers/Graduates <small>(not a subset of those admitted that year)</small>
2008-2009	63 (Fall) + 6 (Spring) = 69	2 (Fall) + 10 (Spring) = 12
2009-2010	10 (Fall) + 0 (Spring) = 10	1 (Summer) + 3 (Fall) + 44 (Spring) = 48
Total	79 (4 semesters)	60 (Fall 2008-Spring 2010)

<u>Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document</u>	<u>Date</u>
• ERA 153 allowed as part of electives; up to 9 units of postbaccalaureate credential allowed as part of electives	2005-2006
• New Program Coordinator	May 2006
• New Blackboard Organization to Support C&I Graduate Students and Faculty was Established.	Fall 2006
• C&I Student Database for Course Tracking and Regular Communication/Advising was Developed and Updated.	2006 (ongoing)
• Wrote proposals to fund Provost's Graduate Scholarships	2006-2007
• New Student Orientation Initiated and Held Each Semester	2007 (ongoing)
• Recognition of C&I Graduates with 3.9 and 4.0 GPAs: Provided Honor Cords to Wear During the Graduate Hooding Ceremony 2007	(ongoing)
• Conducted program assessment in CI 250	Fall 2007
• Focus on Recruitment of District-based Cohorts (recruited two large cohorts--one in Central Unified and one in Sanger Unified)	2007-2008
• Revised appendices of SOAP: (a) Edited/updated Graduate Writing Requirement, (b) edited/updated/substantially revised the Thesis and Project Guidelines, as well as the CI 298 Project Policies and Procedures	October 2008
• Created Advancement to Candidacy Checklist as part of Project/Thesis Guidelines packet, suitable for use by other graduate programs as well as MAE-C&I	Fall 2009
• Created new Web page for MAE-C&I program; update as needed	Fall 2009 (ongoing)
• Initiated discussions among MAE faculty about ERA 220 content and focus, and how to better support students going into their project/thesis semester through workshops, early advising, +	Fall 2009
• Initiated pairing CI 298 faculty with CI 298 advisees 4 months before formal start of the semester in which they would register for CI 298	Fall 2009
• CI 240 redefined and offered as a face-to-face elective with a service-learning component	Fall 2009
• MAE-C&I graduated a record number of students (48)	May 2010
• MAE-C&I graduate named KSOEHD Graduate Dean's Medal recip. Led discussion among KSOEHD program coordinators regarding Human Subjects guidelines for master's students and created new Request for Exemption form for MAE-C&I	May 2010
• Program Coordinator actively participated in project/thesis	Sept. 2010

task force called by the Dean of the Division of Graduate Studies 2009-present

**California State University, Fresno (07-08)
Section A-2**

Candidate Assessment/Performance & Program Effectiveness Information

M.A. in Education–Curriculum and Instruction Option

A. Candidate Assessments the program uses to and through recommending degree

List 4-6 Key Assessments (not admissions data)

1. Program Decision Points Data
2. Graduate Writing Requirement
3. Analysis of Classroom Teaching
4. Project/Thesis

Summary of Data

1. Program Decision Points Data -- The table below summarizes decision points data for the C&I program. In it, we track the number of students admitted in 2006-2007 through 2009-2010 with regard to whether they have passed the graduate writing requirement, advanced to candidacy, completed their project/thesis, and have graduated during these four years. We find that of the 69 students admitted during the 2008-2009 academic year, 58 have passed the graduate writing requirement, and 52 have been advanced to candidacy. So far, 41 have completed their project and graduated. Of the 10 admitted during the 2009-2010 year, 70% have passed the graduate writing requirement (80% of those still in the program) and 10% have been advanced to candidacy so far. We plan to keep tracking the progress of our students from matriculation to graduation.

Curriculum & Instruction Program Candidate Information (Progress Chart)

(Note: "Year" goes from fall through summer.)

Year Admitted	Admitted	Passed Graduate Writing Requirement	Advanced	Project Completed 06-07, 07-08, 08-09, 09-10	Graduated during 2006-07, 2007-08 2008-09, 2009-2010
Before 2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	11, 4, 1, 0	11, 4, 1, 0 (Total: 16)
2006-2007	16	16	16	0, 11, 1, 1	0, 11, 1, 1 (Total: 13)
2007-2008	23	15	12	0, 0, 7, 3	0, 0, 7, 3 (Total: 10)
2008-2009	69	58	52	0, 0, 0, 41	0, 0, 0, 41 (Total: 41)
2009-2010	10	7	1	-	-

2. Graduate Writing Requirement -- As one of the requirements for CI 250, each student identifies a current issue of interest concerning curriculum or instruction, locates and reads related literature, and writes a scholarly paper 8-10 pages in length reviewing the literature and drawing conclusions about the issue. The student’s writing must demonstrate:

- comprehensibility;
- clear organization and presentation of ideas;
- an ability to arrange ideas logically so as to establish a sound scholarly argument;
- thoroughness and competence in documentation;
- an ability to express in writing a critical analysis of existing scholarly/professional literature in the student's area of interest; and
- an ability to model the discipline's overall style as reflected in representative journals.

A Scoring Rubric has been developed to provide guidance to both students and faculty. The student receives a score on each of following three sub-scales: Style and Format, Mechanics, and Content and Organization. Scores range from 1 to 4 with the following designations:

4 - Exemplary 3 - Accomplished 2 - Developing 1 - Beginning

In order to demonstrate writing proficiency, the student must receive a score of "3" in each area. The instructor of CI 250 is the primary evaluator of each student's writing. When the instructor determines that the student meets the criteria (achieves a score of 3 in each area of the rubric), the process is considered completed. If the instructor believes the student's writing to be deficient in one or more areas, the paper is referred to the Review Committee and is evaluated by the committee as a whole. The Review Committee consists of 2 graduate faculty in addition to the instructor. If the committee determines that the student meets the criteria, the process is considered completed and the chair of the committee would notify the Program Coordinator that the student has demonstrated writing proficiency.

If the reviewers determine that the student has not demonstrated competence in written English, the student would be required to remediate writing skills. The appropriate methods for remediation are determined in conjunction with the Review Committee and monitored by the student's Graduate Advisor. Following remediation, the student would submit a letter to the Graduate Advisor outlining the steps taken to improve writing proficiency and requesting that he or she be allowed to redo the writing assessment. With the concurrence of the advisor, the student would be allowed to redo the writing assignment on a different topic. The new writing sample would be evaluated by the Review Committee and the decision of the committee considered final.

A student may pass CI 250 but fail the graduate writing assessment. This assessment must be passed before the student is allowed to advance to candidacy. During Fall 2008 and Fall 2009, a greater number of students than usual did not pass the graduate writing assessment (3 and 2, respectively). It is unclear whether this is because there were a larger number of weaker writers during these semesters or whether the graduate writing requirement guidelines were being followed more closely and enforced more carefully in the classes of these two instructors, both of whom were new to teaching the course. So far, 3 of these students have passed the GWR.

3. Analysis of Classroom Teaching -- One of the required assignments in CI 275 before Spring 2008 was Analyzing Classroom Teaching. There were two goals for this assignment. The first was to help students understand how to successfully implement effective instructional strategies when working with students from diverse populations. The second was to give them practice in systematically recording classroom observations so they can be used for reflective thinking and decision-making.

This assignment required students to:

- Choose a dimension of instruction they would like to improve in their own teaching (or someone else's if they are not teaching);
- Select a feature to analyze in the lesson (e.g., questioning techniques, group interaction, teacher response to misbehavior);
- Develop a method/procedure/instrument for collecting data;
- Videotape at least one lesson taught to a small group or whole class;
- Collect and analyze data collected during the lesson(s) based on the area of instruction selected; and
- Set goals for teaching based on what was discovered.

The assignment was scored in the following categories: Rationale, Overview of lesson, Method of data collection, Analysis, Results, Conclusions, and Goals. A 4-point scoring rubric was used for assessing the assignment. The charts in the last biennial review summarize the scores of each of the students in the two sections of CI 275 taught in Spring 2007 and Spring 2008. The scores are broken down by the seven categories above.

Because there were a number of students who were not classroom teachers in his classes, the instructor of CI 275 in Spring 2008 and Spring 2009 replaced this assignment a more relevant assignment. We will be revisiting all of the core courses in the program for currency and relevance and select one or more assignments can be used for program assessments.

4. Project/Thesis – During the period covered by this review, no student completed a thesis; a project is overwhelmingly viewed as the preferred culminating experience by C&I students. Students who perform at the highest level on the Graduate Writing Exam and who have an interest in research are encouraged to write a thesis. Those who are relatively weak writers are advised that doing so may result in spending at least two semesters on writing the thesis. Even those students who initially consider writing a thesis are discouraged by the requirements (primarily the early submission deadline and the requirement of a committee to review the thesis), and elect to write a project to help ensure that they will finish their culminating experience in one semester. The level of rigor expected of projects is to be no less than that of a thesis, although the focus (development of a product rather than pure research, for example) may be quite different.

During the period of time covered by this review (Summer 2008-Spring 2010), 54 students successfully completed a master's project. One of the goals from the last biennial report was to develop more detailed guidelines for the project; this was completed. Another goal was to develop a rubric that can be used to assess projects. Since this wasn't completed, this is a goal for the next biennial report period. The Division of Graduate Studies has offered to review randomly-selected projects from each KSOEHD program in 2010-2011 (or 2011-2012) to assess quality vis-à-vis the program's project assessment rubric. This review may instead be conducted at the level of the KSOEHD Graduate Committee.

B. Addition information collected on completer performance and program effectiveness

List additional tools used

1. Exit Survey -- Currently students receive the Division of Graduate Studies' exit survey, but results of this survey have not been received for 2008-2010.

During 2006-2007, the MA in Education program was reviewed (5-year review). Several C&I students participated in a focus group meeting with the evaluators, who expressed that we should videotape these students to promote the C&I program, as they were quite passionately positive about all aspects of their graduate experience and the faculty members with whom they had worked.

The Graduate Technician of the KSOEHD required that students applying for graduation in Spring 2010 fill out exit surveys in January 2010. The Program Coordinators are responsible for collecting this data in future semesters. Likert-scale results from the January 2010 survey are included in the chart below. **Demographics:** There were 18 females and 6 males who participated in the survey. Number in each age range: 20-29 (7), 30-39 (8), 40-49 (6), 50+ (3). Fifteen received their undergraduate degree from Fresno State. Twenty worked full-time while pursuing their master's, and four worked part-time. Eighteen took at least 4 semesters to finish the program.

Item 10. As a result of your preparation, please mark the following items indicating how well prepared you are after completing our MOST recent degree and/or credential program at Fresno State:

1. I am prepared to use techniques to build rapport with students/clients.
2. I was taught how to organize my professional tasks.
3. I am prepared to respond with fairness to disabled, ethnically and linguistically diverse students/clients.
4. My preparation has upheld the concept that all individuals can learn.
5. I have proper theoretical grounding in my field.
6. I am familiar with the research in my field.
7. I have related my learning to actual situations in schools/professional settings.
8. I can assess/evaluate the progress of students/clients.
9. I know how to conduct myself in accordance with professional ethics and standards.
10. I have skills to successfully collaborate with others in the workplace.
11. I reflect upon and assess my own performance.
12. I feel that I received a helpful and appropriate amount of supervision/advisement.
13. I can think critically about theory and research in my field and put it into practice.
14. My preparation has modeled the value of life long learning.
15. Indicate the degree to which you feel prepared to assume a full-time position.

Rating of Preparation	1. Build rapport	2. Organize prof. tasks	3. Respond with fairness	4. All indiv. can learn	5. Theoretical grounding	6. Familiar w/research
5 (Excellent)	11	6	12	15	14	15
4 (More than adequate)	7	8	6	6	6	6
3 (Adequate)	6	7	4	3	3	2

2 (Less than adequate)		1	1		1	
1 (Very inadequate)						
NA		2	1			

Rating of Preparation	7. Applied learning	8. Evaluate students	9. Prof ethics & standards	10. Skills to collaborate	11. Self-assess & reflection	12. Helpful advisement
5 (Excellent)	15	12	15	14	13	13
4 (More than adequate)	5	8	6	8	11	4
3 (Adequate)	4	3	2	2		5
2 (Less than adequate)		1	1			2
1 (Very inadequate)						
NA						

Rating of Preparation	13. Think critically about theory & research	14. Modeled value of lifelong learning	15. Prepared for full-time position
5 (Excellent)	13	15	12
4 (More than adequate)	8	7	9
3 (Adequate)	3	3	2
2 (Less than adequate)			
NA			1

11. Please indicate the major strengths of the [MAE-C&I] program:

Overall learning experience was great.

Hands down, the Professors and Faculty

-Allowing a chance to be a part of a cohort. -A GREAT coordinator of the program who is always there when we need her!!!

I really enjoyed nearly all of the classes (CI 250, ERA 153, and CI 285) - The professors were knowledgeable, accessible to students, fair, and were structured, yet flexible enough to adjust to the needs of the students as necessary.

Having the cohort program was beneficial because it enabled me to build lasting, collaborative relationships with other professionals.

FLEXIBLE

I liked the idea of the cohort. I completed my credential through the Block A Cohort. I felt very successful due to the closeness of the classmates and staff. I would recommend doing a cohort to other

students. I liked CI 241. I was able to teach grade level standards and incorporate multi-cultural education/service learning. My students enjoyed the process. Also, I am impressed with Dr. Bohlin's communication via e-mail. She kept me up to date and made sure she referenced previous e-mails if needed.

I feel that I am an expert in my specific area in education due to the research and discussions I've had with colleagues and professors.

Knowledgeable teachers

Great advisors willing to support and help you at any time.

The major strengths of the program would have to be the professionalism that the instructors have for full time working students. In addition, the instructors used methods and curriculum to tie what we were learning in class to our work in education. I found this valuable, not only for my own students, but also for myself. It forced me to self-reflect on my teaching. Finally, the instructors were very competent and knowledgeable.

I enjoyed Dr. Hart's class on Multicultural Education. Scheduling of classes was flexible to our cohort's needs. Professors understanding of school issues that interfered with scheduled classes.

The program provides a well rounded investigation of the curriculum and teaching approaches.

The instructors were highly qualified and knowledgeable in their subject areas. I felt the courses were sufficiently rigorous.

I appreciated the staff who took their time to help me be successful by guiding me throughout.

Our program was a cohort, which made the entire process very student-friendly. The flexibility and strength of communication between the program advisor and the cohort was very helpful.

Preparation for completing a project/thesis in all classes. Communication with professors. Small class sizes.

Flexible schedule which was easy to work around my full-time job as a teacher. Access to resources online (i.e., journal articles). Helpful professors.

Prompt, personal feedback. Qualified, dedicated personnel.

Being in a cohort helped my confidence. Some professors were very helpful via email or through class discussions.

12. Suggestions for potential program changes:

More help with task stream. More examples.

Inclusion of teaching strategies and tactics for post-secondary educators

Review professor selection for stronger, more competent professors - some were very weak in their subject area [e.g., ERA---

Make clear to professors from other departments what the expectations are for the students and class prior to the beginning of the semester. The ERA 220 professor Fall '09 was new to CSUF and didn't seem to have a clear idea of what the requirements were for the class and how it related to the program requirements (there were two cohorts contained in the class). Possibly require ERA 220 project proposals to be assigned in chunks throughout the semester rather than due in total at the very end without any checkpoints or feedback along the way. This seems to be at the professor's discretion, but would be more helpful for students to have it broken up into manageable chunks.

A doctoral program in education that is not focused on administration would be a welcome alternative.

More preparation, timelines in ERA 220 to help with final project. I did not feel I was adequately prepared to begin the project and would have liked checkpoints - ie: Have 10 resources by____, turn Ch 1 by _____. I still have not received feedback from the paper I wrote in ERA 220 and that feedback would be nice since my Advisor is asking for Ch. 1-3 by Jan. 29/Feb. 1.

It would really help returning students to have a place they could turn to for support with Blackboard, Madden library etc.

Help/guide the students to make connections with actual work opportunities related to the degree.

More job/career information in classes. I only had one class in which I was introduced to possible career choices. Alternative fee structure for full-time employees.

Dr. ____ is disorganized, contradicts himself and seems unprepared and often seemed unclear. [LEE professor]

The ERA 220 class did not meet my needs. I'm sure a different instructor would have been better for me.

2. Alumni Survey -- A formal alumni survey has not been conducted recently; one of the goals of 2010-2012 is to develop and administer such a survey.

3. Employer Survey -- A formal employer survey has also not been conducted recently; another of the goals of 2010-2012 is to develop and administer an employer survey.

California State University, Fresno (07-08)
Section A-3
Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

M.A. in Education–Curriculum and Instruction Option

ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION IN SECTION A-2

The section above contains charts and commentary regarding the primary candidate assessments used by the C&I program. In addition, in May 2010, a student from the MAE-C&I program was selected to represent the KSOEHD as the Graduate Dean's Medal candidate. A few students in the C&I program applied for Graduate Student Research and Creative Activities Support Awards, but due to a reduction in funds, the number of awards was greatly reduced. No student other than doctoral students in the KSOEHD received these awards during 2010. However, faculty will still be urged to continue supporting students in applying for the GSRcasa. The documentation of "changes since Commission approval of current program document" above provides evidence of considerable growth in and accomplishments by the C&I program and its students since 2006. One of the goals from the last biennial review was resurrecting the Certificate of Advanced Study in Educational Technology (CASET). Through active recruitment, all CASET courses (e.g., CI 225, CI 227, CI 230) were able to be offered during 2009-2010, a significant accomplishment.

Graduate Writing Requirement -- Although some students require more than one submission of their writing assignment paper in CI 250 in order to pass this requirement, almost 100% of the C&I students eventually pass this requirement. During 2009, more students than in past years have not passed the graduate writing requirement within 6 months of first failing it. Those who have passed the requirement in the past 2 years and who have gone on to write a project have been successful in doing so. The Division of Graduate Studies will hire graduate writing tutors to assist weaker writers free of charge from 4-7 p.m. beginning in October 2010. Students with writing challenges will be referred to these tutors. A winter intersession course will be offered through Continuing and Global Education to review/teach writing skills. These important supports will be offered to students needing assistance with graduate-level writing. The C&I department will also elect members of a graduate writing requirement committee annually.

Project/Thesis -- MAE-C&I has historically produced award-winning theses, but in the past two years no student has elected to write a thesis and successfully complete it. This will be an area that the C&I faculty will need to discuss and determine a plan to encourage and support more theses. Clear expectations of thesis and project advisors need to be understood by all advisors, who also need to understand and reinforce the IRB guidelines. The program also needs to develop a rubric to assess the final project. This would give both students and professors more guidance in evaluating the project (and assigning it an appropriate grade). Plans are being made for selecting projects at random for review/assessment by either the Division of Graduate Studies, the KSOEHD graduate committee, or program faculty. Plans are also being made for a discussion regarding having more than one member of a project committee as is done by many departments on campus.

Exit Survey -- Overall, the results indicated that the students were [enthusiastic about] greatly pleased with their C&I master's program experience. They had strong words of praise for their professors from the C&I department and for the program coordinator. The only negative comments received were regarding courses offered by professors in other departments. This is something that we can discuss with those professors directly. Many mentioned the cohort model as a great strength of their graduate experience. This reaffirms the power of this model and provides impetus to continue recruiting cohorts if the School budget can support both a cohort and an on-campus group of students. Converting the CI 241 online course to a face-to-face format with an emphasis on multiculturalism and service learning turned out to be an excellent idea; it was very popular with the students, who felt that it was a very useful course.

New Alumni and Employer surveys will be developed and piloted during 2010-2012.

California State University, Fresno (09-10)
Section A-4
Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate & Program Performance

M.A. in Education–Curriculum and Instruction Option

Specific Objective	Strategies/Tasks	Person(s) Responsible	Date
<i>Update and revise the C&I Program SOAP</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hold regular meetings to review and revise the SOAP to reflect candidate dispositions and review/update program goals and student learning outcomes. - Review content of courses and align with the program goals and student learning outcomes. Consider including successful elements of CI 241 in core classes. 	Program Coordinator and program faculty	By Spring 2012
<i>Develop new assessments of student learning outcomes.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - C&I faculty meet to develop a new Exit Survey, Employer Survey, and Alumni Survey that align with program goals and objectives. - The new assessments will be administered and the results included in the next report. 	Program Coordinator and program faculty	By Summer 2011
<i>Revisit the Analyzing Classroom Teaching (ACT) assignment in CI 275.</i>	The ACT assignment will be reviewed to determine if it is still serving its purpose or needs to be modified.	CI 275 instructor(s), Program Coordinator, and other program faculty	By Spring 2011
<i>Develop a scoring rubric for the Project (CI 298) and use to evaluate randomly-selected projects</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - C&I graduate faculty will review current project guidelines and develop a scoring rubric. - The KSOEHD graduate committee will discuss how to go about selecting projects to evaluate and conducting the evaluation (if concept is agreed upon by the committee) 	Program Coordinator and program faculty; KSOEHD Graduate Committee	By Spring 2011