
Management Audit of the College of Education

A Report to the
Governor
and the
Legislature of
the State of
Hawaii

Report No. 95-24
November 1995

THE AUDITOR
STATE OF HAWAII

Management Audit of the College of Education

A Report to the
Governor
and the
Legislature of
the State of
Hawaii

Submitted by

THE AUDITOR
STATE OF HAWAII

Report No. 95-24
November 1995

Foreword

This audit of the College of Education, University of Hawaii at Manoa was initiated to determine whether the college's efforts to develop and assess its teacher preparation programs can be improved. Improving these two processes should enable the college to more effectively prepare its candidates to become competent teachers in public schools. The audit was conducted pursuant to Section 23-4, Hawaii Revised Statutes, which requires the State Auditor to conduct post audits of all departments, offices, and agencies of the State.

We wish to acknowledge the cooperation and assistance extended to us by the administration and faculty at the University of Hawaii and the College of Education during the course of this audit.

Marion M. Higa
State Auditor

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction and Background

State's Primary Source of Teachers	1
Nationwide Concerns about Teacher Preparation Programs	2
Objectives of the Audit	3
Scope and Methodology	3

Chapter 2 Findings and Recommendations

Summary of Findings	5
The College Has Yet to Clarify its Mission	5
Program Development Policies and Guidelines are Lacking	7
Teacher Preparation Programs Are Not Adequately Evaluated	14
Conclusion	17
Recommendations	17

Notes	19
-------------	----

Response of the Affected Agency	21
---------------------------------------	----

Exhibit

Exhibit 2.1	College of Education Groups with Program Development Involvement	9
-------------	--	---

Chapter 1

Introduction and Background

Many of today's education reform efforts require changes to traditional teacher preparation programs. In recognition of Hawaii's education reform efforts, the State Auditor initiated an audit of the College of Education, University of Hawaii at Manoa (college) to determine whether the college management processes can be improved to enable it to effectively prepare its candidates to become competent teachers in the public schools.

This audit was performed pursuant to Section 23-4, Hawaii Revised Statutes, which requires our office to conduct postaudits of the transactions, accounts, programs, and performance of all state agencies.

State's Primary Source of Teachers

The College of Education, University of Hawaii at Manoa, is one of the primary sources of teachers for the state's public school system. With an instructional budget of approximately \$7 million, the college offers a variety of upper division undergraduate and graduate programs. The college offers Bachelor of Education degree programs in elementary education and secondary education, as well as a Bachelor of Science degree program in health, physical education, and recreation. Graduate level programs in educational administration, educational foundations, elementary education, secondary education, counseling and guidance, special education, educational technology, educational psychology, and teaching are also available.

While the college's primary responsibility is to prepare teachers for the public school system, it also provides a number of other services such as in-service teacher training, certification in specialized areas, and advanced degrees. College programs also certify recreational fitness staff, school counselors, rehabilitation counselors, and school administrators. Finally, the college conducts research on educational, recreational, and physical fitness issues, and evaluates Department of Education (DOE) programs.

The college is organized into nine instructional departments with approximately 101 authorized instructional positions. The nine departments are: (1) Counseling and Guidance, (2) Curriculum and Instruction, (3) Educational Administration, (4) Educational Foundations, (5) Educational Psychology, (6) Educational Technology, (7) Field Services, (8) Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, and (9) Special Education.

Approximately 460 courses are offered in the fall and spring semesters. About 100 courses are offered during the summer.

Each semester about 1,000 undergraduate and certificate-seeking students enroll in the college. In 1992, about 374 students graduated. From 1993 on, about 500 students graduated each year. A third enroll as part-time students. Since Fall 1992, enrollment in the college's graduate programs has averaged about 680 classified students each semester. About 160 students receive their graduate degrees each year.

Every five years the College of Education undergoes an accreditation review by the DOE called the State Approval of Teacher Education (SATE). The college's teacher preparation programs were last reviewed in 1994.

The SATE review is conducted according to standards set forth by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). In the SATE accreditation review process a state education agency, which may be a department of education, a state standards commission, or a board of education, reviews and accredits all teacher education programs in that state. States can adopt the NASDTEC standards in their entirety or use them as a framework for their own standards. While NASDTEC provides the standards, the states establish procedures for accrediting teacher education programs.

Nationwide Concerns about Teacher Preparation Programs

Today, teacher preparation programs nationwide are under scrutiny because educators and policy makers recognize that improved public school education is based on appropriate preparation of teachers. Michael Fullan, author of *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform*, states that "the weakest and potentially strongest link in educational reform right now is the initial preparation and on-the-job development of teachers....no other change is as basic as this one."¹ The National Conference of State Legislatures asserts "teachers entering the profession out of college are often unprepared for the reality of teaching."²

From such concerns, many suggestions to reform colleges of education have been proposed. The reforms include raising entry standards of the profession, ensuring teacher competency in the subjects they teach, providing teacher candidates with sufficient and practical classroom experience, and improving support services for beginning teachers.

Objectives of the Audit

1. Assess whether the College of Education's programs appropriately reflect its mission, function, and responsibilities.
2. Review how the College of Education has developed programs to accomplish its mission.
3. Assess the extent to which the College of Education has evaluated the accomplishment of its mission.

Scope and Methodology

In performing this audit, we reviewed relevant state laws affecting the University of Hawaii and the College of Education. We reviewed the mission, organization, operations, and management of the college. We interviewed pertinent staff at the University of Hawaii and the Department of Education. We interviewed members of the Hawaii State Teachers' Association and professional staff at various private and public schools and other higher education institutions in the state. We reviewed and analyzed the Board of Regents' policies and bylaws, executive policies, accreditation standards, self-studies, program policies and procedures, program proposals, program reviews, minutes from various faculty advisory groups, previous audit studies, and other related literature.

Our review to determine the extent to which the college has evaluated its programs was limited to current undergraduate programs. This audit did not assess the quality of the programs offered by the College of Education.

Our work was performed from January 1995 through May 1995 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

Chapter 2

Findings and Recommendations

This chapter presents our findings and recommendations on the College of Education's (college) mission, program development process and program assessment methods. We concluded that the college needs to attend to some basic institutional tasks.

Summary of Findings

1. The College of Education has not clarified its mission or its strategy to achieve clarity.
2. The college lacks clear policies and guidelines to guide its program development process.
3. The college's teacher preparation programs are not adequately evaluated.

The College Has Yet to Clarify its Mission

The College of Education has left unresolved the apparent conflict between a single statutory mission and a multi-pronged university mission. It has left itself open to tugging and pulling by stakeholders within and without the college. If it does not succeed in correcting the deficiencies alleged by the Department of Education in a 1994 review, its graduates will be at risk of being deemed unemployable by the public school system.

Historic mission is to train public school teachers

Originally, the College of Education was the Territorial Normal and Training School (Normal School), an independent college for the purpose of training public school teachers. In 1931 the Legislature brought the Normal School under the University of Hawaii as the Teachers College of Hawaii. This eventually became the College of Education. However, despite the jurisdiction of the university's Board of Regents and the university's broad mission and goals, the college's statutory purpose was left unchanged: "to train teachers to meet the requirements of the public schools of the territory."¹ Although the college has developed research and graduate-level programs under the university's broader mission of teaching, research, and community service, its historical, single mission has remained in the statutes since 1931.

Mission is unclear within the college

A mission should be clear to the community affected by it and endorsed by relevant stakeholders. It should guide the work of the institution and become the criteria against which programs can be assessed. W. Edmund Moomaw noted as early as 1984 in *Leadership Roles of Chief Academic Officers* that:

Every college and university must have an academic mission.... Emphasis on mission and goals causes people to recommit themselves to those goals and examine their own activities in light of them. Moreover, continuous articulation of mission and goals will have the effect of making them the conventional wisdom.²

The College of Education-Manoa lacks such a mission to guide it. It has failed to seek either (1) resolution of the conflict between a mission set out in an old statute and the broader mission of a university or (2) an ordering of its several missions. It has no strategy for setting priorities among competing missions. Instead, it has muddled along, at times trying to stratify its various missions, at other times expressing conflicting priorities.

College administration and some faculty assert that the college has a multiple mission but acknowledge teacher preparation as its primary mission. Other faculty assert that the college's overriding mission is to prepare teachers for the State. The college's documents confuse the picture further. Some boast of its diverse undergraduate and graduate programs as well as the extent of its research, while others assert its primary mission is the preparation of educators for the public schools.

The college's programs are indeed diverse. As described in Chapter 1, the college in fact conducts research programs. It trains other school personnel besides teachers, such as school administrators, educational specialists, and counselors. It also offers the Bachelor of Science degree in Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, which allows students to specialize in a non-teaching field.

DOE says other missions detract from teacher preparation

DOE believes the college should focus on teacher training. In its 1994 State Approval of Teacher Education (SATE) report, DOE noted the college's multiple priorities of research, curriculum development, and graduate programs. It believed these were competing priorities that did not contribute significantly or directly to meeting the needs of public schools. DOE recommended that the college give first priority to a "teacher education and school improvement mission." The report also charged that the college did not officially update its mission to give focus to its self-reform efforts.

The DOE and other education agencies that subscribe to the SATE process and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education (NASDTEC) standards will not certify and employ graduates of programs deemed deficient. As a national accreditation agency, NASDTEC requires teacher preparation institutions to develop clear missions with goals and objectives that provide guidelines for educational planning and operation. These guidelines serve as referents for decision making on such matters as student admission and retention policies, curriculum development, faculty research, evaluation, physical facilities, resources, community service, and finance.

From its 1994 SATE review, DOE placed most of the undergraduate and graduate teacher preparation programs of the College of Education-Manoa on a three-year provisional approval status because of “systematic and organizational concerns” about the college. According to the report, the college needs to establish a well-supported long-range plan for its teacher education mission, a formal program development process, and a systematic program evaluation process. Failure of the college to correct these problems could result in the inability of graduates to obtain teacher certification, which is within the jurisdiction of DOE to grant.

It is apparent that the college has not been able to gain DOE’s acceptance of its perception of a multiple mission. Its difficulty can be attributed in part to its failure to explicate its priorities among those multiple missions. Also attributable is its failure to develop and communicate a strategy for dealing with competing priorities in the face of shrinking state resources and a pool of teachers that is smaller than the demand. If the college believes that the 1931 statute, codified as Section 304-20, Hawaii Revised Statutes, contributes to its difficulties with DOE, it should seek the assistance of the university administration and the Board of Regents in raising this issue with the Legislature.

Program Development Policies and Guidelines are Lacking

A university program is a sequence of courses that results in a degree or a certificate. Schools and colleges can modify or create new programs to more adequately reflect their mission and goals.

We found that the college does not have clear policies and guidelines for program development. The authority structure for degree-granting and certificate-granting programs is not clearly defined. The college does not consistently adhere to university-wide program development standards. Also, the college lacks clear policies on its “cohort” programs.

Responsibilities and authority for program development are confused

Several councils, committees, and groups exercise confusing, overlapping roles in the program development process—from initiation, planning, and proposal reviews to approval and evaluation. These entities include the Program Council for Teacher Education (PCTE), the College of Education Faculty Senate, the Teacher Education Committees, the Hawaii School University Partnership, and any of the instructional departments. Each can initiate or propose new programs and can review program proposals from other college bodies.

Exhibit 2.1 illustrates the overlaps and the lack of clarity on the sources of their respective authority.

The college has not adequately defined how these different groups should interact to ensure new college programs contribute to its mission and do not duplicate existing programs.

The confusion over who has what authority over program development was exacerbated in 1992. As administrative head of the college, the dean directs program development and exercises administrative control over the college's programs. Final authority for program approval should rest with the dean. However, in 1992 the dean delegated administrative authority and program governance over teacher preparation programs to the PCTE. This council is composed of faculty members and individuals from the Department of Education. However, "program governance" was not clearly defined nor was PCTE's relationship to the college Faculty Senate. The dean created the PCTE to unify faculty control over teacher education programs under one entity. He indicated that the PCTE would oversee these programs but did not indicate how it would articulate its relationship to the college Faculty Senate.

In 1979 the Board of Regents authorized the creation of faculty organizations to advise college and university administration about academic policies and standards. Manoa campus faculty exercise this right through the Manoa Faculty Congress and Manoa Faculty Senate. In addition, 12 of the educational units at Manoa campus have also exercised this right through their own faculty senates. The College of Education Faculty Senate is one of those entities.

According to its charter and bylaws, the college Faculty Senate is a forum for professional discourse and consideration of college-wide policies that relate to the educational process. The college Faculty Senate makes recommendations about college programs, goals, and policies to the dean. It reviews, on behalf of the college faculty, program and course proposals and then passes those on to the dean for final approval. It is not clear whether the dean, in delegating program governance to the PCTE, has abrogated the program review function of the college Faculty Senate. Some faculty members question whether this function can be abrogated by the dean.

Exhibit 2.1
College of Education
Groups with Program Development Involvement

Group	Basis for Establishment	Membership	Responsibility/ Authority	Meeting Frequency	Reports to Whom
College of Education Faculty Senate	BOR authorized creation of College Faculty Senates	Approximately 30 elected faculty and APT personnel	Recommends goals, policies, and programs to dean	Minimum once per month	Communicates actions to the dean and/or other college personnel
Departments	Dean establishes with BOR approval Faculty may also propose creation of departments	Faculty in the department	Curriculum and course development	Varies from department to department	Curriculum issues sent to college Faculty Senate. Administrative issues such as new hires and budget to dean
Program Council for Teacher Education (PCTE)	Created by dean in 1992 by memo	Approximately 20 appointed by dean	Program governance for teacher preparation programs	Approximately once per month	Consults with the dean on decisions of importance
Teacher Education Committees (TECs)	Established in 1966 by the UH President	Appointed by dean to 15 area committees	Planning, reviewing and recommending course of study for teacher preparation programs	At least once per semester	Proposals & recommendations routed to Associate Dean for Teacher Education who routes for further action
Hawaii School Unit Partnership (HSUP)	Memo of Agreement signed by University of Hawaii, Department of Education and Kamehameha Schools B.P. Bishop Estate in 1986	DOE, University of Hawaii, Kamehameha Schools B.P. Bishop Estate	Supports partnerships between COE and schools. Supports teacher education reform efforts	Once per quarter	N/A

The PCTE and the college Faculty Senate are currently developing a memorandum of understanding on their mutual responsibilities with respect to the college's teacher education programs. The draft memorandum transfers the senate's program review responsibilities with respect to the teacher education programs to the PCTE.

Since faculty do not agree on who should have responsibility for program review and approval, acceptance of the proposed memorandum may be difficult. Even if the proposed memorandum of understanding between the PCTE and the college Faculty Senate is accepted and implemented, the college still needs to develop clear guidelines and policies for program development. These guidelines are necessary to clearly delineate responsibilities to faculty, staff and students.

Then there are also the Teacher Education Committees, which are appointed by the dean and date back to 1966. They are also responsible for developing teacher preparation programs. Their roles and authority are confused in relation to the other faculty groups.

For example, the PCTE and Teacher Education Committees both plan a course of study for teacher education programs. There is no clarity on which plan takes precedence. Also, if the PCTE develops a proposal, it is not clear who has responsibility to review that proposal. Should it be reviewed by a Teacher Education Committee, or the college Faculty Senate? If both entities review a PCTE proposal, which review "counts"? The college needs to answer such questions.

The college needs to follow university policies

We found that the college has not sufficiently adhered to university standards for program development. When the college develops a new program it must follow a set of specific university standards established by the Board of Regents in Executive Policy E5.201, *Approval of New Academic Programs and Review of Provisional Academic Programs*. This policy is designed to ensure the academic and fiscal soundness of proposed and provisional programs and their appropriateness to the university and campus missions.

All written proposals to develop new programs must contain sufficient information to "permit assessment of the academic integrity and quality of the program, to determine its fiscal soundness and efficiency relative to other university activities, and to determine its appropriateness to the mission of the university and the campus." According to the policy, proposals need to address: 1) the objectives of the program, 2) whether the program objectives are appropriate functions of the college and university, 3) how the program is organized to meet its objectives, 4) who will enroll in the program, 5) resources required for program implementation and first cycle operation, 6) how efficient the program will be, and 7) how program effectiveness will be demonstrated.

We found that some proposals for existing programs did not address all of these standards. For example, the proposal for the Master of Education in Teaching submitted in November 1989 did not address: 1) resources required for program implementation and first cycle operation, 2) how efficient the program will be, and 3) how program effectiveness will be demonstrated. Although the number of faculty needed to operate the program was specified, no cost or funding estimates were provided.

Further, a 1991 proposal to establish a Master of Science Degree in Health, Physical Education and Recreation demonstrated a demand for the program but did not clearly identify whether the proposed program was an appropriate function of the college. Although there was an impact statement addressing faculty workload, no cost estimates were presented, and no mention was made of how the effectiveness of the proposed program would be demonstrated. We believe that following the university's standards would help ensure that programs have clearly identified objectives, a clear program definition, and a relationship to the mission of the university.

Programs need clear goals and objectives

The college should ensure that there are clear goals and objectives for each of its degree-granting and certificate-granting programs. These goals and objectives should identify the skills and abilities that students will acquire as a result of enrolling in that program. We found that students are not consistently informed of the college's specific expectations of them. Some program goals and objectives are very clear while others are either rudimentary, unclear, or non-existent.

An example of clearly worded goals and objectives exists in the Master's Degree in Educational Technology program. Upon completion of the educational technology program, master's degree students are expected to:

1. Be capable of planning and designing new media learning facilities, of modifying existing ones, and of using management techniques needed in their operation; and
2. Be able to plan appropriate applications of technology to specific instructional situations, to select or design and develop materials and strategies, and to objectively evaluate such applications.

On the other hand, the goal of the Department of Special Education as described in the *Department Overview* is to "provide university students with information about identifying and teaching persons with disabilities." Although five programs are summarized in the *Department Overview*, no objectives are stated for any of the programs, and no

expectations of students are listed. Thus, the overview does not provide sufficient guidance to potential students considering entry into special education programs. Explicit skills to be developed and program benefits are not defined for students. Recruitment for the special education program is especially critical as the field has been understaffed and under federal order to meet classroom teacher requirements for several years.

In addition, an information bulletin on the Master's of Education program in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction fails to identify the objectives of the program and anticipated student outcomes. The Master of Education in Teaching program objectives are also inadequate because they do not identify the kinds of graduates expected from the program or the skills and abilities expected of those graduates.

Developing and publishing clear goals and objectives for each degree-granting and certificate-granting program would assist students to assess the usefulness and applicability of those programs. In addition, clear goals and objectives would be measures against which the success of the programs can be assessed.

Policies on cohort programs need to be articulated

The college is making a fundamental change in the structure of its program delivery but without a full explication of its ramifications. The college intends to use the new model for most of its teacher preparation programs. Although the model may be a sound approach, the college has not adequately addressed important issues regarding its implementation. These include: 1) clarifying how resources are to be allocated and whether sufficient resources are in place to adequately support the model, 2) clarifying how faculty roles are to change and the impact upon faculty workload, and 3) establishing clear policies on student readmission to the program.

Traditionally, students have completed program requirements individually. Under a cohort model, a group (or cohort) of 20 to 30 students is admitted to a program as a unit and progresses through together, taking most of the same classes and proceeding at the same pace. The college began the cohort model to ensure that students take courses in a logical sequence and within one to two years.

In addition, the cohort model places students in school classrooms from the first semester. The purpose is to better integrate theory and practice, considered a critical need by DOE in the 1994 SATE report.

For example, students now pursuing a degree in elementary education will have a minimum of 40 hours of observation/participation field experience in each of three semesters before student teaching. The total minimum of 120 hours compares favorably with the 90 hours in the "traditional" elementary program.

The college's early involvement in the late 1980s with the Holmes Group, a national consortium of 96 American research universities, influenced its decision to implement the cohort model. As a member of the Holmes Group, the college began to consider alternative means of providing services to its students and to consider new programs. Elements in the "cohort model" advocated by the Holmes group include more integration of theory and practice and more involvement of school and college of education personnel in each other's programs. The college used the cohort model first in the Master of Education in Teaching program and then, in other teacher preparation programs.

The DOE 1994 SATE report commended the college for developing two cohort programs: the Pre-service for Teachers of Minorities Program and the Master of Education in Teaching Program. It noted that these two programs model successful teacher preparation practices.

However, a number of policy issues associated with the cohort model have not been resolved. We found that the college has not clarified how resources such as faculty and funding are to be allocated and whether sufficient resources are in place to adequately support the model. As a result there is no assurance that the model can be implemented successfully, especially in a period of fiscal austerity.

In addition, faculty involved in these cohort models will have a change in their roles and their workload will be increased. The college has not provided the faculty with a clear description of this role change and a set of expectations. The faculty have not been fully apprised of how they are to balance instruction, research, and service to the university, public schools, and the community. Consequently, faculty do not have adequate information to decide whether they should become involved in the model.

Finally, college administrators have not resolved how to readmit those who drop out of a cohort program for financial or personal reasons. NASDTEC standards require institutions to have "well-defined and published policies and procedures for selective admission, retention, and graduation of students in basic and advanced programs."

To improve the effectiveness of the cohort model, the college needs to clarify how resources are to be allocated and whether sufficient resources are in place to adequately support the model, clarify how faculty roles are to change and the impact upon faculty workload, and establish clear policies on student readmission to the program.

Greater control over course objectives is needed

In addition to clear program policies, it is important that each course has clear objectives and that every instructor for that course addresses these objectives. College faculty have discussed the issue and the dean has

disseminated guidelines on developing a course syllabus. However, the college does not have a formal, written policy requiring faculty who teach the same course to address a common objective for that course. As a result, courses could have different objectives if taught by different instructors in the same or subsequent semesters.

Some departments develop course objectives for their most important courses so that all instructors who teach all sections of these courses are consistent in purpose. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction and the Department of Educational Foundations, which offer two of the three core foundation teacher preparation courses, are developing course objectives for these foundation courses to be followed by their instructors. The Department of Educational Psychology, which offers the third foundation course, showed no evidence of consistent course objectives for that course.

The college cannot ensure that a course addresses program objectives if there is a variation in the course objectives among instructors. Thus, students may not receive consistent training. The college should ensure that each course has the same objective or series of objectives for all instructors who teach that course title. Having clear objectives and common learning experiences would provide a basis for evaluating the quality and usefulness of students' training.

Teacher Preparation Programs Are Not Adequately Evaluated

Evaluating undergraduate teacher preparation programs would enable the university and the college to know how well it is doing and how it can improve its two Bachelor of Education programs. Evaluation requirements are found in national accreditation standards.

The University of Hawaii at Manoa is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The College of Education is accredited through the SATE process of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) as described earlier.

Although evaluation standards of these two accreditation agencies vary, both require program evaluation. WASC requires adequate procedures, measurements and resources to evaluate and improve the quality of instruction. NASDTEC requires the college to conduct periodic surveys of its teacher education program graduates to improve its services. In addition, current students need to be assessed to determine whether the program is meeting its objectives.

The University of Hawaii's policies also provide guidance and criteria for program evaluation. Executive Policy E5.202, *Review of Established Programs*, provides for a periodic examination of programs for effectiveness and relevancy. Executive Policy E5.210, *Educational Assessment*, ensures that information gained from assessment activities is used to improve programs and services.

The college's current efforts are useful endeavors. It is trying to assess the quality of work performed by student teachers, obtain student feedback on specific courses and programs, and obtain employment data on college graduates. However, existing assessments do not identify whether or not college graduates have acquired the necessary skills to teach in the classroom—the most basic yardstick of teacher preparation programs.

The university needs to review the college's undergraduate teacher preparation programs

The university's policies require a periodic university review of every program to determine whether those programs are appropriate and meet their stated objectives. Most of the college's degree and certificate-granting programs were recently reviewed by the university's Council of Program Reviews according to these policies.

Program reviews were conducted on a departmental basis. But the college's two major undergraduate teacher preparation programs—the Bachelor of Education in Elementary Education and the Bachelor of Education in Secondary Education—were not included in the university review. The programs were overlooked because they were not specifically housed in any of the college's nine departments. Thus no department was specifically responsible for these programs.

A university program review of the two undergraduate teacher preparation programs is needed. The reviews would determine whether the program objectives are being met and whether the programs are appropriate for the college. Evaluating these two programs is especially important because teacher preparation programs constitute a primary mission of the college and about 40 percent of DOE's teachers hired in the past four years are graduates of the College of Education.

The college lacks a formal program evaluation process

The college does not have a formal process to evaluate its teacher preparation programs. At present the Associate Dean for Teacher Education and the PCTE are responsible for evaluating these programs. Although a variety of individuals and groups are also involved in evaluating elements of those programs or collecting data, the evaluation process is fragmented and incomplete. These include the Office of Student Services and the Division of Field Services, neither of which has a specific mandate to conduct a formal program evaluation of teacher preparation programs.

A formal evaluation process should include explicit guidelines, coordinated evaluation activities, and use of the information to improve programs. We found that the college has not established program assessment standards or a rationale on the need for assessment. Evaluation efforts therefore lack direction and coordination. Finally, the college does not collect sufficient information to know the impact of its teacher education programs. Without clear evaluation policies, the college cannot assure itself or others that its teacher education programs use resources effectively, meet stated objectives, and are of a proven quality. The absence of these policies also hampers effective use of the information that is collected.

Existing evaluation procedures can be better coordinated

The college collects some information about its students and graduates. Its Division of Field Services (DFS) collects performance information on student teachers with the help of DOE's cooperating teachers. The DFS also collects information from student teachers on the college's teacher preparation programs. A formal survey of student teachers on their teacher education program was done in Spring 1995.

The college's Office of Student Services conducts a follow-up survey of the previous year's graduates to obtain information on student employment and placement. The survey also asks respondents to briefly comment on their undergraduate experiences in the college.

However, not all faculty members are aware of the information gathered by the DFS and the Office of Student Services. There is no procedure to ensure that data reaches faculty who administer teacher preparation programs. Nor is it known whether the data is useful. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction does not use the DFS information.

Efforts to gather information to assess program impact can be developed. Current surveys of graduates do not gather sufficient information on how well the college's courses and programs have prepared college graduates to teach in classrooms. For example, the Office of Student Services conducts an employment information survey but does not ask how well teachers are doing in their careers or how useful are the skills they acquired in the teacher preparation programs.

A revised version of the survey to capture more information about individuals in their first year of teaching has been developed. However, the revised instrument does not ask about the quality of preparation, the specific skills they could have acquired, and the problems they face as first-year teachers. Without this information, the college cannot assess how well college graduates are functioning in their fields.

The college can use other information sources. For example, performance information can be provided by DOE district level specialists for teacher development assistance programs. Mentor teachers and school principals could be surveyed on the graduates' classroom performance. The college expressed concern that such information gathering would violate collective bargaining agreements. However, we found nothing to support this contention.

Data collection efforts can be improved by ensuring that they are coordinated for program improvement and that additional information is gathered to answer questions about program impact.

Conclusion

The College of Education can improve its undergraduate teacher preparation programs by clarifying its mission. The college can improve its program development and strengthen its data collection for program assessment and modifications. Some of the steps the college can take are to follow university guidelines more closely, explicate specific roles and responsibilities, and, in a few instances, create new policies.

Recommendations

1. The College of Education should achieve consensus within the college in clarifying its mission. It should seek the assistance of the university administration, the Board of Regents, and the Legislature if it believes Section 304-20, HRS, prevents it from clarifying its mission.
2. The College of Education should provide clearer guidance to its program development process by:
 - a. Establishing a set of policies and procedures that direct and guide its undergraduate programs by identifying responsible parties for developing programs, and identifying program approval authority within the college.
 - b. Ensuring that all proposals for new programs provide the information required by university policy and that such proposals contain cost and impact statements.
 - c. Developing clear goals and objectives for each of its degree-granting and certificate-granting programs that include skills and abilities that students will acquire as a result of enrolling in those programs.

- d. Clarifying how resources are to be allocated to its cohort programs, whether sufficient resources are available, how faculty roles and workload may change and how students may reapply to the cohort programs.
 - e. Ensuring that each course has a specific objective or series of objectives common to all instructors who teach that course.
- 3. The College of Education should develop a coordinated evaluation process for all programs.
 - 4. The university should ensure that program reviews are conducted of the Bachelors of Education in Elementary Education and Bachelors of Education in Secondary Education programs despite their non-departmental status.

Notes

Chapter 1

1. Michael Fullan, *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform*, London, Falmer Press, 1993, p. 134.
2. Jana Zinser, *Reinventing Education*, Issue Paper No. 1, Investing in People Project, Denver, National Conference of State Legislatures, 1994, p. 8.

Chapter 2

1. Chapter 304-20, HRS.
2. W. Edmund Moomaw, "Participatory Leadership Strategy," in *Leadership Roles of Chief Academic Officers*, New Directions for Higher Education, Number 47, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1984, p. 22.
3. Nathaniel H. Karol and Sigmund G. Ginsburg, *Managing the Higher Education Enterprise*, New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1980, p. 92.
4. Ibid., p. 93.

Response of the Affected Agency

Comments on Agency Response

We transmitted a draft of this report to the University of Hawaii and to the College of Education on October 3, 1995. A copy of the transmittal letter to the University of Hawaii is included as Attachment 1. The College of Education provided a written response which is included as Attachment 2. The President of the University of Hawaii did not submit a response but informed us that the college's letter constitutes the official response of the university.

The college provided a lengthy response which articulated the college's perspective on some issues but which essentially agreed with our recommendations. The college commented that it must reflect the university's multiple mission of teaching, research, and service without ignoring any of those elements. In its response, the college noted that it plans to work toward a revision to Section 304-20, HRS. Also, the college indicated that the program governance process is currently being reviewed by the Interim Dean and his administrative staff. The college also agreed that program publications should identify the program's goals and objectives.

The college also agreed that it can improve surveys to provide better information on the effectiveness of its programs and how well its graduates are doing in the classroom. In addition, the college agrees that it needs to ensure that survey information is channeled back to faculty for program improvement. The college also pointed out some clarifying language on the program development process and the evaluation of the teacher preparation programs which we incorporated into the report.

STATE OF HAWAII
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR
465 S. King Street, Room 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-2917



MARION M. HIGA
State Auditor

(808) 587-0800
FAX: (808) 587-0830

October 3, 1995

COPY

The Honorable Kenneth P. Mortimer
President and Chancellor
University of Hawaii
2444 Dole Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Dear President Mortimer:

Enclosed for your information are three copies, numbered 6 to 8 of our draft report, *Management Audit of the College of Education*. We ask that you telephone us by Friday, October 6, 1995, on whether or not you intend to comment on our recommendations. If you wish your comments to be included in the report, please submit them no later than Friday, October 13, 1995.

The Interim Dean of the College of Education, Governor, and presiding officers of the two houses of the Legislature have also been provided copies of this draft report.

Since this report is not in final form and changes may be made to it, access to the report should be restricted to those assisting you in preparing your response. Public release of the report will be made solely by our office and only after the report is published in its final form.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "marion m. higa".

Marion M. Higa
State Auditor

Enclosures



University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Office of the Dean • College of Education
Wist Hall Annex 2 • Room 128 • 1776 University Avenue
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822 • Cable Address: UNIHAW

October 10, 1995

Ms. Marion M. Higa
State Auditor
Room 500
465 S. King St.
Honolulu, HI 96813-2917

RECEIVED
OCT 12 3 22 PM '95
OFF. OF THE AUDITOR
STATE OF HAWAII

Dear Ms. Higa:

Thank you kindly for sending the initial draft of the report entitled "Management Audit of the College of Education" with your letter dated October 3, 1995. The report is thorough, detailed, and provides us with many ideas for improving our programs and procedures. In that letter, you provide the College of Education with the opportunity to comment on the initial draft report and that such comments may be included in the final report. The following comments constitute the College's response; we request that they be so included in the final report.

First, concerning the process of reporting the results of the audit, we were led to believe by Mr. Robert McClelland of your office in our meeting of September 27, 1995 that your initial draft report would be circulated only to the Office of the President of the University of Hawai'i and to the Office of the Dean of the College of Education. We note for the record that your letter states that copies of the initial draft report have also been sent to the Governor of the State of Hawai'i and to the presiding officers of the two houses of the State Legislature. Since our comments are intended to correct inaccuracies and misimpressions contained within the initial draft, we are concerned that premature release of the initial draft report may be misinterpreted by the Governor and the presiding officers of the Legislature. We would appreciate your notifying these officers regarding our amendments to this draft.

Second, on page three of the draft report, under the heading of "Scope and Methodology," the report explicitly claims, "This audit *did not assess the quality* of the programs offered by the College of Education" [our emphasis]. It is important that the public understand that your office never undertook the attempt to evaluate the worth or effectiveness of the preparation programs in the College of Education, since failure to

note this could cause misunderstanding and tarnish the image and reputation of the College in the public mind. This should be stated on page one of the final report in the first paragraph under "Introduction and Background." Instead, the second sentence of this section of the draft report reads "...the State Auditor initiated an audit of the College of Education ... *to determine whether the college's teacher preparation programs adequately prepare its candidates to become effective teachers in the public schools*" [p. 1, our emphasis]. We must take exception to this language since it is precisely the sort of thing that is disavowed on page three, and it is precisely the sort of thing that will cause public misunderstanding and lead to the unfair tarnishing of the College's image. We also trust that in any public briefings by your office that you will stress that your audit did not seek to determine the quality or effectiveness of the College of Education programs. Even as we are constantly trying to improve our programs, we stand by their current quality and effectiveness. Inaccurate statements, such as those on page one, can do great damage.

Third, we note that the audit is, in your terms, a "management" audit of the College, not a fiscal or financial audit, and one that was initiated by your office, rather than at the behest of a second authority. The term 'management,' however, is subject to differing interpretations, as well as misinterpretations. Proper management greatly differs, as well, with the kind of institution or organization with which one is dealing. For example, in a command structure organization such as the military, in which authority is highly vertical and tightly compartmentalized, departures from the norm are irregular and cause for concern. Such organizations in the literature are known as "tightly-coupled." In collegial and professional organizations, however, in which authority is more diffuse and the nature of the work itself dictates diffused authority, we cannot and should not expect management styles and decision-making structures to replicate that of the military. In such "loosely-coupled" systems, we should not expect to find a rule for every situation, for there is no "book" to go by. Universities are excellent examples of loosely-coupled systems in which administration and faculty do have respective spheres of authority, but in which large areas of overlapping jurisdiction, the nature of academic work itself, the cardinal principle of academic freedom, and the necessarily collegial relations between administrators and faculty all ensure that university decision making will differ greatly from command structure organizations. In necessarily loosely-coupled systems, ambiguity and vagueness are often the rule, rather than the exception.

The foregoing in no way exempts universities -- or the College of Education at UH-Manoa -- from critique or criticism in important areas of decision making. Indeed, your audit will help us examine our own practices, and, where found wanting, the report will serve as an important impetus for change in the College. However, it is important to note for all concerned that academic life cannot replicate that found in the military, or

even less tightly-coupled business organizations. To the extent that a management audit of the College takes a command structure organization as the ideal -- and there are suggestions of that in the initial draft report -- and ignores the realities and even necessities of academic life, the audit will miss its mark.

The remainder of our comments refer chapter by chapter to the initial draft report.

Chapter 1 under the heading "State's Primary Source of Teachers"

1. Page 1., third paragraph. In the last sentence beginning "Graduate level programs..." the report fails to note that we also have graduate level programs in the Departments of Curriculum and Instruction (Elementary and Secondary M. Ed.'s) and Educational Foundations. It also fails to note that two other masters' programs (Master of Education in Teaching and the experimental Interdisciplinary Master in Education) are College-wide programs. The Ed.D. program is also College-wide, while the Ph. D. program is administered by the Department of Educational Psychology.
2. Page 1, fourth paragraph, first sentence. While we in the College would not disavow that teacher preparation is our primary responsibility, the inservice professional development of teachers and the initial preparation of school administrators, school counselors, and physical educators are also critical responsibilities of the College. As it reads, the first sentence appears to downplay the significance of these responsibilities.
3. Page 1, fifth paragraph, first sentence. The draft report states that the College employs 101 instructional faculty. This is inaccurate. While the College had 101.25 FTE assigned to it in 1994-95, due to position losses, financial recissions, retirements, and a hiring freeze, its funding is limited to being able to employ only the current 81 instructional faculty. This represents a clear erosion in the College's capacity to fulfill its mission over the past few years through no fault of its own.

Chapter 1 under the heading "Nationwide Concerns about Teacher Preparation Programs"

1. Page 2, fifth and sixth paragraphs. Both of these paragraphs focus on issues of *quality* concerning teacher preparation programs. Yet such issues of quality, as stated on p. 3 of the initial draft report, are outside the scope of the management audit. Thus, it is difficult to understand the relevance of this section to the rest of the report. In fact, once again, it is a misleading invitation for the public to infer

that the audit was about the quality and effectiveness of the College's programs, when it was not. We recommend that this section be removed from the final report. If it is not removed, the report in all fairness should state that the College has addressed or is addressing all of the issues raised in this section. If you need further documentation of these facts, please let us know.

Chapter 2 under the heading "The College Has Yet to Clarify its Mission"

1. Page 6, first four paragraphs on the lack of clarity regarding the mission within the College. The mission of the University of Hawaii at Manoa focuses on teaching, research, and service. As a unit of the campus, the College of Education must also reflect this multiple mission and cannot ignore any of them. Within the College, the initial draft report notwithstanding, there is widespread agreement among faculty and administrators that the College must reflect the University's multiple mission. It is true that the 1931 statute that directs the College's mission to the preparation of teachers for the state is in conflict with UH-Manoa's multiple mission. We agree that the statute should be updated and, through the Board of Regents, we shall work towards an appropriate revision.

Within the College, however, there is a diversity of individuals and a diversity of departments. Given these different backgrounds and interests, it is natural that different emphases will be placed on UH-Manoa's and the College's multiple mission and the primary teaching focus of the College. Specialist-series faculty, who have little if any responsibility for research and scholarship, will naturally state that teaching and service are the primary, if not sole, responsibilities of the College. Instructional- and Research-series faculty, who also have research responsibilities and who are evaluated, partly, by Regents' policy on research responsibilities, will naturally place a greater emphasis on the College's research mission. Likewise, faculty whose primary involvement is with teacher preparation and teacher professional development will naturally place great emphasis on teacher education. And while no College faculty will disavow the College's teacher education mission, faculty in educational administration or counselor education, for example, will naturally place emphasis on their preparation programs. This is not confusion within the College. Rather it is the differing perspectives of faculty, dependent upon their varying backgrounds and interests. The faculty of the College reflect the multiple mission of UH-Manoa, as they must.

2. Page 6, last paragraph, and page 7, first three paragraphs on DOE. On page 6, fifth paragraph, it is stated that the Department of Education believes the College should focus on teacher "training" and disagrees with the College's multiple mission of diverse programs. As stated, this is confusing and requires disentangling. First, the DOE does not object to the College's preparation programs, outside of teacher education, in administrator education, special education, and counselor education. In fact, the DOE strongly supports these other programs, especially since the College is nearly the sole source for these educators. Likewise, the DOE strongly supports the College's graduate programs that offer professional development opportunities to inservice teachers, administrators, counselors, and other school personnel. Without advanced educational opportunities of this sort, the DOE well-realizes that their staff will become stagnant and unproductive. Thus, it is not this multiple mission of diverse programs with which the DOE disagrees. The final report should make this clear.

The DOE's disagreement in the SATE report with the College concerns two aspects: (1) the number of graduates the College produces each year through its teacher preparation programs, including the special education preparation programs and (2) the research portion of the College's mission and programs that do not contribute directly to educator preparation or professional development. The College has responded publicly to the 1994 SATE report, so that should not be belabored here. However, it should be noted that well-over 90 percent of the College's students are enrolled in school personnel preparation or inservice education programs -- absolute numbers that cannot be increased given the College's resource base which has been in precipitous decline. Moreover, the College cannot unilaterally repudiate the research portion of its mission -- a portion that is highly relevant to quality instruction in its preparation and inservice programs. The College believes that the DOE, through the SATE process, has erroneously singled out the College in relation to other teacher preparation programs within the state. The College is, however, attempting to address the DOE's needs within the limits of current resources and mission. We are dedicated to serving the children and youth of Hawai'i.

Chapter 2 under the heading "Program Development Policies and Guidelines are Lacking"

1. Pages 8, 9, and 10 through fourth paragraph in response to the subheading "Responsibilities and authority for program development are confused." This portion of the initial draft report refers to the multiple agencies of the College

involved in program development, review, and evaluation. Specifically, it focuses upon former Dean John Dolly's creation of the Program Council for Teacher Education (PCTE) in 1992 and its relation to other College bodies -- especially the College's Faculty Senate. Prior to the creation of the PCTE, responsibility for the College's teacher preparation programs was apportioned among seven other departments of the College. Due to communication difficulties among the seven departments, as a result of differing backgrounds and interests, there was widespread acknowledgment among faculty and administrators that the College's overall efforts in teacher preparation were ill-served. Over several College-wide faculty retreats, there was broad agreement that the faculty involved in teacher education should be empowered. In response, Dean Dolly created the PCTE with the charge to take responsibility for the overall review, reform, development, and evaluation of the College's teacher preparation programs. Though an administrative committee, the PCTE is composed primarily of College faculty from all departments with responsibility for teacher education. To give weight to this committee, Dean Dolly endowed it with the Dean's authority, but with the understanding that in important matters the Dean himself would reserve final approval authority. It simply is incorrect to say, as does the initial draft report (p.8), that the Dean "gave away" administrative authority and program governance to the PCTE. In this sense, Exhibit 2.1 on page 9 of the draft report is confusing since it seems to suggest that the Dean may disagree with an important decision made by PCTE, but be overridden by PCTE since he had "given away" his authority. Such a situation could not arise because final authority always rests with the Dean. We suggest that Exhibit 2.1 read that the PCTE "Advises the dean on decisions of importance."

Second, while the jurisdiction and lines of authority between PCTE and the College Faculty Senate are easy to state, actual working relations between these two bodies have required adjustment over time because some in the COE Senate erroneously have believed that the PCTE usurped the Senate's authority and others in the COE Senate wished to have veto power over the PCTE. The PCTE, however, is not just another faculty committee, but is an administrative council endowed with the Dean's authority and set up to be the primary body for all aspects of the teacher preparation programs. The Faculty Senate is a faculty council created by the Regents with the power to recommend actions, programs, etc., to the Dean, but its powers are advisory only. However, due to the many reorganization efforts initiated by the former Dean, the governance structure of the College of Education became complex. The governance process is currently being reviewed by the Interim Dean and his administrative staff.

2. Pages 10, fifth paragraph, 11, 12, through third paragraph under the subheading "The college needs to follow university policies." This section of the draft report points to the fact that some programs developed by the College did not fully adhere to Regents' policy concerning program development. Typically, if information is accidentally omitted from program proposals, it is sent back to the unit for inclusion during the University-wide review process.

On the matter of program goals and objectives, the College should have clear goals and objectives for each program. It should also be noted that philosophical differences may form the basis for how program goals and objectives are conceptualized and delineated. However, if some College program publications lack a statement of goals and objectives, this should be remedied.

3. Pages 12, fourth paragraph, and 13, through sixth paragraph under the subheading "Policies on cohort programs need to be articulated." This section addresses three issues (1) the allocation of resources to cohort programs, (2) the change in faculty roles required in field-based cohort programs, and (3) student readmission policies in cohort programs. All of these issues are, indeed, important and require sustained attention. The College, in relation to the new elementary education cohort program, began work on these issues in Spring 1995. Allocation of resources models are being developed, as is the nature of changed faculty roles in this field-based program. Addressing how faculty should balance teaching, research, and service in cohort programs is also underway. Policies are also under development concerning the readmission of students who temporarily withdraw from cohort programs.
4. Page 12, last beginning paragraph on elementary education field experience. A recent survey shows that students are actually completing 80 hours of observation/participation per semester. Forty hours is the minimum. Thus, the total is closer to 240 hours in the new program compared to 90 hours in the "traditional" program.
5. Page 13, first paragraph regarding the origins of the cohort model. The elementary cohort model did not derive from the COE's membership in the Holmes Group. It was developed by COE faculty in their realization that they could not significantly improve the teacher education curriculum without a sequenced, coherent, collaborative, field-based program. The impetus for the cohort model came from College-wide faculty forums in 1992 and 1993.

6. Pages 13, seventh paragraph, and 14, through second full paragraph under the subheading "Greater control over course objectives is needed." It is clear that courses taught by faculty in the College should have commonly-addressed objectives, no matter who teaches the course. The principle of academic freedom requires, however, that choice of materials, priority ranking of objectives, etc., be up to the individual faculty member. We will take positive steps to ensure greater control regarding course integrity.
7. Exhibit 2.1 is inaccurate in stating that the teacher education committees were established by the Dean. In fact, they were established by the UH President.

Chapter 2 under the Heading "Teacher Preparation Programs Are Not Adequately Evaluated"

1. Pages 14, fourth paragraph, 15, 16, and 17, through second paragraph. As noted by the draft report (p. 15), the College now obtains student feedback on specific courses and programs, and employment data on our graduates from the elementary and secondary B. Ed. programs. It also notes that the College lacks extensive and systematic assessments of how well these graduates perform in their employment settings. The College has taken some steps in the past year to obtain more extensive survey data. But clearly, as the draft report notes, we can improve our surveys to provide better information on the effectiveness of our programs and how well our graduates are doing in the field. Moreover, we need to ensure that this information is channeled back to faculty so that we can continuously monitor and, if necessary, change our programs to better attain our program objectives.

The MET program and the PETOM program have extensive, well-designed evaluation systems. And in the most recent effort at teacher preparation program development -- the Post-Baccalaureate Certification in Secondary Education -- now under review, we have included an extensive section in the proposal devoted to an evaluation system for the program. In all future program development efforts, we will make such an evaluation system a regular feature of the development process.

2. Page 15, fourth paragraph, regarding the statement that our elementary and secondary B. Ed. programs were not reviewed. It is important to note that this was not a deficiency of the College, but an oversight on the part of the past university administration. But it is not as if these programs have not been reviewed recently. They were reviewed fully during SATE in 1994.

3. The management audit states on page 15 that "... the Office of Student Services and the Division of Field Services, neither of which has a specific mandate to conduct program evaluation..." have been involved in collecting data, "...resulting in a fragmented and incomplete evaluation process." These statements are not accurate.

Because the existing COE pre-service evaluation form needed revision in light of programmatic changes in the teacher education program, the Assistant Dean for Student Services volunteered to work collaboratively with the Associate Dean for Teacher Education to update the COE pre-service evaluation form to reflect more closely the current teacher education program. Once the form had been revised, the Associate Dean for Teacher Education asked the Division of Field Services to help administer the revised form to the exiting student teachers. The collected data were then analyzed and summarized by the Associate Dean for Teacher Education.

Additionally, the SATE process which is based on NASDTEC standards requires in Standard VI of Chapter II, 2.4 (Student Personnel Services) that the institution conduct periodic follow-up surveys of its graduates and use the resulting data to improve student personnel services. Therefore, the Office of Student Services does have a specific mandate to conduct a survey which will lead to improvement of student personnel services. To meet this mandate, the Office of Student Services administers the Follow-up Survey of Graduates. However, the key words of the mandate are: student personnel services. The DOE and the auditors have continued to confuse this mandate of collecting data to improve student personnel services with the mandate of collecting data to improve teacher preparation programs. This confusion leads to both the DOE and the auditors recommending that the follow-up survey contain questions such as those regarding first year teaching, the quality of preparation, the specific skills students should have but did not acquire, and the problems students face as first-year teachers. To clear the confusion, it is recommended that Chapter II, 2.4 and Chapter II, 2.5 of the SATE standards be carefully read and differentiated. Chapter II, 2.4 requires that a survey of graduates be conducted to allow for improvement of student personnel services. Chapter II, 2.5 stipulates that students participate in program development and evaluation. Chapter II, 2.4 falls under the purview of the Assistant Dean for Student Services; category 2.5 is the responsibility of the Associate Dean for Teacher Education.

Ms. Marion M. Higa
October 10, 1995
Page 10

Conclusion

We appreciate the opportunities to improve the College identified by the audit report, even as we note some inaccuracies and differences of interpretation. We look forward to taking the ideas generated by the audit to clarify our mission, program development process, and evaluation procedures.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Charles T. Araki". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "C" and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Charles T. Araki
Interim Dean

cc: President Kenneth P. Mortimer, University of Hawaii
Honorable Governor Benjamin Cayetano
Honorable Norman Mizuguchi
Honorable Joseph Souki