



# COE ACADEMIC PROGRAM ALIGNMENT COMMITTEE

## Taskforce Recommendations

### Highlights

The APAC proposed realignment recommendation is presented on Page 1.

Nearly 2/3 of COE faculty (63%) strongly agreed that reconfiguration of the COE would be beneficial, but considerations should be taken.

Chris Mueller, CEPR, Chair  
Michelle Brasfield, CEPR  
Jeff Byford, ICL  
Alison Happel-Parkins, LEAD  
Leigh Harrell-Williams, CEPR  
Will Hunter, ICL  
Andrew Tawfik, ICL

# APAC Proposed COE Realignment

Department of  
Counseling, Psychological,  
and Behavioral Sciences  
(CPBS)

- Applied Behavior Analysis
- Counseling
- Counseling Psychology

Department of  
Learning,  
Development, and  
Instructional Design  
Sciences (LDID)

- Educational Psychology & Research
- Higher & Adult Education
- Instructional Design & Technology

Department of  
Instruction and  
Curriculum Leadership  
(ICL)

- Early Childhood
- Elementary
- Leadership & Policy Studies  
(administration license; EdD)
- Literacy
- Secondary Education
- Special Education
- Teacher Education Program and Clinical Practice (TOTECP)
- Urban Education

## Background

The Academic Program Alignment Committee (APAC) was convened by Dean Miller of the College of Education (COE) at the University of Memphis in Fall, 2025 to *develop actionable recommendations for the Dean to consider in relation to potential realignment of academic programs in the COE*. The committee members, representing all three current COE departments, were: Chris Mueller (Chair, CEPR), Michelle Brasfield (CEPR), Jeff Byford (ICL), Alison Happel-Parkins (LEAD), Leigh Harrell- Williams (CEPR), Will Hunter (ICL), and Andrew Tawfik (ICL).

## Data Sources

- OIR data via PowerBI
- Peer institution comparison of other COE programs
- University of Memphis COE faculty survey (CREP) (see Appendix E)

## Our Process

The committee first met on September 8, 2025, and members volunteered to serve on one of three subcommittees to inform the restructuring process, to collect stakeholder data, and to make eventual recommendations. The subcommittees were as follows: Peer Institution subcommittee (Drs. Byford & Hunter); Student and Faculty Data subcommittee (Drs. Brasfield & Harrell-Williams), and Process subcommittee (Drs. Tawfik and Mueller). APAC met roughly every two weeks (or as needed) during the fall semester with the deadline date of end of the fall semester to generate final recommendations.

Over the course of the semester, the main deliverables generated by each subcommittee were:

- The Student and Faculty Data subcommittee generated student enrollment count and SCH data from OIR's PowerBI reporting system and faculty data from PowerBI and department websites. Data were initially organized by current department (see Appendix A), and, for the final report, by recommended department structure (see Appendix B).
  - Goal: To provide understanding of how student and faculty breakdowns would look in the new configuration.
- The Peer Institution subcommittee reviewed organizational charts for colleges or schools of education at five peer institutions: The University of Oklahoma, Kansas State University, University of Cincinnati, University of Louisville, and the University of Houston (see Appendix C).
  - Goal: The goal was twofold: first, to provide a basis of comparison for the APAC members to understand how other institutions were configured. This informed the second goal, which was for APAC members to come up with configurations on their own (see Appendix D). These then served the purpose of informing our final discussions for the final recommendations for the Dean.
- The Process subcommittee met to discuss possible sources of stakeholder data to make actionable recommendations, understanding that current recommendations would only provide a starting point in a more lengthy and thorough process. Both external (e.g., consultant) and internal (i.e., CREP) sources were originally considered. After researching both options, it was decided that hiring an external consultant would be prohibitively expensive and would not yield

valuable data. As a result, CREP was considered the best source given its proximity to the COE (understand context), an established stellar national reputation for conducting program evaluations, and the ability to collect data objectively, which could then be delivered to APAC in only aggregated form to ensure confidentiality and increase validity and reliability of responses.

- Goal: To determine the best approach for collecting actionable data, both externally and internally.
- CREP was added as an additional source of data. In consultation with CREP's Assistant Director Cindy Muzzi, the committee decided to survey all COE faculty to incorporate this stakeholder feedback into APAC discussions. The brief survey was collectively created with input from committee members and Cindy Muzzi (survey questions included in Appendix E). The survey participation request was sent to the COE faculty members on October 3, with a follow-up reminder on October 17, and closed on October 19. Overall, there was an 84% response rate.
  - Goal: To gather faculty data and provide recommendations separate from APAC based exclusively on those data.

### **Emergent Themes**

Nearly 2/3 of faculty (63%) strongly agreed that reconfiguration of the COE would be beneficial, including across faculty within individual programs (see Appendix E).

After reviewing all subcommittee data, CREP data, and making our own individual recommendations for possible restructuring (see Appendix D), the committee reached consensus on the recommended COE configuration (see pg. 1). Three thematic areas emerged from committee discussions:

1. K-12 Education
2. Behavioral health/Counseling,
3. Learning sciences and applied theory.

### **Proposed Benefits for COE Restructuring**

Upon reviewing the data, the committee believes the changes will have the following benefits:

- Students can be advised within departments to take classes that more closely align with their subject area (e.g. – counseling and ABA; educational statistics and learning analytics; school leadership and K-12 education).
- Increased collaboration (publications, grants) among faculty who have similar thematic interests.
- COE recruitment and marketing can more directly align with cohesive program/department identity areas (for examples, refer to new department names on page 1).

### **Potential Issues and Other Considerations for COE Restructuring<sup>1</sup>**

- The proposed reconfiguration (page 1) is differentiated by program area rather than degree area. Additional consideration will be needed to include certain degrees, such as integrated studies and educational studies, for example. Further, considerations should be given to how

---

<sup>1</sup> These represent input by the APAC committee only. Separate considerations and recommendations can be found in Appendix E (COE survey and CREP report).

programs and departments intersect around degree programs and certificates to be considered under an RCM framework (i.e., budgeting, advising, workload, etc.).

- As faculty are in transition, additional consideration should be given to understand how a proposed reconfiguration will impact existing or new service roles or program appointments (e.g., integrated studies program coordination). This can potentially impact teaching load, faculty compensation, faculty evaluation, etc.
- A consideration was how the RCM model will impact funding under the new configuration. A discussion point was the degree to which undergraduate programs would be weighted under RCM, which would impact funding/sustainability of the proposed reconfiguration.
- Given the increased focus in the proposed realignment based on expertise, this allows for more equitable leadership development pathways for all faculty. Additional pathways for leadership development can also support faculty retention.

# **Appendices**

Appendix A: COE Student Enrollment by Department and Program (Old)

Appendix B: COE Student Enrollment by Department and Program (New Design)

Appendix C: Organizational Charts for Peer Institutions

Appendix D: Individual Configurations from APAC members

Appendix E: CREP Final Report and Recommendations

## Appendix A

**Table of 2024-2025 COE Student Enrollment by Department and Program (Old)**

		Enrollment 24-25					
		Full-Time		Part-Time		TOTAL	TOTAL
		Count	SCH	Count	SCH	COUNT	SCH
	<b>Counseling Edu Psyc and Rsrch</b>	196	2009	6	15	202	2024
<b>EDD</b>	<b>Counseling</b>			2	2	2	2
<b>MS</b>	<b>(ALL)</b>	127	1416			127	1416
	<b>Counseling</b>	117	1335			117	1335
	<b>Ed Psychology and Research</b>	10	81			10	81
<b>PHD</b>	<b>(ALL)</b>	69	593	4	13	73	606
	<b>Counseling Psychology</b>	30	326			30	326
	<b>Counselor Ed and Supervision</b>	11	101			11	101
	<b>Ed Psychology and Research</b>	28	166	4	13	32	179
	<b>Instruction and Curr Ldrship</b>	682	7262	93	565	775	7827
<b>BSED</b>	<b>(ALL)</b>	328	4710			328	4710
	<b>++ Human Development and Learning (sunsetting major)</b>						
		24	291			24	291
	<b>Integrated Early Childhood</b>	56	879			56	879
	<b>Integrative Studies</b>	51	739			51	739
	<b>Academic Advising Center</b>						
	<b>Educational Careers</b>	33	465			33	465
	<b>No Concentration</b>	1	15			1	15
	<b>Secondary Math (6-12)</b>	16	247			16	247
	<b>Youth Development</b>						
	<b>Youth Services</b>	1	12			1	12
	<b>Teaching All Learners</b>	197	2801			197	2801
<b>EDD</b>	<b>(ALL)</b>	31	217	29	154	60	371
	<b>Applied Behavior Analysis</b>			8	57	8	57
	<b>Early Childhood Education</b>			2	2	2	2
	<b>Instruction and Curriculum</b>	8	31			8	31
	<b>Instructional Design and Tech</b>	23	186			23	186
	<b>Literacy</b>			7	42	7	42
	<b>No Concentration</b>			3	24	3	24
	<b>Social Studies Education</b>			2	12	2	12
	<b>Special Education</b>			7	17	7	17
<b>MAT</b>	<b>(ALL)</b>	231	1531	45	309	276	1840
<b>MS</b>	<b>(ALL)</b>	92	804	19	102	111	906
	<b>Instr and Curr Leadership</b>	92	804	19	102	111	906
	<b>Applied Behavior Analysis</b>	33	375			33	375

	Early Childhood Education			3	15	3	15
	Instruction and Curriculum	20	141			20	141
	Instructional Design and Tech	24	180			24	180
	Literacy			9	57	9	57
	Pharmacy Education			4	12	4	12
	School Library Info Specialist	10	69			10	69
	Social Studies Education			2	12	2	12
	Special Education	5	39			5	39
	STEM Education			1	6	1	6
	<b>Leadership</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>795</b>
<b>EDD</b>	<b>(ALL)</b>	44	191	60	343	104	534
	Higher and Adult Education	30	126	32	156	62	282
	Leadership and Policy Studies	14	65	28	187	42	252
<b>MS</b>	<b>(ALL)</b>	19	150	13	111	32	261
	Leadership and Policy Studies	19	150	13	111	32	261
	School Admin and Supervision			13	111	13	111
	Student Affairs Administration	19	150			19	150

## Appendix B

Table of Proposed COE Student Enrollment by Department and Program (New Design)

		24-25				TOTAL COUNT	TOTAL SCH
		Full-Time		Part-Time			
		Count	SCH	Count	SCH		
First Department: Counseling & Behavioral Focused Department							
Current CEPR Configuration		196	2009	6	15	202	2024
Proposed Configuration		224	2602	10	59	234	2661
Total Change		28	593	4	44	32	637
Change BSED		33	465	0	0	33	465
Change Grad		-5	128	-6	-15	-1	113
BSED	Educational Careers (ABA/IDT)	33	465			33	465
EDD	Applied Behavior Analysis			8	57	8	57
EDD	Counseling			2	2	2	2
MS	(ALL)	150	1710	0	0	150	1710
	Counseling	117	1335			117	1335
	Applied Behavior Analysis	33	375			33	375
PHD	(ALL)	41	427	0	0	41	427
	Counseling Psychology	30	326			30	326
	Counselor Ed and Supervision (COUN)	11	101			11	101
Second Department: K-12 Focused Department							
Current ICL Configuration		682	7262	93	565	775	7827
Proposed Configuration		602	6271	139	917	759	7462
Total Change		-80	-991	46	352	-16	-365
Change BSED		-33	-465	0	0	-15	-191
Change Grad		-47	-526	46	352	-1	-174
BSED	(ALL)	295	4245	0	0	313	4519
	++ Human Development and Learning (sunsetting major)	24	291			24	291
	Integrated Early Childhood (major)	56	879			56	879
	Integrative Studies (major)	18	274			18	274
	Academic Advising Center						
	No Concentration	1	15			1	15
	Secondary Math (6-12)	16	247			16	247
	Youth Development						
	Youth Services	1	12			1	12
	Teaching All Learners (major)	197	2801			197	2801
EDD	(ALL)	22	96	49	284	71	380
	Early Childhood Education			2	2	2	2
	Instruction and Curriculum	8	31			8	31

	Literacy			7	42	7	42
	No Concentration			3	24	3	24
	Social Studies Education			2	12	2	12
	Special Education			7	17	7	17
	Leadership and Policy Studies	14	65	28	187	42	252
<b>MAT</b>	<b>(ALL)</b>	231	1531	45	309	276	1840
<b>MS</b>	<b>(ALL)</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>723</b>
	Early Childhood Education			3	15	3	15
	Instruction and Curriculum	20	141			20	141
	Literacy			9	57	9	57
	Pharmacy Education			4	12	4	12
	School Library Info Specialist	10	69			10	69
	Social Studies Education			2	12	2	12
	Special Education	5	39			5	39
	STEM Education			1	6	1	6
	Leadership and Policy Studies	19	150	13	111	32	261
	School Admin and Supervision			13	111	13	111

### Third Department

	<b>Current LEAD Configuration</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>795</b>
	<b>Proposed Configuration</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>889</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>1058</b>
	<b>Change Grad</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>-37</b>	<b>-285</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>263</b>
<b>EDD</b>	<b>(ALL)</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>282</b>
	Higher and Adult Education	30	126	32	156	62	282
<b>MS</b>	<b>(ALL)</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>411</b>
	Student Affairs Administration	19	150			19	150
	Ed Psychology and Research	10	81			10	81
	Instructional Design and Tech	24	180			24	180
<b>PHD</b>	<b>(ALL)</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>365</b>
	Ed Psychology and Research	28	166	4	13	32	179
	Instructional Design and Tech	23	186			23	186

Note: Degree programs that would move with proposed realignment are in blue cells.

## Appendix C

Table of Organizational Charts for Peer Institutions

University	Departments & Corresponding Departments	Departments & Corresponding Departments	Departments & Corresponding Departments	Departments & Corresponding Departments
<b>The University of Oklahoma</b> <u>College of Education</u>	<i>Department of Educational Psychology</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning Experiences Design &amp; Technology</li> <li>• Science of Psychology, Data &amp; Research in Education</li> <li>• Professional Counseling</li> <li>• Special Education</li> </ul>	<i>Department of Educational Leadership &amp; Policy Studies</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adult &amp; Higher Education</li> <li>• Educational Administration Curriculum &amp; Supervision</li> <li>• Educational Studies (M.Ed)</li> </ul>	<i>Instructional Leadership &amp; Academic Curriculum</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early Childhood</li> <li>• Elementary</li> <li>• Language Arts</li> <li>• Mathematics</li> <li>• Science</li> <li>• Social Studies</li> <li>• World Languages</li> </ul>	
<b>Kansas State University</b> <u>College of Education</u>	<i>Department of Special Education, Counseling &amp; Student Affairs</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special Education</li> <li>• Counseling</li> <li>• Educational Specialist in School Counseling</li> <li>• College Student Development</li> <li>• Student Affairs in Higher Education</li> <li>• Academic Advising</li> </ul>	<i>Department of Educational Leadership</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educational Leadership</li> <li>• Adult Learning &amp; Leadership</li> <li>• Community College Leadership</li> </ul>	<i>Department of Curriculum &amp; Instruction</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elementary</li> <li>• Secondary Education (Agriculture, Art &amp; Business)</li> <li>• Early Childhood</li> <li>• Language Arts</li> <li>• Mathematics</li> <li>• Science</li> <li>• Social Studies</li> </ul>	

University	Departments & Corresponding Departments	Departments & Corresponding Departments	Departments & Corresponding Departments	Departments & Corresponding Departments
<b>University of Cincinnati</b> <u>College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services</u>	<i>School of Education</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Undergraduate Programs</li> <li>Early Childhood Development (Minor)</li> <li>Early Childhood Education Online (Birth-5)</li> <li>Elementary Education</li> <li>Human Development and Community Engagement</li> <li>Middle School Education</li> <li>Secondary Education</li> <li>Special Education</li> </ul> Graduate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Curriculum Instruction</li> <li>Educational Studies Ph.D.</li> <li>Educational leadership</li> <li>Instruction Curriculum Design</li> <li>Literacy</li> <li>Special Education</li> <li>Medical Education</li> <li>Urban Education Leadership</li> </ul>	<i>School of Information Technology</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bachelor of Science in Cybersecurity</li> <li>Bachelor of Science in Information Techonology</li> </ul>	<i>School of Human Services</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Health</li> <li>Sport Administration</li> <li>Health Education PH.D.</li> <li>Counseling (Counselor Education, Mental Health Counseling, and School Counseling)</li> </ul>	<i>School of Criminal Justice</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bachelor of Science Criminal Justice</li> <li>Bachelor of Science Paralegal Studies</li> </ul>

University	Departments & Corresponding Departments	Departments & Corresponding Departments	Departments & Corresponding Departments	Departments & Corresponding Departments
<p><b>University of Louisville</b>  <u>COEand Development</u></p> <p>***Undergraduate/Graduate/Online/Continuing Education, Global Learning, Dual Credit)</p>	<p><b>Academic Department:</b>  <i>Department of Elementary, Middle &amp; Secondary Teacher Education (EMSTED) (</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elementary Education</li> <li>• Middle School/Secondary Education</li> <li>• Sports Administration</li> <li>• Organizational Leadership</li> </ul>	<p><b>Academic Department</b>  <i>Special Education, Early Childhood, &amp; Prevention Science</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elementary Education, Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education</li> <li>• Learning and Behavior Disorders (MAT)</li> <li>• Applied Behavior Analysis (certificate)</li> <li>• Autism Spectrum Disorder</li> <li>• Moderate and Severe Disabilities</li> </ul>	<p><b>Academic Department</b>  <i>Leadership, Evaluation and Development</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education Administration and Leadership</li> <li>• Human Resources and Organization Development</li> <li>• Organizational Leadership and Learning</li> </ul>	<p><b>Academic Departments</b>  <i>Health &amp; Sports Sciences</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exercise Physiology</li> <li>• Exercise Science</li> </ul> <p><i>Counseling &amp; Human Development</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Counseling &amp; Personnel Services</li> <li>• Counseling &amp; Personnel Services</li> <li>• Counseling and Human Development</li> </ul>

University	Departments & Corresponding Departments	Departments & Corresponding Departments	Departments & Corresponding Departments	Departments & Corresponding Departments
<b>University of Houston</b> <u>College of Education</u>	<b>Academic Department:</b> <i>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Art Education</li> <li>• Bilingual/ESL Education</li> <li>• Early Childhood Education</li> <li>• Health Science Education</li> <li>• Learning, Design, &amp; Technology</li> <li>• Literacy Education</li> <li>• Mathematics Education</li> <li>• Special Education</li> <li>• Science Education</li> <li>• Social Studies Education</li> <li>• Teaching/Teacher Education (M.Ed/Ph.D.)</li> <li>• Teacher Certification</li> </ul>	<b>Academic Department:</b> <i>Educational Leadership &amp; Policy Studies</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher Education</li> <li>• K-12 Leadership</li> <li>• Special Populations</li> <li>• Minor Asian American Studies</li> </ul>	<b>Academic Department:</b> <i>Psychological Health &amp; Learning Sciences</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Counseling Psychology</li> <li>• Measurement, Quantitative Methods, &amp; Learning</li> <li>• School Psychology</li> <li>• CounselingHealth</li> <li>• Human Development &amp; Sciences</li> </ul>	

## Appendix D

**Table of Individual Configurations from APAC members**

Member	Department 1	Department 2	Department 3
Chris	Counseling/Psychological Sciences <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COUN</li> <li>• CPSY</li> <li>• ABA</li> </ul>	Applied Learning Sciences, Design, Development, and Research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IDT</li> <li>• EDPR</li> <li>• HIAD</li> </ul>	Teacher Education and Leadership (K-12 Licensure) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEAD</li> <li>• Teacher Ed/Licensure programs</li> </ul>
Leigh	Counseling and Behavioral Health Sciences <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ABA</li> <li>• COUN</li> <li>• CPSY</li> </ul>	Learning Science, Research, and Technology (???) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IDT</li> <li>• EDPR</li> <li>• HIAD</li> </ul>	ICL <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K-12 Leadership and</li> <li>• Teacher Ed programs</li> </ul>
Andrew	Clinical Setting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ABA</li> <li>• COUN</li> <li>• CPSY</li> </ul>	Learning Science, Research, and Technology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IDT</li> <li>• EDPR</li> <li>• HIAD</li> </ul>	K-12 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher Education Program and Clinical Practice (TOTECP)</li> <li>• Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Instructional Design &amp; Technology, Literacy, Secondary Education, Special Education</li> <li>• Program areas: Leadership &amp; Policy Studies</li> </ul>
Jeff	<i>Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology &amp; Research</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Counseling</li> <li>• Counseling Psychology</li> <li>• Educational Psychology &amp; Research</li> <li>• Applied Behavior Analysis</li> <li>• Autism Certificate</li> <li>• BSED Autism</li> </ul>	<i>Department of Leadership</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher &amp; Adult Education</li> <li>• Instructional Design &amp; Technology</li> </ul>	<i>Department of Instruction &amp; Curriculum Leadership</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early Childhood</li> <li>• Elementary</li> <li>• Literacy</li> <li>• Secondary Education</li> <li>• Special Education</li> <li>• Leadership &amp; Policy Studies (administration license)</li> </ul>
Michelle	CEPR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EDPR</li> <li>• COUN</li> <li>• CPSY</li> <li>• ABA</li> <li>• IDT</li> </ul>	ICL/LEAD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combine into one department</li> </ul>	

## **Appendix E**

**See CREP report beginning on next page.**



# **Faculty Input on Reconfiguring the College of Education**

## **Summary Report**

**Fall 2025**

Cindy Muzzi  
Center for Research in Educational Policy  
College of Education  
University of Memphis

## Introduction

In fall 2025, the Dean formed a task force to explore potential program reconfiguration of departments and programs within the College of Education (COE). This process focused solely on internal adjustments and did not involve transferring departments or programs to or from other colleges. To ensure that faculty voices guided the potential college reconfiguration, the task force sought feedback through a survey designed to determine (a) whether faculty members believed restructuring was needed and (b) how they would reconfigure the College and/or its departments.

In collaboration with the task force, the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP), designed the COE Restructuring Faculty Survey. Data collection and reporting were conducted independently by CREP.

October 2025, CREP distributed the survey link to 73 full-time faculty members within COE and sent two reminder emails to encourage participation. The survey remained open for two weeks, during which **62 faculty members** participated. This indicates strong faculty engagement and provides a high level of confidence that the results reflect the perspectives of the College’s full-time faculty.

## Participants

Most COE faculty who received the survey link participated (84%), including:

- 81% of CEPR faculty
- 83% of ICL faculty
- 100% of LEAD faculty

Number of Faculty by Department	Choice Count
Counseling, Educational Psychology & Research (CEPR)	22
Instruction and Curriculum Leadership (ICL)	30
Leadership (LEAD)	10

## Perceived Benefits of Reconfiguration

Faculty responded to four questions using a six-point Likert scale. Because the option “*Do not know*” was excluded from the analysis, mean scores range from 1.0 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5.0 (*Strongly Agree*).

Overall, faculty generally expressed agreement with the statements related to restructuring—though not overwhelmingly strong agreement. Participants perceived the **greatest benefit to the College** overall (mean = 3.88) and the **least benefit to individual programs** (mean = 3.26). Ratings for department benefit (mean = 3.64) and positive student impact (mean = 3.76) fell in between.

When examining results by department:

- LEAD expressed the highest perceived College benefit (4.13) but reported the lowest ratings for Department benefit (3.22) and Program benefit (2.89).
- ICL reported the strongest perceived Department (M = 3.90) and Student impact (3.93) benefits, suggesting optimism about how reconfiguration could affect their area and students.
- CEPR consistently provided lower ratings across all areas, particularly for Program benefit (3.09).

The table below presents the average faculty agreement scores regarding the benefits of reconfiguration, both overall and by department.

	Overall	CEPR	ICL	LEAD
Q1 - College benefit	3.88	3.76	3.82	4.13
Q2 - Department benefit	3.64	3.48	3.90	3.22
Q3 - Program benefit	3.26	3.09	3.52	2.89
Q4 - Positive student impact	3.76	3.52	3.93	3.75

Additional tables showing the percentage of responses, overall and by department, are provided on the following two pages.

<b>All Departments</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree + Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree + Agree</b>	<b>Do not know</b>
I feel that the College of Education would				
benefit from reconfiguring the academic programs.	11%	18%	63%	8%
I feel that my department would benefit	21%	15%	60%	5%
I feel that my program would benefit from reconfiguring the academic programs.	35%	15%	47%	3%
I believe reconfiguring could have a positive impact on students' academic experience and success.	18%	15%	63%	5%

22 Responses

<b>CEPR</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree + Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree + Agree</b>	<b>Do not know</b>
I feel that the College of Education would				
benefit from reconfiguring the academic programs.	14%	18%	64%	5%
I feel that my department would benefit	27%	14%	55%	5%
I feel that my program would benefit from reconfiguring the academic programs.	41%	14%	45%	0%
I believe reconfiguring could have a positive impact on students' academic experience and success.	23%	18%	55%	5%

30 Responses

<b>ICL</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree + Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree + Agree</b>	<b>Do not know</b>
I feel that the College of Education would				
benefit from reconfiguring the academic programs.	10%	20%	63%	7%
I feel that my department would benefit	13%	10%	73%	3%
I feel that my program would benefit from reconfiguring the academic programs.	25%	14%	57%	4%
I believe reconfiguring could have a positive impact on students' academic experience and success.	13%	10%	77%	0%

10 Responses

<b>LEAD</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree + Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree + Agree</b>	<b>Do not know</b>
I feel that the College of Education would				
benefit from reconfiguring the academic programs.	10%	10%	60%	20%
I feel that my department would benefit from reconfiguring the academic programs.	30%	30%	30%	10%
I feel that my program would benefit from reconfiguring the academic programs.	50%	20%	20%	10%
I believe reconfiguring could have a positive impact on students' academic experience and success.	20%	20%	40%	20%

## Suggested Reconfigurations

As part of the survey, faculty were asked to reconfigure departments and programs using an interactive drag-and-drop question. Of the 62 faculty members who completed the survey, less than half of participants (42%) completed this question: 4 from LEAD, 7 from CEPR, 15 from ICL.

When reviewing the entries in more detail:

- Almost all provided new departments names. See Appendix A for the full list of alphabetized department name suggestions.
- Very few provided additional program suggestions or renamed an existing program.
- 3 faculty members (12%) suggested having just **two departments**.
- 17 faculty members (65%) recommended keeping **three departments**.
- 6 faculty members (23%) proposed creating **four departments**.

Further results highlighting common department name ideas and program groupings are provided below.

### Common Department Name Themes

Faculty proposed 55 new department names and clear patterns emerged.

#### Counseling and Psychology-focused names:

- Examples: Counseling & Psychology, Counseling and Educational Psychology, Counseling and Psychological Services, Behavioral Health Sciences.
- These emphasize integration of counseling, psychology, applied behavior analysis (ABA), and related programs.

#### Curriculum and Instruction / Teacher Education names:

- Examples: *Curriculum & Instruction, Teacher Education, Teaching, Learning, and Innovation.*
- These often include K–12 preparation, literacy, and instructional design programs.

#### Leadership, Policy, and Higher Education names:

- Examples: *Educational Leadership, Educational Policy & Leadership, Higher Education.*
- These focus on administration, leadership, and postsecondary education pathways.

#### Learning Sciences and Research-oriented names:

- Examples: *Learning Sciences, Educational Research, Educational Sciences & Research.*
- These frame the college's academic preparation as research-driven and evidence-based.

## Common Program Groupings

Across faculty responses, several consistent program groupings were identified:

### Counseling and Psychology

- **Commonly grouped programs:** Counseling Psychology, Educational Psychology, Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA), Counseling, and Educational Research.
- **Occasional additions:** Pharmacy Education and Instructional Design & Technology, particularly when faculty framed this cluster around *human development and learning sciences*.

### Curriculum & Instruction / Teacher Education

- **Commonly grouped programs:** Special Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Urban Education, STEM Education, Reading, Literacy, Social Studies Education, and School Library/Information Specialist.
- **Frequent framing:** Often positioned as “Teacher Education” or “Curriculum and Instruction,” with emphasis on PreK–12 preparation and pedagogical training.

### Leadership, Policy, and Higher Education

- **Commonly grouped programs:** Leadership & Policy Studies, Adult Education, and Higher Education.
- **Framing:** Seen as a natural alignment of programs focusing on educational administration, advocacy, and systems-level change.

### Applied & Interdisciplinary Programs

- This category includes programs such as Instructional Design & Technology, Educational Careers, Youth Development, and occasionally Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA). These programs are considered “cross-cutting” because they focus on applied skills and knowledge that span multiple areas of education.

## Results from Open-Ended Questions

The survey also included four open-ended (OE) questions that invited faculty to elaborate on their perspectives regarding potential reconfiguration of the College. Each question, along with the key themes that emerged from faculty responses, is summarized below.

### *OE Q1: If desired, please elaborate on your reasoning for these responses.*

When asked, "elaborate on your reasoning for these responses [to the four Likert-scale questions]," faculty comments reflect a nuanced and thoughtful view of reconfiguration. While many are open to exploring changes that enhance student preparation, academic efficiency, and research collaboration, there is broad agreement that any restructuring must be intentional, transparent, data-informed, and developed collaboratively. Faculty want to ensure that reconfiguration strengthens—not disrupts—academic identity, leadership effectiveness, and student success within the College of Education.

### *OE Q2: What potential benefits do you see from restructuring departments or programs?*

Faculty see the greatest potential benefits of restructuring in enhancing alignment, collaboration, leadership, and visibility, while creating opportunities for innovation and student growth. Many believe that right-sizing departments and grouping related disciplines could improve operational efficiency, equity, and camaraderie. However, several respondents also acknowledged the need for more information about programs and organizational structures before confidently identifying specific benefits or reconfigurations.

### *OE Q3: What potential challenges or concerns do you have about restructuring?*

Faculty acknowledged that while restructuring could bring long-term benefits, it also carries substantial risks if not approached with clear purpose, transparent communication, equitable implementation, and genuine faculty engagement. Concerns centered on leadership stability, departmental culture, fairness, logistics, and the rationale for change. The overarching message was that process matters—a well-structured, inclusive, and clearly communicated approach will determine whether restructuring strengthens or destabilizes the College.

### *OE Q4: Please share any additional thoughts about a potential realignment or restructuring of academic programs within the College of Education.*

Many agree that there is value in reconsidering program alignment to promote synergy, collaboration, and clarity of identity. However, several stressed that the process must be purpose-driven, inclusive, and transparent. Without clear communication of goals and rationale, restructuring risks being viewed as change for its own sake.

## Recommendations

Based on the survey data and open-ended responses in the report, below are data-driven recommendations for the Dean to consider regarding the potential reconfiguration of departments and programs within the College of Education.

1. **Faculty support is moderate for restructuring the College, not overwhelming.** Frame reconfiguration as a strategic enhancement, not a corrective measure. Emphasize benefits to collaboration, student success, and future growth. Change can be difficult—especially when the rationale is unclear—so transparency about the “why” is essential.
2. **Most faculty favor keeping three departments.** While some suggested two or four, 65% recommended maintaining three departments. Consider retaining the three-department structure but reorganize programs within departments to better align with shared missions and reduce silos.
3. **Faculty consistently grouped programs into four thematic clusters.** Use these clusters to guide realignment. Consider meeting with department chairs and program leaders to explore configuration options and gather additional guidance from those overseeing the operations of these broader program groupings.
4. **Feedback suggests that ICL’s current size and structure may present challenges related to broader communication, faculty cohesion, and program alignment.** One potential area for improvement is to review the department’s size and consider whether programs such as ABA, IDT, and Urban Education might be better housed in departments more closely aligned with their focus.
5. **Faculty emphasized the need for (a) clear rationale and data, (b) inclusive decision-making, and (c) transparent communication.** Consider sharing findings, proposed models, and decision criteria openly. Consider faculty-led working groups to co-design changes.
6. **Faculty proposed over 50 department names.** If departments are renamed, choose names that reflect program identity, are easy for prospective students to understand, and are recognizable to external audiences.

### Appendix A: Department Name Suggestions

Applied Human Sciences in Education
Behavioral Health Sciences
Counseling & Psychology
Counseling and Applied Behavior
Counseling and Educational Psychology
Counseling and Educational Sciences & Research
Counseling and Psychological Services
Counseling Psychology
Counseling, ABA and Educational Sciences
Counseling, Behavior Sciences, & Educational Psychology
Counseling, Behavior Sciences, Educational Psychology and Research
Counseling, Psychology, and Human Services
Counseling, Therapy & Behavioral Analysis
Curriculum & Instruction
Curriculum & Instruction. Or Teacher Education
Curriculum and Leadership
Education
Educational Administration
Educational Administration and Research
Educational Careers
Educational Careers & Research
Educational Leadership
Educational Leadership and Policy
Educational Policy & Leadership
Educational Psychology
Educational Research
Higher and Adult Education and Leadership Policy
Higher Education
Higher, Adult, and Professional Education
Instruction, Teaching, and Schools
Leadership and Higher Education
Leadership, Advocacy, and Innovation
Learning and Applied Sciences
Learning Sciences
Learning Sciences and Technology

Other
Psychological and Behavioral Sciences
research and Leadership
School of Education
Social Sciences
Special Education & Disability Studies
Specialized Supplemental Education
Teacher Education
Teacher Education & Learning
Teacher Education and School Leadership
Teacher Education, Curriculum & Instruction
Teacher Education, Curriculum, and Instruction
Teacher Preparation
Teaching, Education and Curriculum Development
Teaching, Learning, and Innovation
Unsure of name