



TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
College of Education™

Higher Education

***Master of Education
(M.Ed.)
Program Handbook***

**College of Education Graduate
Education and Research Texas
Tech University
Box 41071
Lubbock, TX 79409-1071
(806) 742-1997
Fax (806) 742-2197
<http://www.educ.ttu.edu>**

Higher Education

Masters of Education Program Overview

The Higher Education Program is committed to excellence in preparing and supporting instructional and administrative leaders for higher education, generating and supporting research, and delivering public service to the field of higher education.

The **Master of Education** program in Higher Education offers opportunities for individuals who seek careers in entry level to middle management, teaching, and leadership positions at community colleges and universities.. Students have two options for the master's degree.

Non-thesis option: A minimum of 39 hours of graduate work inclusive of a 3 credit hour internship is required in addition to the satisfactory completion of a comprehensive capstone project/course.

Thesis option: A minimum of 36 credit hours of graduate work plus 6 hours of thesis research are required. The master's thesis is expected to represent independent work by the students related to a problem of practice in higher education, conducted under the supervision of faculty member. An oral defense of the thesis is required. *Participation in the Capstone Class/Project is not required under this option.*

Although providing an overview of the policies, procedures, and requirements of the Higher Education Program, this *Handbook* cannot be viewed as having all of the answers. Students must seek answers to questions from other sources including, although not limited to, the Higher Education Program faculty, the College of Education (COE) Office of Graduate Studies and Research (COE Room 105), and the Texas Tech University Graduate School (Administration 3rd floor). While faculty advisors are knowledgeable about the policies, procedures, and requirements, the primary responsibility for reading and following correct policies and procedures remains with the student, not the faculty

Specific descriptions of courses are in the Texas Tech University Catalog. Information about Texas Tech University can be found on-line at www.ttu.edu. Information about the College of Education and the Higher Education Program can be found at <http://www.educ.ttu.edu/>.

Graduate Faculty

Faculty	Rank	Email
Dr. Fred Hartmeister	Professor, Department Chair	fred.hartmeister@ttu.edu
Dr. Dimitra L. Jackson	Assistant Professor	dimitra.jackson@ttu.edu
Mr. David Jones	Assistant Professor of Practice	djones.jones@ttu.edu
Dr. Stephanie J. Jones	Associate Professor; Program Coordinator	stephanie.j.jones@ttu.edu
Dr. Andrew Koricich	Assistant Professor	andrew.koricich@ttu.edu
Dr. David Louis	Assistant Professor	dave.louis@ttu.edu
Dr. Valerie Paton	Associate Professor	valerie.paton@ttu.edu
Dr. Colette Taylor	Assistant Professor	colette.taylor@ttu.edu

Distinctive Skills and Trademark Outcomes

Texas Tech graduate students possess distinctive skills and can produce distinctive products, qualities which establish these students as leaders in their fields.

Understanding the importance of equity and social justice, Graduates of the TTU Higher Education master's program will be *collaborative, team-oriented, practitioner-based professionals who have the ability to access, evaluate, and develop solutions to higher education problem(s) of practice.*

In order to accomplish this outcome, the following distinctive skills and products for Texas Tech's College of Education master's level graduate program in Higher Education are incorporated in this program:

Distinctive Skills

1. Students will become Higher Education administrators who clearly understand the multiple purposes of higher education and effectively assess the lived experiences of the multiple audiences in higher education environments.
2. Students will become Higher Education administrators who utilize effective communication and collaborative skills in team environments.

Distinctive Product

Graduates of the TTU Higher Education Program will be able to develop and evaluate the impact of a solution to higher education problem(s) of practice. These solutions will be characterized by the use of team-based collaboration and its enrichment by diverse views and people

The development and achievement of these distinctive skills will be assessed throughout the program using Masters Higher Education Administrator Evaluation Rubric (See Appendix A).

Program of Studies

The Master in Higher Education curriculum has been developed to assist students to develop the requisite knowledge, skills and competency needed by higher education administrators of tomorrow. Courses will be taken in a prescribed manner according the chosen option for the master's degree (See Appendix B).

Required Courses:

EDHE 5001: Technology in Higher Education
EDHE 5001: Legal Aspects and Crisis Management in Higher Education
EDHE 5300: History of Higher Education
EDHE 5303: Access and Equity in Higher Education
EDHE 5341: Assessment in Higher Education
EDHE 5313: The Comprehensive Community College
EDHE 5332: Student Services in Higher Education
EDHE 5334: College Student Development
EDHE 5321: Administration in Higher Education
EDHE 5323: Budget and Resource Management in Higher Education
EDHE 5393: Internship in Higher Education
EDHE 6310: Higher Education Research Design

Non-Thesis Option

EDHE 5001: Master's Capstone (Group Problem Based Project)

Total 39 Credit Hours

Thesis Option (three required course will be substituted)

Research Core

EPSY 5385: Foundations of Educational Research
EPSY 5380: Introduction to Educational Statistics (Quantitative)
OR

EPSY 5382: Qualitative Research in Education
EDHE 6000: Thesis

Total 42 Credit Hours

Advisement Procedures

Degree Plan

As soon as possible after admission to a degree program, but no later than during the first semester of work, the student should contact their assigned advisor to develop a “Program for the Master’s Degree.” During an individual conference, the advisor will assist the student with selecting courses related to the chosen program option. After the student’s degree plan is signed by the advisor and department head and approved by the Graduate School, the student is expected to follow it as the basis in all subsequent enrollments.

Transfer credit. Only six approved semester hours of coursework may be transferred from another accredited university. Transfer courses may not include practicums or internships. No course on the degree plan may be over six years old at the time the degree is conferred.

Applicants with a prior master’s degree. The TTU Graduate Catalog states that permission to work toward a second degree of the same level is granted only upon approval by the Higher Education Program and review by the Graduate Dean. The applicant is subject to all requirements as a new student. While there is no guarantee that any work from the first master’s degree may apply to the second, at least *one full year (24 semester hours) must be taken specifically for the new degree program*. Therefore, applicants with a prior master’s degree are urged to investigate the Doctoral Program in Higher Education.

Annual Reviews

The Graduate Faculty conducts annual reviews of each enrolled student in the graduate program. These reviews typically take place in February. Students will be reviewed according to the guidelines established in the Satisfactory Progress Policy (See Appendix C).

As a result of this review, the Graduate Faculty will recommend one of the following:

1. Continue in the Graduate Program,
2. Continue in the Graduate Program with Conditions, or
3. Dismissal from Graduate Program

Continuation of Enrollment

Students who have been granted admission are expected to register in the term for which admission is granted. Any student who fails to register during any one-year period prior to graduation, and who does not have an official leave of absence from study granted by the Higher Education Program and the Graduate School, may be required to apply for re-admission to the program according to the procedures and standards in effect at the time of reconsideration.

Although this *Handbook* provides an overview of the policies, procedures, and requirements of the Higher Education program, the *Handbook* cannot be viewed as having all of the answers. Instead, students must seek answers to questions from other sources including, but not limited to, the Higher Education program faculty, the COE Office of Graduate Studies and Research (COE Room 105), and the Texas Tech University Graduate School (Holden Hall). While faculty advisors are knowledgeable about the policies, procedures, and requirements, the **primary responsibility** for reading and following correct policies and procedures **remains with the student**, not the faculty.

Additional Information

Internship

Students must complete 150 hours of supervised internship training at a site that offers opportunities for students to engage in both group and individual higher education administrative work. Refer to the Internship Handbook for complete details.

Comprehensive Evaluation – Capstone Project

All graduate students in the Master of Education degree program must successfully complete a final comprehensive evaluation (capstone project).

In the case of the Higher Education Master's Degree program, this evaluation take the form as the capstone project usually taken during the semester the student expects to graduate. The candidate must be enrolled during the semester in which the project is completed. There are **NO** summer comprehensive evaluations (capstone projects) offered by the program. IF a student anticipates graduating the summer, they must contact their advisor by the beginning of the spring semester to make appropriate arrangements.

Students must apply to take the evaluation in the Office of the College of Education Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research (COE, Room 105) or online at <https://educfmk.educ.ttu.edu/SSL/Applications/mcompapp/>. Since there are deadlines for applying to take the evaluation, students are encouraged to inquire about the procedures during their last year of course enrollment.

The comprehensive evaluation/capstone project is a single, high-stakes assessment. It focuses on the synthesis and application of knowledge acquired during the program of study leading to the Master's degree.

Satisfactory performance in course work does not guarantee successful performance on the comprehensive evaluation. A student who fails the comprehensive evaluation/capstone project may repeat it once after an interval of four months or more. A student who fails the comprehensive evaluation/capstone project a second time is denied a Master's degree in Higher Education.

Statement of Intention to Graduate

Students must file a "Statement of Intention to Graduate" in the Graduate School as early as to meet TTU Graduate School deadlines at <http://www.depts.ttu.edu/gradschool/current/Deadlines.php>.

Financial Aid

A limited number of College of Education Graduate Research/Teaching Assistantships are available on a competitive basis. Deadline for these awards is March 1 for the fall semester. In addition, a number of Texas Tech University Fellowships, scholarships, work study, and other awards are available from the Office of Graduate Admissions' website at <http://www.depts.ttu.edu/gradschool/scholarships/index.php>.

Additional Information & Suggestions

Other important issues such as registration, financial assistance, ethics, and appeals procedures are outlined in the *Texas Tech University Graduate Catalog*, *College of Education Graduate Student Handbook*, and the *Education Student Handbook*.

Appendix A

Higher Education Program Masters Higher Education Administrator Evaluation Rubric

Program Objective: Understanding the importance of equity and social justice, graduates of the Masters in Higher Education program use applied theories and practical research as tools of collaborative change in their leadership positions.				
Objective 1: Professional Foundations/ Higher Education Administrator Competencies (based on CAS/ACPA/NASPA Competencies) P1				
	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Some Expectations	Does not Meet Expectations
Communication	<p>Demonstrates high levels Written, oral, and visual forms of communication are appropriate for the intended audience.</p> <p>Projects are exceptionally well written and organized and connect components in a seamless manner.</p> <p>Communication is highly responsive to audience comments and questions.</p> <p>Articulates ideas clearly and concisely; presented neatly and professionally; grammar and spelling are correct; uses good professional style.</p>	<p>Demonstrates written, oral, and visual forms of communication which are appropriate for the intended audience</p> <p>Projects are well written and organized, and connects components in a seamless manner.</p> <p>Communication is responsive to audience comments and questions.</p> <p>Articulates ideas clearly and concisely; presented neatly and professionally; grammar and spelling are correct; uses good professional style;</p>	<p>Demonstrates written, oral, and visual forms of communication which are somewhat appropriate for the intended audience.</p> <p>Projects demonstrate somewhat satisfactory organization; clear introduction; main points are well stated, even if some transitions are somewhat sudden; clear conclusion.</p> <p>Communication is somewhat responsive to audience comments and questions.</p> <p>Articulates ideas; one or two grammar or spelling errors per page; style is appropriate for audience</p>	<p>Demonstrates written, oral, and visual forms of communication which are not appropriate for the intended audience.</p> <p>Responds to questions inadequately or is not responsive to questions.</p> <p>Lacks organization and some of the main points and conclusions are unclear.</p> <p>Text rambles, key points are not organized; spelling or grammar errors present throughout more than 1/3 of paper; style is inappropriate for audience</p>

Interpersonal Skills	<p>Consistently demonstrates sensitivity to cultural norms and organizational practices.</p> <p>Always conveys ideas and information expertly, frequently, and inclusively through media and verbal and nonverbal means.</p> <p>Always listens actively to understand, comprehend, analyze, engage, and act.</p> <p>Always projects confidence and responds responsively and tactfully.</p>	<p>Demonstrates sensitivity to cultural norms and organizational practices.</p> <p>Consistently conveys ideas and information appropriately and consistently through media and verbal and nonverbal means.</p> <p>Consistent listens actively to understand, comprehend, analyze, engage, and act.</p> <p>Consistently confidence and responds responsively and tactfully.</p>	<p>Demonstrates some sensitivity to cultural norms and organizational practices.</p> <p>Occasionally conveys ideas and information appropriately and consistently through media and verbal and nonverbal means.</p> <p>Occasionally listens actively to understand, comprehend, analyze, engage, and act.</p> <p>Occasionally projects confidence and responds responsively and tactfully.</p>	<p>Insensitive to cultural norms and organizational practices.</p> <p>Seldom or never conveys ideas and information appropriately and consistently through media and verbal and nonverbal means.</p> <p>Seldom or never listens actively to understand, comprehend, analyze, engage, and act.</p> <p>Seldom or never projects confidence and responds responsively and tactfully.</p>
Theory	<p>Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of theory and its application.</p> <p>Identifies and critically analyzes strengths and weaknesses of theory.</p> <p>Aligns with research question, methods, and observations.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of theory and uses existing theory well.</p> <p>Informs the research question and measures.</p> <p>Identifies where theory works and where it does not work adequately.</p>	<p>Demonstrates understanding of theory at a simple level.</p> <p>Theory is minimally applied to recommendations and solutions.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a lack of understanding of theory at any level.</p> <p>Theory is not applied to question or problem.</p>
Objective 2: Leadership, Teamwork, Collaboration and Ethical Practice in Higher Education (P2)				
Knowledge and Awareness of Contemporary Issues and Different Perspectives	<p>Uses varied sources of evidence and analyzes data about current practices and outcomes to shape vision, mission, and goals with high, measurable</p>	<p>Uses several information sources and some data to shape vision, mission, and goals with expectations for students and educators</p>	<p>Uses a single source of information and data about what is currently occurring to shape mission and goals.</p>	<p>Uses no information and data about what is currently occurring to shape mission and goals.</p>

	expectations			
Leadership Roles and Behaviors	Clearly understands the multiple purposes of higher education and demonstrates the leadership behaviors and role needed in higher education.	Demonstrates appropriate understanding of the purpose of higher education and the leadership roles needed in higher education.	Demonstrates limited understanding of the purpose of higher education and the leadership roles needed in higher education.	Appears unable to connect decisions and behaviors to the purpose of education and the role of leadership in higher education.
Teamwork & Collaboration	<p>Demonstrates high levels of knowledge and ability needed to understand how to embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles.</p> <p>Demonstrates high levels of knowledge and ability to develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation.</p> <p>Demonstrates high levels of knowledge and ability to facilitate shared problem solving and decision making.</p>	<p>Demonstrates appropriate knowledge and ability needed to understand how to embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles.</p> <p>Demonstrates appropriate knowledge and ability to develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation.</p> <p>Demonstrates appropriate levels of knowledge and ability to facilitate shared problem solving and decision making.</p>	<p>Demonstrates some knowledge and ability needed to understand how to embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles.</p> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge and ability to develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation.</p> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge and ability to facilitate shared problem solving and decision making.</p>	<p>Demonstrates limited or no knowledge and ability needed to understand how to embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles.</p> <p>Demonstrates limited or no knowledge and ability to develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork.</p> <p>Demonstrates no knowledge and ability to facilitate shared problem solving and decision making.</p>
Ethical Considerations	Possesses and reflects upon a personal and professional code of ethics and expects others in the higher education community to behave ethically and with integrity.	Demonstrates the basic understanding of professional code of ethics and understands how to act with integrity.	Demonstrates limited understanding of professional code of ethics and understands how to act with integrity.	Make little mention of a personal and professional code of ethics and rarely uses it to reflect on actions and decisions.

Section 3: Assessing, Proposing and Evaluating Solutions to Problems in Practice(P3)				
Originality and Problem Definition	<p>Identification of the problem is significant, authentic, interesting, and thoughtful</p> <p>Clearly states the problem in context, gives breadth, depth, and insight to the issues and states why it is important.</p> <p>Use of existing literature is comprehensive, thorough, complete, coherent, concise, and up to date (if applicable)</p>	<p>Identification of the problem is appropriately articulated.</p> <p>States the problem in context and appropriately.</p> <p>Shows understanding of the command over the most relevant literature (if applicable)</p>	<p>Identification of the problem is poorly articulated and organized, weak attempt to address the issue</p> <p>Problem definition is less interesting; has less breadth, depth, and insight</p> <p>Shows limited understanding of the command over the most relevant literature (if applicable)</p>	<p>Identification of the problem is poorly articulated and organized, weak attempt to address the issue</p> <p>Does not provide or does not put the problem in a clear context.</p> <p>Looks at a question or problem that is trivial, weak, unoriginal, or already solved by the partnering institution.</p> <p>Misinterprets or does not understand the literature (if applicable)</p>
Critical Thought and Argument	<p>Demonstrates mature critical thinking.</p> <p>The methods and techniques to be used are clearly and fully described and justified per purpose and research/evaluation questions</p> <p>Limitations of the design are explored at length.</p> <p>Argument is focused, logical, rigorous, and sustained.</p>	<p>Demonstrates appropriate level of critical thinking.</p> <p>Uses existing methods, techniques, or approaches in correct manner.</p> <p>Limitations of the design are explored adequately.</p> <p>Sustains an argument appropriately and is convincing..</p>	<p>Demonstrates limited critical thinking.</p> <p>Uses existing methods, techniques, or approaches in somewhat accurate ways.</p> <p>Limitations of the design are not explored with any breadth or depth.</p> <p>Sustains an argument, but the argument is not imaginative, complex, or convincing</p>	<p>Lacks careful thought.</p> <p>Has a weak, inconsistent, self-contradictory, unconvincing, and/or invalid argument.</p> <p>Methods and techniques to be used are not adequately described or justified.</p> <p>Discussion of the limitations of the design is incomplete, inappropriate, or erroneous</p>
Presentation of Findings	Results are appropriately presented to both audience and according to	Results are somewhat appropriately presented to either the audience or	Results are not appropriately presented to the particular audience or according to the	Results are not presented to the particular audience or according to

	<p>professional scholarly standards.</p> <p>Presentation of results is organized and transitions in a meaningful narrative.</p> <p>The selection of results presented may be considered as the most salient to the study.</p> <p>Tables and figures are provided and used to supplement explanations in text.</p>	<p>according to professional scholarly practitioner standards but not both.</p> <p>Presentation of results is somewhat organized in that the narrative progresses in a meaningful way.</p> <p>There is a selective presentation of results that are salient but still not selecting the most salient.</p> <p>Tables and figures are provided yet not explained in detail</p>	<p>professional scholarly standards.</p> <p>Presentation of results is not organized in a meaningful narrative that transitions smoothly.</p> <p>Results presented without reference to what may be considered most relevant to that particular study.</p> <p>Tables and figures are neither provided nor sufficiently explained in text.</p>	<p>professional scholarly practitioner standards.</p> <p>Presentation of results is missing.</p> <p>Results are missing. Tables and figures are neither provided nor sufficiently explained in text.</p> <p>Tables and figures are used to replace explanation of results rather than supplement.</p>
Results/Interpretations / Conclusions	<p>Provides plausible interpretations</p> <p>Interesting, surprising, and insightful.</p> <p>Discusses strength, weaknesses, and limitations.</p> <p>Context of the study is reiterated in a clear and concise manner.</p> <p>Conclusions are both tied to empirical evidence and explained thoroughly with respect to the context of the problem.</p> <p>Recommendations are explained as founded in both</p>	<p>Provides a good summary of results.</p> <p>Context of the evaluation is not fully reiterated in a clear and concise manner.</p> <p>Findings are explained with some depth according to each research question.</p> <p>Conclusions are tied to empirical evidence but not explained.</p> <p>Recommendations are explained with some foundation in either evidence from the data or the extant literature but not both.</p>	<p>Interpretation is not objective, cogent, or correct.</p> <p>Makes improper inferences.</p> <p>Overstates the results</p> <p>Summarizes what has already been said.</p> <p>Does not understand the results or what has been done.</p> <p>The explanation of recommendations does not clearly or coherently answer research questions.</p>	<p>Has wrong, inappropriate, incoherent, or confused analysis of problem.</p> <p>Interpretation is not objective, cogent, or correct.</p> <p>Has unsupported or exaggerated interpretations.</p> <p>Does not address the significance or the implications of the problem</p> <p>The explanation of findings does not clearly or coherently answer community</p>

	evidence from the data collected and the extant literature.			partner questions.
Implementation and Contributions to the Field	<p>Results demonstrate sophisticated evidence of planning and development of the project.</p> <p>Most or all of the recommendations from the project are more or less functional with minor effort need to complete.</p> <p>Results are of interest to collaborating partner and/or larger community and significantly advances the field of higher education.</p> <p>Demonstrates skills and knowledge of how to implement an intervention/solution to a problem in practice within scope of influence at a high and innovative standard.</p>	<p>Results demonstrate good evidence of planning and development of the project.</p> <p>Many recommendations work, some need additional work to become viable.</p> <p>Results make a contribution to the field of higher education.</p> <p>Demonstrates skills and knowledge of how to implement an intervention/solution to a problem in practice at an intermediate level</p>	<p>Results demonstrate limited evidence of planning and development of the project</p> <p>Some recommendations work with partial function of the rest.</p> <p>Results make a small contribution to the field of higher education.</p> <p>Demonstrates skills and knowledge of how to implement</p> <p>An intervention/solution to a problem of practice at a novice or below level.</p>	<p>Results do not establish criteria for development of the project.</p> <p>Few if any recommendations are functional. Major areas not started or addressed.</p> <p>Results make no contribution to the field of higher education.</p>

Capstone Group Presentation Evaluation

Meets the Standards (Yes or No):	
Strengths:	
Areas of Concern:	
Recommendations:	
<p>Appraisal Component 1: Project Plan</p> <p>Does the group presentation's professional synthesizing project plan include all required elements?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Does the group presentation define the project's purposes? b) Does the group presentation explain the project's significance and benefits to the community partner? c) Does the group presentation create a step-by-step plan with a realistic timeline for completion? d) Does the group presentation set the project's success measures, benchmarks, tasks, roles and responsibilities, resources, and strategies? 	
<p>Appraisal Component 2: Project Criteria</p> <p>Does the group presentation's professional synthesizing project demonstrate achievement of each criterion?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is the group presentation's project original, significant, ambitious, interesting, exciting, and thoughtful? Does the group presentation ask an important question or address an important problem? Does the group presentation clearly state and explain the question or problem? b) Does the group presentation demonstrate a deep understanding of and fully incorporate applicable course, program, and institutional learning objectives? c) Is the project well written, organized, and presented? Does the group presentation 	

follow the *APA Publication Manual* standards? Are components connected in a seamless manner? Does the group presentation have a point of view and a confident voice? Is the project publishable?

- d) Does the group presentation demonstrate mature critical thinking? Is the argument focused, logical, rigorous, and sustained?
- e) Does the group presentation demonstrate a thoughtful understanding of relevant literature? Does the group presentation present thorough research that includes rich data from multiple sources?
- f) Does the group presentation demonstrate a sophisticated and deep understanding of theory?
- g) Does the group presentation demonstrate a comprehensive, complete, sophisticated, and convincing analysis? Are results significant? Does the group presentation's conclusion tie the whole project together? Is the project of interest to a larger community and does it advance the ways readers think?

**Appendix B
Course Sequence
Masters of Education
Non-Thesis Option
(39 hours)**

Year 1:

Required Courses in Higher Education

Fall Semester

EDHE 5300 3 Hours
History of Higher Education in the United States

EDHE 5332 3 Hours
Student Services in Higher Education

EDHE 6310 3 Hours
Higher Education Research Design

Spring Semester

EDHE 5313 3 Hours
The Comprehensive Community College

EDHE 5334 3 Hours
College Student Development

EDHE 5341 3 Hours
Assessment in Higher Education

Summer Semester

EDHE 5393 3 Hours
Internship in Higher Education

Year 2:

Required Courses in Higher Education

Fall Semester

EDHE 5001 3 Hours
Technology in Higher Education

EDHE 5321 3 Hours
Administration in Higher Education

EDHE 5303 3 Hours
Access and Equity in Higher Education

Spring Semester

EDHE 5001 3 Hours
Master's Capstone

EDHE 5001 3 Hours
Crisis Management & Legal Aspects of Higher Education

EDHE 5323 3 Hours
Budgeting and Resource Management in Higher Education

Total 39 Hours

Course Sequence
Masters of Education- Thesis Option (42 hours)

Year 1:

Required Courses in Higher Education

Fall Semester	EDHE 5300 History of Higher Education in the United States	3 Hours
	EDHE 5332 Student Services in Higher Education	3 Hours
	EDHE 6310 Higher Education Research Design	3 Hours
Spring Semester	EDHE 5313 The Comprehensive Community College	3 Hours
	EDHE 5334 College Student Development	3 Hours
	EPSY 5385 Foundations of Educational Research	3 Hours
Summer Semester	EDHE 5393 Internship in Higher Education	3 Hours
	EPSY 5380 Introduction to Education Statistics (Quantitative) OR EPSY 5382 Qualitative Research in Education	3 Hours

Year 2:

Fall Semester

	EDHE 5303 Access and Equity in Higher Education	3 Hours
	EDHE 5321 Administration in Higher Education	3 Hours
	EDHE 6000 Master's Thesis	3 Hours

Spring Semester

	EDHE 5001 Crisis Management & Legal Aspects of Higher Education	3 Hours
	EDHE 5323 Budgeting and Resource Management in Higher Education	3 Hours
	EDHE 6000 Master's Thesis	3 Hours

Total 42 Hours

Appendix C

Higher Education Program Student Progress Evaluations

All graduate students in the Higher Education Program are evaluated annually. Submission of an Annual "Student Progress Report" is essential for remaining in good academic standing. The Annual Progress evaluation provides the faculty the opportunity to assess and communicate the student's accomplishments and whether progress toward the degree is being made in a timely manner. The report assesses course work, internship, and research productivity. The report also captures elements of professional development and leadership. Evaluations occur after the student completes their first 18 credit hours in the program.

Sample Red Light Letter

August XX, 2013

Dear Student :

On August XX, 2013 the full-time program faculty of the Higher Education Program met to review the progress of your entire masters cohort group. We discussed the performance of each student in coursework, with a particular focus on writing and conceptualization skills, and examined the progress of each student in meeting program milestones.

The full-time faculty are particularly concerned about your academic performance. The faculty noted a weakness in your writing skills and with your understanding of quantitative methods. In addition, we are concerned that you are not managing your time and are consistently asking for extensions on your course work. It is necessary for you to pursue a writing course and supplement the research courses you have completed with additional studies. It was the feeling of the committee that you will have a difficult time passing your qualifying examination and completing a dissertation without further effort on your part in those two areas. In addition, the faculty noted that you have not completed one of your core courses and a grade of "I" remains on your transcript.

Because of the issues noted above, it is imperative that you make an appointment with your advisor in the next two (2) weeks to develop a performance improvement plan. Failure to comply with this directive may result in your dismissal of the program. This is at the discretion of the program faculty.

If you have any questions about your review, please contact your advisor or me.

Sincerely,

Higher Education Program Coordinator

Sample Yellow Light Letter

August XX, 2013

Dear Student:

On August XX, 2013 the core faculty of the Higher Education Program met to review the progress of your entire masters cohort group. We discussed the performance of each student in coursework, with a particular focus on writing and conceptualization skills, and examined the progress of each student in meeting program milestones.

The full-time faculty were concerned about your academic progress to date. The faculty encourages you to seek a writing course to help you with your writing skills. The faculty believe this is necessary for you to successfully the capstone project. It was noted that they believe you will be an outstanding representative of the program when you are finished and pursuing your career options.

If you need assistance in finding a writing course, please contact your advisor. The program will need documentation of the writing course/help you are seeking to address the issue stated above by the end of the fall ____ semester. If you have any further questions about your review, please feel free to meet with your advisor or me.

Sincerely,

Higher Education Program Coordinator

Sample Green Light Letter

August XX, 2013

Dear Student:

On August XX, 2013 the core faculty of the Higher Education Program met to review the progress of your entire masters cohort group. We discussed the performance of each student in coursework, with a particular focus on writing and conceptualization skills, and examined the progress of each student in meeting program milestones. We are pleased to report that the core faculty believes that overall you are making good progress in your studies, and anticipate that you will continue to advance in your educational career.

The full-time faculty noted in particular that you are thoughtful about the material presented, and that you have completed all of your coursework to date in an outstanding manner. The faculty particularly noted that you have been taking advantage of working with faculty outside of the coursework and encourage you to continue that practice. Overall, the faculty felt you were make good progress in the program.

We congratulate you on your success to date. If you have any further questions about your review, please feel free to meet with any of us.

Sincerely,

Higher Education Program Coordinator