

Board of Examiners Report for Continuous Improvement Pilot Visit

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

Institution:

University One

Team Recommendations:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Standard Met	Standard Met
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Standard Met	Standard Met
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Standard Met	Standard Met
4. Diversity	Standard Met	Standard Met
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Standard Met	Standard Met
6. Unit Governance and Resources	Standard Met	Standard Met

Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

I. INTRODUCTION

I.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

Located in Treeville, University One (UO) is a public, land-grant institution designated by the Carnegie Foundation as a Research University with very high research activity. Established in 1871 as Northwest Seminary, the institution later merged with the land-grant Agricultural College. By action of the State Legislature in 1910, the college became a university, was renamed University One, and moved to its present site in Treeville. In September 1911, the first classes were offered with an enrollment of 62 students. Now one of the largest universities in the country, UO has developed into a comprehensive research institution with an enrollment of more than 40,000 students and employment of approximately 3,200 faculty members. In addition to its distinction as a land-grant university, UO includes 16 colleges, a Graduate School, and more than 150 research centers and institutes. In the previous academic year, the university was awarded \$450 million to support sponsored research, in areas such as health care and agriculture.

The mission of UO is to offer broad-based, inclusive public education, leading-edge research, and service to the citizens of the state and the nation. The fusion of these three endeavors stimulates a remarkable intellectual vitality and generates a synthesis that promises to be the university's greatest strength. The complete mission statement can be viewed online.

The professional education unit at UO is responsible for managing and coordinating all programs offered for the initial and advanced preparation of teachers and other school professionals. The unit includes professional preparation programs in the College of Education, the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (agricultural education), and the College of Fine Arts (art

education and music education). Headcount enrollment in the College of Education totaled 1,487 candidates in fall 2009 (514 undergraduate and 973 graduate students). The total number of full- and part-time faculty serving the unit is 191 (including 60 graduate teaching assistants). Tables 2 and 3 of the IR accurately reflect specific information about programs, degrees, enrollment, and accreditation and recognition of programs.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

The UO continuing accreditation visit was one of the first institutions to pilot test the new Continuous Improvement option. The pilot consisted of an offsite review conducted by conference call, the preparation of an Offsite BOE Feedback Report, a shortened onsite visit, a smaller Onsite BOE team, and a new BOE report format.

Five NCATE BOE members conducted the offsite review in December 2009 in consultation with the NCATE senior vice president, the state team chair, and representatives from the State Department of Education. An offsite review report was completed and submitted to the institution in preparation for the onsite visit.

A previsit was conducted by conference call in December 2009. During the previsit, discussion focused on identification of programs to be reviewed, clarification of IR contents, individuals to include in onsite interviews, roles of NCATE and state teams, and logistical plans for the onsite visit.

The onsite review was conducted concurrently by an NCATE team and a state team. The state chair and two state consultants from the State Department of Education assisted the NCATE BOE with the visit and provided consultation regarding state program approval policies and processes. In accordance with the state protocol, the teams collaborated on interviews, shared findings throughout the visit, and prepared separate reports.

I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

UO offers the initial preparation program in agricultural education in an off-campus site. A UO faculty member in agricultural education serves as the program coordinator for the off-campus site. Candidates in agricultural education from the off-site campus were interviewed using interactive technology during the onsite visit.

The unit also offers two post baccalaureate alternate route programs. One of these programs is offered in a rural community, the other in an urban school district. Approved by the state in fall 2007, these alternate route programs consist of a year-long teacher residency model. Additionally, the educational leadership program offers an alternative delivery model for candidates who wish to earn the specialist or doctoral degree and eligibility for state certification in educational leadership. This program is delivered in a suburban county with candidates completing face-to-face and online coursework.

Advanced programs in special education and curriculum and instruction are offered through distance learning technologies. The special education program is offered totally online. The C&I program uses hybrid coursework with candidates enrolling in a mix of online and face-to-face courses.

Faculty members who teach in the distance learning programs are the same faculty who teach on-campus courses in addition to adjunct faculty who teach at the distant sites. Instruction is provided through a blend of online and face-to-face courses. Candidates are required to complete the same assignments as candidates in the on-campus program. Assignments are submitted and faculty feedback received through email, Moodle, and phone conversations. Courses have been designed to ensure continuous interaction among the instructor and candidates. Candidates complete faculty and course evaluations using digital evaluation forms. Candidates interviewed during the site visit provided examples of course and curricula changes that have occurred as a result of their feedback and assessment data.

The unit disaggregates data, as appropriate, for its online and off-campus programs. Data were provided for the agricultural education program that is offered in Plant City and for the SITE program. The special education program and the C&I program in curriculum and instruction are delivered totally online; therefore, all candidates are enrolled in the online programs and performance data are reported separately for each of these two programs.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

There were no unusual circumstances that affected the visit.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The conceptual framework for the professional education unit at University One focuses on the following five components: the preparation of reflective professionals; the preparation of technologically-proficient professionals; the creation, organization, and dissemination of knowledge; the promotion of democratic values; and service to diverse communities. This model provides the vision and underlying assumptions for programs, courses, candidate performance, and faculty instruction, scholarship, and service in the unit.

Components of the unit conceptual framework are reflected in the mission of the unit, which reads as follows:

The mission of the College of Education is to prepare exemplary practitioners and scholars; to generate, use, and disseminate knowledge about teaching, learning, and human development; and to collaborate with others to solve critical educational and human problems in a diverse global community.

The unit developed the conceptual framework with four components prior to the last accreditation review in 2003. The framework was updated in 2008 to include the technology component. Thus, the overarching framework and most major components have remained the same for almost a decade and are now integrated in all aspects of the unit's work. The conceptual framework document cites the works of Dewey, Shulman, Schon, Darling-Hammond, Cochran-Smith and Lytle, and Ball and McDiarmid as the knowledge base that supports the unit's emphases on content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and professional knowledge and skills. Since the last accreditation visit, the unit has expanded its work to focus on Boyer's concept of engaged scholarship. Consistent with the unit's mission, engaged scholarship occurs as faculty and school partners participate in collaborative research and inquiry for the purpose of solving educational problems and improving teaching and learning.

Unit faculty members are committed to preparing candidates who demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required of professional educators, particularly as these relate to the candidate performance expectations outlined in state standards and the unit conceptual framework. State standards address principals, the reading competencies, ESOL, and subject matter competencies and skills for teachers. The framework is reflected in candidate assessments and course syllabi. Additionally, unit faculty has aligned the curricula, field experiences, clinical practice, and assessments with the proficiencies outlined in the conceptual framework and state standards. Alignment matrices and interviews with faculty and candidates validate the alignment of candidate proficiencies, i.e., State standards and indicators, with the unit conceptual framework.

To ensure that candidates at the University One become effective educators, the unit uses a continuous assessment process to monitor candidate proficiencies that are outlined in the conceptual framework and in state and professional standards. Candidates are able to articulate the various components of the conceptual framework and demonstrate their proficiency on these components through reflective journals, portfolio artifacts, and lesson analyses. The Educator Assessment System is the electronic system used by faculty and candidates to document candidate mastery of proficiencies across educator preparation programs in the unit.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Initial Teacher Preparation

Candidates in initial teacher preparation programs at the University One continue to demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Initial programs include agricultural education (6-12), art (K-12), elementary education (K-6) single and dual certification with special education, English education (6-12), music education (K-12), early childhood education (Preschool, Pre-K Primary), science education (6-12: biology, chemistry, physics), and social science education (K-12). Two alternative certification programs, are offered through the County Apprenticeship Program.

During the visit, the onsite team followed up on questions raised by the offsite review team. The information in the IR, IR Addendum, and exhibits was validated by reviewing evidence that was not accessed during the offsite review; interviewing unit faculty, unit administrators, candidates, school-based faculty, and other members of the professional community; and observing work on campus and at two partner schools.

The unit's response to the Offsite BOE Report, data reviewed, and follow-up information during interviews allowed for substantial validation and clarification of evidence.

- (1) Findings of the state team concluded that all programs are meeting state standards.
- (2) Candidates' proficiencies for all initial programs are aligned with the unit's conceptual framework.
- (3) The unit presented a sample of candidate assessment data disaggregated for off-campus and distance learning programs.
- (4) Degree clarifications:
 - The master's degree in agricultural education was approved by the State DOE to offer initial certification in 2008, beginning first admission in spring 2010;
 - The mathematics education program was closed in 2002 due to budget cuts;
 - Candidates completing the elementary education dual certification program receive a bachelor's degree in elementary education and a master's degree in special education and are recommended for certification in elementary education (K-6) and exceptional student education (K-12).
 - Special education candidates demonstrate dispositions as they complete embedded projects.
- (4) The state-approved early childhood program is a five-year program culminating in a master's degree in early childhood education. Graduates are eligible in two primary areas (preschool and PreK-Primary) and two endorsement areas (PreK Disabilities and ESOL).
- (5) The 100 percent pass rate was implemented in 2004 for BA programs and in 2005 for all five-year programs; pass rates with less than 100 percent can be observed before 2004.

(7) Student Teaching Performance Evaluation Indicator Descriptions show alignment with the domains and indicators of the state.

As described in the introduction, this review was a concurrent visit with a State Department of Education team that had responsibility for reviewing all educator preparation programs at University One. At the conclusion of the onsite visit, the state team recommended full approval for all programs in the unit.

Two initial programs in the unit are nationally accredited. The art education program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design, and the music education program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music. Both programs are accredited through 2009-2010.

Data indicate that initial teacher candidates meet or exceed expectations related to knowledge of content. Sample assessments include the State Teacher Certification Subject Area Exam and follow-up studies of graduates and employers. The overall pass rate for the unit on the content exam from 2005 through 2008 was 100 percent (N=736). Satisfaction surveys of graduates and employers are administered annually during the graduate's first year of teaching. The average rating of respondents on knowledge and understanding of subject matter was 4.60 for graduates and 4.77 for employers (scale low of 1 to high of 5) from 2003 through 2008, with a response rate of 34 percent for graduates and 46 percent for employers during these years. Interviews with candidates, university supervisors, and school-based faculty indicate that candidates know and are able to demonstrate the subject matter in their respective disciplines.

Candidates in initial programs demonstrate pedagogical content competence through course assignments and internship performances. Grades on assignments, evaluations of portfolio artifacts, and internship evaluations provide means of assessing pedagogical content knowledge. Additionally, follow-up surveys of graduates and employers include at least seven items related to pedagogical content knowledge, e.g., using appropriate teaching strategies; planning, implementing, and evaluating effective teaching; and using appropriate technology. Ratings on these items from 2003 through 2008 for graduates range from 4.22 through 4.54 and for employers from 4.40 to 4.57 (on a five-point scale). The response rate was 34 percent for graduates (N=405) and 46 percent for employers (N=550). Interviews with candidates and faculty indicate that candidates are prepared to use a wide variety of technology tools and applications to facilitate student learning, a key component of the conceptual framework.

Candidates develop and demonstrate professional and pedagogical content knowledge and skills through course-embedded assignments, reflections, and practicum and internship placements. During field placements, candidates are observed and receive feedback and coaching regarding their performance. Items related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are also included on follow-up surveys of graduates and employers. Ratings on these items from 2003 through 2008 for graduates range from 3.88 through 4.54 and for employers from 4.33 to 4.80 (on a five-point scale). The response rate was 34 percent for graduates (N=405) and 46 percent for employers (N=550). During interviews, candidates and faculty reported that candidates are able to consider family and community contexts in which they work, demonstrate the ability to analyze student learning data, and reflect on their own instruction. For candidates in initial

teacher preparation programs, the unit has identified professional dispositions embedded in the State indicators related to fairness, the belief that all students can learn, and the professional dispositions of improving practice through collaboration and reflection; exhibiting professional behavior consistent with the Code of Ethics; expanding knowledge of subject matter by seeking additional resources; and using effective and democratic communication techniques with colleagues, school or community specialists, and families, including families whose home language is not English. Data on these dispositions are reported by program area and aggregated across the unit.

Candidates in initial programs complete course-embedded assessments that demonstrate their ability to impact P-12 student learning. For each program, matrices identify alignment of student learning assessments with State indicators by program and by courses within programs. Examples of assessments include case studies, pre- and post-assessments with interventions, inquiry projects, reflective reports, and portfolio artifacts. Performance data on these assessments and onsite interviews document that candidates are able to positively impact learning of P-12 students.

Advanced Preparation of Teachers and Other School Professionals

The unit offers nine advanced programs, including six for teacher candidates and three for other school professionals. All state-approved programs, including educational leadership, and nationally recognized programs continue to provide regular and systematic evidence that candidates have met performance expectations on all proficiencies, including the state proficiencies. Data for the three advanced programs not nationally or state reviewed (agricultural education, special education, and C&I) also indicate that candidates continue to meet or exceed expectations regarding knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

The unit's response to the Offsite BOE Report, data reviewed, and follow-up information during interviews allowed for substantial validation and clarification of evidence.

- (1) Effective fall 2008, all educational leadership candidates are required to take and pass all portions of the State Educational Leadership Examination prior to graduation.
- (2) Degree clarification: The COE offers a master's degree in curriculum and instruction with an educational technology non-teacher specialization.
- (3) All advanced teacher education programs include program-specific dispositions. Satisfactory performance on all assignments and in all courses assessing dispositional elements must be achieved for program completion.
- (4) Two doctoral programs in the unit, educational leadership and school psychology, fall under NCATE review. Both programs prepare candidates for work in P-12 schools.

1.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit has continued to refine its conceptual framework since the previous site visit. After reviewing the conceptual framework, unit faculty and administrators decided technology was not adequately addressed in the document. In 2008, the technologically-proficient professional was added as a fifth major component of the framework. Since that time, assessments measuring candidate proficiency with technology have been developed, and data have been collected and reported at program levels. During the site visit, candidates reported that faculty members model a variety of technology applications in their teaching and require them to plan and implement various technologies in their practicum and internship placements. Candidates indicated they use multiple technology applications, including Wikis, social networks, open-source software, blogging, Webspiration, Kidspiration, virtual field trips, podcasts, online portfolios (in music education), and PowerPoint presentations.

The unit's emphasis on engaged scholarship has provided opportunities for candidates and faculty to participate in meaningful inquiry that informs improvements in teaching and impacts P-12 student learning. For example, the program in curriculum and instruction features professors-in-residence who work with advanced candidates in the largest city in the state, a rural county, and the county with the second largest city to prepare teacher leaders, master teachers, and teacher researchers. Candidates in the program participate in job-embedded learning that facilitates immediate application of research and theory in their classrooms.

1.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable for spring 2010 pilot visits

1.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Unit faculty and candidates are dedicated to making a difference in the learning of P-12 students. Interviews and documentation reveal that student learning is a central focus in all educator preparation programs in the unit. Candidates provided specific examples of meaningful learning experiences they provide to students based on students' prior knowledge and feedback on formative and summative assessments. Candidates also documented their ability to reflect on their teaching and make adjustments based on student learning needs.

1.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No previous AFIs	

1.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No previous AFIs	

1.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
No previous AFIs	

1.6 Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit has a comprehensive and integrated assessment system aligned with the conceptual framework outcomes as well as state and national standards. The system is integrated well into the unit’s structure, faculty responsibilities, and timelines. Ongoing assessment and evaluation of the system is operating as an integrated feature.

Key assessments of candidate performance have been identified and include unit level assessments (e.g., state licensure examinations, student teaching evaluations, disposition assessments) as well as unique assessments designed to meet individual program standards, as seen in SPA reports. Data from these assessments are gathered at clearly identified transition points and used to make decisions about candidate progress. The timeline for collecting, aggregating, summarizing, and analyzing unit and program operations and quality assessments indicates where all data are stored and who has access to that data.

While outcomes and performance criteria have been specified clearly for candidates, outcomes, and performance, indicators of effective unit operations are not specified. The unit systematically gathers unit operations data, but the questions being answered and the performance indicators are not specified clearly (e.g., “Our programs are operating as we want them to when . . .” Or, what are the implications or expectations from our conceptual framework for how we operate as a unit; are we meeting these expectations?). However, the unit stated it has several benchmarks the unit evaluates to ensure its effective operation, including recruitment and retention of candidates, percent of candidates employed, funding for research, faculty productivity, and funding. A review of data by the onsite team and interviews with the Dean and faculty confirmed the unit's claim.

The unit takes effective steps to ensure that assessments are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias. These include a well aligned system of curriculum, field experiences and clinical placements, and assessments; clear specification of standards, assessments, and scoring guides; clear communication of expectations; alignment with state and professional standards; common scale for scoring key assessments; and review and monitoring assessments for bias.

The unit maintains a well developed assessment system; data to be collected, by whom, and how the data are summarized and disseminated are specified clearly. The proprietary Professional Learning Trajectory database management system is an integral part of the unit assessment system and is used to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data from candidates, recent graduates, faculty, and P-12 faculty.

Candidate assessment data are regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed in annual reports focused on improving candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. Annual Reports for all program areas are now available on the website. Although there is only one secondary report, members from all program areas were part of the review. The unit states that this is done purposely so there is consistency across the secondary program areas. While each program obviously has assessments that evaluate their content area, it is important that the way in which candidates are evaluated is consistent.

Complaint and grievance policies are in place for initial and advanced programs. Records of formal candidate complaints are maintained and archived in the office of the highest level reached by the concern.

The unit uses several information technologies to archive and retrieve data for candidate performance, and unit and program operations and quality. These include, among others, the university Access to the Academic Information system, the teacher licensure database, the state licensure data base, a proprietary EBI follow-up data set, and the Performance Learning Trajectory database.

Structures are in place to ensure that data are used to initiate changes in the five fundamental components of the unit's assessment system. Multiple data sources are evaluated to make changes at the unit level. The university academic calendar structures assessments by candidates, faculty, and administrators; annual reports are also completed and focus on changes indicated by candidate and program operations assessment data. Systematic, data-driven changes are evident in courses, assessments, and programs.

Faculty have access to academic information for candidates through the university database. Through the Professional Learning Trajectory system, faculty members have access to their own assessments. Program Directors have access to all assignments, evaluations, and user data on PLT. Data from follow up surveys and state examinations are provided by the Director of Teacher Licensure.

Candidates receive feedback on key assessments, dispositions, clinical experience evaluations, and other assignments. All faculty receive data from key assessments, dispositions, and follow-

up data each spring prior to completing the program annual report. Annual reports are shared with the Council on Teacher Education as well.

2.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit has made significant improvement in building and maintaining its assessment system since the previous visit. It has used up-to-date technology to develop databases and candidate learning portfolio sites to archive candidate records. The gate point assessments are performance-based and aligned with national and state standards, and the unit conceptual framework. The Professional Learning Trajectory (PLT) candidate portfolio site has been developed by the unit to ensure the permanency of data ownership. The unit faculty have actively participated in designing and using the PLT.

2.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

The unit has made significant progress towards meeting the target level on the following elements of this standard:

- (1) The unit regularly examines the validity and utility of the data produced through assessments and makes modifications to keep abreast of changes in assessment technology and in professional standards.
- (2) Assessment data from candidates, graduates, faculty, and other members of the professional community are based on multiple assessments from both internal and external sources that are systematically collected as candidates progress through programs.
- (3) These data are regularly and systematically compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and reported publicly for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

2.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

- (1) The unit, with the involvement of its professional community, is regularly evaluating the capacity and effectiveness of its assessment system, which reflects the conceptual framework and incorporates candidate proficiencies outlined in professional and state standards.
- (2) Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments made at multiple points before program completion and in practice after completion of programs. The unit's assessment system provides regular and comprehensive data on program quality, unit operations, and candidate performance at each stage of its programs, extending into the first years of completers' practice.

2.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No previous AFIs	

2.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No previous AFIs	

2.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

2.6 Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The evidence presented in the unit's Institutional Report, observations by the onsite review team, and interviews with unit faculty, school-based faculty, and candidates support the continuing effort of the unit “to design, implement, and evaluate field experience and clinical practice.” The unit has developed partnerships with its primary stakeholders to design, implement, and evaluate an effective program for field experience and clinical practice. Field and clinical experiences are designed through the cooperation of unit faculty and the school-based faculty. In the elementary education programs, Professional Development Communities (PDC) play a key role in the implementation of field and clinical experiences. The unit has partnership agreements with numerous school districts and programs.

The majority of initial candidates are placed in the school district of Shelby County or in the Developmental Research School near campus. Advanced candidates, such as those in the C&I program, have created field or clinical programs in cooperation with school districts statewide.

Two alternate route programs have partnerships with two school districts. Other partnerships include Early Steps which provides internships for candidates in the early childhood education program. Once candidates have met the requirements for entrance into the field experience or clinical practice program, the student teaching coordinator (STC) becomes responsible for candidate placements. The STC, with input from unit faculty, school-based professionals, and the candidate, coordinates the placement of all candidates, but school district administrators make the final placement decision. Each program receives data on each candidate's previous field placements. These placements are reviewed within the program to ensure that the candidate will have experiences with students from diverse backgrounds.

Successful field experiences and clinical practices are determined, in part, by the quality of support the candidate has available during the experience. The unit ensures that each candidate is placed under the supervision of properly trained school-based faculty mentors and supervisors. Criteria for school-based mentors are specifically stated by the unit, and all mentors must have completed clinical educator training (CET). Programs also offer training in the use of the Pathwise Observation System used by all unit and school-based faculty for evaluating candidate performance. By signing the "Agreement to Take a Student Teacher," school-based faculty verify that mentors meet the minimum standards of the unit and the state. Other resources available to assist school-based faculty to prepare for their role as mentor include: student teaching handbooks, face-to-face meetings with unit faculty, and orientation conferences to inform mentors of the changes to programs. The details of the support process for candidates vary from program to program, but they all are designed to identify and deal with potential problems as they arise. This process begins with placement and includes frequent site visits by supervising faculty; frequent evaluation of candidate performance; frequent conferences among supervising faculty, school-based faculty, and candidates; and peer group support. If a problem is identified, each program has a process in place to help the candidate resolve the issue.

Another key component of a candidate's success in the field experience or clinical practice is the frequent evaluation of performance. To enter the program, candidates must meet specific requirements, and before exiting the program, they must demonstrate mastery of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of the profession through positive evaluations of their field experiences and clinical practice. To provide a reliable and systematic basis for assessment of the candidates' field experience and clinical practice, the unit adopted the Educational Testing Service's Pathwise Observation System. This system was chosen because "it has a strong base which includes a broad review of teacher job analyses, literature reviews, classroom visitations, field review, and meets state and national requirements such as INTASC standards." Faculty supervisors, clinical faculty, and candidates use a variety of performance data such as observation forms, reflective journals, and portfolios to assess candidate progress. Final assessments of clinical practice are based on tools which incorporate the State standards, the Pathwise Observation System, and professional practice behaviors. Candidates in advanced and other school professional programs are assessed in multiple ways during their clinical practice, such as opportunities for reflection, feedback from school-based faculty, and evaluations by unit faculty. Assessment data are gathered from end-of-term reports from the site host, group supervisors, individual supervisor, and the internship evaluation forms. All initial and advanced programs provide ample opportunity for the candidate to reflect and receive feedback during field and clinical experience. Reflection and feedback are incorporated into the Pathwise

Observation System. Other practices which encourage reflection include co-teaching, internship seminars, online discussions, portfolio artifacts, and electronic journals.

3.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit has continued to assess its field experiences and clinical practice programs, make changes, and create new programs when needed. In 2005, candidate performance assessments were examined, the Pathwise Observation System was aligned with EAS indicators, and new observation forms were adopted for use by supervising and cooperating teachers. Additional field experiences and a new course were added to the Five-Year Elementary Program to support interns placed in high poverty schools.

Between 2006 and 2008, the unit implemented an electronic internship evaluation form and faculty studied issues related to meeting the needs of interns and elementary students in the Five-Year Elementary Program. The elementary education program started a new process to integrate internship with instruction in ELED 6225. Field components were also added to provide more direct interaction with ESOL students with the direct purpose of giving interns more opportunities to use new ESOL strategies.

3.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable for spring 2010 pilot visits

3.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Consistent with its land-grant mission, the unit has demonstrated a strong commitment to meeting the needs of schools across the state through numerous partnerships and outreach efforts. Faculty work with P-12 school partners, families, and communities to tackle important educational issues, develop and study novel solutions, transform schools, and work to close the achievement gap. For example, the C&I program has professors-in-residence who partner with teachers in low income, high poverty schools in three counties in the state. The professors-in-residence live in the local community and collaborate with practicing teachers on curriculum and inquiry/action research projects that have immediate application in P-12 classrooms.

3.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No previous AFIs	

3.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
-----	---------------

No previous AFIs	
------------------	--

3.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

3.6 Recommendation for Standard 3

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools.

4.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

University One recognizes the important role diversity plays in the success of all aspects of life in a growing global community. A statement on the university's Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) homepage declares a commitment to achieving greater diversity in all aspects of campus life. To accomplish its diversity goals, the university acknowledges its engagement in diversity activities including “heterogeneous discourse, administrative and managerial outreach, conferences, publications, and electronic communications. The EEO takes responsibility for the coordinated united efforts of key players at UO with responsibility for diversity among students, faculty, and staff.” To implement this goal, the university created a Council of Diversity which has met regularly since May 2008. The Council has developed a Diversity Action Plan to guide and coordinate efforts to increase the diversity of faculty, staff, and students. The unit under the leadership of the dean is pursuing an aggressive policy toward recruitment and retention of diverse faculty. The unit's Diversity Committee supports the university's diversity plan, but is also in the process of developing its own plan to meet the specific needs of the unit.

The number of minority faculty at UO increased by 29 percent between 2003 and 2007, and currently 26 percent of the overall faculty at the university are minorities. Within the unit, however, minorities make up only 18 percent of the faculty. Although low in comparison to total university faculty numbers, the unit has steadily increased the number of minority faculty from 10 percent in 2002 to 18 percent in 2008. Members of the faculty recruitment committee are

trained in search strategies and have numerous tools available to them in the faculty recruitment tool kit to assist in developing recruitment skills. The tool kit includes information on diversity coaching, diversity recruitment workshops, recruitment travel, and ways to consult with diversity specialists. To retain faculty, the unit relies primarily upon a mentoring program to provide support to new faculty. Data on the diversity of school-based faculty are incomplete because all districts do not provide data. In the Alachua County school district where a majority of field experience and clinical practice candidates are placed, the number of minority faculty is 18 percent.

The unit is also engaged in recruiting and retaining a diverse pool of candidates in its initial and advanced programs. The Office of Recruitment, Retention, and Multicultural Affairs (RRMA) plays an active role in assisting the College of Education in recruiting and retaining candidates from diverse backgrounds in all programs. The RRMA develops and assesses strategies for recruitment and retention and also provides support services for minority candidates. Active recruitment programs include: Opportunity Scholarships, the State Fund for Minority Teachers, recruitment fairs, and Minority Education Scholarships. The number of recipients of the Minority Teacher and Minority Education Scholarships has shown an increase in most years since 2003. Candidates have also taken advantage of the travel support provided by the RRMA. In the past seven years, the number of minority undergraduate candidates has increased from 12 percent in 2003-2004 to 23.4 percent in 2009-2010. During this same time period, the number of minority graduate candidates increased from 23.7 percent to 28.4 percent.

The unit's faculty has the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to work with diverse student populations. They have been classroom teachers, participate on national committees dealing with issues of diversity, and hold leadership roles in research and development projects dealing with diversity. Unit faculty also serves as professors-in-residence in low performing, high poverty schools.

All ESOL faculty members have degrees in linguistics or ESOL. The unit faculty is well prepared and committed to graduating candidates with the appropriate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to successfully create a positive learning environment in which all students can learn. The unit has aligned the State indicators dealing with diversity throughout the curriculum for initial, advanced, and other school professional programs. Assessment data from internship evaluations, exit surveys, and completer and employee satisfaction surveys show that the overwhelming majority (93-100 percent) of candidates meet expectations set forth in the diversity indicators. Results from the 25 performance standards used to assess ESOL candidates show candidates performing at or near 100 percent. Although the sample is small, comments on ESOL in the graduate follow-up summaries indicate that recent graduates (between 2003-2008) recognize a need for enhanced instruction in a variety of areas, including assessment, modification of assignments, writing skills, cultural education, and a desire for more clinical experiences with ESOL students. However, information gathered from interviews with pre-interns and interns is inconsistent with the survey data; they indicated that they feel adequately prepared to work with ESOL students.

The unit not only strives to recruit and retain a diverse faculty and program candidates, it also has developed practices to create an environment for candidates to interact with one another.

Although only 19 percent of initial candidates and 31 percent of advanced candidates are minorities, the unit has designed activities which allow opportunities for candidates to interact with peers of different racial, ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds including peer activities and small group work, tutoring for the English Language Institute, and serving as English language partners to international students.

To ensure that candidates have an opportunity to work with students from diverse backgrounds, candidates in teacher preparation programs participate in multiple field placements. The pool of cooperating school districts represents a broad range of diversity. By requiring multiple placements for field experience, the unit can ensure that candidates will have an opportunity to work with students from diverse backgrounds.

4.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit continues to work on improving the process for placing candidates in diverse settings during field experiences and internship. One way it is attempting to do this is by expanding the role of unit faculty in coordinating internship placements. Placements for field experiences and clinical practice continue to be added in rural and economically disadvantaged areas. Candidates also gain field experiences with migrant children and families through projects and tutoring. The unit applied for and received a grant from the US Department of Education for Project Delta (Developing English Language and Literacy through Teacher Achievement) to study the relationship between the preparation in the Unified Elementary Education Proteach (UEP) program and the academic achievement of English Language Learners. The expectation is that results of the study will lead to changes in training of UEP candidates and related ESOL programs.

4.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable for spring 2010 pilot visits

4.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Candidates in the unit work collaboratively with unit faculty in P-12 classrooms to transform schools and address the achievement gap of students in high-poverty, low-income schools.

4.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No previous AFIs	

4.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
-----	---------------

No previous AFIs	
------------------	--

4.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

4.6 Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit employs faculty who possess the credentials and qualifications appropriate for the courses and programs of study offered by the institution. All tenure track faculty hold terminal degrees. In addition, several faculty members occupy distinguished chairs related to their areas of expertise. Other members of the unit have experience and licensure in those areas for which they are responsible. Non-tenure track faculty members include current P-12 teachers, retired educators, doctoral candidates, and lecturers with significant related experience and expertise ranging from NBPTS certification to administrative practice.

Mentor teachers and university mentors meet the criteria established by the state. Faculty credentials indicate they possess a thorough knowledge of the content they teach. As one faculty member reported, "the hallmark of staying here is knowing and sustaining your stuff." The curriculum is aligned with state and national standards. A range of instructional, assessment, and technological strategies is used by faculty. Incorporated into classes are reflections and activities that faculty use to gather information about candidates as reflective practitioners and that encourage critical thinking.

Candidates evaluate professional unit faculty at the end of each semester. Faculty use this information to reflect on their teaching and to make respective changes. Data gathered from interviews with candidates indicate that they feel strongly about the caring nature of and the positive relationships they have with faculty. They also reported that the faculty definitely model how to teach in P-12 settings and are thus able to see the theories studied being applied.

Faculty demonstrate a high level of scholarly productivity as evidenced by journal articles, books, book chapters, presentations, grants, and other awards. Data indicate this high level of productivity has been maintained over a number of years. In addition, faculty members provide service to local schools and educational agencies through consultation and professional development. They are also engaged in leadership roles in professional organizations, ranging from committee memberships to officer positions to executive board spots. In addition, faculty often involve candidates in conducting research and in making presentations at conferences.

Procedures for faculty evaluation and guidelines for tenure and promotion are in place. The results of student evaluations of faculty serve as vehicles leading to professional learning experiences for improving teaching. These professional development experiences include orientations; faculty mentoring; faculty colloquia; attendance at state, national, and international conferences; and leaves of absences.

5.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Continuous improvements to the unit and the programs are driven from the faculty annual review reports and overall instructor rating from student evaluations, emphasizing innovative instructional strategies, technology integration, instructional improvement grants, opportunities to provide service to the profession, and engagement with schools, among others. Teaching assistants and adjunct faculty interviews provided insight into the ways that the unit is responding to candidates' recommendations for extensive field or practicum opportunities.

The faculty is continually engaged in self-improvement through inquiry about their practices. In addition to goal self-identification, faculty pursue in an ongoing manner professional development or teaching enhancement opportunities, including those offered by the COE's Diversity Committee, the Teacher-Scholar program organized by the Office of the Provost, and the Teaching Enhancement Symposium offered by the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences. The unit spends approximately \$15,000 per year for travel, in addition to supplemental funds provided by individual departments.

5.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable for spring 2010 pilot visits

5.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Productive scholarship and quality teaching are equally important to the COE. The faculty is engaged in both instructional and research programs, contributing new knowledge and innovative educational approaches, and accomplishing national leadership in their disciplines. The unit's focus on Engaged Scholarship has resulted in faculty scholarship that informs and positively impacts practices in P-12 classrooms.

5.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No previous AFIs	

5.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No previous AFIs	

5.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

5.6 Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The dean of the College of Education serves as the unit head and is responsible for providing leadership in the development of educational programs within the unit. The University Council on Teacher Education (UCOTE) provides a means for communication and collaboration across educator preparation programs in the institution. Candidates have access to counseling and advising services and recruitment and admission materials, which are available online and appear to be accessible and current. Though the unit has experienced a 17.2 percent budget reduction over the past three years, an interview with the dean and budget director indicated that changes in the percentages of tuition allocation to the college coupled with distance education funds have limited the negative impact that such reduction has had upon unit operations.

The offsite team expressed concern for the absence of a link to the exhibit describing resources for distance learning. The link was found to be available, and the information was reviewed during the onsite visit.

The concern for the absence of the faculty workload document as expressed in the offsite review was addressed through the onsite review of the Faculty Workload Policies exhibit during the onsite visit. The concern for the involvement of arts and sciences faculty was addressed during interviews with faculty from agricultural education, art education, and music education. An interview with members of the University Council on Teacher Education (UCOTE) also verified the involvement of the associate deans from the colleges of Fine Arts, Agricultural and Life Sciences, and Liberal Arts and Sciences.

The document “Assuring Instructional Coherence” (6.1) clearly indicated that the use of adjunct faculty does not negatively impact program coherence.

6.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The building in which the College of Education is housed has experienced extensive renovation since the last visit. More renovation is required and planned.

6.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable for spring 2010 pilot visits

6.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

None

6.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No previous AFIs	

6.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No previous AFIs	

6.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

6.6 Recommendation for Standard 6

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Documents Reviewed

See attachment

Persons Interviewed

See attachment

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

Persons Interviewed and Participants in Sunday Evening Events
Documents Reviewed

See **Attachments** panel below.

CONFIDENTIAL