



NCATE

The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

PRAIRIE VIEW A&M UNIVERSITY

P.O. Box 4049

MS 2400

Prairie View, TX 77446

11/16/2008-11/18/2008

Type of Visit:

Focused visit - Initial Teacher Preparation

Focused visit - Advanced Preparation

Institutional Report

OVERVIEW

This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel.

A. Institution

1. What is the institution's historical context?

Prairie View A&M University, the second oldest public institution of higher education in Texas, originated in the Texas Constitution of 1876. On August 14, 1876, the Texas Legislature established the “Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas for Colored Youths” and placed responsibility for its management with the Board of Directors of the Agricultural and Mechanical College at Bryan. The A&M College of Texas for Colored Youths opened at Prairie View, Texas on March 11, 1878. In 1879 the curriculum expanded to include arts and sciences, home economics, agriculture, mechanical arts, and nursing after the University was established as a branch of the Agricultural Experiment Station (Hatch Act, 1887) and as a Land Grant College (Morrill Act, 1890). In 1919, the four-year senior college program was begun and, in 1937, a division of graduate studies was added, offering master’s degrees in agricultural economics, rural education, agricultural education, school administration and supervision, and rural sociology.

In 1945, the name of the institution was changed from Prairie View Normal and Industrial College to Prairie View University, and the school was authorized to offer, “as need arises,” all courses offered at the University of Texas. On August 27, 1973, the name of the institution was changed to Prairie View A&M University, and its status as an independent unit of the Texas A&M University System was confirmed. In 1981, the Texas Legislature identified various statewide needs which the University should address including the assistance of students of diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds to realize their full potential. In 1983, the Texas Legislature proposed a constitutional amendment to restructure the Permanent University Fund to include Prairie View A&M University as a beneficiary of its proceeds. In 1983 an amendment was added to identify the University as an “institution of the first class” under the governing board of the Texas A&M University System. In addition, the University was to receive its share of the Available University Fund, as previously agreed to by Texas A&M University and the University of Texas. Consequently, the University’s enrollment now exceeds 8,500 including more than 2,000 graduate students and has awarded some 46,000 academic degrees during the University’s 130-year history.

2. What is the institution's mission?

Prairie View A&M University is dedicated to excellence in teaching, research and service. It is committed to achieving relevance in each component of its mission by addressing issues and proposing solutions through programs and services designed to respond to the needs and aspirations of individuals, families, organizations, agencies, schools, and communities-both rural and urban. Prairie View A&M University is a state-assisted institution by legislative designation, serving a diverse ethnic and socioeconomic population. Having been designated by the Texas constitution as one of the three

“institutions of the first class” (1984), the University is committed to preparing undergraduates in a range of careers including but not limited to engineering, computer science, natural sciences, architecture, business technology, criminal justice, the humanities, education, agricultural sciences, nursing, mathematics, and the social sciences. It is committed to advanced education through the master’s degree in education, engineering, natural sciences, nursing, selected social sciences, agriculture, business, and human sciences. It is committed to expanding its advanced educational offerings to include multiple doctoral programs. The University’s research foci include extending knowledge in all disciplines offered and incorporating research-based experiences in both undergraduate and graduate academic development.

3. What are the institution's characteristics [e.g., control and type of institution such as private, land grant, or HBI; location (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban area)]?

Prairie View A&M University is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools as a comprehensive public institution of higher education authorized to award Bachelor’s, Master’s and Doctoral degrees. The institution is on the U.S. Department of Education’s list of Historically Black Colleges and Universities and is a member of the Texas A&M University System. It is a land-grant university authorized under the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. The main campus is located in Waller County approximately 40 miles northwest of Houston with the Nursing facility being located in the Texas Medical Center in Houston.

Prairie View A&M University’s target service area includes the Texas Gulf Coast Region; the Northwest Houston Corridor. Prairie View A&M University’s offers specialized programs and initiatives in nursing, juvenile justice, architecture, education, and social work. Public service programs are offered primarily through the Cooperative Extension Program in both rural and urban Texas counties.

4. (Optional) Links and key exhibits related to the institutional context could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members can access other exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

Links to COE.doc

See **Attachments** panel below.

B. The unit

1. How many candidates are enrolled in programs preparing them to work in P-12 schools at the following levels: initial teacher preparation, advanced teacher preparation, and other school professionals?

An analysis of the data on candidate enrollment data from spring 2008 indicates that there are approximately 363 candidates enrolled in the Unit’s 23 initial programs: Bachelor of Arts in Health, 9 candidates (2.5%); Bachelor of Arts in Special Education, 44 candidates, (12.1%); Bachelor of Arts in Generalist (EC-4), 158 candidates (43.5%); and a Bachelor of Arts in Physical Education , 9 candidates, (2.5%). The Unit also offers initial teaching certification in the following areas: Social Studies (4-8), 38 candidates (10.5%); English Language Arts (4-8), 30 candidates (8.3%); English Language Arts (8-12), 6 candidates (1.7%); Mathematics (4-8), 6 candidates (1.5%); Secondary Art, 0 candidates at this time; Bilingual (EC4), 1 candidate, (.3%); Spanish Oral Pro, 0 candidates at this time; Health All (8-12), 9 candidates, (2.5%); History (8-12), 2 candidates (. 6%); as well as Life Sciences (8-12), 2 candidates (. 6%).

6%). Other certification programs include Music (all levels), 5 candidates (1.4%); Physics (8-12), 0 candidates at this time; Science (4-8), 7 candidates, (1.9%); Science (8-12), 3 candidates, (.8%); and Generalist ESL, 0 candidates at this time. Our final certification programs include Social Studies (8-12), 3 candidates, (.8%); Mathematics (8-12), 5 candidates, (1.4%); Secondary Spanish, 2 candidates, (.6%); and Generalist (4-8), 24 candidates, (6.6%).

At the advanced level for other school professionals, the Unit currently has approximately 1512. This figure breaks down to Educational Administration with 671 candidates enrolled, the School Counseling Program with approximately 816 candidates, and the Educational Diagnostician Program has approximately twenty-five.

1a. (Optional) A table with these data could be attached here. A summary of what the data tell the unit about its candidates should be included in the response to B1a above.

| |
|---------------------------------------|
| Initial Teacher Preparation Table.doc |
| Advanced Program Table.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

2. Please complete the following table (Table 1) to indicate the size of the professional education faculty.

**Table 1
Professional Education Faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants**

| Academic Rank | # of Faculty who are full-time in the unit | # of faculty who are full-time in the institution, but part-time in the unit | # of faculty who are part-time at the institution & assigned to the unit (e.g., adjunct faculty) | # of graduate teaching assistants teaching or supervising clinical practice |
|----------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Professors | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Associate Professors | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Assistant Professors | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Instructors | 4 | 7 | 38 | 0 |
| Lecturers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 32 | 11 | 38 | 0 |

2a. (Substitute Table 1) If the titles for academic ranks at your institution do not match the table above, a substitute table reflecting your titles could be attached here.

3. What do the data in above table (Table 1) tell the unit about its faculty?

Table 1 shows that the Unit's number of adjunct faculty slightly exceeds the number of full-time professors. Nevertheless, the faculty count for fall semester 2008 shows a movement to increase the number of full-time faculty in order to (1) reduce the number of adjunct faculty and (2) reduce the faculty to candidate ratio. For example, for the fall 2008 semester, three new faculty positions have been allocated to the Unit. Education Leadership and Counseling was allocated two new faculty positions and one new faculty position in Health and Human Performance. In addition the number of full-time to the university, but part-time to the Unit reflects the Unit's continuing collaboration with the arts and science departments.

4. Please complete the following table (Table 2) to indicate the programs offered at your institution at the initial teacher preparation level.

Table 2
Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

| Program Name | Award Level (e.g., Bachelor's or Master's) | Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted | Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents) | Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No) | State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional) | Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| Health (8-12) | Bachelor | 9 (2.5%) | AHE | Yes | Approved | Further Development Required |
| Special Education EC-12 | Bachelor | 44 (12.1%) | CEC | Yes | Approved | Further Development Required |
| Generalist (EC-4) | Bachelor | 158 (43.5%) | NAEYC | Yes | Approved | Further Development Required |
| Physical Education (EC-12) | Bachelor | 9 (2.5%) | NASPE | Yes | Approved | Further Development Required |
| Social Studies (4-8) | Certification | 38 (10.5%) | NCSS | Yes | Approved | Further Development Required |
| English Language Arts Education (4-8) | Certification | 30 (8.3%) | NCTE | Yes | Approved | Further Development Required |
| Secondary Mathematics (4-8) | Certification | 6 (1.7%) | NCTM | Yes | Approved | Further Development Required |
| Secondary Art | Certification | 0 | NA | No | Approved | NA |
| Bilingual (EC4) | Certification | 1 (.3%) | NA | No | Approved | NA |
| Spanish Oral Pro | Certification | 0 | NA | No | Approved | NA |
| History (8-12) | Certification | 2 (.6%) | NA | No | Approved | NA |
| Life Sciences (8-12) | Certification | 2 (.6%) | NA | No | Approved | NA |
| Music (all levels) | Certification | 5 (1.4%) | NA | No | Approved | NA |
| Physics (8-12) | Certification | 0 | NA | No | Approved | NA |
| Science (4-8) | Certification | 7 (1.9%) | NA | No | Approved | NA |
| Science (8-12) | Certification | 3 (.8%) | NA | No | Approved | NA |
| Generalist ESL | Certification | 0 | NA | | Approved | NA |
| English Language Arts Education (8-12) | Certification | 6 (1.7%) | NA | Yes | Approved | Further Development Required |
| Social Studies (8-12) | Certification | 3 (.8%) | NCSS | Yes | Approved | Further Development Required |
| Mathematics (8-12) | Certification | 5 (1.4%) | NCTM | Yes | Approved | Further Development Required |
| Secondary Spanish | Certification | 2(.6%) | NA | No | Approved | NA |
| Generalist (4-8) | Bachelor | 24 (6.6%) | NAEYC | Yes | Approved | Development Required |

5. What do the data in above table (Table 2) tell the unit about its initial teacher preparation programs?

An analysis of the data on candidate enrollment data from spring 2008 indicates that there are approximately 363 candidates enrolled in the Unit's 23 initial programs: Bachelor of Arts in Health, 9 candidates (2.5%); Bachelor of Arts in Special Education, 44 candidates, (12.1%); Bachelor of Arts in Generalist (EC-4), 158 candidates (43.5%); and a Bachelor of Arts in Physical Education , 9 candidates, (2.5%). The Unit also offers initial teaching certification in the following areas: Social Studies (4-8), 38 candidates (10.5%); English Language Arts (4-8), 30 candidates (8.3%); English Language Arts (8-12), 6 candidates (1.7%); Mathematics (4-8), 6 candidates (1.5%); Secondary Art, 0 candidates at this time; Bilingual (EC4), 1 candidate, (.3%); Spanish Oral Pro, 0 candidates at this time; Health All (8-12), 9 candidates, (2.5%); History (8-12), 2 candidates (. 6%); as well as Life Sciences (8-12), 2 candidates (. 6%). Other certification programs include Music (all levels), 5 candidates (1.4%); Physics (8-12), 0 candidates at this time; Science (4-8), 7 candidates, (1.9%); Science (8-12), 3 candidates, (.8%); and Generalist ESL, 0 candidates at this time. Our final certification programs include Social Studies (8-12), 3 candidates, (.8%); Mathematics (8-12), 5 candidates, (1.4%); Secondary Spanish, 2 candidates, (.6%); and Generalist (4-8), 24 candidates, (6.6%).

These data show that a number of the Unit's initial programs such as Bachelor of Arts in Health, 9 candidates (2.5%); Bachelor of Arts in Physical Education , 9 candidates, (2.5%); English Language Arts (8-12), 6 candidates (1.7%); Mathematics (4-8), 6 candidates (1.5%); Secondary Art, 0 candidates at this time; Bilingual (EC4), 1 candidate, (.3%); Spanish Oral Pro, 0 candidates at this time; Health All (8-12), 9 candidates, (2.5%); History (8-12), 2 candidates (. 6%); as well as Life Sciences (8-12), 2 candidates (. 6%). In addition, Music (all levels), 5 candidates (1.4%); Physics (8-12), 0 candidates at this time; Science (4-8), 7 candidates, (1.9%); Science (8-12), 3 candidates, (.8%); and Generalist ESL, 0 candidates at this time. Our final certification programs include Social Studies (8-12), 3 candidates, (.8%); Mathematics (8-12), 5 candidates, (1.4%); Secondary Spanish, 2 candidates, (.6%) also have poor enrollment. Consequently, the programs in question will benefit from ongoing recruitment programs within the college and University. The Unit is also working with the Arts and Science Departments to substitute CUIN Education courses with the current requirement for a minor in order to increase enrollment in the secondary programs.

In addition, all educator preparation programs offered by the Unit are aligned with the standards of the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) and have received full accreditation from SBEC based on candidate performance on the state licensure examinations.

6. Please complete the following table (Table 3) to indicate the advanced programs offered at your institution for the advanced preparation of licensed teachers and other school professionals.

**Table 3
Advanced Preparation Programs and Their Review Status**

| Program Name | Award Level (e.g., Master's or Doctorate) | Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted | Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents) | Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No) | State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional) | Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Preparation of Educational Leaders -Building Leadership Level | Master | 671 | ELCC | Yes | Approved | Further Development Required |
| School Counseling | Master | 816 | SBEC | No | Approved | NA |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------|----|------|----|----------|----|
| Educational Diagnostician | Master | 25 | SBEC | No | Approved | NA |
|---------------------------|--------|----|------|----|----------|----|

7. What do the data in above table (Table 3) tell the unit about its advanced programs?

At the advanced level for other school professionals, the Unit currently has approximately 1512. This figure breaks down to Educational Administration with 671 candidates enrolled, the School Counseling Program with approximately 816 candidates, and the Educational Diagnostician Program has approximately twenty-five. These data suggest that enrollment for the Unit's advanced programs is satisfactory. However, the advanced programs will benefit from becoming nationally recognized by the programs' respective SPAs. Currently, work toward this goal is progressing.

8. What programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are offered?

The Unit offers master's level graduate degree programs in Educational Administration and Counseling at the satellite campus at the Northwest Graduate Center in Houston as well as in the Urban League Center. Master's level graduate courses are also offered at the University Center, the Woodlands, TX. Candidates enrolled at any of the off-campus or distance learning centers cannot take more than fifty percent of their coursework off campus.

The Unit offers Alternative Certification Programs (ACP) in Secondary Content Areas, grades 8-12 and Generic Special Education, grades EC-12. The following Secondary Content area certification fields require applicants to have at least 24 semester hours in the desired discipline (12 hours must be upper division course work): Art (All Levels), Business Administration, Computer Information Systems, Dance, French, German, Health Education, History 8-12, Journalism, Latin, Life Science 8-12, Mathematics 8-12, Music (All Levels), Physical Education (All Levels), Physical Science 8-12, Speech Communication, Spanish, and Theater Arts.

The following Secondary ACP Content Areas require 48 semester hours in the desired discipline with (24 must be upper division course work): Composite Business, English Language Arts and Reading 8-12, Industrial Technology, Industrial Education 8-12, Science 8-12, Social Studies 8-12. For the Generic Special Education ACP, applicants are required to have at least 24 semester hours, with a minimum of 3 semester hours per course, in English, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science.

9. (Continuing Visit Only) What substantive changes have taken place in the unit since the last visit (e.g., added/dropped programs/degrees; significant increase/decrease in enrollment; major reorganization of the unit, etc.)? (These change could be compiled from those reported in Part C of the AACTE/NCATE annual reports since the last visit.)

Since the November, 2006 NCATE visit, the Unit has undergone a number of substantive changes in:

- A new dean was hired for the College of Education in January 2008.
- An Associate Dean was hired for the College of Education in January 2008.
- An Interim Director of Teacher Education was hired in September 2008.
- The Office of Data Management, Accreditation, and Assessment was established in November 2007 and its roles continue to be clarified.
- In June 2008, the Dean's Executive Council assumed temporary responsibility for data analysis and decision in until a viable, permanent committee can be established.

- TrueOutcomes Professional Electronic Portfolio (PEP) and data management system was adopted by the Unit and implemented in January 2008.
- The Dallas Campus was closed in August 2008.

10. (Optional) Links and key exhibits related to the unit context could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members can access other exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

Links to COE.doc

See **Attachments** panel below.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This section provides an overview of the unit's conceptual framework(s). The overview should include a brief description of the framework(s) and its development.

1. Briefly summarize the following elements of the unit's conceptual framework:

- **the vision and mission of the unit**
- **philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit**
- **knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit**
- **candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards**
- **summarized description of the unit's assessment system**

The mission of the Unit is predicated on the philosophy that the Unit prepares educators to work in a multicultural world where change occurs constantly. A guiding philosophy of Unit is that all candidates must be encouraged to invest in their own learning processes. The conceptual framework is anchored by the shared vision of, "Educator as facilitator of learning for a diverse population." This theme is central to the mission of the Unit as it works together in the preparation programs in the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences.

The Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) mandated by Senate Bill 1 and adopted by the State Board for Educator Certification became effective September 1, 1998. The Educator preparation entities must meet the minimum standards of TExESpass rates in all seven demographic groups-All, Female, Male, African-American, White, Hispanic, and Other. The Unit has met these standards for all demographic groups and has earned state Accredited status since September 1, 2000. The Unit's philosophy is articulated in the core dispositions that drive the conceptual framework. These core dispositions were born of consideration for the Unit's goals for excellence in teaching; the examination of established national and state standards for teaching and learning; and the review of curriculum experiences and expectations.

The Unit's core disposition beliefs maintain that candidates must : (1) Use self-reflection; (2)

Understand candidate learning is the goal; (3) Demonstrate instructional strategies; (4) Acknowledge diverse characteristics of all candidates; (5) Knowledgeable of ones' subject area (6) Use on-going assessments; (7) Use technology in the classroom; (8) Seek a variety of methodologies, strategies, and technologies; (9) Recognize the importance of parents, staff, and community members; (10) Demonstrate ethical behavior in personal and professional relationships; (11) Seek research based educational practices; (12) believe that that all children can learn. These dispositions illustrate the importance of preparing skilled professionals to work with all children.

At the initial and advance levels, the Continuous Assessment System has been designed to measure both candidate and program performance and serve as a guide for candidate development and program refinement. This system involves multiple assessments at multiple transition points, providing both formative and summative evaluations. Consequently, at each designated program juncture the system provides definitive points of reflection by the candidate as well as an opportunity for prescriptive interventions. In addition, each candidate receives oral and written feedback regarding strengths, progress in the program, and growth areas. The system also provides systematic feedback for reviewing and refining Unit programs, helps to ensure effective alignment of policy and practice, and provides data for program improvement.

1a. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to the conceptual framework could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

2. (Continuing Visits Only) What changes have been made to the conceptual framework since the previous visit?

In the summer of 2004 the Unit's committee on conceptual framework recommended the substitution of "Educator" for "Teacher" in the title of the conceptual framework. It also recommended modifications to reflect the importance of technology. The new title "Educator as Facilitators of Learning for Diverse Populations" (E-FOLD-P) depicts educator as a teacher, administrator, counselor, or any other educational professional. In January 2008, the Unit developed a new visual depiction of the conceptual framework, which was adopted by the Teacher Education faculty, in February 2008.

3. (First Visits Only) How was the conceptual framework developed and who was involved in its development?

STANDARDS

This section is the focus of the institutional report. **A description of how the unit meets each standard element must be presented.** Significant differences among programs should be described as the response is written for each element under subheadings of initial teacher preparation, advanced teacher preparation, and other school professionals. Links to key exhibits to support the descriptions may be included in the text for each standard.

STANDARD 1: CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical content knowledge, 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. What content knowledge tests are used for the purpose of state licensure and/or program completion? If the state has a licensure test for content, what is the overall pass rate? What programs do not have an 80% or above pass rate?

The state of Texas requires individuals seeking teaching certification to pass the Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES). TExES is a comprehensive examination of content knowledge in the certification areas offered by the state as part of the requirements for teacher certification. Candidate performance on these content examinations serves as an indicator of candidates' proficiency related to content knowledge necessary to succeed in an increasingly challenging social, political, and professional milieu of public school systems. Candidates who pass the required TExES examinations and complete all program requirements at Prairie View A&M University (PVAMU) meet the requirements for teacher certification in the state of Texas.

Initial candidates are required to pass two TExES examinations, one for content and one for professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Program areas including Math, Science, History, English Language, these program areas are outside the College of Education in other colleges within the University, the TExES subject matter examinations are especially useful in that they provide a robust, uniform measurement of how external programs are meeting the needs of candidates. These TExES pass rates are used by the Unit as a general measurement of how well candidates in each area are being prepared, and to set general expectations for program improvement.

During 2005-2007, the aggregate pass rates of the Unit's graduates on the state certification TExES examinations was approximately 88%. Sixteen of the Unit's twenty-two programs (55%) had pass rates greater than 80%. Nine other programs (31%) including Science (4-8), Superintendent, Life Science (8-12), Mathematics (8-12), Music (EC-12), Social Studies (4-8), English Language Arts and Reading (4-8), Generalist (4-8), and Physical Education (EC-12) fell below a 80% pass rate. Four programs (approximately 14%), Secondary Art, Generalist ESL (EC-4), Physics/Mathematics (8-12), and Secondary Spanish had no candidates take the test during 2006-2007 period.

Those programs with pass rates less that 80% percent have been targeted for review by the Assessment Committee and Executive Council to assess program data and way to improve test scores and enrollment.

2. Please complete the following table (Table 4) to indicate pass rates on content licensure tests program by program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate). (This information could be compiled from Title II data submitted to the state or program reports prepared for national review.)

**Table 4
Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation**

For Period:

FALL 2006- FALL 2007

| Programs | # of Test Takers | % Passing at State Cut Score |
|--|------------------|------------------------------|
| Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all initial | | |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|------|
| teacher preparation programs) | 392 | 88.7 |
| Art Secondary | NA | NA |
| Bilingual (EC-4) | 4 | 100 |
| Spanish | 4 | 100 |
| English Lang (4-8) | 10 | 70 |
| English Lang (8-12) | 3 | 100 |
| Generalist (4 -8) | 4 | 75 |
| Generalist ESL(EC-4) | 0 | NA |
| Generalist (EC-4) | 21 | 95.2 |
| Health All (8-12) | 1 | 100 |
| History (8-12) | 1 | 100 |
| Life Science (8-12) | 1 | 50 |
| Mathematics (4-8) | 6 | 83 |
| Mathematics (8-12) | 1 | 50 |
| Music (all levels) | 3 | 67.7 |
| Physical Ed.(EC-12) | 77 | 76.6 |
| Physics (8-12) | NA | NA |
| Science (4-8) | 4 | 25 |
| Science (8-12) | 3 | 100 |
| Secondary Spanish | NA | NA |
| Social Studies (4-8) | 3 | 67.7 |
| Social Studies(8-12) | 2 | 100 |
| Special Ed. (EC-12) | 16 | 100 |

3. What do the data in the above table (Table 4) tell the unit about the content knowledge of initial teacher candidates?

Pass Rate data shows that although most of the Unit's initial programs' overall pass rates on the state certification TExES examinations were approximately 88% and 22 programs (50%) had pass rates greater than 80%. Nine other programs (40%) including Science (4-8), Superintendent, Life Science (8-12), Mathematics (8-12), Music (EC-12), Social Studies (4-8), English Language Arts and Reading (4-8), Generalist (4-8), and Physical Education (EC-12) fell below a 80% pass rate. Moreover, four programs (approximately 18%), Secondary Art, Generalist ESL (EC-4), Physics/Mathematics (8-12), and Secondary Spanish had no candidates take the test during 2006-2007 period. Consequently, several of the Unit's programs have some areas that are in need of improvement and efforts need to be made to improve the pass rates of these programs by conducting practice tests and study sessions.

4. What data from other key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? (Institutions that have submitted programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

Key assessments used in addition to the TExES indicating that the Unit's candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated by professional, state, and institutional standards include GPA, Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS), TrueOutcoems electronic portfolio, as well as graduate and employer surveys.

The unit utilizes GPAs to convert numerical percentages of examinations and assignments to grades that identify students' mastery of the respective instructional areas within the unit. GPAs are applied in good

faith by instructors to critique candidates' performance, which allows the instructor to identify categories of performance. (i.e. A=Excellent, B=Good, C=Average, D=Poor, and F=failing). Ultimately, GPA determines if candidates demonstrate of their respective subject areas or academic failure. Consequently, GPA produces data that allows identification of a range of students' mastery of various content areas and will identify gaps in achievement; identifying areas for program improvement

GPA is collected for the major or area of concentration at the first transition point, admission to the program. Candidates must complete all core curriculum requirements with a minimum overall 2.50 grade point average with a grade of "C" or higher in English and Mathematics. The professional GPA is calculated from all of the courses in candidates' content areas. Coursework with the Curriculum and Instruction (CUIN) prefix includes the domains of content knowledge for those candidates in all of the Generalist programs. The average major GPA is consistently above 2.50 indicating strength across all of the program areas.

An evaluation of the candidate's GPA in the Major Content Area occurs at transition point II. The minimum GPA required for candidates' Major is 2.50 on a 4-point scale. Candidates who do not satisfy this requirement are denied admission into Student Teaching and advised of a course of action in order to correct any deficiencies or, in extreme cases, advised out of the program. Analysis of transition point II indicates that 91.5% of our candidates' average Major GPA are consistently 3.00 or higher. In order to continue in the program, Initial candidates are monitored throughout their programs of study and are required to maintain a grade point average of 2.50 in both professional education courses and content area.

The Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) is the State's approved instrument for appraising its teachers and identifying areas in need of improvement. This instrument is used by the Unit to assess teacher candidates' performance during student teaching. Domains II and VII are the principal domains that address Content Knowledge. Analysis of these PDAS domains from fall semester 2005 to fall semester 2007 indicate that over 95% of the Unit's initial candidates scored 3.5 or above on a scale of 4.00. These scores suggest that our candidates' content knowledge falls within the "Target" area.

TrueOutcomes, an electronic data management system, was implemented by the Unit in the spring semester 2008. TrueOutcomes allows candidates to keep a record of completed artifacts, the courses they have completed, create a Professional Electronic Portfolio (PEP), and plan future courses to help meet their career goals. The PEP provides faculty members with a copy of the candidate's work. The PEP is comprehensive in nature and addresses institutional, state, SPA, and NCATE standards identified within the candidate's program or area of study,

The PEP contains candidate-generated artifacts directly aligned with the program area for review by the faculty. Faculty members review the PEPs and identify areas of improvement for the candidate and area (s) for program improvement determined by "Closing the Loop." This process ensures the quality of our graduates. PEP artifacts are graded using rubrics that faculty members have developed for each artifact. In addition, the PEPs are accessible throughout their academic careers' and into their professional career. Artifacts included in the PEPs include candidates' experiences, written and oral work, videos of candidates teaching and their reflections, as well as evidence of their professional interactions.

Although implemented in spring 2008, the artifacts entered and evaluated for the spring and summer semesters have provided some preliminary data for analysis. Planned to start in the spring 2009 semester, the Arts and Science programs do not yet require teacher education candidates to submit Artifacts in TrueOutcomes. Nevertheless, approximately 1,000 candidates in the initial programs have submitted artifacts for the spring and summer semesters that relate to Content Knowledge. Analysis of these artifacts indicate that over 95% of the Unit's initial candidates scored 3.5 or above on a scale of

4.0.

Education graduates were surveyed to determine their opinion about their preparation in the areas of content, content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge, their ability to help all students learn, preparation related to knowledge and skills in their Field, and their ability to create positive environments for student learning. The return rate for the initial level graduates was approximately 98%. The mean for content knowledge is approximately 2.6 with a mode of 3.0 with an N return of 33. The survey results suggest that our candidates at the initial level perceive their preparation for content knowledge as between "Acceptable" and "Target" on a 1-3 scale.

Surveys were also sent to employers to evaluate our graduates' performance on the job about their preparation in content area, content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge, their ability to help all students learn, preparation related to knowledge and skills in their field, and their ability to create positive environments for student learning. Approximately 350 surveys were mailed to area schools with a return rate of 10%. The low return rate was a result of number of schools receiving the survey did not have any of our graduates employed on their campus at that time. With a mean for content Knowledge of approximately 2.4 and a mode of 2.0 results of the employer survey suggest that our candidates are rated by employers as "Acceptable" or above in the area of content knowledgea 1-3 scale.

4a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to content knowledge of initial teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about content knowledge should be discussed in the response to 1a4 above.

| |
|------------------------------------|
| Adm Stu Teaching Major GPA.doc |
| PDAS Domain 2and 8.doc |
| Content Initial Surveys.doc |
| Advanced Content Surveys.doc |
| Overall Pass Rates Trend Chart.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

5. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teaching candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? (Institutions that have submitted advanced teaching programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

At this time, the unit does not have any advanced teaching programs. However, starting in fall 2009, the Unit is planning a program to assist local teachers become National Board Certified, and starting a Master of Arts in Teaching.

5a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to content knowledge of advanced teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about content knowledge should be discussed in the response to 1a5 above.

6. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in the content area? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

At the initial level, teacher graduates were surveyed to determine their opinion about their preparation in the areas of content area, content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge, their ability to help all students learn, preparation related to knowledge and skills in their field, and their

ability to create positive environments for student learning. The return rate for the initial level graduates was approximately 98%. The mean for content knowledge is approximately 2.6 with a mode of 3.0 with an N return of 33. The survey results suggest that our candidates at the initial level rate their preparation for content knowledge as between "Acceptable and Target on a scale 1-3 scale.

Surveys were also sent to employers to evaluate our graduates' performance on the job about their preparation in content area, content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge, their ability to help all students learn, preparation related to knowledge and skills in their field, and their ability to create positive environments for student learning. Approximately 350 surveys were mailed to area schools with a return rate of 10%. The low return rate is because several of these schools did not have any of our graduates working on their campus. With a mean for content knowledge of approximately 2.4 and a mode of 2.0 results of the employer survey suggest that our candidates are rated by employers as "Acceptable" or above in the area of content knowledge on a 1-3 scale.

7. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to content knowledge could be attached here.

| |
|-------------------------------|
| Content Knowledge Surveys.doc |
|-------------------------------|

See **Attachments** panel below.

8. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to the content knowledge of teacher candidates could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Note: In this section, institutions must address both (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.

1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? (Institutions that have submitted programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

One key assessment to evaluate candidates' knowledge of pedagogy is the state's Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility (PPR) exam. The PPR focuses on pedagogy knowledge of those individuals seeking teaching certification in Texas. The examination includes the following domains: Domain I- Designing Instruction and Assessment to Promote Student Learning (approximately 31% of the test); Domain II- Creating a Positive, Productive Classroom Environment (approximately 15% of the test); Domain III- Implementing Effective, Responsive Instruction and Assessment (approximately 31% of the test); and Domain IV.- Fulfilling Professional Roles and Responsibilities (approximately 23% of the test). For the 2006-2007 school year, the overall PPR pass rate for the Unit is approximately 85%. This percentage suggests that most of initial candidates are well versed in pedagogy. These pass rates are used by the Unit as a general measurement of how well candidates in each area are being prepared in pedagogy as well as means to set general expectations for programs.

Another key assessment is the the Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS). This

system is the State's approved instrument for appraising its teachers and identifying areas in need of improvement is used by the Unit to assess teacher candidates' performance during student teaching. The PDAS was developed under a legislative mandate to establish a fair and practical appraisal process that acknowledges and reinforces good teaching practices and quality professional development. The PDAS includes 51 criteria within eight domains reflecting the Proficiencies for Learner-centered Instruction adopted by the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC).

The eight domains include Active, Successful Student Participation in the Learning Process; Learner-centered Instruction; Evaluation and feedback on Student Progress; Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies, Time/Materials; Professional Communication; Professional Development; Compliance with Policies, Operating Procedures and Requirements; and Improvement of All Students' Academic Performance.

The overall mean score of the candidates by program for fall semester 2005 through fall semester 2007 shows that over 95% of the scores lie above 3.5, on a 4.00 scale. These scores suggest that our candidates' pedagogical performance in the classroom is in the "Target" area on a scale of 1-3.

1a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills of initial teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about pedagogical content knowledge and skills should be discussed in the response to 1b1 above.

| |
|---|
| Overall PDAS Mean Scores by Program.doc |
| PPR Data Results 2005-2007.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

2. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teaching candidates know and apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, including the use of a range of instructional strategies and the ability to explain the choices they make in their practice. (Institutions that have submitted advanced teaching programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

At this time, the unit does not have any advanced teaching programs. However, starting in fall 2009, the Unit is planning a program to assist local teachers become National Board Certified

2a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills of advanced teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about pedagogical content knowledge and skills should be discussed in the response to 1b2 above.

3. What data indicate that candidates can integrate technology in their teaching?

Domain II-9 on the Professional Development Assessment System (PDAS) illustrates that all of the candidates evaluated on the use of technology in the various programs had a mean value greater than 3.00 on a four point scale. This score suggests that our candidates are rated proficient in the use of technology in the classroom. Moreover, greater than 50% of the candidates scored over 3.5 on the use of technology in the classroom. This higher score indicates that the majority of our candidates have an excellent understanding of the purpose and understanding of using technology in the classroom. The highest ratings are in the Social Studies 4-8, Bilingual EC-4, and generalist EC-4 programs.

Another means the Unit employs to integrate technology into our candidates' teaching is TrueOutcomes. TrueOutcomes is an electronic data management system implemented by the Unit in the spring semester 2008. TrueOutcomes allows candidates to keep a record of completed artifacts, the courses they have completed, create a Professional Electronic Portfolio (PEP), and plan future courses to help them meet their career goals. The PEP provides the faculty member a copy of the candidate's work. It is comprehensive in nature and addresses institutional, state, SPA, and NCATE standards identified within the candidate's program area of study.

The PEP contains candidate-generated artifacts directly aligned with the program area for review by the faculty. Faculty members review the PEPs and identify areas of improvement for the candidate and area (s) for program improvement determined by "Closing the Loop." This process ensures the quality of our graduates. PEP artifacts are graded using rubrics that faculty members have developed for each artifact. In addition, the PEPs are accessible throughout their academic careers' and into their professional career. Artifacts included in the PEPs include candidates' field journals, written and oral work, and evidence of professional interactions.

Although implemented in spring 2008, the artifacts entered and evaluated for the spring and summer semesters have provided some preliminary data for analysis. Planned to start in the spring 2009 semester, the Arts and Science programs do not yet require teacher education candidates to submit Artifacts in TrueOutcomes. At this time, approximately 1,000 candidates in the initial programs have submitted artifacts for the spring and summer semesters that relate to content knowledge. Analysis of preliminary artifacts indicate that over 95% of the Unit's initial candidates scored 3.5 or above on a scale of 4.0.

3a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to candidates' ability to integrate technology in their teaching could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about candidates' technology skills should be discussed in the response to 1b3 above.

Use_of_Technology_in_Teaching.doc

See **Attachments** panel below.

4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

The results of the analysis of the follow-up survey for initial teacher educators (100% response rate) on the quality of our program and their level of preparation in the areas of knowledge, skills and dispositions indicates that overall 95 percent of the Unit's initial candidates perceive their respective programs as preparing them well for their job assignments (above acceptable). Areas of concern even though acceptable are the graduates' satisfaction with their ability to work with students with disabilities, their effective use of technology and their use of data to improve teaching. As a result, efforts are currently underway to revise the related courses, write a grant to create a virtual classroom, and infuse more technology related assignments into courses to give the candidates greater exposure to the use of modern technology in teaching. For example, the Unit has recently been awarded a Title III grant in order to renovate room 240 in the Delco into a "Smart Classroom.

5. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills could be attached here.

Table only Initial Teachers Graduation Survey.doc

See **Attachments** panel below.

6. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to the pedagogical content knowledge of teacher candidates could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Note: In this section, institutions must address both (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.

1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills related to foundations of education; the ways children and adolescents develop and the relationship to learning; professional ethics, laws, and policies; the use of research in teaching; the roles and responsibilities of the professional communities; diversity of student populations, families and communities (this one may be addressed in the first element of Standard 4); and the consideration of school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students? If a licensure test is required in this area, how are candidates performing on it?

Key assessments used to demonstrate initial teacher preparation programs candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills related to foundations of education; the ways children and adolescents develop and the relationship to learning; professional ethics, laws, and policies; the use of research in teaching; the roles and responsibilities of the professional communities knowledge of pedagogy include GPA, Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS), as well as graduate and employer surveys.

The unit utilizes GPAs to convert numerical percentages of examinations and assignments to grades that identify students' mastery of the respective instructional areas within the unit. GPAs are applied in good faith by instructors to critique candidates' performance, which allows the instructor to identify categories of performance. (i.e. A=Excellent, B=Good, C=Average, D=Poor, and F=failing). Ultimately, GPA determines if candidates demonstrate of their respective subject areas or academic failure. Consequently, GPA produces data that allows identification of a range of students' mastery of various content areas and will identify gaps in achievement; identifying areas for program improvement

One primary key assessment used to assess candidates' pedagogical content knowledge and skills is GPA. An evaluation of initial program candidates' GPA in their Professional Education Core, (CUIN), occurs at Transition Point II. The minimum GPA required for candidates' Professional Education Cores 2.50 on a 4-point scale. Candidates who do not satisfy this requirement are denied admission into student teaching and advised of a course of action in order to correct any deficiencies or, in extreme cases, advised out of the program. Analysis of Transition Point II indicates that 91.5% of our candidates' average GPAs are consistently 3.00 or higher. In order to continue in the program, Initial candidates are monitored throughout their programs of study and are required to maintain a grade point average of 2.50 in both professional education courses and content area.

The Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) is the State's approved instrument for appraising its teachers and identifying areas in need of improvement. This instrument is used by the Unit to assess teacher candidates' performance during student teaching. Domains II and IV are the principal domains that address Pedagogy Content Knowledge. Analysis of these PDAS domains from fall semester 2005 to fall semester 2007 indicate that the majority of the Unit's initial candidates scored 3.6 or above on a scale of 4.00. These scores suggest that our candidates' pedagogy content knowledge falls within the Target area.

TrueOutcomes, an electronic data management system was implemented by the Unit in the spring semester 2008. TrueOutcomes allows candidates to keep a record of completed artifacts, the courses they have completed, create a Professional Electronic Portfolio (PEP), and plan future courses to help them meet their career goals. The PEP provides the faculty member a copy of the candidate's work. It is comprehensive in nature and addresses institutional, state, SPA, and NCATE standards identified within the candidate's program area of study.

The PEP contains candidate-generated artifacts directly aligned with the program area for review by the faculty. Faculty members review the PEPs and identify areas of improvement for the student and area(s) for program improvement determined by "Closing the Loop." This process ensures the quality of our graduates. PEP artifacts are graded using rubrics that faculty members have developed for each artifact. In addition, the PEPs are accessible throughout their academic careers' and into their professional career. Artifacts included in the PEPs include candidates' field journals, written and oral work, and evidence of professional interactions.

Although implemented in spring 2008, the artifacts entered and evaluated for the spring and summer semesters have provided some preliminary data for analysis. Planned to start in the spring 2009 semester, the Arts and Science programs do not yet require teacher education candidates to submit Artifacts in TrueOutcomes. At this time, approximately 1,000 candidates in the initial programs have submitted artifacts for the spring and summer semesters that relate to content knowledge. Analysis of these artifacts indicate that over 95% of the Unit's initial candidates scored 3.5 or above on a scale of 4.0.

Education graduates were surveyed to determine their opinion about their preparation in the areas of content area, content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge, their ability to help all students learn, preparation related to knowledge and skills in their field, and their ability to create positive environments for student learning. The return rate for the initial level graduates was approximately 98%. The mean for content knowledge is approximately 2.6 with a mode of 3.0 with an N return of 33. The survey results suggest that our candidates at the initial level perceive their preparation for content knowledge as between acceptable and excellent.

Surveys were also sent to employers to evaluate our graduates' performance on the job about their preparation in content area, content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge, their ability to help all students learn, preparation related to knowledge and skills in their field, and their ability to create positive environments for student learning. Approximately 350 surveys were mailed to area schools with a return rate of 10%. The low return rate was a result of number of schools receiving the survey did not have any of our graduates employed on their campus at that time. With a mean for Pedagogy Knowledge of approximately 2.4 and a mode of 2.0 results of the employer survey suggest that our candidates are rated by employers as acceptable or above in the area of pedagogy skills and knowledge.

1a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of initial teacher candidates could be attached here. What the

data tell the unit about professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills should be discussed in the response to 1c1 above.

| |
|------------------------------|
| GPA Initial Students.doc |
| PDAS domains 2 and 4.doc |
| Pedagogy Employer Survey.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

2. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teaching candidates demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills such as those delineated in the core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards?

At this time, the unit does not have any advanced teaching programs. However, starting in fall 2009, the Unit is planning a program to assist local teachers become National Board Certified.

2a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of advanced teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills should be discussed in the response to 1c2 above.

3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

The results of the analysis of the follow-up survey for advanced graduates (21% participation) on the quality of our program and their level of preparation in the areas of knowledge, skills and dispositions indicate that overall graduating candidates perceive their respective programs as preparing them well for their job assignments (significantly above acceptable). The mode for each response was 3, which is a further indication of the perceived competency of our advanced graduates.

There are no areas of major concern; however, efforts are currently underway to infuse more technology related assignments into courses to give our advanced and initial candidates greater exposure to the use of current technology in management. Based on input from the faculty, the current survey is being revised to include the gender and ethnicity of the respondents in order to improve our efforts to find areas for improvement in our programs.

4. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills could be attached here.

| |
|--|
| Advanced Teachers Graduation SurveySpr2008.doc |
|--|

See **Attachments** panel below.

5. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of teacher candidates could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here.)

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Note: In this section, institutions must address both (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.

1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn? (Institutions that have submitted programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

Key assessments used to demonstrate initial teacher preparation programs candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills related to foundations of education; the ways children and adolescents develop and the relationship to learning; professional ethics, laws, and policies; the use of research in teaching; the roles and responsibilities of the professional communities knowledge of pedagogy include the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility exam (PPR), GPA, Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS), as well as graduate and employer surveys.

One key assessment to evaluate candidates' knowledge of pedagogy is the state's Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility (PPR) exam. The PPR focuses on pedagogy knowledge of those individuals seeking teaching certification in Texas. The examination includes the following domains: Domain I- Designing Instruction and Assessment to Promote Student Learning (approximately 31% of the test); Domain II- Creating a Positive, Productive Classroom Environment (approximately 15% of the test); Domain III- Implementing Effective, Responsive Instruction and Assessment (approximately 31% of the test); and Domain IV, Fulfilling Professional Roles and Responsibilities..

For the 2006-2007 school year, the overall PPR pass rate for the Unit is approximately 85%. The pass rates on the PPR are used by the Unit as a general measurement of how well candidates in each area are being prepared in these areas as well as means to set general expectations for programs

Another primary key assessment used to assess candidates' ability in this area is GPA. An evaluation of initial program candidates' GPA in their Professional Education Core, (CUIN), occurs at transition point II. The minimum GPA required for candidates' Major is 2.50 on a 4-point scale. Candidates who do not satisfy this requirement are denied admission into student teaching and advised of a course of action in order to correct any deficiencies or, in extreme cases, advised out of the program. Analysis of transition point II indicates that 91.5% of our candidates' average GPAs are consistently 3.00 or higher. In order to continue in the program, Initial candidates are monitored throughout their programs of study and are required to maintain a grade point average of 2.50 in both professional education courses and content area.

The unit utilizes GPAs to convert numerical percentages of examinations and assignments to grades that identify students' mastery of the respective instructional areas within the unit. GPAs are applied in good faith by instructors to critique candidates' performance, which allows the instructor to identify categories of performance.(i.e. A=Excellent, B=Good, C=Average, D=Poor, and F=failing). Ultimately, GPA determines if candidates demonstrate of their respective subject areas or academic failure. Consequently, GPA produces data that allows identification of a range of students' mastery of various content areas and will identify gaps in achievement; identifying areas for program improvement

The Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS) is the State's approved instrument for appraising its teachers and identifying areas in need of improvement. This instrument is used by the Unit to assess teacher candidates' performance during student teaching. Domains III, V, and VII are the principal domains that address candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills related to foundations of education; the ways children and adolescents develop and the relationship to learning;

professional ethics, laws, and policies; the use of research in teaching; and the roles and responsibilities of the professional communities knowledge of pedagogy. Analysis of these PDAS domains from fall semester 2005 to fall semester 2007 indicate that the majority of the Unit's initial candidates scored 3.67 or above on a scale of 4.00. These scores suggest that our candidates' knowledge of these domains

1a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to student learning for initial teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about student learning should be discussed in the response to 1d1 above.

| |
|------------------------------|
| PPR DATARESULTS2005-2007.doc |
| GPA Initial Students.doc |
| PDAS Domain 3 5 8.doc |
| Employer survey .doc |
| Graduate Survey.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

2. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teaching candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning and regularly apply them in their practice? (Institutions that have submitted advanced teaching programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

At this time, the unit does not have any advanced teaching programs. However, starting in fall 2009, the Unit is planning a program to assist local teachers become National Board Certified.

2a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to student learning for advanced teacher candidates could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about student learning should be discussed in the response to 1d2 above.

3. What do follow-up studies of employers and graduates indicate about graduates' ability to help all students learn? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

Follow up surveys were given to our initial and advanced graduates in the College of Education as well as employers of our graduates starting in the Spring Semester 2008 in order to assess their preparation in the content area, content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge, their ability to help all students learn preparation related to knowledge and skills in their field, and their ability to create positive environments for student learning. The return rate for the advanced level graduates was approximately 20%. The mean for positive environments for student learning was approximately 2.04 with a mode of 2.1 with an N return of 77. The survey results suggest that most of our candidates at the advanced level rate their preparation for positive environments for student learning is above the acceptable level.

At the initial level, graduates were also surveyed to determine their perception regarding content area, content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge, their ability to help all students learn, preparation related to knowledge and skills in their field, and their ability to create positive environments for student learning. The return rate for the initial level graduates was approximately 98%. The survey mean for graduates' ability to help all students was 2.5 with a mode of 3.0 with an N return of 33. The results of this survey suggests that our initial level candidates rate their ability to help all students learn as falling between acceptable and excellent.

We asked Employers to fill out surveys regarding our graduates' preparation in content area, content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge, their ability to help all students learn, preparation related to knowledge and skills in their field, and their ability to create positive environments for student learning. Approximately 350 surveys were mailed to area schools with a return rate of 10%. A low return rate resulted due to several of these schools not having any of our graduates working on their campus at that time. The mean for helping all students learn was approximately 2.3 with a mode of 2.0 with an N return of 30. The survey results suggest that most of our candidates employers at the advanced level rate their preparation for helping all students learn as above the acceptable level.

4. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to student learning could be attached here.

| |
|--|
| Employer all students learnsurvey.doc |
| All students learn Initial Surveys.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

5. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to student learning for teacher candidates could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

1. What content knowledge tests are used for the purpose of state licensure and/or program completion? If the state has a licensure test for content, what is the unit's overall pass rate across all programs for other school professionals? What programs do not have an 80 percent or above pass rate?

Advanced candidates' pass rates on the TExES are used by the Unit as one measurement of candidate performance. The TExES examinations serve as an indicator of candidates' proficiency related to their chosen field of study. Analysis of the period from the fall 2005 semester until the 2007 fall semester shows an aggregate pass rate on the state certification TExES examinations for the Unit's advanced programs for approximately 90.1%. For the Counseling Program, 135 candidates took the test with 127 passing; resulting in a pass rate of 94. 1%. Similarly, 139 candidates in the Principal Program who took the state test with 121 passing; resulting in a pass rate of 87. 1%. Only one candidate took the Superintendent test. Unfortunately, this single candidate failed the test resulting in a 0% pass rate.

2. Please complete the following table to indicate pass rates on content licensure tests for other school professionals program by program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate).

**Table 5
Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests for Other School Professionals**

For Period:

2006-2007

| Program | # of Test Takers | % Passing at State Cut Score |
|---------|------------------|------------------------------|
|---------|------------------|------------------------------|

| | | |
|--|-----|--------|
| Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all programs for the preparation of other school professionals) | 275 | 90.1%, |
| School Counselor | 135 | 94.1% |
| Principal | 139 | 90.1% |
| Superintendent | 1 | 0% |
| Educational Diagnostician | 21 | 85.7% |

3. What do the data in the above table (Table 5) tell the unit about the content knowledge of other school professionals?

Analysis of the period from the fall 2005 semester until the 2007 fall semester shows an aggregate pass rate on the state certification TExES examinations for the Unit's advanced programs for approximately 90.1%. For the Counseling Program, 135 candidates took the test with 127 passing; resulting in a pass rate of 94.1%. Similarly, 139 candidates in the Principal Program who took the state test with 121 passing; resulting in a pass rate of 87.1%. Only one candidate took the Superintendent test. Unfortunately, this single candidate failed the test resulting in a 0% pass rate. The Educational Diagnostician Program had 21 candidates take the test with 18 passing for a 85.7% pass rate. These pass rates suggest that our advanced programs' candidates are well prepared in their respective content areas. However, the Superintendent Program's low number of candidates merits an evaluation of the viability of the program.

4. What data from other key assessments indicate that these candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? (Institutions that have submitted programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

Key assessments other than the state test that indicates the Unit's candidates in advanced preparation programs include GPA, TrueOutcomes electronic portfolio, internship evaluations, as well as graduate and employer surveys.

The unit utilizes GPAs to convert numerical percentages of examinations and assignments to grades that identify students' mastery of the respective instructional areas within the unit. GPAs are applied in good faith by instructors to critique candidates' performance, which allows the instructor to identify categories of performance. (i.e. A=Excellent, B=Good, C=Average, D=Poor, and F=failing). Ultimately, GPA determines if candidates demonstrate of their respective subject areas or academic failure. Consequently, GPA produces data that allows identification of a range of students' mastery of various content areas and will identify gaps in achievement; identifying areas for program improvement

GPA is collected for advanced candidates at Transition Points one-three. GPA is calculated at Transition Point I, admission to the Graduate School, from applicants' undergraduate coursework. GPA for regular admittance is 2.75 on a 4-scale; however, candidates can be admitted into advanced programs with "Special Student Classification" with a 2.4. An analysis of Transition Point I suggests that most (approximately 92.4%) of the Unit's advanced candidates' GPAs exceed the minimum required for admission to Graduate School.

An evaluation of GPA also occurs at transition point II, advancement to candidacy.

Candidates must complete 12 semester hours of required graduate courses with an average of at least 3.0. Candidates who do not satisfy this requirement are denied admission to candidacy and advised of a course of action in order to correct any deficiencies or, in extreme cases, advised out of the program. Analysis of GPA at transition point II indicates that approximately 91.5% of our candidates' average Major GPA is consistently 3.00 or higher.

Transition Point III, Admission to the Internship, requires advanced Candidates to have maintained a 3.0 in their coursework before they are allowed to register for their respective internship. Again, candidates who do not satisfy this requirement are denied admission to internship and advised of a course of action in order to correct any deficiencies or, in extreme cases, advised out of the program.

The Unit implemented an electronic Data Management System, TrueOutcomes, in the spring semester 2008. This system creates a comprehensive Professional Electronic Portfolio (PEP) that aligns with institutional, state, SPA, and NCATE standards within candidate's program areas. The PEP contains candidate-generated artifacts evaluated by the faculty using faculty developed rubrics for each artifact. By evaluating these portfolios, faculty members are able to identify areas of improvement for the candidate as well as areas for program and unit improvement by a faculty feedback termed "Closing the Loop." Artifacts include candidates' experiences, written and oral work, reflections, and evidence of professional interactions.

Artifacts entered and evaluated for the spring, summer, and fall semesters have provided some preliminary data for analysis. Approximately 1500 candidates in advanced programs have submitted artifacts for the spring, summer, and fall semesters that relate to Content Knowledge. Analysis of these artifacts indicate that over 97.2% of the Unit's advanced candidates scored 3.5 or above on a scale of 4.0. These preliminary results suggest that our advanced candidates' are well prepared in Content Knowledge for their respective areas.

Follow-up surveys were given to our advanced spring semester 2008 graduates as well as employers of our graduates. The return rate for the advanced level graduates was approximately 20%. The mean for the Content Knowledge domain was approximately 2.8 with a mode of 3.0 with an N return of 79. These survey results suggest that most of our candidates at the advanced level rate their preparation for content knowledge as excellent.

Employers' surveys regarding our graduates' work performance were sent to approximately 350 area schools with a return rate of 10%. The survey resulted in a mean for Content Knowledge of approximately 2.4 and a mode of 2.0. These results suggest that employers rate our candidates acceptable or above in Content Knowledge.

Counseling and Principal internships use evaluation instruments to assess candidate performance. The Counseling Interns Evaluation Instrument is designed to allow supervisors a means to provide feedback about intern performance. The instrument comprises seven categories with indicators for each category. Candidates are scored on a five-point scale ranging from far below expectations to far above expectations. The overall candidate scores range between 3.86 and 4.28. This shows that our Counselors perform well in the area of Content Knowledge.

The Principal Intern Evaluation Instrument also allows field supervisors a means to evaluate intern performance. The Principal Intern Evaluation is composed of 21 categories with indicators for each category. Candidates are scored on a three-point scale that includes Target, Acceptable, and Unacceptable. The composite average of these categories show that 94% of the Principal interns scored in the "Target" range with 6% scoring in the "Acceptable" range. These percentages suggest that most of our internship candidates perform well during their internship.

4a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to the knowledge and skills for other school professionals could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about content knowledge should be discussed in the response to the new 1e4 above.

| |
|---|
| Advanced GPA.doc |
| Advanced Employer Surveys.doc |
| Advanced Graduate Surveys.doc |
| Counseling Internship Evaluation Data.xls |

See **Attachments** panel below.

5. What data from key assessments indicate that these candidates know their students, families, and communities; use data and current research to inform practices; and use technology in their practices?

Key assessments other than the state test that indicate the Unit's candidates in other school professional candidates are proficient in the areas of students, families, and communities; use data and current research to inform practices; and use technology in their practices include GPA, TrueOutcomes electronic portfolio, and internship evaluations.

GPA is collected for advanced candidates at Transition Points one-three. GPA is calculated at Transition Point I, admission to the Graduate School, from applicants' undergraduate coursework. GPA for regular admittance is 2.75 on a 4-scale. An analysis of Transition Point I suggests that most (approximately 92.4%) of the Unit's advanced candidates' GPAs exceed the minimum required for admission to Graduate School.

An evaluation of GPA also occurs at transition point II, advancement to candidacy. Candidates must complete 12 semester hours of required graduate courses with an average of at least 3.0. A number of these classes include the areas of students, families, and communities; use data and current research to inform practices; and use technology in their practices. Candidates who do not satisfy this requirement are denied admission candidacy and advised of a course of action in order to correct any deficiencies or, in extreme cases, advised out of the program. Analysis of GPA at transition point II indicates that approximately 91.5% of our candidates' average Major GPA is consistently 3.00 or higher.

Transition Point III, Admission to the Internship, requires advanced Candidates to have maintained a 3.0 in their coursework before they are allowed to register for their respective internship. Again, candidates who do not satisfy this requirement are denied admission to internship and advised of a course of action in order to correct any deficiencies or, in extreme cases, advised out of the program.

The Unit implemented an electronic Data Management System, TrueOutcomes, in the spring semester 2008. This system creates a comprehensive Professional Electronic Portfolio (PEP) that aligns with institutional, state, SPA, and NCATE standards within candidate's program areas. The PEP contains candidate-generated artifacts evaluated by the faculty using faculty developed rubrics for each artifact. By evaluating these portfolios, faculty members are able to identify areas of improvement for the candidate as well as areas for program and unit improvement by a faculty feedback termed "Closing the Loop." Artifacts include candidates' experiences, written and oral work, reflections, and evidence of professional interactions.

Artifacts entered and evaluated for the spring, summer, and fall semesters have provided some preliminary data for analysis. Approximately 1500 candidates in advanced programs have submitted artifacts for the spring, summer, and fall semesters related to classes that address the area of candidates' knowledge of students, families, and communities; use data and current research to inform practices; and use technology in their practices.

Analysis of these artifacts indicate that approximately 97% of the Unit's advanced candidates scored 3.0 or above in this area. These preliminary results suggest that our advanced candidates' are well prepared in knowledge related to students, families, and communities; use data and current research to inform practices; and use technology in their practices for their respective areas.

Counseling and Principal internships use evaluation instruments to assess candidate performance. The Counseling Interns Evaluation Instrument is designed to allow supervisors a means to provide feedback about intern performance. The instrument comprises seven categories with indicators for each category. Candidates are scored on a five-point scale ranging from far below expectations to far above expectations. Domain 1. Basic Work Requirements, and Domain V, Interactions with Client, are related to candidates' knowledge of students, families, and communities; use data and current research to inform practices; and use technology in their practices. Candidates scored a mean of 4.28 and 4.12 respectively. This data shows that our Counselors perform well in these areas.

The Principal Intern Evaluation Instrument also allows field supervisors a means to evaluate intern performance. The Principal Intern Evaluation is composed of 21 categories with indicators for each category. Candidates are scored on a three-point scale that includes Target, Acceptable, and Unacceptable. The composite average of these categories show that 94% of the Principal interns scored in the "Target" range with 6% scoring in the "Acceptable" range. These percentages suggest that most of our internship candidates perform well during their internship including those categories related to candidates' knowledge of students, families, and communities; use data and current research to inform practices; and use technology in their practices.

5a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to the knowledge and skills outlined in the 1e5 could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about content knowledge should be discussed in the response to 1e5 above.

| |
|---|
| Counseling Interns Evaluation Analysis.doc |
| Adv GPA students, families, and communities.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

6. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to knowledge and skills for their field? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

Follow up surveys were given to our advanced graduates in the College of Education as well as employers of our graduates starting in the Spring Semester 2008 in order to assess their preparation in the content area, content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge, their ability to help all students learn, preparation related to knowledge and skills in their field, and their ability to create positive environments for student learning. The return rate for the advanced level graduates was approximately 20%. Knowledge and skills for their field was approximately 2.7 with a mode of 3.0 with an N return of 76. The survey results suggest that most of our candidates at the advanced level rate their preparation for positive environments for student learning is above the acceptable level.

We asked Employers to fill out surveys regarding our graduates' preparation in Content Area, Content Knowledge and Skills, Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, their ability to help all students learn, Preparation related to Knowledge and skills in their Field, and their ability to create positive environments for student learning. Approximately 350 surveys were mailed to area schools with a return rate of 10%. A low return rate resulted due to several of these schools not having any of our graduates working on their campus at that time. The mean for knowledge and skills for their field was 2.3 with a

mode of 2.0 with an N return of 30. The survey results suggest that most of our candidates' employers at the advanced level rate our candidates preparation for knowledge and skills for their field as above the acceptable level.

7. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to knowledge and skills for other school professionals could be attached here.

| |
|-------------------------------------|
| employer other pros survey.doc |
| Advance knowledge skills survey.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

8. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to the knowledge and skills of other school professionals could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates can create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work? (Institutions that have submitted programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed.)

Key assessments that indicate the Unit's advanced program candidates create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work include TExES, GPA at Transition Point II, and internship evaluations.

Advanced candidates' pass rates on the Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES) are used by the Unit as one measurement of candidate performance. The TExES examinations serve as an indicator of candidates' proficiency related to their chosen field of study. Analysis of the period from the fall 2005 semester until the 2007 fall semester shows an aggregate pass rate on the state certification TExES examinations for the Unit's advanced programs for approximately 90.1%. For the Counseling Program, 135 candidates took the test with 127 passing; resulting in a pass rate of 94. 1%. Similarly, 139 candidates in the Principal Program who took the state test with 121passing; resulting in a pass rate of 87. 1%. Only one candidate took the Superintendent test. Unfortunately, this single candidate failed the test resulting in a 0% pass rate. These pass rates suggest that our two largest advanced programs' candidates are well prepared in their respective fields. Moreover, the Superintendent Program's low number of candidates merits an evaluation of the viability of the program

An evaluation of GPA occurs at transition point II, advancement to candidacy. Because creating positive environments for student learning, the diversity of students, families, and communities; and policy contexts are integrated into candidates' required classes, GPA can be used to evaluate candidate progress in these areas. Candidates must complete 12 semester hours of required graduate courses in their chosen program with an average of at least 3.0. Candidates who do not satisfy this requirement are denied admission candidacy and advised of a course of action in order to correct any deficiencies or, in extreme cases, advised out of the program. Analysis of GPA at transition point II indicates that approximately 91.5% of our candidates' average Major GPA is consistently 3.00 or higher.

Counseling and Principal internships use evaluation instruments to assess candidate performance. The Counseling Interns Evaluation Instrument is designed to allow supervisors a means to provide feedback about intern performance. The instrument comprises seven categories with indicators for each category. Candidates are scored on a five-point scale ranging from far below expectations to far above expectations. Domain I, Basic Work Requirements, and Domain III, Interactions with Client, are related to candidates' knowledge of creating positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work. Candidates scored a mean of 4.28 and 4.12 respectively. This data suggests that our Counselors perform well in these areas.

The Principal Intern Evaluation Instrument allows field supervisors a means to evaluate intern performance. The Principal Intern Evaluation is composed of 21 categories with indicators for each category. Candidates are scored on a three-point scale that includes Target, Acceptable, and Unacceptable. The composite average of these categories show that 94% of the Principal interns scored in the "Target" range with 6% scoring in the "Acceptable" range. These percentages suggest that most of our internship candidates perform well during their internship including those categories related to creating positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work.

1a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to other school professionals' support of student learning could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about student learning should be discussed in the response to 1f1 above.

| |
|--|
| Pass Rates 2005-2007 advanced.doc |
| Advanced GPA.doc |
| Counseling Interns Evaluation Analysis.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

2. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to create positive environments for student learning? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

Follow up surveys were given to our advanced graduates in the College of Education as well as employers of our graduates starting in the Spring Semester 2008 in order to assess their preparation in the content area, content knowledge and skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge, their ability to help all students learn, preparation related to knowledge and skills in their field, and their ability to create positive environments for student learning. The return rate for the advanced level graduates was approximately 20%. Candidates' ability to create positive environments for student learning was approximately 2.0 with a mode of 2.1 with an N return of 77. Although candidates rates this section as the lowest on the survey, the results suggest that most of our candidates at the advanced level rate their preparation for positive environments for student learning is at acceptable level or above.

We asked Employers to fill out surveys regarding our graduates' preparation in Content Area, Content Knowledge and Skills, Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, their ability to help all students learn, Preparation related to Knowledge and skills in their Field, and their ability to create positive environments for student learning. Approximately 350 surveys were mailed to area schools with a return rate of 10%. A low return rate resulted due to several of these schools not having any of our graduates working on their campus at that time. The mean for their ability to create positive environments for

student learning was 2.4 with a mode of 2.0 with an N return of 30. The survey results suggest that most of our candidates' employers at the advanced level rate our candidates' preparation for their ability to create positive environments for student learning as acceptable or above.

3. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to support for student learning could be attached here.

| |
|----------------------------|
| Advanced enviro survey.doc |
| employer enviro survey.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

4. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to other school professionals' support of student learning could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Note: Indicate where the responses refer to initial teacher preparation, advanced preparation of teachers, or other school professionals, noting differences when appropriate.

1. What professional dispositions are candidates expected to demonstrate by completion of programs?

| |
|---|
| <p>Uses self reflection on previous experiences to refine personal and professional practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Practices meaningful reflective self-assessment. *Applies reflective thinking to improve student learning. *Seeks feedback from colleagues and supervisors for improvement of professional skills. *Responds proactively to assessments by supervisors to address areas of concern. <p>Understands student learning is the goal and the teacher or administrator's role is to maximize growth, development, and learning opportunities for each student.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Encourages classroom interaction. *Has high expectations for all students. *Treats students with dignity and respect at all times. *Arrives prepared and on time. *Creates and maintains a safe learning environment <p>Understands and demonstrates the use of instructional strategies including, motivational techniques to successfully and actively engage students in the learning process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Is a thoughtful and responsive listener. *Uses a variety of strategies to optimize student learning. *Is sensitive to student differences. *Understands students have needs that must be met before learning can take place <p>Acknowledges the varied characteristics of all students and the need for instructional materials, which are developmentally appropriate.</p> |
|---|

- *Exhibits a caring attitude toward students and others.
- *Accepts and adapts to differences in learning styles, intelligence, and behaviors of others.
- *Is open to consideration of alternative ideas.
- *Adapts teaching to accommodate the needs of exceptional learners.
- *Treats others with diverse values, languages, cultures, and traditions with respect

Possesses a strong academic knowledge base in the subject area, across disciplines, and in life applications.

- *Creates connections to subject matter that are meaningful to students.
- *Collaborates with others in implementing a common curriculum
- *Initiates research when content and pedagogical knowledge is insufficient
- *Work indicates engagement in course content and process.

Understands the use of on-going assessments to identify P-12 students' strengths and challenges.

- *Is familiar with, and uses different kinds of assessments
- *Applies assessments before, during, and after the instructional process to evaluate learning progress
- *Knows how to prepare and use authentic assessments to measure performance-based learning tasks.
- *Understands norm-referenced testing and its application to instruction.
- *Uses evaluation and assessment to guide instruction.
- *Creates and uses scoring guides/rubrics to guide assessments.

Understands and demonstrates appropriate use of technology as part of the learning process

- *Provides different and alternate approaches to learning.
- *Stays abreast of educational technology innovations.
- *Uses technology to communicate effectively with students, parents, and peers.

Persistent in seeking different and varied methodologies, strategies, and technologies to address the needs of diverse learners through culturally relevant and sensitive curricula and pedagogies.

- *Demonstrates equitable treatment and respect for all individuals.
- *Adjusts and revises plans to meet student needs.
- *Demonstrates a commitment to equity in learning

Understands the role and importance of parents, staff, community members and other professionals in the learning process for students.

- Communicates effectively with colleagues, parents, and students.
- *Respects the opinions and contribution of others.
- *Participates in group assignments, projects, or activities.
- *Makes significant contributions to group projects.
- *Serves as leader in group projects and workshop activities.
- *Designs and uses instructional collaborative activities and assignments.

Demonstrates ethical behavior in personal and professional relationships.

- *Complies with all legal requirements of the education profession.
- *Demonstrates academic and professional integrity.
- *Uses professional language to address students, peers and instructors.
- *Respects the ethical and moral values of the school and community.
- *Abides by the strictest standards of confidentiality with student records, parent communication, and collegial personal information.
- *Maintains appropriate professional appearance.

Seeks research and professionally based information to improve his/her educational practices.

- *Is committed to study and self-discipline to gain knowledge.
- *Seeks the most current thought and modes of practice in the field of education.
- *Maintains an open mind to new ideas
- *Demonstrates a willingness to learn

Acts in a manner that shows a belief that that all children can learn, and demonstrates dedication, enthusiasm and respect for the profession

- *Believes that all children can learn.
- *Embraces positive attitudes and a commitment to quality education.
- *Builds working relationships with others in the profession.
- *Participates in professional organizations.
- *Approaches professional tasks energetically.
- *Develops positive skills of leadership.

2. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions?

Whitlowe R. Green College of Education defines dispositions as patterns of professional behaviors shown toward students, families, colleagues, and other members of learning communities. These dispositions affect student learning, motivation, and development in addition to having an impact on the candidate's professional growth. In addition to skill set related standards evaluated using programmatic assessments, the unit committees have agreed upon professional dispositions that reflect the core values of the Unit. These twelve core values outline the dispositions that the faculty, unit, and professional community value in teachers and other professional school personnel and are directly related to the Conceptual framework of the Unit. All candidates in the College of Education, both at the initial and advanced levels, are expected to demonstrate these dispositions. Each candidate's disposition is assessed by the candidate as well as the course instructor in order to ensure consistency and minimize bias. The results are a data set composed of the compounded average of a self assessment by the candidate's and the course instructor's assessment.

At this time, measurements have been conducted for spring, summer, and fall 2008 and is available in True Outcomes and the exhibit room. The roman numerals in the table correspond to the numbering of the questions on the disposition instrument for advanced candidates. The results of the analyses of our advanced candidates dispositions indicate that on the scale (0 = unacceptable, 1 = acceptable, and 2 = target) over 98% are acceptable or are on target on every disposition assessed, and 99% are acceptable or are on target on the overall average disposition for each of the advanced programs. The minimum average value for the programs is 1.80 on a scale of 2.00. Follow-ups with individual candidates who were assessed as unacceptable are conducted by advisors at the end of each semester to address areas of weaknesses.

The attached table provides a summary of our initial candidates' disposition for Spring 2008. Similar measurements were conducted for summer and fall 2008 and available in TrueOutcomes and the exhibit room. The roman numerals in the table correspond to the numbering of the questions on the disposition instrument for initial candidates. The results of the analyses of our initial candidates' dispositions indicate that on the scale (0 = unacceptable, 1 = acceptable, and 2 = target) over 98% are acceptable or are on target on every disposition assessed, and 99% are acceptable or are on target on the overall average disposition for each of the initial programs. The minimum average value for the programs is 1.60 on a scale of 2.00. Follow up with individual candidates who were assessed as unacceptable are conducted to address areas of weaknesses.

In order to ensure consistency between the candidates' self-evaluation and the course instructor's

evaluation, the evaluations of the candidates were statistically compared to those of the respective instructors of the courses over a period of two semesters. A stratified sample of ten courses from all the departments in the college was randomly selected and analyzed to compare the evaluation of the candidates to those of the course instructor for the spring and similarly for the summer semesters. The t-test (0.05 level) was used to compare the means of the averages of the candidates to that of the instructors, to see if there was a statistically significant difference between the scores.

The results of the evaluation for spring indicates that even though the means of the candidates self-evaluation (1.78) was higher than that of the instructors (1.55), there is no significant difference on the t-test ($p = 0.59$, $n=10$) between the means of the candidates self evaluation and that of the instructors evaluation. Similarly, the results of the evaluation for summer indicates that even though the means of the candidates self-evaluation (1.78) was higher than that of the instructors (1.70). Consequently, there is no significant difference on the t-test ($p = 0.47$, $n=10$) between the means of the candidates self evaluation and that of the instructors evaluation.

2a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to professional dispositions could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about professional dispositions should be discussed in the response to 2g2 above.

| |
|---|
| Advanced Candidate Disposition Table.doc |
| Initial Candidate Dispositions Table.doc |
| Disposition , Conceptual Framework and Unit Core Matrix.doc |
| Validation of Disposition Evaluation.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

3. In what ways do candidates demonstrate that they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn?

A summary of 3377 disposition self and professor evaluations for advanced candidates regarding dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn for Spring 2008 indicates that on the scale (1 = unacceptable, 2 = acceptable, and 3 = target) over 86% are on target, 13% are acceptable, and only about 1% were rated as unacceptable. In addition, those candidates falling within the unacceptable range are required to participate in follow-up consultations with their major advisor to address identified areas for improvement

The results of the analyses of dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn for 534 of our initial candidates for Spring 2008 indicates that approximately 88% are on target, 11% are acceptable, with no candidates rated as unacceptable.

4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' demonstration of professional dispositions? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

Measurements have been conducted for spring, summer, and fall 2008 and is available in True Outcomes and the exhibit room. The results of the analyses of our advanced candidates dispositions indicate that on the scale (1 = unacceptable, 2 = acceptable, and 3 = target) over 98% are acceptable or are on target on every disposition assessed, and 99% are acceptable or are on target on the overall average disposition for each of the advanced programs. Follow-up meetings with individual candidates who were assessed as unacceptable were conducted by advisors at the end of the semester to address

areas of candidate weaknesses.

The results of the analysis of the follow-up survey for graduates for spring 2008 resulted in a (21% return rate. The survey measured graduates' perception regarding the quality of their programs and their level of preparation in the areas of knowledge, skills and dispositions indicate that overall graduating candidates perceive their respective programs as preparing them well for their job assignments (significantly above acceptable). Question 13 asked for graduates, perception regarding professional dispositions. The disposition question resulted in an mean of 2.75 with and a mode of 3.0, which suggests our graduates competency of our graduates.

The survey results indicated that there are no areas of major concern; however, efforts are currently underway to infuse more technology related assignments into courses to give our advanced teacher educators greater exposure to the use of modern technology in management. Based on input from the faculty, the current survey is being revised to include the gender and ethnicity of the respondents so we can dig deeper in our efforts to find areas for improvement in our programs.

5. A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional dispositions could be attached here.

| |
|---|
| TOTAL DISPOSITION SUMMER 2008.xls |
| Disposition , Conceptual Framework and Unit Core Matrix.doc |
| Dispositions Initial and Advanced.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

6. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to professional dispositions could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 1?

The Department of Curriculum and Instruction emphasizes culturally responsive teaching in methods courses at the initial level. The Department also prepares their candidates to take the State examination by having candidates complete practice tests and class activities in preparation for the licensure examinations they must pass in order to be certified in the state.

In addition, the Educational Diagnostician candidates have consistently passed the State examination at a rate of 80% to 100% for the last five years. We encourage our candidates to consider their role as an expanding one in that they will be consultants who will be advocates for a diverse student population particularly, those students misdiagnosed and placed into special education.

The department of Health and Human Performance successfully researched and implemented use of the disposition surveys to candidates and closed the loop in TrueOutcomes electronic data management system. The department met to discuss candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions in September 2007 and developed a strategy to improve our candidate's learning and improve our instructional methodology. In addition, the department has infused assignments to strengthen critical thinking and increase candidate's knowledge base regarding health and physical education content, institutional, state, and national standards.

In addition, faculty are participating in on-going faculty development to increase their knowledge base of our content area to increase our capacity to educate our candidates, infuse culturally responsive teaching to our candidates, increase pass rates of our candidates in health and human performance, as well as increase our candidates' employment rates.

2. What research related to Standard 1 is being conducted by the unit?

The Department of Curriculum and Instruction evaluates instruction for individual classes and make adjustments as needed. The faculty meets regularly to discuss data trends in state test data and offer suggestions for greater emphasis in classes. We are re-considering the entry criteria for admission into teacher education in the initial program by investigating the predictability of current criteria and passing of the state examination.

Educational Administration & Leadership faculty developed an ELCC Survey to examine the usefulness of ELCC Standards for candidates who are serving as school leaders. There is an abundance of learning communities research for undergraduate candidates; but, little research has been conducted in graduate courses. Therefore, to increase content and professional knowledge, communication skills and cultural understanding research is being conducted in specific graduate courses to investigate the impact of Learning Communities with graduate candidates.

STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

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

[Note: Include programs for teachers, including graduate programs for licensed teachers, and other school professionals, noting differences when appropriate.]

2a. Assessment System

1. How is the unit assessment system evaluated and continuously improved? Who is involved and how?

The Prairie View Teacher Education Unit Assessment System is designed to measure and evaluate candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions as well as to guide Unit improvement. The System operates at two distinct levels, one on programs and the other on the unit. Program-level assessment data on candidate performance and relevant operations are disaggregated by program and reviewed in order (a) to make decisions and provide feedback to individual candidates on program progress as well as (b) used to judge the effectiveness of specific programs and guide program improvement. Unit-level assessment utilizes data on unit operations as well as candidate performance data aggregated across programs to examine Unit effectiveness. The data management is overseen by the Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Data Management (OAADM). All data gathered from key assessments channeled through the OAADM and disseminated to the respective department heads and committees for analysis. Program Committees (PCs), functioning as assessment review committees for specific programs,

examine aggregated program, candidate performance, and relevant unit data to make judgments about program effectiveness and any needed changes. The Unit Assessment Committee (UAC) examines unit operations and candidate assessment data, aggregated across programs, to make judgments about unit effectiveness.

To guide program reviews, the UAS specifies that each unit program (initial and advanced), through its PC, establishes and maintains a Program Assessment Plan (PAP) and conducts a program assessment review at least once annually in accordance with that plan. A minimum requirement of a PAP is to review programs' transition points, program admission, admission to clinical practice/internship, exit from clinical practice, and program exit. At each transition point, candidates are to be informed of their program status, and the options for candidates who fail to meet established criteria. To implement its PAP, each PC has identified transition points and associated evaluations/criteria and identified/developed standards-related assessments and associated rubrics. Assessment data is collected and periodically aggregated and reports generated for PCs to review and make recommendations. An electronic Data Management System, TrueOutcomes, was set in place in fall 2007 across the university. TrueOutcomes allows candidates to keep a record of artifacts, the courses they have completed, create an electronic portfolio, and plan future courses to help them meet their career goals. Administrators and instructors have access to real-time information and statistics to track candidates' progress and achievement, which allows instructors and advisers to monitor candidates' progress, and provide remediation if needed. The system also generates relevant reports that support candidate progress decisions as well as initial and advanced program reviews and are used to make decisions about candidates, programs and the unit.

2. Please complete the following table (Table 6) to indicate the key assessments used by the unit and its programs to monitor candidate performance at transition points such as those listed in Table 6?

Table 6
Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments

| Programs | Admission | Entry to clinical practice | Exit from clinical practice | Program completion | After program completion |
|-----------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Initial Programs | Core GPA | CUIN GPA | PDAS | Cumulative GPA (Completion of all Program Requirements) | TExES Content Area Test (By Program), |
| | Disposition Assessment | Complete CUIN pedagogy courses (12 hours) | | Electronic Portfolio Review | Preparation & Responsibilities (By Program) |
| | Electronic Portfolio Review | Electronic Portfolio Review | Electronic Portfolio Review | Disposition Assessment | Graduate Survey, Employer Survey |
| All Advanced Programs | Bachelor's Degree GPA 2.5 or above Official Transcript Application to Graduate School | 12 semester hours of required graduate courses with a GPA of 3.0. | Internship evaluation | Program GPA (Completion of all Program Requirements) | TExES Content Area Test (By Program) |
| | | Electronic Portfolio Review | Electronic Portfolio Review | Electronic Portfolio Review | Graduate Survey |
| | | Disposition Assessment | | Disposition Assessment | Employer Survey |
| | | | Secure Employment | 6 Observations by University Supervisors | |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| Alternative Certification Program | Bachelor's Degree GPA 2.5 or above Official Transcript THEA Math 230 Reading 260 Writing 220 Complete ATCP Application to Graduate School and ATCP | Letter of Acceptance Orientation Sign Intern Commitment Form 30 Hours Field Experience Begin 6 hours of University Coursework Attend required TExES Review Sessions Pass the TExES Content Examination | with a school district Sign Financial Contract for payroll deduction for program fees Complete probationary period with SBEC Register for final 6 hours of University coursework Pass TExES PP-R Examination | Interns submit completed Documentation Books Principal completes and submits Recommendation for Certification Form Intern completes the Standard Certification Application University recommends intern for Standard Certification | Intern completes Follow-up Form Contact is made to determine job status of Intern The Intern's Audit Folder is kept on file for a period of 5 years |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|

3. How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards?

The professional education unit adheres to the following assessment timeline effective Fall 2007:

Prior to the beginning of each semester: The university technology specialist migrates course offering information from Banner to TrueOutcomes.

During each fall and spring semester: Data are collected via TrueOutcomes. According to dates identified by the program coordinators and the technology specialist.

During each spring semester: Progress of advanced graduate candidates at designated transition points are monitored in a meeting of all program faculty members.

Within four weeks after the final exam each semester: The OAADM office aggregates the data from the common unit assessments for the unit and disaggregates the unit data for each program; and aggregates the program data from the specific program assessments.

Within five weeks after the final exam each semester: The OAADM office forwards the aggregated unit data to the dean of the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education, and forwards the disaggregated unit data and the aggregated specific program data to the program coordinators.

By January 31 for the fall semester, by June 1 for the spring semester, and by September 15 for the summer semester: Each program coordinator submits a report to the dean of the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education addressing the disaggregated unit data and the aggregated specific program data for the semester using a prescribed format.

By March 1 for the fall semester, by July 1 for the spring semester, and by October 1 for the summer semester: Dean of the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education prepares a report addressing the aggregated unit data for the semester using a prescribed format.

Each March, September, and October: Unit and program assessment reports are presented by the dean of the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education at the monthly College of Education faculty meeting and at the Local Cooperative Council meeting.

The unit and program assessment reports, along with the recommendations of the Professional Education Board, are shared by the dean with the program coordinators and department chairs outside the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education and with the provost.

By November 1 each year: Dean of the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education prepares an Annual

Report on candidate performance for the unit for the academic year covering fall, spring, and summer semesters.

4. How does the unit ensure its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?

Unit faculty members are committed to a standard of equity and fairness in assessing candidates' performance in coursework as they progress through the program. To ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency among all classes, programs, and faculty, the Unit faculty developed common syllabi and rubrics for each course. These common elements form the foundation of candidates' professional, electronic portfolio. During the development of the rubrics, there was 100% agreement on the overall and summary analysis and there was 80% agreement on using the three-point rubric for assessing the course outcomes. Further, no score included more than a one-point differential.

To make certain faculty understood the procedures and expectations of the electronic portfolio, faculty were trained in the use and scoring of assignments using the common developed rubrics in an online environment. In addition, for each major artifact graded as part of the electronic portfolio, inter-rater reliability data are collected each semester starting in spring 2008.

All electronic portfolios at both the initial and advanced levels are created in TrueOutcomes and graded as individual assignments by the professors assigned to teach the courses. The various artifact scores are compiled as a dataset presented and presented to the Unit Assessment Committee (UAS) for analysis. The UAS compares the scores for each artifact across sections and professors. Artifact scores for individual classes and sections that fall outside the standard deviation of similar artifacts or sections are treated as outliers and further analyzed to determine appropriate changes to the assignment or if further training for the professor is necessary.

Upon completion, the final portfolio grade is determined by an average of the compiled artifacts that were graded individually by various professors over the course of the candidate's program. Consequently, this process eliminates the necessity for grading complete portfolios, which serves to reduce the bias because the portfolios are never graded by a single evaluator.

Also, The Prairie View A & M University Student Information System (SIS) collects and maintains institutional and candidate data, including but not limited to, names, contact information, diversity information (e.g., race, gender), GPA, transcript data (e.g., major, degree or non-degree seeking, course lists, grades), and test scores (e.g., SAT, MAT, GRE, and THEA). Faculty members can access their advisees' information stored in SIS via the Internet, and data can be imported into EXCEL spreadsheets (or into TrueOutcomes) to monitor candidate progress at the transition points.

The existing databases in SIS, are in a state of transition to Banner in Fall 2008 as the University moves toward a more sophisticated and user friendly system that will permit integration and aggregation of data to examine developmental trends across the programs.

5. What assessments and evaluations are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?

The Prairie View A & M University Student Information System (SIS) collects and maintains institutional and candidate data, including but not limited to, names, contact information, diversity information (e.g., race, gender), GPA, transcript data (e.g., major, degree or non-degree seeking, course lists, grades), and test scores (e.g., SAT, MAT, GRE, and THEA). Faculty members can access their

advisees' information stored in SIS via the Internet, and data can be imported into EXCEL spreadsheets (or into TrueOutcomes to monitor candidate progress at the transition points.

The existing databases in SIS, are in a state of transition to Banner in Fall 2008 as the University moves toward a more sophisticated and user friendly system that will permit integration and aggregation of data to examine developmental trends across the programs.

Each course that a professor teaches at PVAMU has incorporated in it an assessment of the overall course, the professor's efforts, the classroom activities, the skills and disposition of the professor, and the professionalism of the professor. The Student Opinion Survey (SOS) is primarily designed to allow candidates to provide feedback to the professor on the efforts, professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions of the professor.

The Student Opinion Survey, which is a university wide assessment instrument completed by candidates in each course at the end of each semester, is a collection of questions designed to evaluate the material presented in the course and the effectiveness of the instructors delivery. The data is analyzed by the Office for Institutional Research and the results are disseminated to the instructors via the various divisions, schools and departments. The results show a comparison of the instructors mean score for each item compared to the college mean and university mean. Sample copies of the instrument and evaluations are available in the various departments and in the Office for Institutional Research.

The results from the SOS indicate that for the last five semesters our faculty have been rated by candidates as between very good and excellent each semester, and in addition our average faculty rating has been above the university average each semester. Samples of the instrument, and detailed reports are available in the exhibit room.

TrueOutcomes, an electronic data management system was implemented by the Unit in the spring semester 2008. TrueOutcomes allows candidates to keep a record of completed artifacts, the courses they have completed, create a Professional Electronic Portfolio (PEP), and plan future courses to help them meet their career goals. The PEP provides the faculty member a copy of the candidate's work. It is comprehensive in nature and addresses institutional, state, SPA, and NCATE standards identified within the candidate's program area of study.

The PEP contains candidate-generated artifacts directly aligned with the program area for review by the faculty. Faculty members review the PEPs and identify areas of improvement for the candidate and area (s) for program improvement determined by "Closing the Loop." This process ensures the quality of our graduates. PEP artifacts are graded using rubrics that faculty members have developed for each artifact. In addition, the PEPs are accessible throughout their academic careers' and into their professional career. Artifacts included in the PEPs include candidates' field journals, written and oral work, and evidence of professional interactions.

Although implemented in spring 2008, the artifacts entered and evaluated for the spring, summer, and fall semesters have provided some preliminary data for analysis. Planned to start in the spring 2009 semester, the Arts and Science programs do not yet require teacher education candidates to submit Artifacts in TrueOutcomes. At this time, approximately 1,000 candidates in the initial programs have submitted artifacts for the spring and summer semesters that relate to content knowledge. Analysis of these artifacts indicate that over 95% of the Unit's initial candidates scored 3.5 or above on a scale of 4.0.

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the unit assessment system could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 2a. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of

attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

| |
|---------------------------------|
| SOS Results.doc |
| Assessment System Overview .doc |
| Counseling Alignment .xls |
| Early Childhood Alignment.xls |
| Ed ADMN Alignment.xls |
| Health Alignment .xls |
| History Program Alignment.xls |
| PE Alignment .xls |
| Special Ed Alignment.xls |

See **Attachments** panel below.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

1. What are the processes and timelines used by the unit to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, unit operations, and program quality?

- **How are the data collected?**
- **How often are the data summarized and analyzed?**
- **Whose responsibility is it to summarize and analyze the data? (Dean, assistant dean, data coordinator, etc.)**
- **In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? (Reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)**
- **What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?**

Analysis of the Data Collection, Analysis, and Dissemination Process

Step one (1A-1C) is the initial collection of data.

- Data from external sources, i.e. the Texas Education Agency (TEA) accreditation agency reports and Graduate and Employer Surveys are forwarded to the Unit head.
- Data from both internal and external sources are forwarded to the Unit head, i.e. survey results from the office of Office for Institutional Research, state and federal mandates, accrediting agency reports.
- Data from internal sources, i.e. professional and content specific examinations, professional dispositions assessments, internship ratings are collected in the departments and colleges.

Step two (2)

Data collected in step one is sent to the Assessment Committee for analysis.

Step three (3)

Analysis reports are sent to the Unit head and department chairs by the Assessment Committee.

Step four (4)

Analysis reports are analyzed in faculty/ discipline/ departmental meeting to determine if change is needed. If no change is needed the process stops here. If change is needed the faculty/ discipline/ departmental members develop a proposal for the change. The proposal specifies if the change is for an individual program or a Unit change across all programs.

Step five (5)

Proposals of change are presented to the College of Education Executive Committee. If approved in the College of Education Executive Committee the proposal is presented to the appropriate academic committee for approval.

Step six (6)

Undergraduate program changes are presented before the Undergraduate Committee. Graduate program changes are presented before the Graduate Committee. Changes approved by these committees are forwarded to the Unit head. The Unit head disseminates the information to the appropriate department chairs for dissemination to faculty/discipline/departmental members.

Step (7)

Prior to the beginning of each semester: The university technology specialist migrates course offerings and proposed changes into Banner and TrueOutcomes. The changes are also integrated into faculty syllabi.

Time line

During each fall and spring semester: Data are collected via TrueOutcomes. According to dates identified by the program coordinators and the technology specialist.

During each spring semester: Progress of advanced graduate candidates at designated transition point is monitored in a meeting of all program faculty members.

Within four weeks after the final exam each semester: The Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Data Management (OAADM) aggregates the data from the common unit assessments for the unit and disaggregates the unit data for each program; and aggregates the program data from the specific program assessments.

Within five weeks after the final exam each semester: The OAADM forwards the aggregated unit data to the dean of the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education, and forwards the disaggregated unit data and the aggregated specific program data to the program coordinators.

By January 31 for the fall semester, by June 1 for the spring semester, and by September 15 for the summer semester: Each program coordinator submits a report to the dean of the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education addressing the disaggregated unit data and the aggregated specific program data for the semester using a prescribed format.

By March 1 for the fall semester, by July 1 for the spring semester, and by October 1 for the summer semester: Dean of the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education prepares a report addressing the aggregated unit data for the semester using a prescribed format.

Each March, September, and October: Unit and program assessment reports are presented by the dean of the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education at the monthly College of Education faculty meeting and at the Local Cooperative Council meeting.

The unit and program assessment reports, along with the recommendations of the Professional Education Board, are shared by the dean with the program coordinators and department chairs outside the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education and with the provost.

By November 1 each year: Dean of the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education or his designee prepares an Annual Report on candidate performance for the unit for the academic year covering fall, spring, and summer semesters.

2. How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?

Generally, candidate complaints about grades or other class related performance assessments can be addressed by the instructor of record and the candidate. When that cannot be achieved, the candidate may have his/her complaint addressed by the procedure outlined below. Faculty, other classroom professionals, and candidates' rights are to be protected and their human dignity respected. Grading and other class related complaints are to be filed initially within thirty days following the alleged precipitating action on which the complaint is based. Except where extenuating circumstances render it unreasonable, the outcome of a complaint that reaches the level of department/division will be reviewed within thirty days and a written notification of outcome will be provided to the candidate.

2. If the instructor is no longer at the university or if the subject of the grievance arises when faculty are not expected to be on duty for a week or more, the candidate should report to his or her advisor or the absent faculty member's immediate supervisor (department head, division head, or dean).

3. If the issue is not resolved at the faculty level and the candidate wishes to pursue the issue beyond the instructor, he/she should meet with his/her academic advisor even if the grade or other issue is not in the department, division, school, or college in which the candidate's class is being offered. The advisor will intervene appropriately, but if unable to negotiate an agreement between the candidate and his/her instructor, will direct the candidate to follow each level of the appeals procedures items 4 through 10 below.

4. If no agreement can be reached following discussion among the advisor, the candidate, and the instructor, the candidate should write a letter to the instructor's immediate supervisor. In the School of Architecture; or School of Nursing the Dean; in all other colleges the immediate supervisor of faculty, teaching assistants, laboratory assistants and other classroom professionals is the department or division head. The letter or form should present the grievance, the rationale for it, and the remedy sought. The letter or form should be sent at least one week prior to the candidate's scheduled appointment to meet with the instructor's immediate supervisor.

5. If the instructor's immediate supervisor cannot resolve the issue to the candidate's satisfaction and the candidate wishes to pursue the matter, the instructor's immediate supervisor will refer the matter to a three to five person faculty appeals panel, one of whom must be a part-time faculty person if part-time faculty members are employed in the department, school, or college..

7. If the candidate believes that the decision of the highest official in the College or School, the dean, deserves further review due to flaws in the previous reviews or due to his/her having information of such nature as to potentially impact the outcome, the candidate should provide a written request for review to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs who will employ a review process appropriate to the situation and notify the dean of the outcome. The dean will notify the

candidate of the outcome. A decision that has reached review by the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee is final.

8. Grading and other class related academic issues are referred in writing to the Office of the President only in instances where a preponderance of the evidence reveals that a candidate's Constitutional rights or human dignity may have been violated. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will transmit to the President the entire record of reviews conducted at each level if requested by the President following his/her receipt of the candidate's written appeal. The President will employ a review process appropriate to the matter presented and notify the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and dean of the outcome. The dean will notify the candidate of the outcome.

9. If the class related complaint is related to issues including but not limited to sexual harassment, violence, drug use, possession of firearms, or other behaviors prohibited by federal law, state law, Texas A&M University System policy or University regulations, the candidate may select one of the following options: Option A: Report the incident, in writing, to the instructor's or other classroom professional's immediate supervisor (department head, division head, or dean).

Option B: Report the incident, in writing, to the Director of Human Resources in Room 122 W.R. Banks Building or to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in Room 214 A.I. Thomas Building. Academic Information and Regulations

3. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the data collection, analysis, and evaluation could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 2b. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here.)

| |
|---------------------------------|
| Assessment Manual 10_7_08.pdf |
| Assessment System Overview .doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

1. What are assessment data indicating about candidate performance on the main campus, at off-campus sites, and in distance learning programs?

Key assessments that are used to evaluate the Unit's candidates at off-campus site include Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES), GPA, TrueOutcomes electronic portfolio, internship evaluations, as well as graduate and employer surveys.

Advanced candidates' pass rates on the Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES) are used by the Unit at off site locations as one measurement of candidate performance. The TExES examinations serve as an indicator of candidates' proficiency related to their chosen field of study. Analysis of the period from the fall 2005 semester until the 2007 fall semester shows an aggregate pass rate on the state certification TExES examinations for the Unit's advanced programs for approximately 90.1%. For the Counseling Program, 135 candidates took the test with 127 passing; resulting in a pass rate of 94.1%. Similarly, 139 candidates in the Principal Program who took the state test with 121 passing; resulting in a pass rate of 87.1%. Only one candidate took the Superintendent test. Unfortunately, this single candidate failed the test resulting in a 0% pass rate. These pass rates suggest that our two largest

advanced programs' candidates are well prepared in their respective fields. Moreover, the Superintendent Program's low number of candidates merits an evaluation of the viability of the program

The unit utilizes GPAs to convert numerical percentages of examinations and assignments to grades that identify students' mastery of the respective instructional areas within the unit. GPAs are applied in good faith by instructors to critique candidates' performance, which allows the instructor to identify categories of performance. (i.e. A=Excellent, B=Good, C=Average, D=Poor, and F=failing). Ultimately, GPA determines if candidates demonstrate of their respective subject areas or academic failure. Consequently, GPA produces data that allows identification of a range of students' mastery of various content areas and will identify gaps in achievement; identifying areas for program improvement

GPA is collected for all advanced candidates at Transition Points one-three. GPA is calculated at Transition Point I, admission to the Graduate School, from applicants' undergraduate coursework. GPA for regular admittance is 2.75 on a 4-scale; however, candidates can be admitted into advanced programs with "Special Student Classification" with a 2.4. An analysis of Transition Point I suggests that most (approximately 92.4%) of the Unit's advanced candidates' GPAs exceed the minimum required for admission to Graduate School.

An evaluation of GPA also occurs at transition point II, advancement to candidacy.

Candidates must complete 12 semester hours of required graduate courses with an average of at least 3.0. Candidates who do not satisfy this requirement are denied admission candidacy and advised of a course of action in order to correct any deficiencies or, in extreme cases, advised out of the program. Analysis of GPA at transition point II indicates that approximately 91.5% of our candidates' average Major GPA is consistently 3.00 or higher.

Transition Point III, Admission to the Internship, requires advanced Candidates to have maintained a 3.0 in their coursework before they are allowed to register for their respective internship. Again, candidates who do not satisfy this requirement are denied admission to internship and advised of a course of action in order to correct any deficiencies or, in extreme cases, advised out of the program.

The Unit implemented an electronic Data Management System, TrueOutcomes, in the spring semester 2008. This system creates a comprehensive Professional Electronic Portfolio (PEP) that aligns with institutional, state, SPA, and NCATE standards within candidate's program areas. The PEP contains candidate-generated artifacts evaluated by the faculty using faculty developed rubrics for each artifact. By evaluating these portfolios, faculty members are able to identify areas of improvement for the candidate as well as areas for program and unit improvement by a faculty feedback termed "Closing the Loop." Artifacts include candidates' experiences, written and oral work, reflections, and evidence of professional interactions.

Artifacts entered and evaluated for the spring, summer, and fall semesters have provided some preliminary data for analysis. Approximately 1500 candidates in advanced programs have submitted artifacts for the spring, summer, and fall semesters that relate to Content Knowledge. Analysis of these artifacts indicate that over 97.2% of the Unit's advanced candidates scored 3.5 or above on a scale of 4.0. These preliminary results suggest that our advanced candidates' are well prepared in Content Knowledge for their respective areas.

Follow-up surveys were given to our advanced spring semester 2008 graduates as well as employers of our graduates. The return rate for the advanced level graduates was approximately 20%. The mean for the Content Knowledge domain was approximately 2.8 with a mode of 3.0 with an N return of 79. These survey results suggest that most of our candidates at the advanced level rate their preparation for content knowledge as excellent.

Employers' surveys regarding our graduates' work performance were sent to approximately 350 area schools with a return rate of 10%. The survey resulted in a mean for Content Knowledge of approximately 2.4 and a mode of 2.0. These results suggest that employers rate our candidates acceptable or above in Content Knowledge.

Counseling and Principal internships use evaluation instruments to assess candidate performance. The Counseling Interns Evaluation Instrument is designed to allow supervisors a means to provide feedback about intern performance. The instrument comprises seven categories with indicators for each category. Candidates are scored on a five-point scale ranging from far below expectations to far above expectations. The overall candidate scores range between 3.86 and 4.28. This shows that our Counselors perform well in the area of Content Knowledge.

The Principal Intern Evaluation Instrument also allows field supervisors a means to evaluate intern performance. The Principal Intern Evaluation is composed of 21 categories with indicators for each category. Candidates are scored on a three-point scale that includes Target, Acceptable, and Unacceptable. The composite average of these categories show that 94% of the Principal interns scored in the "Target" range with 6% scoring in the "Acceptable" range. These percentages suggest that most of our internship candidates perform well during their internship.

2. How are data regularly used by candidates and faculty to improve their performance?

Candidates' performance is assessed through multiple strategies to assess proficiency levels. Candidates at all levels are required to reflect upon their teaching experiences and cite ways to improve their performance. Data from assessments such as GPA, internship Evaluations, electronic portfolios, and Student Opinion Surveys are used to generate candidate and faculty improvement plans as appropriate.

An evaluation of GPA also occurs at transition point II, advancement to candidacy. Candidates must complete 12 semester hours of required graduate courses with an average of at least 3.0. Candidates who do not satisfy this requirement are denied admission candidacy and advised of a course of action in order to correct any deficiencies or, in extreme cases, advised out of the program.

Counseling and Principal internships use evaluation instruments to assess candidate performance. The Counseling Interns Evaluation Instrument is designed to allow supervisors a means to provide feedback about intern performance. The instrument comprises seven categories with indicators for each category. Candidates are scored on a five-point scale ranging from far below expectations to far above expectations. The overall candidate scores range between 3.86 and 4.28. This shows that our Counselors perform well in the area of Content Knowledge.

The Principal Intern Evaluation Instrument also allows field supervisors a means to evaluate intern performance. The Principal Intern Evaluation is composed of 21 categories with indicators for each category. Candidates are scored on a three-point scale that includes Target, Acceptable, and Unacceptable. The composite average of these categories show that 94% of the Principal interns scored in the "Target" range with 6% scoring in the "Acceptable" range. These percentages suggest that most of our internship candidates perform well during their internship.

The Unit implemented an electronic Data Management System, TrueOutcomes, in the spring semester 2008. This system creates a comprehensive Professional Electronic Portfolio (PEP) that aligns with institutional, state, SPA, and NCATE standards within candidate's program areas. The PEP contains candidate-generated artifacts evaluated by the faculty using faculty developed rubrics for each artifact.

By evaluating these portfolios, faculty members are able to identify areas of improvement for the candidate as well as areas for program and unit improvement by a faculty feedback termed “Closing the Loop.” Artifacts include candidates’ experiences, written and oral work, reflections, and evidence of professional interactions.

The Student Opinion Survey which is a university wide assessment instrument completed by candidates in each course at the end of each semester, is a collection of questions designed to evaluate the material presented in the course and the effectiveness of the instructors delivery. It affords our candidates the opportunity to provide feedback to faculty.

3. How are data used to discuss or initiate program or unit changes on a regular basis?

Many program and unit changes have occurred within the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education since the installation of a new Dean and Associate Dean in January 2008. Examples of program changes are standardization of critical artifacts within and across course sections, the standardization of rubrics for these artifacts, hiring an new interim Director of Student Teaching and data reports that are regularly shared with faculty and community stakeholders. Examples of unit changes are the development of the website, implementation of an electronic data management system, TrueOutcomes, a summer retreat to discuss data and other NCATE related items, and the initiation of the weekly department chair meetings.

4. What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years?

Since the January 2008 has undergone a number of critical changes :

- A new dean has been hired for the College of Education.
- An associate dean was hired for the College
- A new Director of Teacher Education, was hired
- The roles of the Office of Data Management, Accreditation and Assessment have been clarified.
- The Dean’s Executive Council has assumed temporary responsibility for data analysis and decision until a viable, permanent committee can be established.

5. How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders?

For both initial and advanced programs, the Whitlowe R. Green College of Education Performance Assessment System collects data from each checkpoint and uses it to inform both the candidate and the program. Data summaries are compiled from the program requirements, state tests and electronic portfolio. The resulting data provides feedback to the candidate for the purpose of facilitating the candidate’s growth during the preparation process. By providing these assessment checkpoints for candidates, the program exemplifies the conceptual framework. Candidate, program, and external data are aggregated across semesters and academic years and disaggregated by program area.

In addition, program data is disaggregated by standards, allowing the unit to identify successful or problematic areas. Using the evaluation process, the department reviews the data and determines areas of strength, areas in need of improvement, and the impact on the program. Recommendations are then made to corresponding areas of the unit. This becomes the feedback loop in which aggregate and disaggregated data are reviewed for overall unit effectiveness. The feedback impacts decisions regarding

assessment, curriculum, field and clinical experiences, faculty teaching, policy, and/or the development of new programs. This refinement process provides quality assurance for the program and focuses the direction of the unit toward improving the preparation effectiveness for both Initial and Advanced programs.

Assessment data is shared with unit faculty and staff, relevant institution faculty and staff, and with community stakeholders through regularly scheduled departmental meetings, retreats, and Teacher Education Committee, and Graduate Education Committee meetings. In addition, the unit meets annually in August for a two-day retreat. Data from both initial and advanced programs undergo exhaustive review. Insights from faculty are shared and action plans for each of the candidate outcomes and program goals are designed to respond to areas of concern noted from the data.

These action plans are targets for immediate implementation for the next academic year and also become a part of the strategic planning process of the unit. The annual reports for the initial and advanced programs document planned changes in the programs resulting from the analyses, resources needed to implement the proposed changes, and means of assessing whether the changes have produced the desired outcome.

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the use of data for program improvement could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 2c. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 2?

Using the new TrueOutcomes electronic data management system to inform instruction and program and unit changes. Unit faculty examined assessments already in place and considered what needed to be added to create a more complete cycle of information to assist our advanced programs. The Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling (ELC) has put departmental artifacts and rubrics in place to measure teaching and learning. Conversations surrounding candidate data such as the results of candidates' TExES scores are discussed in departmental meeting to see how we can increase passage rates as well as assist those who did not pass the TExES. As a result, a schedule of review sessions have been implemented.

The department of Health and Human Performance reviews candidates' dispositions and makes program improvement decisions. The faculty self evaluate, review the dispositions of the candidates, and evaluate the data from the course (grades on examinations and assignments) to determine where the gaps are in order to improve delivery of information to future candidates. Thus, these actions improve program performance of future candidates, which should lead to a program based on best practices.

2. What research related to Standard 2 is being conducted by the unit?

We utilize data to help inform instruction. We make certain our candidates are reflecting the values illustrated by the Unit's conceptual framework and dispositions through class assignments, grades on artifacts, observations, and interviews of those professionals in the field who work with our candidates. In addition, in order to examine the impact of distant learning courses on candidate knowledge in, faculty and candidates were surveyed and the results published and presented at national and

international conferences. The purpose of the study as to identify “successes and pitfalls” of distant learning courses at HBCUs. We are also planning to conduct a study regarding the transition to an electronic assessment system.

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 personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

[Note: In this section institutions must address (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus and distance learning programs.]

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

1. Who are the unit's partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?

2. In what ways have the unit's partners contributed to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?

3. What is the role of the unit and its school partners in determining how and where candidates are placed for field experiences, student teaching, and internships?

4. How do the unit and its school partners share expertise and resources to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice?

5. What differences, if any, exist in collaboration with school partners in programs for other school professionals, off-campus programs, and distance learning programs?

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to collaboration between unit and school partners could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 3a. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access

most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

1. Please complete the following table (Table 7) to identify the field experiences and clinical practice required for each program or categories of programs (e.g., secondary) at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels, including graduate programs for licensed teachers.

Table 7
Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program

| Programs | Field Experiences | Clinical Practice (Student Teaching or Internship) | Total Number of Hours |
|----------|-------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | | | |

2. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards through field and clinical experiences in initial and advanced preparation programs?

3. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences and clinical practice?

4. What criteria are used in the selection of school-based clinical faculty? How are the criteria implemented? What evidence suggests that school-based clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals?

5. What preparation and ongoing professional development activities does school-based clinical faculty receive to prepare them for roles as clinical supervisors?

6. What evidence demonstrates that clinical faculty provides regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing graduate programs, and other school professionals?

7. What differences, if any, exist in the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice for programs for other school professionals, off-campus programs, and distance learning programs?

8. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions in field experiences and clinical practice could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 3b. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

1. What are the entry requirements for clinical practice? How many candidates are eligible for clinical practice each semester or year? How many complete successfully?

2. What is the role of candidates, university supervisors, and school-based faculty in assessing candidate performance and reviewing the results during clinical practice?

3. How is time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty incorporated into field experiences and clinical practice?

4. What data provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field experiences and clinical practice?

5. What is the process for candidates to collect and analyze data on student learning and reflect on those data and improve learning during clinical practice?

6. What differences, if any, exist in the ways candidates develop and demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn in field experiences and clinical practice in programs for other school professionals, off-campus programs, and distance learning programs?

7. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all student learn could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 3c. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in

the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 3?

2. What research related to Standard 3 is being conducted by the unit?

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.

[NOTE: In this section, institutions must address (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus and distance learning programs. Institutions should review NCATE's definition of diversity as this section is written.]

4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

1. What proficiencies related to diversity are candidates expected to develop and demonstrate?

2. What required coursework and experiences enable teacher candidates and candidates for other professional school roles to adapt instruction to different learning styles, connect instruction or services to students' experiences and cultures, communicate with students and families in culturally sensitive ways, incorporate multiple perspectives into teaching, develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity, demonstrate behaviors consistent with the ideas of fairness and the belief that all students can learn?

2a. (Optional) One or more tables related to coursework and experiences for developing diversity proficiencies could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about student learning should be discussed in the response to 4a2 above.

3. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate proficiencies related to diversity, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities?

3a. (Optional) One or more tables of key assessment data related to candidates' demonstration of proficiencies related to diversity, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities, could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about diversity proficiencies should be discussed in the response to 4a3 above.

4. What differences, if any, exist in the ways candidates develop and demonstrate their proficiencies related to diversity in programs for other school professionals, off-campus programs, and distance learning programs?

4a. (Optional) One or more tables that disaggregate data on diversity proficiencies by on-campus, off-campus, and distance learning programs could be attached here. What the data tell the unit about any differences in performance should be discussed in the response to 4a4 above.

5. (Optional) Links to key exhibits related to diversity proficiencies and assessments could be attached here. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

1. What educational interactions do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning programs) have with higher education and school-based faculty from diverse groups?

2. What knowledge and experiences do unit and clinical faculty have related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups?

3. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain a diverse faculty?

4. Please complete the following table (Table 8) to identify the gender, ethnic, and racial diversity of professional education faculty members using the U.S. Census categories.

Table 8
Faculty Demographics

| Table | Prof. Ed. Faculty in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%) | Prof. Ed. Faculty in Advanced Programs n (%) | All Faculty in the Institution n (%) | School-based faculty n (%) |
|---|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | | | | |
| Asian | | | | |
| Black, non-Hispanic | | | | |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | | | | |
| Hispanic | | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | | | | |
| Two or more races | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| Total | | | | |
| Female | | | | |
| Male | | | | |
| Total | | | | |

5. What do the data in Table 8 tell the unit about its faculty? Diversity characteristics beyond those in Table 8 should be discussed.

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to faculty diversity could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 4b. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

1. What educational interactions do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning programs) have with peers from diverse groups?

2. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups?

3. Please complete the following table (Table 9) to identify the gender, ethnic, and racial diversity of candidates preparing to work in P-12 settings using the U.S. Census categories.

**Table 9
Candidate Demographics**

| | Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%) | Candidates In Advanced Preparation Programs n (%) | All Students in the Institution n (%) | Diversity of Geographical Area Served by Institution (%) |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | | | | |
| Asian | | | | |
| Black, non-Hispanic | | | | |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | | | | |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Hispanic | | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | | | | |
| Two or more races | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| Race/ethnicity unknown | | | | |
| Total | | | | |
| Female | | | | |
| Male | | | | |
| Total | | | | |

4. How diverse are candidates in the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs? Diversity characteristics beyond those in Table 9 should be discussed. What do the data in Table 9 tell the unit about its candidates?

5. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to candidate diversity could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 4c. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

1. How does the unit ensure that each candidate has at least one field/clinical experience with students from ethnic/racial groups different than his/her own, English language learners, students with exceptionalities, and students from different socioeconomic groups?

2. How does the unit ensure that candidates develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical practice?

3. How does the unit ensure that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups?

4. Please complete the following table (Table 10) to identify the diversity of P-12 students based on their gender, ethnicity, racial, and socioeconomic levels, native language and exceptionalities in the schools in which education candidates do their clinical practice.

**Table 10
Demographics on Sites for Clinical Practice in Initial and Advanced Programs**

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | Students receiving | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------|--|--|

| Name of school | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian | Black, non-Hispanic | Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | Hispanic | White, non-Hispanic | Other | Race / ethnicity unknown | free / reduced price lunch (student socio-economic status) | English Language Learners | Students with Disabilities |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|-------|---------------------|---|----------|---------------------|-------|--------------------------|--|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

5. What do the data in Table 10 tell the unit about the diversity of students in the schools in which candidates do their clinical practice?

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the diversity of P-12 students in schools in which education candidates do their field experiences and clinical practice could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 4d. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 4?

2. What research related to Standard 4 is being conducted by the unit?

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.

[NOTE: In this section, institutions must address (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus and distance learning programs.]

5a. Qualified faculty

1. Please complete the following table (Table 11) to identify the qualifications of the full- and part-time professional education faculty. (These data may be compiled from the tables submitted earlier for national program review by clicking on "Import" below.)

Table 11

Faculty Qualification Summary

2. What do the data in Table 11 tell the unit about the qualifications of its faculty?

3. What expertise qualifies faculty members without terminal degrees for their assignments?

4. How does the unit ensure that school faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or are supervising?

5. What contemporary professional experiences in school settings does higher education clinical faculty have?

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to faculty qualifications could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 5a. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

1. How does instruction by professional education faculty reflect the conceptual framework as well as current research and developments in the fields?

2. How does unit faculty encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions?

3. What types of instructional strategies and assessments do unit faculty model?

4. How does unit faculty instruction reflect their knowledge and experiences in diversity and technology?

5. How does unit faculty systematically engage in self-assessment of their teaching?

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to faculty teaching could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 5b. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

1. What types of scholarly work are expected as part of the institution's and unit's mission?

2. In what types of scholarship activities are faculty engaged? How is their scholarship related to teaching and learning? What percentage of the unit's faculty is engaged in scholarship? [NOTE: Review the definition of scholarship in the NCATE glossary]

3. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to faculty scholarship could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 5c. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

1. What types of service are expected as part of the institution's and the unit's mission?

2. In what types of service activities are faculty engaged? Provide examples of faculty service related to practice in P-12 schools and service to the profession at the local, state, national, and international levels (e.g., through professional associations). What percentage of the faculty is actively involved in these various types of service activities?

3. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to faculty service could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 5d. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here.)

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

1. How are faculty evaluated? How regular, systematic, and comprehensive are the faculty evaluations for adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as for graduate teaching assistants?

2. How well do faculty perform on the unit's evaluations? (A table summarizing faculty performance could be attached at the end of Element 5e.)

3. How are faculty evaluations used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service?

4. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the unit's evaluation of professional education faculty could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 5e. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

1. How is professional development related to needs outlined in faculty evaluations? How does this happen?

2. What professional development activities are offered to faculty related to performance assessment, diversity, technology, emerging practices, and the unit's conceptual framework? What, if any, other professional development activities have been available to faculty over the past 2-3 years?

3. How often does faculty participate in professional development activities both on and off campus? [Note: Include adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants.]

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the unit's facilitation of professional development could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 5f. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 5?

2. What research related to Standard 5 is being conducted by the unit?

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.

[NOTE: In this section, institutions must address (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus and distance learning programs.]

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

1. How does the unit manage or coordinate the planning, delivery, and operation of all programs at the institution for the preparation of educators?

2. What members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation? In what ways do they participate?

3. How does the unit ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling?

4. What are the unit's recruiting and admissions policies? How does the unit ensure that they are clearly and consistently described in publications and catalogues?

5. How does the unit ensure that its academic calendars, catalogues, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current?

6. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to unit leadership and authority could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 6a. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

6b. Unit Budget

1. What is the budget available to support programs preparing candidates to meet standards? How does the unit's budget compare to the budgets of other units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other institutions?

2. What changes to the budget over the past few years have affected the quality of the programs offered?

3. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to the unit's budget could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 6b. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here. The number of attached exhibits should be limited in number; BOE members should access most of the exhibits in the unit's electronic exhibit room.)

6c. Personnel

1. What are the institution's workload policies? What are the unit's workload policies? What is included in the workloads of faculty (e.g., hours of teaching, advising of candidates, supervising student teachers, work in P-12 schools, independent study, research, and dissertation advisement)? How do workload policies differentiate between types of faculty positions?

2. What are the workloads of faculty for teaching and clinical supervision?

3. To what extent do workloads and class size allow faculty to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service (including time for such responsibilities as advisement, developing assessments, and online courses)?

4. How does the unit ensure that the use of part-time faculty contributes to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the unit and its programs?

5. What personnel provide support for the unit? How does the unit ensure that it has an adequate number of support personnel?

6. What financial support is available for professional development activities for faculty?

7. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to personnel could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 6c. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here.)

6d. Unit facilities

1. How adequate are unit facilities--classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, and school facilities--to support teaching and learning? [Note: Describe facilities on the main campus as well as the facilities at off-campus sites if they exist.]

2. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to unit facilities could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 6d. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here.)

6e. Unit resources including technology

1. What information technology resources support faculty and candidates? What evidence shows that candidates and faculty use these resources?

2. What resources are available for the development and implementation of the unit's assessment system?

3. What library and curricular resources exist at the institution? How does the unit ensure they are sufficient and current? How does the unit ensure the accessibility of resources to candidates, including candidates in off-campus and distance learning programs, through electronic means?

4. (Optional) One or more tables and links to key exhibits related to unit resources, including technology, could be attached here. Data in tables should be discussed in the appropriate prompt of 6e. (Links with descriptions must be typed into a Word document that can be uploaded here.)



Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 6?

2. What research related to Standard 6 is being conducted by the unit?