NCATE

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★ *Report*

Accreditation Visit to:

CHADRON STATE COLLEGE

1000 Main Street
Chadron, NE 69337
10/19/2008-10/21/2008

Type of Visit:
Focused visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Focused visit - Advanced Preparation

Board of Examiners Report

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Institution:

Chadron State College

Team Findings:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Standard Met	Standard Met
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
4. Diversity	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
6. Unit Governance and Resources	Standard Met	Standard Met

Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Provide a brief overview of the institution and the unit.

Chadron State College is the only four-year institution of higher learning in western Nebraska and is located in the scenic Pine Ridge area in the northwest corner of the state. It is located 300 miles from Denver, Colorado, to its southwest and is 425 miles west of the state capital of Lincoln. The college began as a normal school in 1911 and progressed to become Chadron State College in 1964. Thirty-one percent of the undergraduate degrees and 64 percent of the graduate degrees conferred by CSC are in education.

While it serves approximately 49 percent of the state's geographic area, only 11 percent of the state's population resides within that service area. The area served by the unit is geographically isolated and the college overcomes numerous challenges to meet the needs of a large geographic area with sparse population. The unit also serves portions of Colorado, Wyoming, South Dakota, and Kansas. The diversity of the area includes the Oglala Lakota Nation and a significant Hispanic population along with its predominantly white citizens of European decent.

Chadron State College is organized by schools that are managed by deans. The dean of the School of Education, Human Performance, Counseling, Psychology, and Social Work (EHPCPSW) serves as the unit head and works through the Department of Education and 12 other academic departments to administer the unit's programs. Tables 2 and 3 of the Institutional Report list the programs and the approvals granted by the state in 2006.

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

Nebraska is a partnership state and most NCATE visits are conducted shortly after the state program approval team's visit. However, this was a focused visit centering on Standards 2 and 6. Since all programs had already been approved during the regular visit in 2006 by the Nebraska State Department of Education following specific state criteria, no state team reports were presented. The official Board of Examiners team included three members. One state consultant and one NEA representative were present and assisting during the visit.

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

There are approximately 664 candidates in undergraduate programs and 113 in advanced programs. The unit offers parts of several programs (elementary education, secondary alternative certification, and advanced programs) via Instructional Television or on-line delivery. All distance learning programs do require that a portion of the program be completed on campus or face-to-face with unit faculty at the distance location.

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

There were no unusual circumstances affecting the visit.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

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

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

The conceptual framework of Chadron State College grows from the demands of the geographic region of the western high plains, a vast expanse of open land and sparse population. The unit seeks to "develop visionary leaders for lifelong learning" who will serve this geographically isolated region as leaders in educational settings and also local communities. In areas such as this with small populations it is the graduates of this unit that must become leaders in their schools for they may be the only one in their area of expertise in that location. Graduates also become leaders in the community because of the educational experiences they have had. The conceptual framework then fits inside the institution's strategic plan to promote leadership and innovation in the region.

The unit has identified six elements as the basis for curriculum, field experience and clinical practice, and unit assessment: assessment, communication, human relations/diversity, methodology/technology, professionalism, and thinking skills. The conceptual framework identifies the knowledge, skills, and dispositions for each of the key elements. Each program will vary the way the element is assessed, but

the six elements can be clearly seen in the key assessments from each program at both the initial and advanced levels. The conceptual framework has guided the development of the electronic assessment system. All programs use a common four-point rubric in all assessments. Coherence among all aspects of CSC programs and operations is developed and maintained through systematic communication in the Teacher Education Council.

III. STANDARDS

In its responses to each standard, the team should indicate when differences exist among the main campus, distance learning programs, and off-campus programs.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1. Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes   No

j n   j n

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼

Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

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

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

Student Learning for Other School Professionals	▼

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Preparation	▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Overall Assessment of Standard

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number &Text	AFI Rationale

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Advanced Preparation	▼

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 2 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes   No

j̇n   j̇n

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

2a. Assessment System

Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Assessment System – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The candidate outcomes outlined in the conceptual framework are clearly reflected in the assessment systems for both initial and advanced programs. The programs have identified proficiencies based on state and national standards. Programs at both levels have comprehensive sets of assessments that have been aligned with the conceptual framework.

The Teacher Education Committee (TEC), with guidance from its assessment sub-committee, is the body responsible for all policy and procedural decisions regarding the development and implementation of the unit assessment system. The assessment sub-committee meets regularly to discuss data and monitor indicators calling for program and unit change. The TEC includes members of the professional community and is supported by an assessment coordinator and two administrative assistants. The assessment system was redesigned following the 2006 NCATE visit. Important changes include the move away from five-point rubrics to standard four-point rubrics. While this change has complicated the ability to do longitudinal studies of data, it has promoted the use of universal scoring rubrics across initial teacher programs and advanced programs. It also makes it possible for the unit to track the consistency of other key assessments with grades and the four-point GPA scale.

The system for evaluating candidate performance in initial and advanced programs is accurately described in Table 6, pages 21 and 22 of the Institutional Report. Each undergraduate key assessment features a field-based experience evaluated by both unit and school-based faculty evaluators using common rubrics. The advanced programs have relevant culminating experiences and assessments that address their acquired expertise. All programs regularly survey graduates to monitor program quality.

The unit stresses multiple perspectives and training for assessors to assure fairness, consistency, and accuracy of scoring in assessments. The unit provides access to continuous training for cooperating teachers in relation to assessment tools they used in field and clinical experiences. The unit uses the eCollege course management system to provide 24-hour access to instruction (video, print, and audio) in how to use the necessary assessment tools and allows school faculty to download assessment instruments from the site. While assessments are currently mailed or e-mailed back to faculty supervisors, the unit will soon move to having the cooperating teachers complete the forms online. Follow-up surveys of program completers show that key assessments are accurate predictors of candidate success.

The unit's electronic system enables the faculty to access data and reports on candidates, cohorts, courses, and gateways. The unit is continuing to develop new report formats and encourages faculty to provide input into new ways of sorting and utilizing data.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The advanced program portion of the assessment system mirrors the initial programs in the scope of their alignment with standards and the conceptual framework, adherence to Nebraska's content knowledge criteria, use of a four-point rubric, and use of the electronic assessment system for maintenance of data. The assessment system for advanced programs gathers information that is used more for assisting candidates to apply knowledge as compared to the information gathered for undergraduates which tends to be used more direcftly to inform the unit about developmental needs and progress. Undergraduate and graduate faculty all serve together on the Teacher Education Committee and accept equal responsibility for candidate success and program and unit improvement.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit studied available software products for data collection, storage, and analysis but decided to utilize available technical personnel to develop its own integrated system, now called the CSC Educational Assessment System (EAS). This system interfaces with the CSC Student Information System (SIS) which is used by the entire college to collect and maintain vital information on all students and staff. Data points such as GPA and PPST scores are automatically retrieved from SIS by EAS. EAS generates, aggregates, and disaggregates data and provides reports to ensure that candidates are meeting standards.

Candidate data are entered into the system upon admission into the program, at the end of each term, at entry and exit into clinical practice and upon program completion. The system generates reports as needed by faculty and at least once per year prior to the unit's data retreat. The unit's annual data report is organized for review by the assessment sub-committee and the TEC. Each year program faculty review and analyze the data relevant to their programs in order to guide program and unit modifications. The unit provided a demonstration of the features of the system by candidate, gateway, assessment type, and cohort. Faculty can request additional report formats for special purposes.

The unit has a systematic appeals procedure for addressing candidate complaints. Grievances are maintained within confidential files in the unit head's office.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Same as above.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Data are systematically used to evaluate the unit at many levels. Data are collected at the candidate level through the Electronic Assessment System (EAS). Key assessments tied to the conceptual framework can be disaggregated by program, by delivery system, and by elements of the conceptual framework. The Teacher Education Council through regularly scheduled meetings and the annual data retreat review the many standard and specialized reports created by the EAS.

Faculty have access to the EAS system and can view program reports as well as information about individual candidates at any time through a web interface. Interviews with faculty revealed that they can easily articulate the capabilities of the EAS. Faculty report that they are only beginning to utilize the power of the EAS that they have built.

Even though the EAS has only been in place less then a year the unit has already begun to make a few changes. The agenda and summary of the recent data retreat meeting reveal changes to instruments and the assessment system, as well as programmatic changes.

At the initial level some differences between alternative and academy programs have been noted. These differences will be monitored by the unit to determine if this is a trend before changes are made in the program. The unit has also developed a content knowledge assessment to better determine candidates' content knowledge.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Data utilization is much the same for advanced level programs as initial level programs. Faculty from both initial and advanced programs meet together at the Teacher Education Committee and data retreats. Faculty teaching in the advanced programs have the same access as in the initial programs. The advanced programs have also made changes based on the review of data. One program added a required course to the curriculum to meet a low-scoring assessment item. Another program has added a course on assessment and strongly encourages all candidates to take this course.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has an assessment system that reflects the conceptual framework and professional and state standards and is regularly evaluated by the professional community. At each transition point decisions about candidate performance are made based on multiple assessments viewed from multiple perspectives. Data are systematically collected, stored, and analyzed by an electronic system. The unit can disaggregate candidate assessment by program, delivery method, and element of the conceptual framework. The institution has provided the unit with technical expertise and clerical assistance to utilize the current technological infrastructure to create a robust electronic assessment system. Data from the assessment system are systematically used by the unit to improve candidate performance and modify programs and unit operations.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

The unit has creatively utilized the institution's course management system to train cooperating teachers in the use of its assessment tools. This addresses the issues created by the large geographic service area. This solution takes into account the difficulty teachers face in traveling long distances for training on the unit's assessment tools. This method allows for just-in-time training of teachers.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number &Text	AFI Rationale
(1) The unit lacks a system that includes a comprehensive set of evaluation procedures for monitoring candidate performance, and managing and improving programs and unit operations.	The unit has redesigned the assessment system and assessment instruments, based the instruments on the conceptual framework, developed an effective electronic data collection system to store and analyze the data, and trained faculty and cooperating teachers in how to use the assessment tools and the electronic assessment

	system. They use the system to monitor and advise candidates and to make changes in programs and in the unit.
(2) Data are not regularly and systematically compiled, summarized, and analyzed for key assessments.	The unit's electronic assessment system (EAS) allows the unit to systematically compile, summarize, analyze, and report the data on key assessments. The unit has utilized the data to improve programs, assessment tools, and delivery methods.
(3) The unit has not implemented procedures to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency in the assessment of candidate performance, and to eliminate bias in assessment instruments.	The unit stresses multiple perspectives and training for assessors to assure fairness, consistency, and accuracy of scoring in assessments. The unit reviewed and redesigned its assessments to conform to a standard four-point rubric and checked to assure that every assessment is aligned with the conceptual framework.
(4) The unit lacks an adequate technological infrastructure to support and maintain the assessment system.	The unit has the necessary resources to provide hardware, software, and personnel to maintain a robust electronic assessment system. Every faculty member has access to the system on campus and elsewhere via the internet.

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met ▼
Advanced Preparation	Met ▼

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 3 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes   No

jn   jn

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Advanced Preparation	▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

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

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Advanced Preparation	▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

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

Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation	▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Overall Assessment of Standard

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 3

Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Advanced Preparation	▼

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

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.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 4 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes   No

jn   jn

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

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

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Advanced Preparation	▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation	▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation	▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

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

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation	▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Overall Assessment of Standard

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Advanced Preparation	▼

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

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.**

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 5 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes   No

ȷ⌐   ȷ⌐

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

5a. Qualified Faculty

Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation	▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

[ ]

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation	[▼]
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation	[▼]

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

[ ]

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation	[▼]
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation	[▼]

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

[ ]

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation	[▼]
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation	[▼]

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

[ ]

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation	[▼]
Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation	[▼]

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

| Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation | ▼ |
| Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation | ▼ |

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Overall Assessment of Standard

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs:

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 5

| Initial Teacher Preparation | ▼ |
| Advanced Preparation | ▼ |

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

> [blank text field]

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.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 6 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes   No

ʝ∩   ʝ∩

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

> [blank text field]

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

Unit Leadership and Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Leadership and Authority – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The School of Education, Human Performance, Counseling, Psychology, and Social Work (EHPCPSW) is identified as the unit with responsibility for all programs that offer preparation for school personnel. The dean of the unit provides leadership and has managerial responsibility and authority for all planning, programs, and resources that pertain to the preparation of school personnel at the initial and advanced levels.

The Education Department is a part of the unit and provides preparation for degrees in Elementary Education and Special Education. Candidates seeking preparation to teach at the middle and secondary levels receive pedagogical preparation in the Education Department but their teaching content preparation, identified as teaching endorsement (consistent with their major), is provided by other departments at the College in the Arts and Sciences.

The leadership in the unit assures that programs, procedures, committees, councils, and assessment systems required for preparing school personnel, are established and maintained. This organizational structure encourages cooperation and collaboration between departments at the College and P-12 school personnel. Documentation indicates that current students in the unit receive approximately $202,610.00 in scholarship money that obviously attracts them to the institution and specifically to the unit.

The dean of the EHPCPSW serves as the unit head and chairs the Teacher Education Committee that oversees governance of the unit. All documents that pertain to teacher education, including assessment data, are reviewed and approved by the Teacher Education Committee. The committee meets at least four times per year and at other times by request of the chairperson or by one of the committee members. The membership includes the dean of EHPCPSW and chair of the Graduate Council, secondary subject area special methods instructors/professors, elementary/middle grades methods instructors/professors, secondary education professors, graduate administration professors, director of field experiences, two school administrators (or their designees) from Nebraska Public School Districts, and a student representative, majoring in either early childhood, elementary middle grades, or secondary education. The Teacher Education Program Bylaws do not require teacher practitioners to serve on the Teacher Education Committee.

A committee structure is established that assists the dean in managing the unit. The Faculty Senate Academic Review Committee and the Unit Screening Committee have major responsibilities for admission to all programs in the unit. They also assure that all unit program entrance and admissions policies and exit criteria are described in unit brochures and college publications. The Faculty Senate Academic Review Committee governs curriculum and policy for undergraduate programs. The Unit Screening Committee oversees entrance standards for undergraduate education candidates and admission to all programs; and the Faculty Senate Graduate Council governs entrance standards, curriculum and policy for graduate programs.

6b. Unit Budget

Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The unit head (dean for EHPCPSW) has managerial authority for the operational budgets for education, physical education, health, special education, counseling, and psychology. The unit is not dependent on grants for the operation of any of its programs. The budget for the unit is based on number of faculty, number of students, and operational costs. Though it shows a small annual percentage increase over the last three years, the budget provides sufficient support for professional development, coursework, and field supervision consistent with preparation of school personnel at the initial and advanced levels. A review of the budget verifies that the unit received annual budgetary increases for the past five years. The 2007 and 2008 increases in the budget provided additional funds for operations, professional development, and for using state-owned vehicles to transport students for field trips.

Professional development funds are available annually for each full time faculty member in the unit in the amount of $500.00 per year. Additional funding is available for professional development upon request by unit faculty members from four sources; unit discretionary funds, the Faculty Senate, Department Funds, and Rural Education Funds. These sources increase professional development funds to a level of at least $1,000.00 per faculty member annually.

Faculty in the unit received professional development during the past five years through unit technology

initiatives. They participated in on-campus technology training to establish the unit assessment system that would reflect the elements in the conceptual framework and enhance teaching and learning in media-rich classrooms used for teacher preparation courses.

6c. Personnel

Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Personnel – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The unit has 11 full-time faculty; seven part-time faculty, who are full-time at the college; eight part-time or adjunct faculty; and four full-time professional staff at the college who are part-time in the unit. The workloads are established by the college through the negotiated agreement for the State College System and include teaching, scholarship, and service. They are regulated by the Nebraska Department of Education and reflect accreditation requirements at the state level plus recommendations from NCATE.

Workloads for full-time tenure track faculty in the unit are 30 credit hours per academic year. Twenty-four credit hours are for teaching per academic year that includes instruction, advising, independent study, and supervision. Six credit hours are for scholarship and service per academic year. Scholarship includes applied research, presentations, publications, grants, and professional leadership roles. Service includes working on campus committees, working with P-12 districts, and service to the professional community. Mentoring responsibilities provided by full-time faculty to adjunct faculty who teach distance learning courses are not reflected in the workload calculations for full-time faculty.

The faculty/student ratio for teaching is 1/17 and unit faculty who teach two or more graduate courses have their workloads reduced to 18 credit hours per academic year. Unit faculty teaching one graduate course per academic year are assigned a 21 credit hour teaching load. Unit faculty teaching undergraduate courses have a 24 credit hour workload per academic year. In addition to teaching, faculty advise students, evaluate benchmark portfolios, assist with accreditation activities, serve on college and state committees, and participate in professional organizations.

Part-time (adjunct) faculty contribute to successful preparation of initial and advanced candidates. The unit provides them with a required orientation that informs them of unit policies and procedures for initial and advanced programs. These faculty are qualified for their assignments consistent with the credentials of full-time faculty, and they know and can apply the conceptual framework in their teaching and supervision activities.

The chair of the Education Department serves as chair of the Screening Committee and Certification Officer for the unit. Clerical assistance to the Education Department is provided by an Office Assistant who is located in Hildreth Hall. The unit receives substantial support for unit assessment from the director of institutional assessment. Approximately thirty percent of this person's work time is devoted to assessment and data management for the unit.

6d. Unit Facilities

Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Unit facilities reflect the high value the institution places on teacher preparation at the initial level, and preparation programs at the advanced level. The buildings demonstrate consistent maintenance to assure that teaching and learning occur in environments that are clean and orderly for faculty, administrators, and diverse student populations.

The office for the dean of the unit is located in the Miller Building, a building which was renovated in 1999 and is handicapped accessible. The School Counseling Program and the classrooms where many of the education courses for the unit are currently taught at the initial and advanced levels are also located in Miller Hall. The classroom facilities incorporate multimedia and distance learning technologies consistent with a quality learning environment. Two classrooms are designed for interactive television (ITV); one uses T-1 technology and the other uses POD fiber optics.

Each full-time faculty member with an office in Miller Hall has a private office with a multimedia computer, a phone with voice mail, high speed internet access, and email. The two office assistants located in Miller Hall who provide clerical support, have individual office spaces, and also have up-to-date technology with a laser color printer that is networked to all department computers.

The Department of Education is a part of the unit and is housed in Hildreth Hall. Though it is a vintage building and scheduled for renovation, Hildreth Hall has a state of the art technology instructional laboratory, three multimedia classrooms, individual office spaces for faculty, and is handicapped accessible. A multimedia cart is available for faculty use to facilitate electronic presentations, and sufficient electronic smart-boards and printers are available. One faculty office contains a library of children's literature that is available to students preparing to teach.

In January 2009 the Education Department will move from Hildreth Hall to a newly-renovated campus building with wireless capability in all areas, state of the art classrooms, individual office spaces for education faculty, conference rooms, and staff spaces fully equipped with current technology.

6e. Unit Resources including Technology

Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Unit classrooms provide wireless and direct connect internet access, a web-based student information system, an on-line course management system (eCollege's E-companion system). Computer laboratories are located throughout the campus in appropriate buildings and classrooms, and a computer service unit is available at the College to address technological concerns.

All candidates at the initial level, candidates in advanced programs, faculty, and staff have access to state of the art technology in the unit. Students complete a multimedia course that prepares them to use a variety of informational technologies. The Computer Center provides faculty and staff with professional development and technical assistance to prepare them to use and purchase appropriate hardware, software, and other technical equipment. Syllabi and interviews provide evidence of the consistent use of technology in faculty offices and in all courses. Instructional activities and assignments in syllabi reflect library research and web enhancement using the eCollege course management system. Evidence indicates that technology used by faculty (in their offices and in classrooms), and for candidates in the curriculum laboratory is current and updated on a regular basis.

The Unit Assessment Committee worked collaboratively with personnel in the Computer Center at the college to technically design the electronic assessment system (EAS). The unit Assessment Committee utilized a consultant to ensure that the content design was consistent with the conceptual framework of the unit and all technical requirements could be integrated. Technology hardware and software are available to implement the assessment system in the unit and a percentage of the work time of the Computer Center Director is specifically allocated to the unit to ensure the success of the assessment system.

The full service King Library provided by the institution provides sufficient support and resources for in-house research and on-line research. Candidates in the initial and advanced level programs may access library resources through their MyCSC portal. The library contains sufficient curricula and instructional materials required to support all courses taught in the unit at the initial and advanced levels. Library requisitions are made by unit faculty for middle grades and secondary content knowledge from their department budgets to support their content courses, and the faculty in the Education Department use their library budget allocations to make requisitions to support professional studies. Library personnel provide support services (as required) to supplement and enhance instruction in the unit. Space is available for students to receive classroom instruction or participate in group presentations

Overall Assessment of Standard

The dean of the unit is recognized at the college and throughout the local and state academic communities as the leader responsible for providing governance and management for the preparation of professional educators at Chadron State College. The unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations to design, manage, and coordinate all programs that offer initial teacher preparation, and preparation of other school personnel for P-12 schools. Funds are available to employ a sufficient number of qualified faculty and provide professional development opportunities.

The unit has developed and implemented an assessment system and adequate technology is visibly used to enhance teaching and learning in classrooms, computer laboratories, and faculty/staff offices. Faculty workloads are consistent with state standards and allow faculty to demonstrate best practice in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

The institution has recognized the value and sophistication of the electronic assessment system developed by the unit as a model for other academic units across campus. The process of developing the system has served as a model of collaboration among academic and support entities.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1.The unit lacks authority to plan, operate, and deliver coherent programs of study.	1.Since the last NCATE visit in 2006, the interim dean of the School of Education has been appointed dean of the School of Education and head of the unit. The dean has the responsibility and authority to govern and manage all programs and resources at the initial and advanced levels that are offered to prepare school personnel for P-12 schools. The dean serves as a member of the administrative team at the college and meets regularly with the president and vice presidents. Personnel with programmatic responsibilities in teacher preparation are recognized as members of the unit. A committee and council structure operates to assure inclusion of all faculty, staff, students and P-12 administrators in decisions that impact the management programs at the initial and advanced levels.
2.The unit lacks sufficient budgetary allocations to support programs at levels that prepare candidates to meet standards.	2. The unit is not dependent on grants for the operation of any of its programs. The unit budget is based on number of faculty, number of students, and operational costs that provide sufficient support for professional development, coursework, and field supervision consistent with preparation of school personnel at the initial and advanced levels. A review of the budget verifies that the unit received small budgetary increases annually for the past five years. Though the increases were small, they occurred at a time when other deans did not receive budget increases. The 2007 and 2008 budget increases provided additional funds for operations, professional development, and for using state-owned vehicles to transport students for field trips. Annual professional development funds in the amount of $500.00 are available to each full-time faculty member in the unit. Faculty, however receive at least $1,000.00 annually because additional funding (upon request) is available from other sources in the unit and at the college.
3.Workloads do not allow faculty members to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, service, and assessment.	3. Workloads are established by the college through the negotiated agreement for the State College System and include teaching, scholarship, and service. They are regulated by the Nebraska Department of Education and reflect accreditation requirements at the state level plus recommendations from NCATE. Workloads for full-time tenure track faculty in the unit are 30 credit hours per academic year. Twenty-four credit hours are for teaching per academic year that includes instruction, advising, independent study, and supervision. Six credit hours are for scholarship and service per academic year. The unit has 11 full-time faculty; seven part-time faculty, who are full-time at the college, eight part-time or adjunct faculty; and four full-time professional staff at the college who are part-time in the unit. The faculty/student ratio for teaching is 1/17 and unit faculty who teach two or more graduate courses have their workloads reduced to 18 credit hours per academic year. Unit faculty teaching one graduate course per academic year are assigned a 21 credit hour teaching load. Unit faculty teaching undergraduate courses have a 24 credit hour workload per academic year. Substantial support is received for unit assessment from the director of institutional assessment who provides 30 percent work-time to assessment and data management.
4.The unit lacks adequate technology and personnel resources to	4.The Unit Assessment Committee worked collaboratively with personnel in the Computer Center at the college to technically design the electronic assessment system (EAS). Technology hardware and software are available to implement the assessment system in the unit and a percentage of the work time of the Computer Center director is allocated to the unit to ensure the success of the assessment system. All candidates at the initial level, candidates in advanced programs, faculty, and staff have access to state of the art technology in the unit that is current and updated on a regular basis. Unit classrooms provide wireless and direct connect internet access, a web-based student information system, an on-line course

	management system (eCollege's E-companion system). Instructional activities and assignments in syllabi reflect library research and web enhancement, and computer laboratories are located throughout the campus in appropriate buildings and classrooms. A computer service unit is available at the college to address technological concerns. Candidates complete a multimedia course that prepares them to use a variety of informational technologies that include accessing library resources through their MyCSC portal. The Computer Center provides faculty and staff with professional development and technical assistance to prepare them to use and purchase appropriate hardware, software, and other technical equipment.
develop and implement an assessment system.	

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 6

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met ▼
Advanced Preparation	Met ▼

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Consistent with statements written in standard #2, the number of credit hours for faculty workload should be reported per academic year.