# NCATE

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

# BOARD OF EXAMINERS

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★ *Report*

Accreditation Visit to:

# 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

# Board of Examiners Report

## SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

**Institution:**

| Prairie View A & M University |
| --- |

**Team Findings:**

| Standards | Initial | Advanced |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice | 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 | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |

Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

## I. INTRODUCTION

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

Prairie View A&M University, the second oldest public institution of higher education in Texas, originated in the Texas Constitution of 1876. It is a land grant university authorized under the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. 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. 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 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 and the Northwest Houston Corridor. Prairie View A&M University 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.

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 as a result of this funding, the university's enrollment now exceeds

8,500, including more than 2,000 graduate students, and has awarded some 46,000 academic degrees.

Prairie View A&M University 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. 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.

**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?**

This visit focused on NCATE Standards 1 and 2. There were no state team members participating in this visit. The team consisted of three NCATE Board of Examiners members. A representative from the Texas Education Agency, Tabita Gutierrez, made a presentation to the team on Sunday entitled, "The Texas Perspective: Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP)." She did not remain 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.).**

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, in the Woodlands, Texas. Candidates enrolled at any of the off-campus or distance learning centers cannot take more than 50 percent of their coursework off campus. These candidates are assessed using the same key assessments as on the main campus.

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

The current administrative team of the unit was not hired until January 2008. The full visit took place in spring 2006. The unit received a "not met" rating for Standards 1 and 2. The unit administration at that time did not address these issues. When the current administration was hired in January 2008, there were additional obstacles when the dean was hospitalized for five weeks. He was able to work with his team from the hospital and then was back on campus in February 2008. The administrative team has made significant progress in the past 10 months in addressing the areas for improvement listed in the report.

Data for the Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction programs were not reported in the institutional report (IR). These programs include the MEd/MSEd Curriculum & Instruction with a concentration in: agriculture education, educational media & technology, elementary education (early childhood education), home economics, industrial education, mathematics education, reading education, and science education; the MAEd/MEd Curriculum & Instruction with a concentration in: English education and music education; the MEd/MSEd in Special Education; and the MEd/MS in Health & Physical Education with a concentration in: health education and physical education. The unit provided data during the visit on candidate dispositions and candidate artifacts for the advanced teacher preparation programs. In fall 2008, there were a total of 114 candidates enrolled these programs. D

The unit stated that during the 2006 visit they were told by the BOE chair of that team that it did not have to report on these programs because the programs did not lead to licensure. As a result, the 2008 focused visit team was unaware that these programs existed until they arrived on campus. The team did request documentation of these programs and included the data provided by the institution in this report.

## 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 mission of the unit focuses on preparing educators to work in a multicultural world where change occurs constantly. The unit firmly believes 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." The acronym for the conceptual framework is E-FOLD-P. 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 unit's 12 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) be knowledgeable of ones' subject area (6) use ongoing 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 and are aligned with the four themes of the conceptual framework and the 12 unit core values. At the initial and advanced levels, the assessment system has been designed to measure both candidate and program performance and serve as a guide for candidate development and program refinement. There are four transition points for both initial and advanced programs. The system also provides feedback for reviewing and refining unit programs, helps to ensure effective alignment of policy and practice, and provides data for program improvement.

Faculty and candidates clearly articulated how the conceptual framework is integrated into courses, assignments, and the assessment system. Coherence among all aspects of unit programs and operations is developed and maintained through systematic communication among them. These actions include, but are not limited to, regular meetings of the Executive Council, program meetings, and College of Education meetings. Feedback from candidates is brought to these meetings either directly by candidates or through faculty.

## 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                                                    j

**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 | Acceptable ▼ |
| Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation | Acceptable ▼ |

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

The Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES) is required for all initial teacher preparation candidates by the state for licensure and is comprised of two parts: the content knowledge section and the Pedagogy and Professional Roles (PPR) test. Data from the content portion of this test are reported for all initial licensure programs and indicate an overall unit-wide pass rate of better than 80 percent. A summary is provided in Table 4 of the IR and a corrected version was provided onsite. This corrected version indicates a 90 percent pass rate for initial preparation candidates in 2007-2008 partial year and a final 85.3 percent pass rate for initial program completers in the last full year of data in 2006-2007. Considering data from the last three years, nine of 23 programs indicated a pass rate below 80 percent, all of them with fewer than 10 candidates taking the exam: Language arts and reading (8-12), mathematics (4-8), life science (8-12), mathematics (8-12), music (EC-12), physical education (EC-12), science (4-8), and social studies (8-12) and advanced superintendent. Four programs had no test takers: art (8-12), generalist ESL (EC-4), physics/mathematics (8-12), and Spanish (8-12).

A second critical assessment of content for the undergraduate initial programs is candidate major GPA calculated at Transition Point II. Data for this assessment indicate that 91.5 percent of the initial candidates score at a target level of 3.0 in 2006-2007. Candidates interviewed onsite appeared knowledgeable and well prepared in their content areas.

Survey data for initial preparation program graduates indicate that 97 percent of the candidates felt that their preparation for "knowledge of subject area" was acceptable or target. The response rate for the

spring 2008 survey was 100 percent (N=33). These data were corroborated by interviews with graduates onsite.

### Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

No aggregated content knowledge data are available for the advanced non-licensure programs. Key assessments within the core courses emphasize advanced pedagogy related to student learning, but data from these courses have not yet been implemented within the TrueOutcomes assessment system. Advanced teacher preparation candidates were able to articulate key concepts and content knowledge expectations within onsite interviews.

### 1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

| | |
|---|---|
| Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable ▼ |
| Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation | Acceptable ▼ |

### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Both initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation candidates were able to discuss in onsite interviews the instructional strategies they learned or improved through their programs at PVAMU. They were knowledgeable and experienced in the application of instructional technology and reported a variety of technology use modeled within their classes.

For initial undergraduate candidates, assessments show that candidates have a clear understanding of instructional strategies connecting content and pedagogical knowledge. The assessments used to assess pedagogical content knowledge for these candidates include the state Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility (PPR) exam and the Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS). Data for these assessments in 2005-2007 indicate an overall pass rate of 85 percent on the PPR and that 95 percent of the PDAS scores lie above 3.5 on a 4.0 scale.

For initial graduate (alternative certification) candidates, assessments show that candidates have a clear understanding of instructional strategies connecting content and pedagogical knowledge. The assessments used to assess pedagogical content knowledge for these candidates include the same as for traditional undergraduate candidates. Data from these assessments from 2006-2007 indicate an 85 percent pass rate on the PPR. Disaggregated PDAS summaries were not available for alternative certification candidates, but examination of individual scores indicates a pass rate above 80 percent.

Domain II-9 on the PDAS is used to evaluate candidate use of technology. Aggregate means for Domain II-9 indicate a target level of proficiency each semester from fall 2005 through fall 2007.

### Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Advanced candidates demonstrated an in-depth understanding of pedagogy and learning. Faculty within the advanced programs were able to articulate numerous assignments for encouraging acquisition of technology and in-depth understanding of pedagogy and learning.

No data are available for the advanced non-licensure programs. Key assessments within the core courses emphasize advanced pedagogy related to student learning, but data from these courses have not yet been implemented within the TrueOutcomes assessment system.

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable ▼ |
| Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation | Acceptable ▼ |

### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Initial teacher preparation, advanced preparation, and other school personnel candidates shared numerous instances in which they were able to apply professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills gained from their coursework in field experiences and class projects. Within these experiences, candidates were required to analyze and apply research and best practice models and to reflect on their experiences. Consideration of school, family, and community contexts was required within the 12 identified dispositions measured in every class and was evident in threaded assignments mapped throughout all programs.

Key assessments that measure initial candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills include GPA in professional education core classes, Domains II and IV of the PDAS, and candidate-generated artifacts in the Professional Education Portfolio (PEP). GPAs monitored at Transition II indicated that 91.5 percent of candidates maintained a grade point average above 3.0. Analysis of scores from the PDAS domains aligned with professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills indicates that candidates perform at the target level on these assessments. Preliminary data from spring 2008 implementation of the PEP indicate that 95 percent of candidates score at 3.5 or target on summative scores for such key assessment items as field journals, written and oral work, and evidence of professional interactions.

Education graduates and their employers were also surveyed in spring 2008. Results from 98 percent of graduates surveyed indicate a target level perception of preparation for professional and pedagogical knowledge. An area-wide survey of local schools yielded only a 10 percent return rate from 350 potential employers, who indicated an acceptable rating (mean 2.4) for satisfaction with candidates' pedagogical skills and knowledge.

### Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

No data are available for the advanced non-licensure programs. Key assessments within the core courses emphasize advanced pedagogy related to student learning, but data from these courses have not yet been implemented within the TrueOutcomes assessment system.

## 1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

| Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable ▼ |
|---|---|
| Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation | Acceptable ▼ |

### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Interviews with initial teacher preparation candidates and observations of candidate teacher work samples provided onsite demonstrated that they felt confident in their ability to 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. Assessments used to document these abilities include PPR scores, GPA, PDAS, and follow-up surveys of graduates and employers.

Specifically, Domain III, "Implementing Effective, Responsive Instruction and Assessment" of the PPR deals directly with this element. Domains 3, 4, and 7 on the PDAS are also aligned with the skills in this element. Candidate scores on these domains from 2006-07 indicate that all program means exceeded the acceptable rating and that all but two program means scored in the target rating.

Follow-up surveys of graduates in spring 2008 supported observations with a self-efficacy rating of "acceptable" (2.520) for "working with students with disabilities, Effective strategies for differentiation among students, Using data to improve teaching, and Working with diverse populations." Return rate was 98 percent of 35 candidates. Ninety percent of employers surveyed rated graduates' performances as "acceptable" in "using data to improve teaching."

### Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

No data are available for the advanced non-licensure programs. Key assessments within the core courses emphasize advanced pedagogy related to student learning, but data from these courses have not yet been implemented within the TrueOutcomes assessment system.

### 1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

| Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals | Acceptable ▼ |
|---|---|

### Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Candidate and faculty interviews verified that technology applications are threaded throughout the advanced programs and that candidates are able to apply research in their coursework and internships prior to program completion.

In regard to content, advanced candidates in licensure programs are required to take the TExES for content. The pass rates for this test in 2006-2007 are 89.6 percent overall, with 85.7 percent for educational diagnostician, 87.1 percent in the principal, 94.1 percent in counseling, 100 percent in school librarian, and 0 percent (a single candidate did not pass) in superintendent; for 2007-2008 pass rates are 94.4 percent for school counselor, 94.2 percent for principal, no test takers in school librarian, and no test takers in superintendent.

Other key assessments maintained in the TrueOutcomes PEP require use of technology, creation of school and district technology plans, and review/reflection on current research regarding application of

technology into classroom instruction.

Follow up surveys conducted in the spring 2008 semester resulted in a return rate of 20 percent for a total N of 79 graduates from the counseling and principal preparation programs. Responses indicated that graduates felt prepared in "knowledge of subject area content" at the target level (mean =2.76 on a three-point scale) and in "Preparation related to knowledge and skills in their field" (mean = 2.69). Eighty-nine percent felt well prepared in "effective integration of technology."

### 1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

| Student Learning for Other School Professionals | Acceptable ▼ |
|---|---|

### Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

All programs for other school professionals require portfolios aligned with state and national association standards. Professional knowledge and skills are assessed in clinical evaluation instruments by program and field-based faculty. Other key assessments include GPA, TrueOutcomes Professional Education Portfolio (PEP), internship evaluations, and graduate and employer surveys.

A second test of content for the advanced candidates in licensure programs (School Counseling and Leadership) is GPA at transition points 1 and 2. Numerous course-based assessments are being readied for tracking with the TrueOutcomes key assessments and include assessment of candidates' abilities to work with students, families, and communities; use data and current research to inform practices; and use technology in their practices. Examples of artifacts threading this element within the assessment rubric include the Research Paper over Special Programs in ADMIN5053 and numerous research article readings and reflections in multiple courses. The pass rates for 2006-2007 are 92.4 percent at Transition 1 and 91.5 percent at Transition 2. All candidates are required to maintain a 3.0 GPA at Transition 3 and 4.

Additionally, 97.2 percent of all advanced program candidates in other school personnel programs achieved a target rating of 3.5 on a 4.0 scale on professional program artifacts presented via the TrueOutcomes portfolio.

The Counseling Interns Evaluation Instrument assesses seven categories that includes, Domain I, Basic Work Requirements, and Domain V, Interactions with Client which are aligned with knowledge of students, families, and communities; use of data and current research to inform practices; and use technology in their practices. Candidates from spring 2008 scored means of 4.28 and 4.12 on a five-point scale, indicating target performances on these requirements.

The Principal Intern Evaluation Instrument contains a similar component using a three-point scale; 94 percent of the spring 2008 candidates scored at target, with the remaining six percent scoring at acceptable.

Follow up surveys conducted in the spring 2008 semester resulted in a return rate of 20 percent for a total N of 79 graduates from the counseling and principal preparation programs. Responses indicate that graduates feel prepared for "working with individuals with disabilities, effective strategies in management, using data to improve student learning, and working with diverse populations" at the target level (mean =2.79 on a three-point scale). Follow up surveys of employers of these candidates yielded 33 responses (10 percent return rate), indicating a 2.52 rating on these same elements.

## 1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

| | |
|---|---|
| Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation | Acceptable ▼ |
| Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Preparation | Acceptable ▼ |

### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

A review of the data, summary matrix provided onsite, and interviews from faculty and candidates confirmed that candidates are knowledgeable about the professional dispositions of the unit and that the professional dispositions are aligned with the conceptual framework and assessed within programs using candidate portfolio artifacts in TrueOutcomes.These dispositions include measures for candidates' behaviors consistent with fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Assessment of candidates' dispositions in working with students, families, and communities takes place throughout the programs. Evidence of this is located in the IR attachment entitled "Disposition, Conceptual Framework and Unit Core Matrix.doc." The unit monitors candidates' professional dispositions at all transition points in the program, assessing them with a standard rubric.

The dispositions assessment instrument is administered to all candidates at each course across all initial and advanced programs, both licensure and non-licensure. Summative data for all candidates since January 2008 presented in the IR attachment entitled, "Dispositions, Initial and Advanced.doc," indicate the pass rates (scoring acceptable or target): for all initial preparation programs was 99 percent.

### Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

The unit monitors candidates' professional dispositions at all transition points in the program, assessing them with a standard rubric. Summative disposition assessment data for all candidates since January 2008 indicate that 99 percent of the Curriculum and Instruction candidates score at the acceptable or target level on the standard disposition assessment. A review of the data, summary matrix provided onsite, and interviews from faculty and candidates confirmed that the professional dispositions are aligned with the conceptual framework and assessed within programs using candidate portfolio artifacts in TrueOutcomes.

### Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Summative disposition assessment data for all candidates since January 2008 indicate the following pass rates (scoring acceptable or target): educational administration, 99 percent; educational leadership, 100 percent; supervision, 98 percent; counseling, 99 percent; curriculum and instruction, 99 percent; initial preparation programs in instruction and curriculum, 99 percent; and health and human performance, 99 percent.

A review of the data, summary matrix provided onsite, and interviews with faculty and candidates confirmed that the professional dispositions are aligned with the conceptual framework and assessed within programs using candidate portfolio artifacts in TrueOutcomes. The unit monitors candidates' professional dispositions at all transition points in the program, assessing them with a standard rubric.

### Overall Assessment of Standard

Initial teacher preparation candidates and other school personnel know the content they are to teach and in their professional fields. Interviews with advanced teacher candidates indicate that they have in-depth

knowledge of their fields and pedagogy, but data are not yet available to corroborate this. Pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and candidate assessment of student learning are measured with multiple state instruments and reflect high achievement by candidates.

Dispositions are measured with a single standard instrument throughout all programs and levels within the unit and indicate a high level of performance. The 12 dispositions within the instrument are well developed with benchmarks and indicators that include diversity and working with all students, schools, families, and communities.

**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 |
|---|---|
| 1.1 (Initial Teacher Preparation) According to the last available data, 2004, the pass rate on content tests was less than 80 percent. | The overall pass rate for state content tests for the past three years was above 80 percent. |
| 1.2 The unit lacks performance assessment data that indicates the quality of performance of program candidates. | A new technology-assisted assessment system has been implemented since January 2008 and now provides adequate data to monitor candidate performance with the exception of advanced teacher preparation candidates. |
| 1.3 The unit does not clearly and consistently identify or assess dispositions. | The unit has established a clear set of 12 dispositions with indicators and consistently assesses them throughout all programs. |

### AFIs from last visit: Continued

| AFI Number & Text | AFI Rationale |
|---|---|
| None | |

### New AFIs

| AFI Number & Text | AFI Rationale |
|---|---|
| 1.1 The unit lacks consistent performance assessment data that indicate the quality of performance of advanced non-licensure program candidates. | Data from key performance assessments within the advanced teacher preparation programs have not yet been fully implemented within the TrueOutcomes system and were not available. |

### Recommendation for Standard 1

| 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 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

jn                                                           jn

**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 unit has designed an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on both initial and advanced teacher preparation and other school personnel programs. The unit's assessment system includes the collection and analysis of data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs at regular intervals by different groups within the unit. The assessment system was developed in collaboration with the professional community.

Oversight for the unit's assessment system is housed primarily in the Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Data Management (OAADM). All data gathered from the key assessments in each program are reviewed by OAADM and disseminated to the respective program committees for continued review and analysis. Program committees function within departments at the program level as assessment review committees to examine aggregated program, candidate performance and relevant unit data in order to make judgments about program effectiveness.

The Executive Council of the Whitlow R. Green College of Education is temporarily serving in the dual capacity of the Unit Assessment Committee (UAC). The UAC specifies that all programs (initial and advanced) through the respective program committee establish and maintain a Program Assessment Plan

(PAP) and conduct a program assessment review at least once annually in accordance with the program plan. Minimally, all program assessment plans outline multiple evaluation measures to include transition points for the program, program admission, admission to clinical practice/internship, exit from clinical practice, and program exit. At each transition point, candidates are informed of program status including options for those candidates who fail to meet the established criteria to move forward in the program.

It is evident that the unit is using the diverse components of TrueOutcomes to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of the assessment of candidate performance. As they continue to implement TrueOutcomes, faculty indicate that they need to continue to explore strategies to incorporate a procedure into the assessment system to determine if key assessments are predictors of candidate success.

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

The unit's assessment system describes a single system that includes initial and advanced teacher preparation programs as well as programs that prepare personnel for other professional roles in schools. However, the advanced teacher preparation programs (M. Ed. - Curriculum and Instruction) are not fully integrated into the unit's assessment system.

See detailed response in Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation.

### 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 regularly and comprehensively gathers, compiles, and analyzes assessment and evaluation information on candidates, graduates, courses, and programs at initial and advanced levels. The Whitlowe R. Green College of Education approved the adoption and implementation of TrueOutcomes, effective fall 2007, as the information technology management system for the revised unit assessment system. TrueOutcomes is used by the unit to collect, analyze, and evaluate assessment data comprehensively and systematically on candidates, courses, programs, field experiences and faculty. All candidates, initial and advanced, have TrueOutcomes accounts that allow them to document the knowledge, skills, and dispositions they acquire as they progress through their educational program. Candidates are now able to keep a personal record of their artifacts as well as the courses they have completed in their TrueOutcomes ePortfolio. Effective spring 2008, the use of TrueOutcomes was expanded to include those key assessments used to evaluate field experiences by school- and university-based personnel.

Administrators and faculty have access to real-time information and statistics within and across programs to track candidates' progress and achievement. This feature of the data management system allows advisors to monitor candidate progress and provide remediation immediately, if needed. The unit utilizes TrueOutcomes to generate reports at the candidate, course, program, and unit levels. This information management system also yields program-level assessment data on candidate performance and relevant operations at the program level. In addition, the unit also obtains unit-level assessment data on unit operations. All performance data are aggregated across programs to examine unit effectiveness.

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

The process of data collection, analysis and evaluation is the same for initial as well as advanced programs. However, the unit does not systematically collect and analyze assessment data in the advanced teacher preparation programs (M. Ed. - Curriculum and Instruction). The collection, analysis, and evaluation of key assessments, other than dispositions, for the advanced teacher preparation programs (M. Ed. - Curriculum and Instruction) are not fully integrated into the unit's assessment system.

See detailed response in the Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation.

### 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:**

It is evident, from multiple sources, that the new TrueOutcomes electronic data management system yields data that are used regularly and systematically to evaluate candidates, courses, programs, and clinical experiences. Additionally, both faculty and candidates have immediate and ongoing access to data. Data are also shared formally with faculty and candidates routinely to help them reflect and improve.

As a result of the unit's adoption of TrueOutcomes, there has been a visible increase in the collaboration among faculty in the unit and in the College of Arts and Sciences. Faculty in the Colleges of Education and Arts and Sciences collaborate to revise syllabi and rubrics for key assessments based on the candidate and course report data generated by TrueOutcomes. The use of TrueOutcomes as the assessment information technology data management system has helped faculty to identify weaknesses in the rubrics they designed for key assessments in different courses and programs. Some candidates have indicated that they are pleased with TrueOutcomes and wish this system had been available earlier in their education programs. Conversations with faculty confirmed the candidates' sentiments about the potential powerfulness of TrueOutcomes to illustrate the new culture of evidence advocated by the unit.

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

The unit did not address the use of data for program improvement for advanced teacher preparation programs nor the preparation of other school personnel separately.

See detailed response in Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

The unit has implemented an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs at initial and advanced levels. The unit, faculty, and programs have systematically made numerous changes to improve programs as the various components of the assessment system were created and implemented since January 2008. Faculty and candidates are enthusiastic about the rich data

that they are able to mine as a result of the unit's adoption of TrueOutcomes as the unit's electronic data management system. An area of improvement focuses on the lack of the collection and analysis of data in the advanced teacher education programs (M. Ed. - Curriculum and Instruction) and the initial graduate alternative certification programs. The key assessments, other than dispositions, for the advanced teacher preparation programs (M. Ed. - Curriculum and Instruction) and the initial graduate alternative certification programs are not fully integrated into the unit's assessment system.

**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.]**

TrueOutcomes was adopted as a university-wide approach to using information technology as an anchor to enhance and support data-driven decision making at the program and unit levels. The College of Education is the first college on campus to implement this data management system. Oversight for the university-wide implementation of TrueOutcomes is the responsibility of the Office of Distance Learning. Faculty in the unit as well as the staff in the Office of Distance Learning speak passionately about and highly of the collaboration and reflection that have occurred among faculty in the unit and their partners in the College of Arts and Sciences .

## Areas for Improvement and Rationales

### AFIs from last visit: Corrected

| AFI Number &Text | AFI Rationale |
|---|---|
| 2.1 The assessment system has not been developed in collaboration with the professional community. | The unit collaborated with the professional community to revise the assessment system. |
| 2.2 The unit does not regularly and comprehensively gather, compile, and analyze assessment and evaluation information for the unit's operations, its programs, its candidates, and its graduates. | The unit has put in place an assessment system that regularly and comprehensively gathers, compiles, and analyzes assessment and evaluation information for the unit's operations, its programs, its candidates, and its graduates. |
| 2.3 Information technologies are not used systematically to collect and analyze data. | TrueOutcomes is the information technology data management system that is used by the unit to systematically collect and analyze data. TrueOutcomes was first introduced in the unit in January 2008. |
| 2.4 The unit has not implemented procedures to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of the assessment of candidate performance. | It is evident that the unit is using the diverse components of TrueOutcomes to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of the assessment of candidate performance. |

### AFIs from last visit: Continued

| AFI Number & Text | AFI Rationale |
|---|---|
| 2.1 The unit has not incorporated procedures to determine if key assessments are predictors of candidate success. | The unit has made tremendous progress in the development of the unit assessment system since the implementation of TrueOutcomes began in January 2008. Unit leaders as well as the faculty articulate future plans to incorporate a procedure into the assessment system to determine if key assessments are predictors of candidate success. |

### New AFIs

| AFI Number & Text | AFI Rationale |
|---|---|
| 2.1 The unit does not systematically collect and analyze data in the advanced teacher education programs (M. Ed. - Curriculum and | The key assessments, other than dispositions, for the advanced teacher preparation programs (M. Ed. - Curriculum and Instruction) |

| Instruction) and the initial graduate alternative certification programs. | and the initial graduate alternative certification programs are not fully integrated into the unit's assessment system. |
|---|---|

### 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

⌀                                               ⌀

**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

�                                                        �

**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

jn                                                               jn

**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.]**

**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.**

[                                                                    ]


### 6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

| | |
|---|---|
| Unit Leadership and Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation | [ ▾] |
| Unit Leadership and Authority – Advanced Preparation | [ ▾] |

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

[                                                                    ]


### 6b. Unit Budget

| | |
|---|---|
| Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation | [ ▾] |
| Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation | [ ▾] |

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

[                                                                    ]


### 6c. Personnel

| | |
|---|---|
| Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation | [ ▾] |
| Personnel – Advanced Preparation | [ ▾] |

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

[                                                                    ]


### 6d. Unit Facilities

| | |
|---|---|
| Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation | [ ▾] |
| Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation | [ ▾] |

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

[                                                                    ]

**6e. Unit Resources including Technology**

| | |
|---|---|
| Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation | ▼ |
| Unit Resources including Technology – 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 6**

| | |
|---|---|
| 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.]**

|  |
|---|
|  |

## IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

You may either type the sources of evidence and persons interviewed in the text boxes below or upload files using the prompt at the end of the page.

**Documents Reviewed**

| See attached Exhibit Lists. |
|---|

**Persons Interviewed**

| See attached Interview List. |
|---|

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

| Interview List |
|---|
| Additional Exhibits List |
| Exhibit List |

See **Attachments** panel below.


**(Optional) State Addendum:**