NCATE

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★ *Report*

Accreditation Visit to:

SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY AT NEW ORLEANS

6801 Press Drive, Building 32-A
New Orleans, LA 70126
10/25/2008-10/29/2008

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

Board of Examiners Report

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Institution:

Southern University at New Orleans

Team Findings:

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

Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

I. INTRODUCTION

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

Southern University at New Orleans (SUNO) is a state institution of higher learning. The university is located in the southern part of Louisiana in the city of New Orleans with an estimated post Hurricanes Katrina and Rita population of 223,388 as compared to the 2000 census of 484,674. SUNO was established in 1956 as a public Historically Black College and University (HBCU) serving the higher education needs of the urban populace of the city of New Orleans and the five parishes (Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, and St. Charles) that surround the city.

Since SUNO was established, the university has grown into a comprehensive institution consisting of five academic colleges: College of Education, College of Business and Public Administration, College of Arts and Sciences, and School of Social Work, and a School of Graduate Studies with courses that support undergraduate and graduate programs.

The university is still recovering from the impact of hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005. The university experienced loss of student enrollment, faculty, instructional resources, and suffered damage to all 11 buildings that comprised the campus. However, with federal assistance, and under the leadership of a new chancellor, SUNO was able to secure temporary buildings through FEMA. These buildings, establishing the Lake Campus, are located on 39 acres adjacent to the shores of Lake Pontchartrain. At the time of the visit, programs in the unit had not moved back to the main campus, but other university programs are occupying spaces on the second and third levels of buildings on the main campus. Enrollment, recruitment of faculty, administrators, staff, and program growth are approaching pre-Katrina and Rita levels.

The College of Education (COE) is the unit responsible for managing and coordinating all programs offered for the initial preparation of teachers. The COE affiliates with departments in the College of Arts and Sciences which operates programs linked to the COE for the purpose of delivering specific teaching certifications. There are no advanced or other school programs in the unit. The COE is composed of 15 full-time faculty. In addition to the 15 unit faculty, there are five adjuncts for a total of 20. Table 1 on page 5 of the IR accurately reflects the academic rank of teacher education unit faculty.

Table 2 on page 6 of the IR lists specific information about programs, degrees, enrollment, accreditation, and recognition of programs. At the time of the visit, four program majors are offered that lead to licensure. Two of the four programs are post-baccalaureate non-degree programs that lead to certification in Early Childhood Education or Elementary Education. All programs are state-approved and two of the four are nationally recognized. Early Childhood Education at the bachelor's level and Early Childhood Education undergraduate non-degree (for alternative certification candidates) programs are pending national recognition. The alternative teaching certificate is for degreed individuals who are interested in a position as early childhood or elementary school teachers. Early Childhood Education prepares candidates to teach grades PK-3. Elementary Education prepares candidates to teach grades 1-5. All education units in the state of Louisiana, as part of a redesign mandate, are required to submit programs for state review.

Total full-time and part-time enrollment in education courses for fall 2008 is 380. Of the total enrollment, 337 are undergraduates (72 candidates and 265 pre-candidates), 43 are post-baccalaureate (31 alternative teaching certification and 12 pre-candidates alternative teaching certification).

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?

Louisiana has a joint partnership with NCATE. The protocol agreement between Louisiana and NCATE requires the national team to have one more team member than the state team. Four national team members, three state team members, and one state consultant conducted the review. The visit was a joint visit where NCATE and state team members worked together, sharing equal roles and responsibilities in all functions of the review. The BOE team operated as a combined team, made a single recommendation for each NCATE standard resulting in one BOE report with an addendum addressing Louisiana State Standards.

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.).

SUNO has no distance learning (off campus) courses or programs, but does have online courses. In spring 2008, the unit offered 16 sections of online classes. In fall 2008, nine sections are offered. Blackboard is the online course management system. Unit faculty have completed Blackboard training and most are using Blackboard as an instructional delivery tool.

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

There were no unusual circumstances that affected the visit.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

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

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

The mission of the COE is preparation and development of effective and reflective professional educators who think critically and analytically, and who are transformative practitioners and learner advocates for children functioning in global environments. To achieve this mission, it was evident that faculty seek to generate, use, and disseminate knowledge about teaching, learning, and human development by emphasizing efficient and successful teaching practices, policies, and procedures to enhance and support the academic achievement and social development of all PK-12 students.

The conceptual framework seeks to prepare beginning professional teachers who have the potential to become master teachers and educators. The unit's conceptual framework is based on the theme "Reflective Practitioners for Global Environments." The unit proposes to prepare teachers who are: (1) instructional leaders, (2) continuous assessors, (3) astute technologists, (4) advocates for diversity and collaboration, and (5) reflective professionals.

Knowledge bases that support the framework are based upon research from educational leaders like Dewey, Piaget, Comer, Darling-Hammond, Fullan, Hallinger, Heck, and Kessler. Additionally, the conceptual framework was developed based on The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education's publication, A Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teacher (Reynolds, 1989).

The six levels and five transition points defined in the unit assessment system are aligned to the conceptual framework and are used for candidate assessment for all unit programs. The six levels are Level I: Pre-Candidacy, Level II: Candidacy, Level III: Teaching Methods, Level IV: Student Teaching, Level V: Program Completion, and Level VI: Induction. Candidates must successfully progress through six levels of the assessment system. The signature assessment of candidate performance is the portfolio that includes a Thematic Unit, An Impact on Student Learning Analysis, Student Teaching Observation Rating Form, and Student Teaching Evaluation Form. The assessment system incorporates the process for data collection and tabulation, reporting, analysis, program revision, and evaluation of the unit's operation. The unit gathers assessment data throughout the program.

The unit's knowledge, skills, and dispositions are based on institutional, state, and national standards. The Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching standards (LCET), which are aligned to the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards, serve as the foundation for Professional Education Standards. The conceptual framework guides the unit in developing and assessing candidates.

The unit also conducts follow-up surveys of its graduates to determine the effectiveness of programs. Data from these surveys provide the unit and community partners with vital information to ensure effective teacher education programs.

Changes to the conceptual framework since the last NCATE visit include:
• changes to the conceptual framework's theme with a focus on global environments;

• modified strands in the framework to instructional leaders, continuous assessors, astute technologists, advocates for diversity and collaboration, and reflective professionals; and
• expansion of the Conceptual Framework Committee to include a more diverse PK-12 composition.

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

j̇n   j̇n

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

Page 20, The unit indicates that the "Impact on Student Learning Analysis" was created and used for the first time in fall 2008, they report an overall mean score of 3.93 for 2006-2007.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Program content for the Elementary Education major (bachelor's and undergraduate non-degree) is approved by the state and is nationally recognized by ACEI. The Early Childhood major (bachelor's and undergraduate non-degree) is state approved and is pending national recognition by NAEYC. The unit has until February 2009 to respond to NAEYC. Pass rate data presented in Table 4 on page 10 of the IR, show that candidates have sufficient general education and content knowledge. Elementary Education candidates scored 89 percent (2006-2007) and 100 percent (2007-2008). Early Childhood is a new program and did not have completer data. The overall pass rates across the initial teacher preparation are 94.1 percent (2006-2007) and 100 percent (2007-2008).

Teacher candidates must maintain a 2.5 GPA in their content major to be eligible for student teaching and graduation. Candidates in the two majors must complete required levels and transition strands identified in the conceptual framework and assessment system prior to moving to the next level. Both

majors require successful completion of Praxis II before student teaching or internship.

Data from Student Teaching Evaluation Assessment evaluations show mean scores for content knowledge on a scale of 1-4 ranged from 3.61 to 3.89 for 2006 -2007 and mean score ranged from 3.96 – 4.00 for 2007-2008. Additionally, content knowledge is supported by data from other key assessments including portfolios, GPA, clinical practice, and early field experiences.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Not applicable

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	Not Applicable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Several data sources provide evidence that candidates are well prepared in terms of pedagogical content knowledge. All program graduates scored above the cut score on the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) tests. Surveys of graduates and employers provide strong evidence of pedagogical knowledge and skills. The program provides 180 hours of practicum type experience even before student teaching and requires reflections of observations and practice teaching. Technology scores on the employer surveys also indicate that employers felt candidates were well prepared.

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	Acceptable
Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

A review of the approved national recognition reports indicates candidates have sufficient professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. The signature assessment of candidate performance is the portfolio that includes a Thematic Unit, An Impact on Student Learning Analysis, Student Teaching Observation Rating Form, and Student Teaching Evaluation Form.

As mentioned previously, Praxis PLT scores exceed the 80 percent pass rate with the last graduating cohort scoring an exemplary 100 percent pass rate. Portfolio scores represented in Table S1c.1.1, page 18-19 of the IR also indicate faculty rated candidates highly. Data from portfolio submissions indicate candidates have sufficient professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Additional key assessments of this standard included scores from student teacher evaluations, candidate exit surveys, and employer surveys (these data were exceptionally high). All of these assessment data indicate an acceptable level for this standard.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Data from student teaching evaluations, exit surveys, and employee surveys, and graduate follow-up surveys, all point to a positive impact of candidates on student learning. The primary instrument used to measure the impact on student learning was designed in 2005 and included a scoring rubric. As of this time the unit could only provide one example of its use. Data from 2005-2006 on the Impact on Student Learning Analysis was presented in the evidence room, but it was not correlated with the 2005 instrument and faculty members could not explain the source of that data.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals	Not Applicable

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

Student Learning for Other School Professionals	Not Applicable

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Unacceptable ▼
Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Dispositions found in documents could not be articulated or referenced by candidates or faculty. While unit members rate teacher candidates on a variety of statements that relate to dispositions, they are not clearly articulated to candidates or faculty. A document printed in May of 2008 does identify 11 dispositions, but the updated (September 2008) Conceptual Framework's Strands Alignment Chart lists only nine dispositions. Another document in the Exhibit Room, Rubric for Evaluation of Dispositions, identifies 13 dispositions. These three documents are not congruent in their approach to dispositions.

The unit provided documents with data on candidate dispositions. Faculty assessed candidates, relative to dispositions, on a variety of assignments using rubrics and other scoring systems but measures were not always labeled as dispositional measures. These data are shared with the faculty in general and with the candidates but not always as measures of any specific disposition. Data collected and referenced as dispositional measures rates candidates highly on statements identified as measures of dispositions.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Overall Assessment of Standard

Content knowledge for teacher candidates is acceptable considering the impacts that Hurricanes Katrina and Rita had on the University and more specially the teacher education unit. Teacher candidates continued to have high passing rates on Praxis exams and other measures. Even with concerns related to student learning and dispositions, employer surveys indicate a high level of satisfaction with graduates and highlight the strengths of content and pedagogical content knowledge for the program.

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
No AFI's for this Standard	

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1d. (Initial) Impact on student learning analysis data was limited.	The instrument, designed by the unit in 2005, used to measure the Impact on Student Learning, has only been used by one candidate in fall 2008.
1g. (Initial) Candidates did not clearly demonstrate an understanding of professional dispositions defined in the unit conceptual framework.	While the unit provided several versions of dispositions, candidates did not demonstrate understanding of professional dispositions as delineated in the conceptual framework.

Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met ▼
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

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.]

Page 20, The unit indicates that the "Impact on Student Learning Analysis" was created and used for the first time in fall 2008, they report an overall mean score of 3.93 for 2006-2007.

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

j̊n   j̊n

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

2a. Assessment System

Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Assessment System – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The Unit Assessment System (UAS) for the College of Education (Unit) at Southern University at New Orleans (SUNO) describes (a) the manner in which the unit determines its success in meeting its goals and objectives, (b) whether instructional programs are effective, and (c) whether its candidates are performing satisfactorily and progressing through its respective programs as planned. The four major components of the UAS include (a) Setting Expectations (University, Unit, and Candidate), (b) Defining Performance (proficiencies) in terms of knowledge, skills, and dispositions; (c) Assessing Performance (description of the assessment process/instrument with rubrics; (d) Analyzing Data generated from the performance assessments and reports, which are then used to inform the Unit of the level of success and/or the need for change within the University or Unit. The Unit utilizes PASS-PORT for data management system.

The UAS is evaluated by faculty, including liaisons from the College of Arts and Sciences and representatives of partner schools. The unit seeks to make the assessment process known through a variety of ways including published and web-based diagrams and narratives found within university documents. All unit programs of study are initially approved by the Louisiana Board of Regents for Higher Education and continuously assessed by the unit. All instructional program changes are approved by the unit, Teacher Education Council, University Curriculum Committee, and the Louisiana State Department of Education.

Unit meetings are held with appropriate faculty to discuss assessments and data collection for each NCATE Standard. Presently there is no Unit Assessment Coordinator due to a personnel resignation. The position is presently being advertised for replacement. In the interim, two faculty and the Instructional Technology Coordinator (IT) share the duties of the previous Assessment Coordinator. This team meets regularly with unit faculty as well as individual departments to share data and get input for NCATE standards and unit improvement plans. In addition, assessment data are regularly shared with the Teacher Education Council (TEC) which serves as the policy making body to the unit. The TEC consists of a diverse membership that includes professional education faculty, leadership in the arts and sciences, as well as PK-12 personnel and candidates. The TEC activities are coordinated through the unit.

The assessment process is summarized in the UAS calendar. Candidate performance on Praxis I and II exams are collected, maintained, and reported by the Praxis Coordinator. These data are then loaded, aggregated, and summarized by the Assessment Team, Praxis Coordinator, and/or Certification Office for submission to the departments and dean who share the information with faculty in scheduled departmental and unit meetings. Candidates load assignments to PASS-PORT and are assessed by the appropriate course instructor using an approved rubric.

Candidate skills are assessed by cooperating teachers and instructors of the respective courses with

respect to field experiences. These data are collected by the appropriate unit faculty and loaded to PASS-PORT. These data are then compiled and reported by the Assessment Team to the department chairs and dean. The provided data are then shared with course instructors, unit faculty, other university faculty and liaisons who make recommendations for change as needed.

The Assessment Team compiles data for each candidate, aggregates the data by program and the unit, and provides summaries to each department head and to the dean prior to pre-registration advisement each semester. These data are then analyzed by the respective departments and any recommendations deemed necessary are made and presented to the entire unit.

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

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The UAS contains six levels of progressive development for program candidates which are coordinated with five corresponding transition points. Specific information related to student progress within the unit is maintained by the electronic data management system, PASS-PORT. Candidates are required to submit their signature documents for identified courses for assessment to PASS-PORT, where they are stored and evaluated by the appropriate faculty/adjunct faculty who assess course documents while candidates are enrolled in the courses. These grades along with other requirements (such as Praxis scores, etc.) are also stored and tabulated in PASS-PORT as they are received in order that candidates will be able to move through the data management system.

Assessment instruments and corresponding scoring rubrics are developed by faculty teams and aligned with institutional, state, and professional association standards to ensure content validity. All faculty and cooperating teachers are trained to use the scoring rubrics to ensure accuracy and consistency within candidate ratings. The rubrics provide objective assessments that are relatively free of bias. The use of multiple reviewers for various program assessments helps eliminate evaluator bias and provides for a measure of inter-rater reliability.

The UAS protocol includes (a) schedules for collection and analysis for candidate data, (b) necessary program timelines, and (c) identification of persons responsible for collecting, compiling, aggregating, summarizing, and analyzing data on candidate performance. This protocol is summarized in the UAS calendar which is published for all parties. Candidate performance on Praxis I and II are collected, maintained, and reported by the Praxis Coordinator. These data are posted to the unit's master roster and are compiled, aggregated, and summarized by the Assessment Team, Praxis Coordinator, and/or Certification Officer for submission to the departments and dean who share and discuss the information with faculty in regular departmental and COE meetings. While enrolled in their respective program courses, candidates posted assignments and other specific program data into PASS-PORT.

Candidates' skills are assessed by cooperating teachers and instructors of respective courses in which field experiences are required. These data are also collected by the instructor who posts these data into PASS-PORT. The Assessment Team then compiles, aggregates, summarizes, and reports to the department chairs and dean. The data are then analyzed and shared with unit faculty who make recommendations for change as needed.

The Assessment Team compiles data for each candidate, aggregates the data by program and for the unit, and provides summaries to each department and to the dean prior to pre-registration advisement each semester. These data are then analyzed by the respective departments and recommendations are presented to the entire unit, including faculty liaisons and support staff. The recommendations, as modified by the unit, are then presented to the TEC, which accepts or rejects the recommendations or suggests additional modifications or alternatives.

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

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	Not Applicable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Program planners report that data collected from the UAS are analyzed on an annual basis to inform the unit of the need for changes in the instructional program. Data about candidate program performance are collected each semester and analyzed annually. Program changes are also based on trends in national, state, and professional association standards as well as best practice research. Changes to instructional programs or individual courses are initiated by unit faculty, department chairs, or the dean and are reviewed by the TEC. Any result in program changes are also reviewed by the University Curriculum Committee. Some changes are introduced as a result of recommendations from external reviews in the accreditation process. A specific example of a needed change cited by the last NCATE visiting team concerned diversity. One of the ways in which this notation has been addressed was through the development of a new course, EDUC 275: Foundations of Multicultural Education. Major program changes are also made as a result of performance data arising from within the department and are made after trend data have been analyzed for a three-year period. Because the three-year period includes the year of devastation caused by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the data analysis is incomplete until the end of the present 2008-2009 term. However, information was shared with the visiting team that includes data from 2007-2008.

A number of further significant changes have occurred within the past three years as a result of data collected through the UAS. Some of the major events are listed: (a) the unit adopted a new course coding system to distinguish between Early Childhood Education (ECE) and Elementary Education (ELED) programs, (b) revised programs of study were aligned with the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching (LCET), (c) assessments and syllabi to support candidate acquisition of appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions, syllabi, and assessment items and rubrics were added to PASS-PORT, (d) a standard, comprehensive folder detailing candidate advisement and assessment procedures

at each program level [I-VI] was developed. In addition, (a) the Conceptual Framework, aligned with national, state, and professional associations' standards, was revised to include research-based literature and candidate performance outcomes, (b) The Student Teaching Handbook and the Field Experiences Handbook were revised to reflect enhanced and diversified placements, (c) the unit re-established partnerships with PK-12 schools and two-year colleges through elaborate articulation agreements and memoranda of understanding, (d) workshops to assist candidate in preparation for Praxis exams was instituted, and (e) advising and registration was strengthened through the use of the transition points made available through PASS-PORT.

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

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit assessment system is the result of unit representatives and community stakeholders with defined levels and transitions and support that enables the unit to function efficiently and make sound decisions based upon data, research, and stakeholder input. Unit officials use Pass-Port as an assessment tool to aggregate and disseminate data for analysis for unit and program continuous improvement. The structure of the system promotes discussion and collaboration among faculty within and between programs.

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 2

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met ▼

Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▾

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	Acceptable ▾
Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▾

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

It is evident that the unit implements measures that demonstrate school partners and other members of the professional community are involved in the development of the design and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practices for teacher candidates. The unit demonstrates this through the reestablishment of the PK-16+ action plan and council that is comprised of members of the professional community representing a variety of administrators from local area candidate placement sites to representatives of the United Teachers Union of New Orleans. The purpose of the PK-16+ action plan and council is to meet the educational needs of the New Orleans community. Another way the unit collaborates with school partners is in the decision of appropriate placement for candidates.

The unit collaborates with school partners to ensure that candidates acquire the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions needed for future educators. This is demonstrated through the unit's collaborative efforts with K-12 administrative teams to assess the needs of students and teachers. It is also evident through the efforts of faculty members providing support for K-12 schools in the opportunity to redesign curriculum to accommodate student population and to reconfigure school structure and curriculum by becoming members of school improvement teams. Candidates are becoming

completely immersed into the partnership school through professional development opportunities.

The unit works collaboratively with representatives of New Orleans Public Schools, as well as charter schools and the Archdiocese of New Orleans to offer programs giving community members multiple educational opportunities. The Literacy Academy and Turning Point Academy are programs demonstrating the unit's collaborative efforts in investing into the educational community of the New Orleans metropolitan area.

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	Acceptable ▼
Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Unit candidates meet entrance and exit criteria as outlined by the unit. Candidates need to complete 180 field experience hours prior to clinical practice. The unit requires candidates to meet course requirements, field experience hours, PRAXIS testing, and background checks prior to being placed in clinical practice. Candidates attend a student teaching seminar and orientation to student teaching. The purpose is to explain the roles of candidates, cooperating teachers and supervising faculty. Another purpose is to explain the cooperating teacher evaluation and candidate observation and evaluation/rating forms. The unit's conceptual framework is interwoven into the student teaching syllabus, the student teaching handbook, and the field experience handbook.

State criteria are met to place candidates with cooperating teachers who are qualified. The unit requests cooperating teacher information which includes areas such as: teaching experience, area of expertise, and type of certification. Cooperating teachers provide a list of awards and recognitions received and sign an agreement form with the unit. The unit collects and reviews feedback on cooperating teachers by partnership school administration and candidates. This is corroborated in an interview with the unit's field experience director.

Both cooperating teachers and candidates understand and use multiple measures and assessments to evaluate candidate knowledge, skills and professional dispositions. The unit provides a PowerPoint presentation to accompany cooperative teacher information which includes expectations and roles of the cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and candidate along with copies of the student teaching evaluation forms. The lesson plan template requires inclusion of state standards and benchmarks to be addressed in each lesson. The unit conducts needs assessments to help plan and implement enrichment sessions for candidates who are deficient. The unit has aligned course offerings in the area of mathematics for elementary education to include 12 additional hours to meet state requirements.

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	Acceptable ▼
Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates demonstrate understanding of content areas and pedagogical and professional dispositions. This is indicated through candidates' application of professional, state, and institutional standards and benchmarks through use of the lesson plan template. The template addresses accommodations for diversity, materials used in classroom, re-teaching and enrichment activities, evaluation and assessments used to determine student mastery and candidate reflection of lesson effectiveness. Sample thematic units and sample candidate impact on student learning analyses demonstrate a candidate's' ability to construct lesson plans and reflect on effective teaching methods.

All candidates participate in field experiences or clinical practices that include students with diverse learning needs, which offers candidates the opportunity to demonstrate differentiation of instruction. Both field experiences and clinical practices allow time for reflection. These reflect feedback from clinical faculty and cooperating teachers or teacher supervisors, which help teacher candidates develop strategies for improving student learning. Student work samples were provided demonstrating candidate reflection on how to help students who are reading below grade level and students with diverse needs, goals and backgrounds. The purpose is to analyze diversity in three parts: whole group, subgroups, and individually. According to Table 10 on page 57 of the IR the list of field experience sites, the initial program demographics of student population in partner schools for clinical practice and field observation demonstrate diversity. Samples of evaluations that demonstrate areas of diversity and differentiation are provided. Lesson plan rubrics are provided to show the evaluation process.

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

Overall Assessment of Standard

Collaboration exists between the unit and school partners through the development of councils and committees that work toward implementation of programs that will benefit the New Orleans educational community. The unit has designed and implemented a process that evaluates both field experience and clinical practice through criteria the COE has created for completion of the teacher education program that correlates to state teaching requirements. Expectations of candidates are clearly stated to both candidates and cooperative teachers. Unit candidates are developing and demonstrating knowledge, skills and professional dispositions through evaluations of their students and reflection about their own teaching methods.

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	Met
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

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	Acceptable ▼
Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

A goal of SUNO is to provide equitable education for all university students. As part of the curriculum, teacher candidates enroll in classes that prepare them to serve diverse groups of students. Since the last NCATE accreditation visit, the unit has changed its focus from preparing teacher candidates to teach in urban schools to preparing teacher candidates to be "Reflective Practitioners for Global Environments". This change in focus is evident in the curriculum and field experiences of teacher candidates. It is also evident in one of the tenets of the unit's theme; that is, being "advocates for diversity and collaboration".

The curriculum reflects diversity through such courses as Foundations of Multicultural Education for a Global Society (EDUC 275), Diverse Learner (ELED 476) and Diverse Learner (EDUC 315). Syllabi from these courses indicate topics such as racial, economic and cultural diversity, the development of culturally responsive teaching practices, and encouraging parental and community involvement in the school. Teacher candidates also receive instruction in planning for students with diverse learning styles. Lesson plans include alternate teaching strategies, and accommodations for students are also noted. Lesson plan rubrics as well as student teaching evaluation forms provide for input on the teacher candidate's ability to plan for and adjust lessons for students with diverse learning needs.

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

Not applicable

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

While enrolled in classes at the university, teacher candidates are taught by faculty of different ethnic backgrounds. The University reports the following ethnic makeup of faculty: 6 percent Asian or Pacific Islander, 59 percent African American, 34 percent White, and 1percent not identified by race. When interacting with various COE faculty, BOE members learned that several of the faculty were from countries such as Kenya and China. In the fall of 2008, the faculty of the College of Education was 80 percent African American, 13.3 percent White, and 6.7 percent other race. The majority of the faculty are female (86.7 %), and 13.3 percent are male. The adjunct faculty (n=5) are all African American. Similar to the full-time faculty, the majority of the adjunct faculty are female (80 %), and 20 percent are male. In an attempt to provide students with exposure to diverse faculty, students are provided with the opportunity to cross-enroll at area universities. Teacher candidates report that the need to do so seldom arises as most classes are offered in the unit.

The university does have a non-discriminatory policy with regard to sex, race, creed, color, religion, disability or ethnic background. The University's Recruitment and Marketing Plan for the academic years 2007-08 through 2009-10 addresses the recruiting of minorities.

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

Not applicable

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The majority of students enrolled at SUNO are African American (94.6 %); however, the unit reports that efforts are made to recruit students of various ethnicities. For example, cross-enrollment is permitted with neighboring institutions (e.g., University of New Orleans, Delgado Community College and Nunez Community College). Additionally, the Institutional Report indicates faculty engage in meetings with these institutions and other local institutions. Through these exchanges, students and faculty are provided opportunities to engage with students of various cultural, socio-economic, and ethnic backgrounds.

More than 50 percent of students enrolled in the university are non-traditional students who work full or part-time and attend school. Many of these students are pursuing a degree in education following a career in other areas such as business or service industries. Additionally, some of the teacher candidates in the alternative certification program are completing an internship and are employed by local districts or schools.

According to the Recruitment and Marketing Plan, a concerted effort continues to focus on recruiting minority students.

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

Not applicable

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

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit reports that during field experiences, students are strategically placed in at least one setting that is diverse with regard to race/ethnicity and socio-economic groups. By placing teacher candidates in neighboring school districts for student teaching, the unit is able to place students in classes with multiple ethnic groups. The unit noted the increase of Hispanic/Latino students since Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

A review of current field experience sites supports the unit's attempt to increase teacher candidate exposure to students of various socioeconomic and ethnic groups. For the 2006-07 academic year, 100 percent (n=6) of the schools had students of two or more ethnic backgrounds. Five of the six schools (83 percent) had students from four or more ethnic backgrounds. For the 2007-08 school year, 83 percent (n=5) of the schools had students of three or more ethnic backgrounds; one of the schools only had students who were African American. In the Fall of 2008, 100 percent of the schools (n=4) had students from four or more ethnic backgrounds. Interviews with teacher candidates revealed that they are given opportunities to work with students with disabilities of various degrees. They receive instruction in the methods classes in providing accommodations for students with disabilities. The candidates also revealed that the theme of multicultural education is woven in the methods classes as well.

The unit has made attempts since the last accreditation visit to ensure that students are afforded the opportunity to work with students from diverse backgrounds during field and clinical experiences, however, candidate interviews indicate inconsistencies in the number of teacher candidates utilizing the diverse settings available. Candidate interviews and a review of portfolios indicated that several teacher candidates fulfilled the required number of field experience hours for classes in the same school. Documents showing procedures for assigning teacher candidates for diverse field and clinical practices were not available.

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

Not applicable

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has made efforts to increase diversity. The most evident area of increased diversity has been in the area of teacher candidates working with students from diverse backgrounds. Specifically, the partner schools reflect the changing demographics of the New Orleans metropolitan area. The majority of schools have students from three or more ethnic backgrounds and various socioeconomic groups.

Unit faculty represent various ethnic backgrounds as well as countries of birth. The majority of the students in the unit are African American. The majority of the students are also non-traditional students,

many of them choosing education as a second career.

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
4d. (Initial Teacher Preparation) The unit does not ensure that teacher candidates have experiences in diverse settings.	Interviews with unit officials and candidates could not confirm the unit has a systematic way of ensuring teacher candidates have field experiences in diverse settings.

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

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	Acceptable ▼
Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

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

SUNO benefits from a well credentialed and qualified cohort of full-time, adjunct and clinical faculty. During the 2007-2008 academic year, the unit had 12 full-time faculty. In spring 2008, two faculty members with master's degrees were temporarily employed. Of the ten remaining faculty, eight hold terminal degrees, and two hold master's degrees. Since that time, the unit has recruited three additional faculty members bringing the unit's total to 15, for fall 2008. The faculty unit consists of one professor, four associate professors, 10 assistant professors, and five adjuncts. The unit was assisted in delivering the teacher education programs in elementary education and early childhood by eight adjunct professional faculty in spring 2008. Full-time and adjunct faculty who do not hold terminal degrees have earned a minimum of a master's degree with at least 18 graduate hours in their fields of expertise.

All PK-12 partner and supervising teachers who are responsible for instruction, supervision, and assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practices are certified in the fields they supervise by the Louisiana State Department of Education.

Qualifications of the unit faculty were documented in the IR and were verified by examining materials provided as exhibit evidence and through faculty interviews. Faculty members who teach courses that lead to certification in the College of Education's programs have contemporary professional experiences in PK-12 school settings and continue to remain involved in public school education via consulting, field supervision, mentoring, and serving on school based committees and school improvement teams. The faculty members integrate and balance current theory with contemporary practical experience which enriches the overall quality of the teacher preparation program.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

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

A review of the course syllabi, faculty vitae, and faculty professional development profiles indicate that faculty have an in-depth understanding of their fields and align and incorporate the unit's conceptual framework into their coursework. Based on several interviews, faculty demonstrate best practices in teaching using a variety of instructional delivery models. They encourage reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and the development of dispositions through field experiences, group learning, focused activities, facilitated discussions, structured questions, and guided lectures. Course assignments include writing samples, literacy and electronic portfolio development, presentations, journal reflections, case studies, visual displays, inquiry questions, connections to education, and literature reviews.

Issues related to diversity and the integration of technology are critical parts of the instructional practice in the majority of courses. Candidates report widespread use of diverse assignments, professors' concern for their learning, and teaching practices that support creating a classroom conducive to learning. Issues related to diversity and the integration of technology are critical parts of the instructional practice in the majority of courses. Faculty incorporate instruction addressing a wide variety of diversity issues. In many cases special course units are allocated to diversity topics including, but not limited to, gender, race, and special needs. Unit faculty members report having access to multiple sources of technology to use in their daily instruction. Faculty members use Blackboard and PASS-PORT in all courses taught. A review of documents and faculty interviews confirms these focus areas. In addition, all teacher candidates are required to complete a three-semester hour course in multicultural education. Additionally, syllabi show the integration of diversity and technology through the programs of professional study.

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

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

Scholarship is an expectation of unit faculty. Action research and collaborative studies demonstrates how scholarship informs instruction. The unit supports scholarship through providing financial support to attend conferences and providing release time for writing and obtaining advanced degrees. The institution expects faculty to present at professional conferences at the local, regional, national, and international levels; to conduct and publish research findings; submit articles in refereed journals; write books or chapters in books; book reviews; and handbooks. In fact, promotion requires publication. SUNO is a teaching-focused university, with scholarly activity being important to instructional pedagogy. A review of curriculum vitae for faculty provided evidence that unit faculty are actively involved in producing and disseminating new knowledge through primarily presentations and some publications and grants in their fields.

Publications and presentations listed by faculty include journal publications, research and creative activities, presentations, and grant writing. The Unit faculty's scholarship and research have focused on early childhood development, training pre-service teachers, and multicultural and bilingual education all of which are related to the teaching and learning process. Documents provide an illustration of faculty scholarly endeavors for the last two calendar years, 2006 and 2007. Many of the scholarship activities reflect faculty engagement in the improvement of schools, teaching and learning.

Over the past five years, the COE faculty has published four books, one book chapter, nine eBook chapters, four dissertations, one exhibit, five journal publications, two newsletter articles, 48 presentations, six book reviews and eleven grants.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

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

Service is considered an integral part of the mission of SUNO and the teacher education unit. The unit's faculty provides service to the university, PK-12 schools, professional associations and community through ways that are consistent with the conceptual framework. Review of faculty vitae indicate that many faculty are sought as consultants to local, state, regional and national school districts and agencies, which is expected of all SUNO faculty. The grading system used for tenure and promotion is located in the Faculty Handbook. Examples of services modeled include: presenting workshops for teachers, demonstration lesson, action research, tutoring, and conducting action research.

Service is also provided by the faculty through on-campus participation with a variety of committees and activities. A few examples of service include faculty participation on the Faculty Senate Committee, the Teacher Education Council, the First Year Experience Committee, the Faculty Search Committee, and the PK-16 Council. At the local, state, and national levels, Unit faculty are members of various professional associations. All Unit faculty are expected to serve on at least two committees within the university. Faculty service is well documented.

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):

SUNO faculty are evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Within guidelines established by the university, the College of Education determines its own faculty evaluation procedures. All departments conduct evaluations annually. One level of evaluation includes course evaluations completed by candidates (conducted each semester). These evaluations are conducted in a manner to maintain complete anonymity for the candidates. The results of these course evaluations are required for the annual review of each faculty member by their peers and their departmental chairperson. The department head discusses in consultation with the faculty member the degree to which performance expectations have been achieved. Evaluations of professional education faculty are used to improve the faculty's teaching, scholarship, and service. Deans are annually evaluated by chairs, the

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and candidates when they teach a class during the evaluation period. Upon examination of administrative materials, e.g., exhibit room tenure documents, tenure and promotion policy documents, and in interviews, it is clear that the unit has a systematic process for evaluation of faculty performance as well. The institution has university policies and procedures, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook to reappoint, tenure, and promote faculty.

During the Spring 2008, SUNO conducted a unit faculty member evaluation. Faculty were evaluated on a scale of 1 to 3 (highest) in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Data from the Faculty Peer Evaluation Checklist, indicate that unit faculty scored between 2.8 and 3.0 with an overall composite score of 2.97 as it relates to the traits identified on the form. This feedback was used to assist in developing individual professional development plans. The unit head also uses this information to make decisions as it relates to faculty assignments and workloads.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

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

The unit requires participation in professional development to help faculty remain current in areas of expertise. The unit provides opportunities for faculty to develop new knowledge and skills as they relate to the conceptual framework, performance assessment, technology, and other important practices based on needs identified through the dean and department heads.

Faculty participate in professional development on and off campus. Professional development opportunities are chosen based on the reflections from their professional development plans after review of annual evaluations. Faculty attend the University Conference as a professional development activity at the beginning of fall and spring semesters. They also attend workshops held by the unit which include topics of Assessment and Diversity. University workshops are offered on safety and technology (BlackBoard, e-learning, and PASS-PORT and the new campus-wide e-mailing system).

The unit supports travel via a travel budget to state, regional, national, and international professional development conferences to accomplish multiple professional development goals. The unit has practices that encourage all professional education faculty to be continuous learners. The unit allows faculty to attend at least two to three conferences per year. Professional development funds from the dean's budget and at the departmental level as well as opportunities to write self-improvement grants provide opportunities for professional development. It is recommended that faculty return to campus and share newly acquired knowledge and information with colleagues. Consultants also provide trainings to the unit faculty (NCATE preparation, PASS-PORT usage, and SPA Report writing)

Faculty members attend professional development conferences to present their own scholarly work as well as to participate in professional organizations. Faculty hold leadership positions within professional organizations.

Evidence was provided that unit faculty members participate in a wide variety of professional development activities that are linked to the university's mission. Five years of data were summarized verifying faculty have completed professional development.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Faculty possess the qualifications and experience required to implement a highly effective teacher preparation program in Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education and Alternative Certification. Faculty integrate best practices for teaching in the classrooms. The faculty model and implement multiple teaching and learning strategies in their courses reflective of the unit's conceptual framework. They demonstrate a thorough understanding of the content they teach. Faculty effectively balance "best practices" in educational theory and practice and is actively engaged in scholarly activities and as community leaders. Faculty is evaluated on a systematic basis and the documentation of faculty assessments reveals that the evaluations are used to improve teacher effectiveness.

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
5e. (Initial) Evaluation Policies have not been revised since 1990.	Evaluation policies are aligned with current university policies.
5c. Scholarly productivity is generally low.	Faculty scholarly productivity has increased and is comparable to other university units.

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs:

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

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

jn   jn

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

>

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

Unit Leadership and Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Leadership and Authority – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

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

As noted in the Introduction of the IR, SUNO has experienced many administrative changes in the past few years, including the appointment of a new dean in 2006. The COE, defined as the unit, coordinates all initial teacher preparation programs at SUNO. The TEC is the governing body for teacher education programs at SUNO. Its membership is comprised of representatives from Teacher Education, Arts and Sciences and community members. The Chancellor, in consultation with the Chief Academic Officer, determines the number, term, and manner of appointment of TEC members. Committee chair and vice-chair are elected annually, and the Dean of the COE serves as secretary. Review of documentation confirmed policies and procedures designating its function, membership, and meeting schedule as described on page 56 in the IR. Interviews with the members of the TEC confirmed involvement of the entire campus and public school representatives in the governance of the unit.

All candidates are assigned a faculty advisor based on the last digits of their social security number. Student interviews confirmed access to advisement. Admission, retention, and exit policies are published in the university catalog and the unit's Policies and Procedures for Candidate Performance and Progression in Teacher Preparation Programs. Admission and retention policies are described clearly and consistently in publications and catalogs. Admission policies were updated in 2008. Departmental publications are reviewed biannually and revised as necessary. Academic calendars, catalogs, and publications are current.

6b. Unit Budget

Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

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

The university budget for 2007-08 was $16,576,070. The budget available to support unit activities was $1,198,282, an increase of 13.4 percent over the previous years' budget. The unit's allocation represents approximately seven percent of the total university budget. The unit was allocated an additional $100,000 provided to the university by Greater New Orleans. According to interviews, funding for operational expenses at the university has been static in recent years; however, funding for the unit is proportional to that of other units on campus.

Faculty members in the unit have at least four sources of possible funding for travel and professional development. Faculty interviews confirmed that travel funds are readily available for their use.

6c. Personnel

Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Personnel – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

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

The Faculty Handbook maintains clear policies regarding faculty workloads. During the fall and spring semesters, the normal teaching load is twelve hours for those teaching undergraduate courses and nine credit hours for persons teaching undergraduate and graduate courses. Interviews confirmed the 12 hour teaching load described in the IR on page 59. In addition to teaching, faculty members are expected to serve on university, division, and faculty committees, and schedule a minimum of eight office hours per week to advise students. The director of field experiences and student teaching has a reduced load for administrative responsibilities. Supervision of student teaching workloads are within 18 candidates for each full-time equivalent faculty member.

Although there are no graduate assistants, adjunct faculty teach courses in the unit. The unit ensures that the use of part-time faculty contribute to the quality of the unit and its programs. Adjunct faculty members interviewed reported support from the unit that assists them in their teaching responsibilities. Chairpersons are responsible for the orientation, supervision, and evaluation of all part-time faculty members. Adjuncts interviewed felt well-prepared to teach their specific courses, to address the conceptual framework, to conduct the necessary assessments, and to use technology.

Interviews confirm that support personnel are adequate to meet the needs of the unit. The unit personnel include a full-time Praxis Coordinator, Director of Alternative Certification Program, and two administrative assistants.

6d. Unit Facilities

Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

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

The team found that the IR accurately describes the facilities. The campus suffered severe facility damage due to Hurricanes Katrina and and is still recovering three years later. Facilities including classrooms and faculty offices are adequate to support teaching and learning. Each full-time faculty member is provided private office space. Remodeling and rebuilding is still in progress. Following the hurricane, no library resource was salvageable. Materials were provided via a partnership agreement. Candidates noted that materials were available for their use.

6e. Unit Resources including Technology

Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable ▼

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

Resources provided to the unit are sufficient for the incorporation of technology. Computer labs are available on campus, and candidate interviews confirm use of them. Faculty members have computers in their offices. Current program candidates confirm the use of technology in their classes.

PASS-PORT is the primary tool used to manage assessment data. PLATO, an interactive tutorial for candidates is available to assist candidates preparing for licensure exams.

Due to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, limited library and curricular resources exist at the institution. The description of library and media resources described on page 62 of the IR is accurate. The library is currently being renovated, and additional money has been allocated to increase resources. Faculty and candidates have access to interlibrary loan as well as many databases. Interviews confirm that candidates utilize electronic resources available to them and find them adequate.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The TEC is the governing body for all teacher education programs at SUNO. Review of documentation confirmed policies and procedures designating its function, membership, and meeting schedule. Responsibility for administration and coordination of all teacher education programs rests with the Dean of the College of Education. The Faculty Handbook maintains clear policies regarding faculty workloads. The budget available to support unit activities in FY 2008-09 represents an increase of 13.4 percent over the previous years' budget. Even though state funding has remained static, funding for the unit is proportional to that of other units on campus. Facilities are adequate for the programs of the education unit. Current program candidates confirm the availability and use of electronic resources.

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
6b. The unit relies too heavily on outside funding to support basic operations.	Internal funding has increased and funding from grants and other resources have reduced the unit's dependence on soft funds.

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	Not Applicable

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.]

The position of Special Assistant to the Dean on page 60 of the IR has been deleted.