

Areas for Improvement Samples

Below is a list of commonly cited areas for improvement (AFIs). BOE members may use these as a guide for writing AFIs.

Standard 1

Program Reviews

- (Initial) The history program was denied national recognition.

Content Knowledge

- The unit does not have summarized performance data indicating that candidates have the necessary content knowledge in their areas of study.

Pedagogical Knowledge

- The unit does not ensure that candidates, with the exception of elementary candidates, demonstrate the pedagogical knowledge necessary to help all students learn.

Professional Knowledge

- The unit does not ensure that all candidates possess the professional knowledge and demonstrate the professional skills necessary to help all students learn.

Student Learning

- (Initial) The unit does not ensure that candidates focus on student learning, use assessments in instruction, and develop meaningful learning experiences for P-12 students based on their developmental levels and prior experiences.
- (Advanced) The unit does not ensure that candidates for other professional school roles are able to create positive environments for student learning and understand and build upon the developmental levels of P-12 students with whom they work; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work.

Dispositions

- Dispositions are not identified and systematically assessed.
- (Advanced) The M.Ed. program has not identified nor assessed candidate dispositions.

Standard 2

Development of system

- The unit assessment system is not aligned with the unit's conceptual framework.
- The assessment system has not been developed in collaboration with the professional community.
- The unit has not identified a system that collects, summarizes, and aggregates data that are aligned with candidate proficiencies.
- The unit has not implemented procedures to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency in the assessment of candidate performance.
- The assessment system does not indicate how data will be regularly analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.
- The unit assessment system does not include the evaluation of unit operations.
- The unit's assessment system does not clearly address candidate outcomes identified in the conceptual framework.
- Assessments of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions in courses are not clearly and consistently linked to candidate proficiencies described in the conceptual framework.

Data collection

- The unit does not systematically collect and analyze assessment data in the secondary programs.
- The unit's gathering of data from graduates and employers of graduates is inconsistent.
- Although programs are involved in the collection of data, the unit does not systematically analyze and evaluate those data for program and unit improvement.
- Technology is not used to support the systematic collection and analysis of data at either the program or unit level.

Use of data for program improvement

- The unit has not used data from the assessment system to make program improvements.
- The unit does not systematically share assessment data with candidates and faculty across programs to help them reflect on and improve their performance.

Standard 3

- (Advanced) Except for the reading and school counseling programs, the unit does not make field placements in collaboration with its P-12 partners.
- Not all candidates have the opportunity during their field experiences and internships to apply the technology skills acquired through university coursework to their teaching and other professional roles.
- The field component of the educational technology program is not sufficiently intensive and extensive.

- Candidate performance in field and clinical experiences is not linked to the conceptual framework.

Standard 4

- The unit has not identified the curriculum related to diversity.
- The unit has not identified proficiencies related to diversity.
- The unit does not evaluate candidate proficiencies related to diversity.
- Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with other candidates from diverse backgrounds.
- Candidates have no opportunities to interact with other candidates from diverse backgrounds.
- Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with faculty members from diverse backgrounds.
- Candidates have no opportunities to interact with faculty members from diverse backgrounds.
- The unit does not ensure that all candidates have an opportunity to complete field experiences in diverse settings.

Standard 5

- (Advanced) The program in school psychology lacks a sufficient number of full-time faculty with the advanced degree.
- Faculty members do not model best practices in teaching, including the use of technology.
- The faculty's involvement in scholarly activities is limited.
- The unit has no systematic and comprehensive process for evaluating the teaching performance of adjunct faculty members.

Standard 6

- The current governance structure does not provide for the effective monitoring of the implementation of the various program assessment plans or the regular reporting of candidate performance relative to each program's defined outcomes.
- (Advanced) The unit lacks the authority and structure to approve and manage all of its advanced programs.
- Budgetary resources for the unit are not comparable to other colleges within the university.
- The unit does not provide sufficient support for adjunct faculty to ensure coherence within programs.
- Most faculty loads exceed 12 hours of undergraduate and 9 hours of graduate teaching, thus interfering with the quality of teaching, research, and service.
- (Advanced) The lack of technology at the off-campus site creates uneven access for

candidates to campus resources.

- An insufficient number of faculty members has an adverse effect on the quality of the graduate and undergraduate secondary programs.
- Curricular resources are not sufficient to support the continuing development of candidates.
- The space allocated to the unit for instruction, research, and academic support does not meet the needs of faculty, candidates, and staff.