



National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★ *Report*

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:

Dr. Deborah E. Bordelon
Ms. Brenda DeRamus-Coleman
Dr. David C. Bell
Dr. Susan L. Harlan
Dr. Emily Lowe Brizendine

State Team:

Dr. Susan Gore
Dr. Valerie Copeland Rutledge
Jim Herman

State Consultant:

Mr. Martin Nash

NEA or AFT Representative:

Dr. Alzenia Walls

Continuous Improvement Pilot Visit to:

UNIVERSITY OF
TENNESSEE AT MARTIN

237 Gooch Hall
University Street
Martin, TN 38238-7010
November 14-16, 2010

Type of Visit:

Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

Board of Examiners Report for Continuous Improvement Pilot Visit

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

Institution:

University of Tennessee at Martin

Team Recommendations:

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	Standard Met	Standard Met
4. Diversity	Standard Met	Standard Met
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Standard Met	Standard Met
6. Unit Governance and Resources	Standard Met	Standard Met

Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

I. INTRODUCTION

I.1 Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

The University of Tennessee at Martin had its start in 1900 when a group of clergy began Hall-Moody Institute. In 1927, the University of Tennessee bought the property and renamed the institution UT Junior College. In 1951, the campus became a senior college and was named The University of Tennessee Martin Branch. It offered bachelor's degrees in agriculture and home economics. In 1967, the institution officially became The University of Tennessee at Martin (UT Martin). As the only public university in West Tennessee outside the city of Memphis, UT Martin has historically embraced the residential university experience. UT Martin's main campus covers approximately 250 acres with an adjoining 680-acre farm dedicated to agricultural initiatives. The campus serves middle and west Tennessee and neighboring states. The majority of UT Martin undergraduate and graduate students are from west Tennessee.

The primary purpose of The University of Tennessee at Martin is to provide a quality undergraduate education in a traditional collegiate atmosphere characterized at all levels by close collaboration among students, faculty, and staff. In addition, the university is dedicated to meeting lifelong educational needs by providing graduate programs, distance-learning opportunities and other creative endeavors. The university is strongly committed to advancing the regional and global community through scholarly activities, research, and public service.

As of fall 2009, 8,101 students were enrolled at UT Martin (7,586 undergraduate and 515 graduate). The minority population for undergraduate students is 18.9 percent and for graduate students it is 12.4 percent. Females represent 57.4 percent of the undergraduate population and 68.7 percent of the graduate population. Males comprise 42.6 percent of the undergraduate population and 31.3 percent of the graduate population. Approximately 43.3 percent of the undergraduates at the institution receive

need-based financial aid and 87 percent of teacher education candidates receive some form of financial aid.

The professional education unit at UT-Martin includes all licensure areas at the initial and advanced level. The Dean of the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences is the head of the unit with other administrative staff, including a NCATE coordinator, Director of Assessment and Teacher Education, Director of Education Student Services, Coordinator of Teacher Licensure, Department Chair for Educational Studies, and Staff Assistant for Graduate Studies. The Professional Education Council is the communications link among all licensure areas in the college and is the primary way all licensure areas relate. Since the Professional Education Unit includes content area faculty as well as licensure areas outside the department of Educational Studies (Consumer Science Education, Agriculture Science Education, Art, Music, and Dance), all unit faculty are made aware of any curricular changes, teacher education policies and procedures, and data collection and aggregation through the Professional Education Council. The Council meets once each semester.

NCATE retreats are held at the beginning of the academic year each fall. Data are shared with faculty during these retreats to assist them in making decisions about changes to programs or unit operations for the new academic year. The chair of Educational Studies hosts a meeting of the secondary education content area stakeholders once each semester. The feedback loop for data collection and dissemination also includes the Teacher Education Effectiveness Committee (TEEC), which was established in 2004. The TEEC committee members include professional educators from the teacher education unit, area school administrators and teachers, community members, and candidates and meets once a year. The TEEC is given information derived from data collection throughout the academic year and provides feedback to be shared with the faculty in the teacher education unit as they prepare for a new academic year. The feedback loop for the teacher education unit allows for unit assessment data to be shared with multiple stakeholders for review and feedback.

I.2 Summary 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 continuing visit was conducted as a joint visit. The Tennessee State BOE Team and the NCATE BOE team worked collaboratively to determine whether the NCATE standards are being met and confirm that the unit is engaged in continuous improvement. The State BOE team members are not assigned primary writing standards for the NCATE report. Each state team member provides information on the NCATE standards and reviews state program reports for meeting state standards. The institution receives a report from the state and a report from NCATE.

I.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 UT Martin McNairy County Center/Selmer is in its tenth year of offering higher education opportunities to McNairy County and the surrounding region. The center was built as a joint venture by McNairy County and the city of Selmer. The K-6 licensure program at the undergraduate level is offered through the center with most candidates transferring from Jackson State Community College. A full-time assistant professor serves the educational and advising needs of the candidates. Other off-campus sites include the Ripley Center and the Parsons Center, which both offer K-6 programs. The Ripley Center is in a new facility that offers a variety of day, night and weekend courses for both traditional and nontraditional candidates. The Parsons Center is UT Martin's fourth off-campus site, and courses have been offered there since 2007. The new building offers technologically enhanced classrooms and meeting spaces. UT Martin has an additional off-campus site at Jackson State Community College;

however, no education courses or programs are offered at that location.

Since the last visit, both the School Counseling and Educational Leadership advanced programs are being offered totally online.

Information on these sites and online programs was obtained through interviews onsite with faculty and candidates.

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

This was a pilot visit for the Continuous Improvement accreditation model. There were no unusual circumstances during 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.

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

The conceptual framework has been reviewed and revised since the last visit in 2005. Two very similar frameworks were developed to capture the fundamental nature of the initial and advanced programs. For initial teacher preparation programs, the theme is "Educators as Facilitators of Learning" with three key elements, 1) Knowledge Skills and Application, 2) Reflective Practice, and 3) Professional and Ethical Behavior. The theme for the advanced programs is "Professional Educators as Leaders and Enhancers of Human Development" with four key elements, 1) Knowledge, Skills and Application, 2) Human Relations, 3) Inquiry, and 4) Professional and Ethical Behavior. Diversity and technology competencies are interwoven through the conceptual frameworks for both initial and advanced candidates. In 2008, the faculty adopted diversity competencies for both levels. Technology competencies have been expanded and better integrated into the programs of study. Course syllabi include a section on the Conceptual Framework. It was evident through interviews with candidates, faculty members, and P-12 partners that the conceptual framework is interwoven throughout initial and advanced programs. Assignments and assessment rubrics illustrate the alignment of the conceptual framework with the program and course outcomes.

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.

1.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

State licensing test data (Praxis II) were at 90 to 100 percent pass rates. In the 2007-2008 Title II report, 24 exams had less than 10 test takers. Between 2005 and 2008 the unit reported that the 183 candidates in the programs with less than 10 completers had a pass rate of over 96 percent. These tests are required of initial candidates to apply for certification. The Title II report for 2008-2009 was unavailable at the time of the onsite visit. It is presently being compiled as the due date had been moved to December. The institution has noted that it appears the pass rates will continue to surpass the 80 percent required pass rate. Candidates in the Health and Human Performance program have had lower pass rates, but were still above the 80 percent cutoff in 2006-2007.

The unit provided data on the pass rates for "other school professionals" by cross referencing a list of program completers from commencement books and official score reports on file from ETS. The data were aggregated for each of the programs, showing a 100 percent pass rate for 2008 to 2010 for the 42 candidates in EDAS/Ed Leadership and a 92 percent pass rate for the 12 candidates in the Counseling program in the same time period.

Content knowledge for initial program candidates is assessed through coursework and at multiple points in the programs: entry, prior to student teaching, exit from student teaching, and at program completion. Effective in 2008, all candidates must have a cumulative undergraduate GPA of 2.75 prior to admission into teacher education and must maintain that GPA throughout their program of study. Additional admission requirements include successful passage of PRAXIS I and a successful interview with the unit faculty. There have been several significant changes in both initial and advanced programs to ensure candidates are prepared to meet the academic demands of the teacher education programs and be better aligned with the Tennessee Lottery GPA requirements. These changes have been based on data collected from unit faculty evaluation of programs and courses, candidate exit interviews, and employer surveys.

The Master of Science with Initial Licensure (MSIL) in Elementary and Secondary Education was also revised based on feedback from candidates. Two new courses were developed so that candidates are provided with additional field experiences and stronger content area methods. The MSIL K-12 program in PE and SPED has been redesigned to better prepare candidates in content and pedagogy. These changes better align the two MSIL programs.

Based on the exit interview data, the unit has addressed some inconsistencies with advising and portfolio guidance through the development of a student handbook and consistency in who teaches the introductory course, TCED 211. In addition, the unit has piloted blocking TCED 302 – Integrated Teaching Strategies and TCED 305 – Classroom Management to provide candidates with opportunities to directly apply knowledge and skills in the schools setting. Initial program candidates are now required to submit a Student Teaching notebook, including a reflective paper on student teaching. Documentation of this was found in the exhibit room.

Candidates are also assessed in the areas of content and pedagogy through the evaluation of their portfolios. These portfolios are developmental and consist of artifacts from the courses in the programs of study. Faculty and academic advisors provide feedback on the portfolios throughout the candidate's program of study. Several candidates' portfolios were examined. Each portfolio contained a feedback sheet and evidence of faculty and/or advisor ratings over time. Overall, the candidates met or exceeded expectations for the portfolio as evidenced by data charts in the electronic exhibit room and onsite interviews.

The portfolio process used in the Educational Leadership (BAL) licensure option required candidates to

assemble a portfolio compiled of work samples created as they progressed through the program. The final compilation is presented at the conclusion of the program and is reviewed by program faculty. The unit reports that most candidates were successful on the first submission and if not, a second submission is requested.

All programs listed in the unit's Institutional Report have been approved. As of the onsite visit, the state team has also approved the following new programs: ESL, Reading Specialist, Gifted Education (PreK-12), Math/Physics (7-12), and Chemistry/Physics (7-12) programs.

The unit provided samples of rubrics and assessments. Many of the assessments and rubrics are tied to key courses throughout the programs of study. Rubrics and data for student teaching and other clinical experiences are identified as tools to assess candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions. Data were not available for all the rubrics listed, so it is unclear how candidates are performing on the respective assessments. Examples of candidates work at the exemplary, acceptable, and unacceptable levels were provided and scored rubrics were found for some assessments. Interviews with candidates confirm the use of rubrics for assignments. Candidates reported extensive feedback from course faculty and advisors. This feedback is also evident in the professional portfolio process. Interviews with faculty, cooperating teachers and school administrators confirm that the unit is making excellent use of assessment data for program and unit improvement.

During interviews, candidates and faculty described the impact candidates' have on student learning in their field experiences. Additional clarity is needed in the rubrics and assessments on how impact on student learning is assessed at both the initial and advanced levels.

Graduate exit interview data are available from 2007 to 2009. Alumni and employer data are available for 2009. The response rates on the alumni survey conducted in 2009 were 26 percent (54 of 228); the response rates on the employer satisfaction survey conducted in 2009 were 26 percent (41 of 153). Data from program completers and employers indicate that candidates are well prepared in content. Overall alumni and employers are satisfied with the program preparation. Interviews with recent graduates and employers confirm this overall satisfaction. There were some areas identified in the data for improvement. Program completers and employers identified working with diverse learners and interpreting data from multiple assessments as areas that could be improved. Interviews with recent graduates corroborate the need for more field experiences with children with exceptionalities.

The response rates on these surveys were up from the previous survey years. This is possibly because several initiatives were implemented in hopes of improving the rate of response. In 2009, alumni and employers were contacted by e-mail and postcards; there was the opportunity to complete the survey online through Survey Monkey. Incentives, such as drawings for televisions, were also offered to try to increase the return rate. The unit reports that they will continue these measures in January 2011.

The unit also asks candidates for feedback on their advisors. At the end of each semester, the graduate assistants who assist with advising in Education Student Services send the Advisor Rating form to all teacher education majors in the unit. The advisees may return the form electronically or they may choose to submit a hard copy. Feedback from this assessment is given to advisors. The unit reports that the results are used to conduct advising workshops with faculty and graduate assistant advisors. Data were found for three semesters from spring 2009 to spring 2010 on both open-ended comments and frequencies which indicate very high levels of candidate satisfaction with advising.

Professional dispositions are examined through use of the Professional Dispositions Rubric and a Dispositions Survey at identified points as candidates move through the teacher education program. Initial and advanced candidates are assessed by faculty in key assessment courses. Initial candidates in

the TCED 302-305 courses complete a self-reporting dispositions survey. If there are concerns about a candidate's dispositions, the candidate may receive a Candidate Dispositions Remediation Plan and several examples were found in the exhibit room. The average scores on the Professional Dispositions Rubric are between "Clearly Exhibited" and "Exhibited Most of the Time."

Faculty or university supervisors may file a dispositions rubric to document any observed concern about a candidate at any time. Faculty usually alert the department chair and/or Director of Education Student Services to the issue. The majority of concerns have focused on academic dishonesty issues. These have been addressed collaboratively between the Teacher Education Program, the department chair, and the Office of Student Conduct. Several other examples of dispositions concerns and how they were addressed are provided. These examples include extensive documentation of the process and the use of the disposition rubric.

At the advanced level, the Educational Leadership program underwent a state mandated revision to be better aligned with new standards. The focus has shifted from administration duties to instructional leadership. The School Counseling program was redesigned in 2008 to better align with CACREP standards. A new Interdisciplinary option has been designed for advanced candidates in the areas of ESL, Reading Specialist, and Early Childhood Education. The ESL and Reading Specialist options will lead to an additional endorsement. The comprehensive exam process for all of the advanced programs has been revised to provide consistency and a more thorough and non-biased assessment.

1.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

There have been several significant changes in both initial and advanced programs. These changes have been based on data collected from unit faculty evaluation of programs and courses, candidate exit interviews, and employer surveys. Admission GPA requirements have increased to ensure candidates are prepared to meet the academic demands of the teacher education programs and be better aligned with the Tennessee Lottery (HOPE) GPA requirements. The unit reports that based on the exit interview data, the unit has addressed the inconsistencies with advising and portfolio guidance through the development of a student handbook and consistency in teaching assignments for the introductory course, TCED 211. In addition, the unit has piloted blocking TCED 302 "Integrated Teaching Strategies" and TCED 305 "Classroom Management" to provide candidates with opportunities to apply knowledge and skills directly in the school setting. Initial program candidates are now required to submit a Student Teaching notebook, including a reflective paper on student teaching.

The Master of Science with Initial Licensure (MSIL) in Elementary and Secondary Education was also revised based on feedback from candidates. Two new courses were developed so that candidates are provided with additional field experiences and stronger content area methods. The MSIL K-12 program in PE and SPED has been redesigned to prepare candidates more completely in content and pedagogy. These changes better align the two MSIL programs.

At the advanced level, the Educational Leadership program underwent a state mandated revision to afford better alignment with new standards. The focus has shifted from administration duties to instructional leadership. The School Counseling program was redesigned in 2008 to better align with CACREP standards. A new Interdisciplinary option has been designed for advanced candidates in the areas of ESL, Reading Specialist, and Early Childhood Education. The ESL and Reading Specialist

options will lead to an additional endorsement. The comprehensive exam process for all of the advanced programs has been revised to provide consistency and a more thorough and non-biased assessment.

1.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable to this standard

1.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

None

1.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Assessments of clinical practice have not been systematically aggregated and analyzed. (ADV)	The unit has a systematic process in place to collect, analyze and use data from assessments of clinical practice.
Key assessments identified in the assessment system have not been systematically aggregated and analyzed. (ITP)	The unit has a systematic process in place to collect, analyze and use data from key assessments.

1.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

1.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
Even though the unit has a systematic assessment process in place, data have not been collected on all key assessments. (Initial and Advanced)	Of the assessments found online , several did not show data from the rubrics. Only the assignment and the rubric were available for some of the assessments.
The unit does not clearly indicate in the assessments and rubrics how 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. (Initial)	Though the candidates and faculty were able to address candidate impact on student learning during the interviews, the assessments and rubrics did not clearly indicate how candidates were addressing student learning.
The unit does not clearly indicate in the assessments and rubrics how 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. (Advanced)	Though the candidates and faculty were able to address candidate impact on student learning environments during the interviews, the assessments and rubrics did not clearly indicate how candidates were addressing student learning.

1.6 Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation

Met

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.

2.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit utilizes the Unit Assessment System (UAS) to systematically collect, analyze, and evaluate data for candidate performance, program improvement and unit operations. It is a comprehensive and integrated assessment system that is aligned with the conceptual framework outcomes as well as state and national standards. The system is well integrated into the unit's structure with a timeline for collection and reporting of data. There is evidence of changes made in candidate qualifications, program requirements, course assignments, and unit operations resulting from the data analysis.

Based on interviews with unit faculty and review of the IR addendum, the UAS is a dynamic, interactive, and integrated system where data are collected and summarized. The data are accessible and shared at candidate, programmatic, and unit levels throughout the year. The operations of the UAS are represented by the Decision-Making Model which is a flowchart of data collection, analysis and report back to the professional community. During the onsite visit, clarification of the model was provided by the Assessment Director and the unit head.

Data from key assessments of candidate performance at transition points are collected and reported to program faculty as they are available for analysis and decisions for program changes. For example, fall semester exit surveys of student teaching are collected, compiled, and aggregated during the winter break and ready for review by the program faculty by the second week of the following spring semester. Program faculty can begin to analyze the data to determine what program changes might be needed. All key assessments are online and accessible to faculty.

These program changes may be included with the aggregated reports that are presented to the Professional Education Council (PEC), an advisory council to the unit head that meets twice a year. The PEC includes both unit faculty and disciplinary faculty in other colleges and is a forum for feedback and communication of changes that are common to all education majors.

Review of electronic exhibit documents and onsite interviews indicate that aggregated reports from data collected during the year are presented to the Teacher Education Effectiveness Committee (TEEC) for feedback once a year. As a group composed of current candidates, employers, faculty representatives, alumni, current teachers, state department of education representative, and a community representative, the TEEC provides internal and external feedback on the data presented and how well the programmatic changes are working. It is part of the feedback loop of those engaged in multiple levels of the teacher education program. The committee is chaired by the unit head along with the Assessment Director reviews the data reports with the committee. The committee members reported during an interview that one of the meetings was held in a computer lab so they could learn how to access the data from the college website. The unit head provides data reports and the feedback from PEC and TEEC to the unit faculty at a fall retreat for unit review and analysis of data and decisions about program changes.

The assessment system provides detailed requirements of key assessments at various transition points and is aligned with the conceptual framework at the initial and advanced levels. It is designed to assess candidate performance at the various transition points. The offsite team expressed concerns that only two of the 28 data tables were complete across the check points and that summary data were not provided to determine candidates' performance at each transition point. The IR addendum clarified that the missing data was due to a computer glitch and/or low enrollment programs. The program that downloads information from BANNER is date specific. The date of entry into BANNER was used rather than the date of the assessment. If the data was entered in between semesters, the information was not downloaded at all. This problem has been corrected and the information has been downloaded for the appropriate semester.

The summary data for each program reflect candidate performance at the point they are collected in the fall and spring semesters for that year. During onsite interviews, the Assessment Director explained that some programs with missing data sets are low enrollment programs (N= 1-5). The data are not available if the candidates have not yet taken the courses where the assessments are embedded or if those courses have not been offered that specific semester. As a result, the number of candidates for each program will be added to the summary data tables for clarification. Based on the review of electronic exhibit documents, summary data tables for all the programs are complete to the extent that data are available for that assessment.

All data reports are summaries of the majors' performance on the assessment for that particular rubric. The assessment and rubric for each of the key assessments at the transition points are available from the summary data tables by clicking on the key assessment. Data reports are available to unit faculty and members of TEEC on the college website. A review of selected summary data tables found in the exhibits and IR addendum provided support that the UAS is assessing the defined transition and check points at both initial and advanced levels.

Based on interviews with unit faculty, administrators and a review of IR addendum, the team verified the changes listed in the offsite report. It also verified that the UAS has procedures embedded for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and evaluations of unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias. These included:

- Level I Field Experiences: Faculty teaching the Level I courses review expectations of field experiences, explanation of evaluation form and rubric to the candidates and to the cooperating teacher. Once the evaluations are received by the university instructor, a face-to-face conference is held with the candidate. The disposition survey follows the same process.
- TEP Interviews: Standard interview questions are selected from educational resources to ensure consistency and fairness. A minimum of two interviewers is required. Interviewers complete an individual evaluation with a clearly worded rubric and a summary evaluation is given. Results are returned to the Office of Education Student Services and shared with candidates upon request.
- Written Comprehensive Exams: The counseling program faculty selected questions from published test banks that are aligned with national standards across all programs. Item analysis is conducted by faculty to eliminate poor questions. Information about test dates is disseminated through the Blackboard (Bb) course management system and student handbook.

The significant program and unit changes as a result of data collection from the assessment system and analysis at all transition points reported in the offsite report were verified by onsite visit interviews and electronic document review. There is evidence of the unit's use of data for candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. There are additional examples of how data are used for program

improvement from the IR addendum and onsite interviews. One example is a revision of courses in Health and Human Performance after a close examination of candidate and program data by the pedagogy faculty and department curriculum committee. Curriculum changes were made to address candidates' poor performance on the PRAXIS content area exam and the need to align course content and requirements with knowledge and skills required for passing the licensure exam. Changes were made to questions, scoring rubric and process for the TEP interviews as well as results notification and appeal, resulting in greater uniformity in the admissions process.

Based on review of documents, IR Addendum and onsite interviews, data from key assessments are compiled for initial and advanced programs through BANNER student information system and Excel, following a data collection timeline indicating what is collected and from which courses. Assessments include evaluations of key assessments, candidate exit interviews, and electronic exit surveys. The Assessment Director ensures the timely collection, compilation and summarization of all data. He also assists faculty with obtaining access to the data and generating reports.

Onsite review of documents and interviews provide evidence of use of assessment data for unit and program improvement. Over the past three years, the number of unsuccessful candidates who were advised into a non-licensure program that leads to graduation with a Bachelor of Science in Education (non-teaching) is: 2007-08 (n=4); 2008-09 (n=12); 2009-10 (n=3). In addition, data are provided on the number of former education majors who were advised out of teacher education.

2.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Since the last NCATE visit in 2004, the unit has engaged in continuous improvement and made significant changes to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. The Unit Assessment System collects, aggregates, summarizes, and analyzes candidate and program data for improvement. Key assessments at transition points and clear timelines for collection have created an expectation of when data are available. The mechanism for review and analysis is established to create a feedback loop for continuous improvement. The unit has a full time Assessment Director to ensure the smooth functioning of the UAS. The up- to-date database system and technology support enables timely data reports. Summarized data reports are accessible on the college website for analysis and feedback. Data driven decisions are an integral part of the unit's activities.

2.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable to this standard

2.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

None

2.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit does not regularly examine and eliminate bias and establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency. (ITP, ADV)	At onsite visit and review of IR addendum, available documents provide evidence that the unit has taken steps to eliminate bias and to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency in the assessments.

Not all data are regularly and systematically reported and analyzed to provide comprehensive information to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. (ITP, ADV)	The unit is using the UAS to provide reports related to candidate, program, and unit performance regularly and systematically at both the initial and advanced levels
---	---

2.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

2.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

2.6 Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

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.

3.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit works with school partners to ensure collaboration and continuity. Field experiences for programs in the unit provide opportunities for observation, tutoring, service learning, contact with families and community, and association with P-12 faculty and other school professionals prior to clinical practice as reported in the Institutional Report (IR) and as evidenced in the exhibits. Email samples provide evidence of university and school-based faculty collaboration. The strong relationships with school partners were confirmed through interviews with employers, principals, and cooperating teachers.

The unit and its school partners deliver and assess a variety of field experiences and clinical practices to aid candidates in developing requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The Director of Education Student Services coordinates placements in the initial programs in collaboration with an administrator designated by its school partners. The Director of Education Student Services coordinates placements with administrators designated by local education agencies for field experiences in the Teaching—Interdisciplinary Option, an advanced program. Unit faculty members in Counseling, Educational Leadership, and Advanced Teaching coordinate internships and observations with mentors in local education agencies. Presented evidence indicates that the professional teaching and supervising staff have the expertise to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice.

The IR indicates that candidates meet entry and exit criteria for clinical practice prior to student teaching as indicated in university and state guidelines. Field experiences facilitate candidates' development as professional educators by providing opportunities for candidates to observe in schools and other agencies. Clinical Practice requires two 7.5 week placements in public schools for a total of 75 days or 1500 contact hours. Candidates are placed in settings that offer opportunities to work with diverse student populations. The IR states that in fall 2009 the program in School Counseling reorganized the internship activities to align with CACREP standards in completing the 600 hours internship requirement. The Internship in Elementary School Counseling (COUN 790) requires 300 supervised hours and the Internship in Secondary School Counseling (COUN 789) requires 300 supervised hours. Course syllabi for field experiences and the clinical practice reflect the unit's conceptual framework with emphasis on reflective practice as well as supporting development in the content knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Candidates meet required criteria for clinical practice prior to student teaching, which indicates mastery of content and some pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills. The Overview of Key Assessments and Transition Points template outlines the requirements and transition points that are required for candidates at the Initial and the Advanced levels. The candidates are required to meet with faculty advisors to check portfolios. Each advisor completes the portfolio review form that indicates the student's progress toward meeting requirements prior to completion of the clinical experience. The faculty advisor must sign each student teaching application and this signature verifies that all requirements for entry into clinical practice have been met. The Director of Education Student Services/Coordinator of Field Services conducts a final check to ensure that all prerequisites have been met. Counseling Candidates must be admitted to Candidacy, complete the Practicum, have a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher, and complete a criminal background check prior to applying for the internship experience. The Office of Education Graduate Programs verifies that candidates have met all requirements prior to applying for internship. The semester prior to their final semester, candidates seeking the Educational Leadership license must apply for a practicum that requires candidates to complete a professional portfolio. The portfolio includes key assessments from all courses in the program and provides for candidate reflection and self-assessment of acquired skills.

Syllabi review and interviews with candidates and supervising teachers validated that coursework provides candidates opportunities to practice assessing student learning in the classroom. Candidates enrolled in READ 438/638 are required to complete a student assessment project to identify a student's strengths and areas of continued growth.

Interviews with candidates and graduates indicate that reflective activity is a major requirement in many courses. The candidates are required to complete a Reflective Information Record each time their University Supervisor observes them. The candidates are required to complete a student teaching notebook that contains a collection of materials that serve as documentation for the candidate. Many of the materials submitted provide evidence that the candidates are assessing how their students learn. Work samples from this notebook are also placed in the Professional Portfolio.

Candidates in Curriculum and Instruction are required to complete a 15-hour, Level I field experience in TCED 705-Advanced Classroom Management.

Candidates in the Educational Administration program complete a three credit hour internship, EDLD 780 - Clinical Supervision, during the term in which the candidate will graduate. There is a set of leadership activities and modules that must be completed during this internship. Candidates must demonstrate mastery in these designated areas. Two members of the Education Studies faculty were members of the state's committee for revision of programs in education leadership, previously Educational Administration and Supervision. As a result of the state revisions in Fall 2009, the unit

enacted clinical supervision requirements that focused on activities instead of merely completing a certain number of field experience clock hours. Internship assignments in this program stipulate that candidates design, implement, and evaluate projects related to their future roles as other school professionals.

In the fall of 2009, the School Counseling program's revision included reorganization to align internship activities with CACREP standards in completing the 600 hours requirement. Candidates have two placements—one at the elementary level and one at the secondary level: COUN 789 Internship in Secondary School Counseling and COUN 790 Internship in Elementary School Counseling. Internship assignments are designed to promote the development of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective school counselors.

Site visits, interviews, and classroom observations were made in two of the three districts that have collaboration agreements with the unit. The signed agreements between the Board of Education of each school district and the unit's program were available. The unit provided exhibits indicating planned involvement with P-12 partners. Unit personnel have conducted workshops and served as proctors in P-12 settings and P-12 teachers have conducted workshops at the request of unit personnel.

The Director of Education Student Services/Coordinator of Field Services works collaboratively with the school partners to ensure that all cooperating teachers meet the state department guidelines for serving as cooperating teachers. When placing candidates for field experiences or clinical practice, school partner representatives are contacted to see if they will be able to accommodate candidates. The school partner is provided autobiographical data and criminal background information on each candidate with a request for placement. The placement request is specific to the candidate's major. The Director of Education Student Services' office keeps a database of candidates, their contact information, and the locations of their placements.

Cooperating teachers conduct multiple formative and summative assessments throughout candidates' clinical practice. Candidates participate in field experiences and clinical practice that include diverse populations. The unit's diversity standards have been included in syllabi for courses with field experiences and clinical practice. The candidates complete a diversity survey to reflect on their inclusion of students with exceptionalities and those from diverse ethnic, racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups.

Work samples of lessons using technology are evidenced in the portfolio based on the three keys of the conceptual framework. Candidate and supervising teacher interviews indicated that candidates' knowledge, skill, and use of technology is more than adequate. Each semester candidates are provided Promethean Board training during student teacher orientation. The student teacher notebook must also show evidence of technology use. All supervisors are provided a packet of training materials, which includes a mileage log, student teaching calendar, and university supervisor handbook.

3.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

In fall 2009, the program in School Counseling reorganized the internship's activities to align with CACREP standards in completing the 600 hours requirement.

A previous area for improvement indicated that planned involvement of the unit's P-12 school partners in the design of field experiences and clinical practice was limited. Review of the provided exhibits and interviews with candidates, principals, and cooperating teachers validate that cooperating teachers and

university supervisors collaborate on the student teaching experience and participate in other cooperative and professional activities. Additionally, the unit has worked to expand the continuum of field experiences prior to clinical practice for some undergraduate programs in the unit. In 2006, the unit added field experience hours in the initial programs as a result of feedback from candidates and school partners.

3.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable to this standard

3.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

None

3.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Planned involvement of the unit's school partners in the design of field experiences and clinical practice is limited.	The IR states that cooperating teachers and university supervisors jointly plan the student teaching experience. It also addresses training of cooperating teachers and the use of multiple formative and summative assessments. There is communication via email to arrange meetings to discuss specific assignments. This was verified through interviews and review of additional documents.
Initial field experiences for secondary education candidates and other K-12 candidates, excluding special education, are not designed to provide a continuum of field experiences prior to clinical practice and graduated preparation for clinical practice (i.e., student teaching).	IR states that the unit has worked to expand the continuum of field experiences prior to clinical practice for some undergraduate programs in the unit. In 2006 the unit added field experience hours. Secondary programs include a total 60-75 planned hours of field experience (TCED 302/305, SEDU 414) prior to clinical practice; art and dance programs include a total of 45 hours prior to clinical practice; and music programs include a total of 65 hours of field experience prior to clinical practice. This was verified during the onsite visit.

3.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

3.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

3.6 Recommendation for Standard 3

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.

4.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit's Teacher Candidate Diversity Proficiencies are clearly linked to the conceptual framework and were designed to develop specific teaching skills, competencies, and dispositions related to diversity. These proficiencies address all areas of diversity including: 1) ethnicity; 2) race; 3) socioeconomic status; 4) gender; 5) language; 6) exceptionalities; 7) religion; 8) sexual orientation; and 8) geographical area. Candidates in both initial and advanced programs are required to develop and demonstrate these proficiencies. Diversity is interwoven throughout various courses. A matrix provided in the electronic exhibit room outlines the required diversity proficiencies with coursework. Comprehensive diversity awareness courses are provided at the initial level (SWRK 220) and at the advanced level (EDFN 720). The emphasis on diversity awareness was confirmed through interviews with student teachers. Student teachers reported that through class assignments and the reflection process their dispositions and awareness of diversity underwent considerable positive changes. Of particular interest was their understanding of the effects of poverty on children and families.

The unit has devoted considerable effort toward ensuring that candidates are assessed in areas of diversity awareness and preparedness. Before admittance to initial or advanced licensure (TEP Interview Form), candidates must satisfactorily address diversity issues. At other check points, and at both levels, a dispositions rubric is submitted by unit faculty to assess candidate diversity dispositions. The Mid-Session Student Teaching Progress Report and Exit Survey are both listed as diversity checks. The College of Education Diversity Survey for Teacher Candidates, which surveys their self-efficacy beliefs toward diversity, is administered to all candidates before program exit. The data collected since 2008 show a positive score of around 3.5 out of a 4.0 scale.

Faculty diversity shows little change from 2007-2009. Specifically, for the university as a whole, 54% of its faculty members are male, while 46% are female. With respect to race and ethnicity, 92.9% are White, 1.2 percent are Asian, 5.0 percent are Black, and 0.8 percent are Hispanic. For the unit, 54 percent of unit faculty members are male, while 46 percent are female. Within the unit with respect to race and ethnicity, 93 percent are White, 1 percent are Asian, 5 percent are Black, and 1 percent are Hispanic. The composition of the unit faculty is nearly identical to the university faculty composition. A university planning document completed in October 2010 acknowledged the ongoing challenge of recruiting African American faculty members. The Office of Equity and Diversity provides ongoing assistance for the unit in these efforts. The unit currently has three ongoing searches and is committed to increasing the diversity of its faculty. Examination of documents and interviews with administrators and faculty affirmed the commitment to recruit faculty from diverse backgrounds.

Student demographics for the university as a whole show 81.1 percent of students identifying as white, 14.7 percent identifying as Black and less than 4 percent Hispanic and Asian. An Education Majors

Diversity Report Fall, 2010 indicates the diversity of educator preparation candidates: 88.1 percent of the unit candidates identifying as White, 9.8 percent as Black, 1.02 percent as Hispanic and less than 1 percent Asian and Others each. In addition, 75 percent of the candidates are female and 24.9 percent are males.

Demographics of the surrounding counties of Martin (main campus) and the centers show similar diversity with the exception of the Ripley Center where there is greater total minority diversity. For the Martin area, 85.26 percent of the population identify as White, 12.76 percent as Black, 0.68 percent as Asian or Pacific Islander, 0.43 percent as Hispanic, 0.22 percent as American Indian or Alaskan Native and 0.64 percent as Other. Females make up 51.37 percent of the population and 48.63 percent are males.

For the Parsons Center, 93.71 percent of the population identifying as White, 4.66 percent as Black, and less than one percent of all the other groups. Females make up 51.48 percent of the population and 48.52 percent are males.

In the areas surrounding the Selmer Center, 82.33 percent of the population identify as White, 16.07 percent as Black, and less than one percent of all other groups. Females make up 49.79 percent of the population and 50.21 percent are males.

At the Ripley Center, 72.64 percent of the population identify as White, 24.76 percent as Black, and less than one percent of all the other groups. Females make up 50.85 percent of the population and 49.15 percent are males.

The university is socioeconomically diverse with 43.3 percent who are first generation college attendees; 43.3 percent of the students receive need based financial aid. In the teacher education unit, 87 percent of the candidates receive some form of financial aid. Forty percent of teacher candidates are from outside west Tennessee (2007-2008).

The unit is continuing its efforts to recruit and attain high achieving African American candidates through the Young Scholars Academy and Project STEP. Two candidates from Project STEP graduated in Spring, 2010. The focus of Project STEP is to recruit, support and mentor minority teacher candidates in order to increase the ratio of minority teachers in west Tennessee schools. The university Admissions Office supports recruitment efforts of the unit by sending admission advisors to community colleges and high schools in the Memphis area. They also generate reports based on any criteria requested by the unit for targeted communication.

The unit's service area targets the geographic region surrounding the institution. Using the surrounding local school districts, the unit is limited in the racially diverse experiences that it is able to provide candidates. Candidates are placed for field experiences in racially diverse settings for specific courses, such as SEDU 415/615's service-learning project with the Martin Housing Authority and ECED 460/SPED 386 field experiences at Dresden Head Start. The partnership with Union City School District is one attempt to ensure that each candidate has a placement in a diverse setting. TCED 302 and TCED 305 may require a placement in Union City Schools. The Director of Education Student Services ensures that placement occurs with one of the racially diverse partnering schools during one of the candidate's clinical practice placements. The Office of Education Student Services keeps a database of all field placements for each candidate in the Teacher Education Program. Candidates lacking a diverse experience prior to clinical practice are identified and are ensured a diverse placement for at least one of the clinical practice placements. Site visits, interviews, and classroom observations were made in four of the schools where candidates are placed for field experiences and/or clinical practice. Interviews with candidates indicated that the diverse experiences have been valuable in helping to shape their

professional philosophies and in their work with teaching children; however, this is an area that candidates have indicated on exit surveys that needs to be strengthened in all of the programs.

The candidates indicated that they are assessed by their cooperating teachers and unit supervisors on the professional dispositions related to diversity. The unit's effort to provide access to diverse settings can be observed in the varied field experiences and through courses like EDFN 720, Multicultural Issues in Education and Counseling, which graduate students seeking Advanced and Initial licensure take. Candidates acknowledged that they are assessed by supervisors and cooperating teachers, but they feel that the frequent self-assessments and reflections are valuable.

4.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Since the last visit, the unit has worked systematically to address diversity across the unit. The unit has a strong commitment to recruiting diverse candidates and faculty. Several strategies are in place; however, the unit and the administration are continuously reviewing the effectiveness of their efforts and making modifications as needed. The unit also carefully monitors candidate placements to ensure that each candidate addresses several areas of diversity in their field experiences.

4.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable to this standard

4.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

None

4.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.	

4.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.	

4.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

4.6 Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

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.

5.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Interviews and examination of electronic artifacts reveal that the professional education faculty in the unit is well qualified for their teaching assignments and other responsibilities. A review of faculty vitae provided evidence that unit faculty members hold earned doctorate degrees or have exceptional expertise that qualifies them for their assignments. Clinical faculty members have contemporary professional experiences that qualify them for supervision of field experience placements, with a wealth of experience in P-12 schools. Field based supervisors meet the criteria established by the state. A review of course syllabi and other artifacts reveals a consistent presence of the conceptual framework throughout various courses. The review also supports the unit's commitment to diversity and technology.

Full-time faculty members in the institution are engaged in scholarly or creative activity. Faculty vitae list scholarship activities such as book reviews, participation in professional conferences, and various publications. This effort was wide spread among the faculty. It was not isolated to the work of only one or two faculty members. It also represents consistent effort over a number of years.

Artifacts reveal that unit faculty are involved in service to the school community in a useful fashion. There were many examples cited in the individual faculty vita. Faculty vitae provide evidence that professors are collaborating with P-12 schools. Collaboration with other college units to improve teaching is evident

According to exhibit documents, faculty are evaluated using multiple assessments. The tenure and promotion process involves faculty evaluation, as well as annual reviews of faculty work. The tenure and promotion process is well explained. Faculty is also evaluated by candidates; these assessments are included in faculty assessment evaluations. The tenure and promotion policies are well defined and readily available. Adjunct faculty members are also evaluated. Faculty provided examples of adjuncts that were not renewed because of poor evaluations.

Unit faculty members are supported with opportunities for professional development. The STEM Center for Learning, which was created in the fall of 2009, provides many opportunities for development. The Instructional Technology Center provides a number of workshops and trainings related to the use of technology for teaching. The unit also provides training and support for the online teachers. A help desk is available 24/7 for faculty and candidates. Travel funds are available to attend and present at professional conferences. This was verified by interviews with faculty and administrators.

Examination of additional electronic documents and interviews with administrators, faculty, and candidates validated questions noted in the offsite review. These included use and evaluation of adjunct faculty, criteria for field based supervisors, integration of technology and diversity into classes, service activities of unit faculty, and professional development opportunities for faculty.

5.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit has made a number of continuous improvement initiatives related to Standard 5. In the fall of 2006, faculty research awards were instituted. These awards provide a workload adjustment during the academic year so the faculty members can focus on their particular research interests. Two professors in the teacher education unit are recipients of the award.

The institution was selected by the UT system as the campus compact lead institution for civic learning and engagement. Faculty members in the teacher education unit have introduced service learning into the curriculum in their classes. The unit continues to offer the opportunities for faculty members to work collaboratively with faculty members in other colleges. They also provide professional development for area schools. An ITQ grant provides professional development to twenty-five teachers in Jackson-Madison County schools on teaching reading to middle school students. A STEM center was organized on the campus during the spring 2009 in response to the national focus on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. One of the teacher education faculty members is on the STEM center board.

Another change is the development of a more formal and structured process to assist faculty members in the unit to monitor their progress toward tenure and promotion. At least four members of the unit have moved forward for tenure, promotion, or both under the new process. This is reviewed each academic year for refinement.

5.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable to this standard

5.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

None

5.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.	

5.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale

No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.	
--	--

5.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

5.6 Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

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.

6.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The College of Education and Behavioral Sciences serves as the unit for the preparation of teachers and other school professionals. The dean is the unit head and has the responsibility for management, coordination, planning, delivery, and operation of all education programs. Other administrative staff members who support the dean are the NCATE Coordinator, Director of Assessment and Teacher Education, Director of Education Student Services, Coordinator of Teacher Licensure, and a staff assistant for Graduate Studies. The Chair of Educational Studies, the Chair of Health and Human Performance Education, and the Chair of Behavioral Sciences also report to the Dean and provide leadership for the educator preparation programs in their respective areas.

The governing structure includes the Professional Education Council, which is comprised of all teacher education programs including those housed outside of the department of Educational Studies. This body meets once a semester to discuss curricular changes and teacher education policies and procedure as well as data collection and aggregation. It serves as an advisory body to the dean. Additional meetings such as the annual NCATE retreat are held with unit faculty. The Teacher Education Effectiveness Committee (TEEC) was formed in fall 2004 to provide a feedback loop. This committee is comprised of educators from the unit, area school administrators and teachers, community members, and candidates. This committee meets once a year.

Unit admission and degree requirements are clearly and consistently described in university catalogs, departmental materials, and online resources. Additionally, information regarding the application process and key transition points within programs is clearly articulated in unit materials on the website and in the student handbook.

The Education Student Services provides support for candidates in the areas of advisement and program planning, directed field experiences, student recruitment, student scholarship awards, and certification/licensure requests. Advanced candidates are advised by the staff assistant in Graduate Studies.

The unit's budget is comparable to the budgets of other units on campus. The budgets for the Social Work program and the Nursing program were used for comparison. Evidence indicates that funding is adequate to support curricular programs and support the preparation of candidates to meet state and professional standards. This was confirmed through interviews with faculty and the administration. Approximately \$60,000 was spent in unit faculty travel and professional development.

The unit follows the campus-wide policies concerning faculty workload, tenure and promotion, and other faculty-related matters as described in the Faculty Handbook. Faculty members maintain a twelve credit hour workload per semester for an annual load equivalent of twenty-four semester credits. Faculty members who teach courses in advanced programs maintain the equivalent of eighteen semester hours per year. The faculty handbook delineates the workload as 80 percent teaching and 20 percent focused on advising, research, professional development, and service. Scholarship, service, and teaching quality are critical in reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions. Faculty load was verified through faculty load summaries in the exhibit center and through interviews. Faculty loads for the unit members are reasonable and do not seem to hinder scholarly and service activities.

The unit is housed primarily in Gooch Hall. Classroom and office spaces are adequate. All of the classrooms in Gooch Hall are technology enhanced. The majority of classrooms across the campus have technology available for instructional presentations. Distance learning resources such as Blackboard appear to be adequate to support quality online instruction. The director of the library works closely with the unit on identifying appropriate resources and library materials. The library resources are appropriate and are accessible on and off campus. The physical library is very inviting and student oriented. Candidates in the unit have access to the latest textbook and supplemental materials across the disciplines in the textbook depository. Through the Steve Rogers Media Center housed in the library, candidates may check out curriculum guides, manipulatives and DVDs to assist with lesson development. There is also a section of the library dedicated to literature for children and adolescents.

6.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit has been engaged in making governance transparent. Data and information are transmitted to faculty in numerous ways including through the TEEC and PEC governance committees. Through the interviews, it was clear that faculty, candidates, P-12 educators and administrators felt that their feedback was being heard and acted upon by the unit head.

6.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

The unit has developed and implemented several processes to facilitate and enhance unit operations. Communication and transparent decision making are both being actively addressed by the unit head. It appears that the unit is making progress toward the target level for leadership and authority. Through interviews with faculty, governance committee members, and administrators as well as a review of additional documentation, it was confirmed that the unit is making significant progress toward target for Standard 6.

6.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

See 6.3

6.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.	

6.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.	

6.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? (These new AFIs may be an area of concern cited in the Offsite BOE Team Feedback Report if evidence in the IR Addendum, new exhibits, observations, or interviews indicates that an area of concern has not been adequately addressed.)

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

6.6 Recommendation for Standard 6

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Documents Reviewed

Please see attached file.

Persons Interviewed

Please see attached file.

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

Exhibits List
Interview List

See **Attachments** panel below.

(Optional) State Addendum: