

BOARD OF EXAMINERS REPORT

N C A T E

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

ACCREDITATION VISIT TO:

University of Tennessee, Martin
Martin, Tennessee
October 22-24, 2006

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:

J. Phillip Bennett, Chair
Elaine Francis
Maetta Johnson

State Team:

Philip Roberson
Esther Swink

State Consultant:

Martin Nash

NEA or AFT Representative:

Gera Summerford

Type of Visit

First _____
Continuing _____
Combination _____
Probation _____
Focused X

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT	i
INTRODUCTION	1
A. The University	1
B. The Unit: College of Education and Behavioral Sciences.....	1
C. The visit: 22 – 24 October 2006	4
STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION	5
A. Assessment system.....	5
B. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation	9
C. Use of data for program improvement.....	11
Overall Assessment of Standard	13
Recommendation:	13
Areas for Improvement:	14
SOURCES OF EVIDENCE	15
Documents reviewed:.....	15
Persons interviewed	21
CORRECTIONS TO THE INSTITUTIONAL REPORT	24

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Institution: University of Tennessee, Martin

Standards		Team Findings	
		Initial	Advanced
2	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	M	M

M = Standard Met
NM = Standard Not Met

INTRODUCTION

A. The University

Background

The University of Tennessee Martin (UT Martin) originated in 1900 when a group of clergy began Hall-Moody Institute. The University of Tennessee purchased Hall-Moody Institute in 1927 and renamed it University of Tennessee Junior College. In 1951, the campus became a senior college and was named The University of Tennessee Martin Branch and offered bachelor's degrees in agriculture and home economics. In 1967, the institution officially became The University of Tennessee, Martin. Currently the university offers baccalaureate degree programs in more than 80 specialized fields and master's degrees in accounting and business administration, administration and supervision, counseling and teacher education, agricultural operations management, and family and consumer sciences. All teacher education programs are state approved by the Tennessee State Board of Education.

Location and Population

The University of Tennessee, Martin is a campus in the University of Tennessee system. As the only public university in West Tennessee outside the city of Memphis, UT Martin has historically embraced the residential university experience. According to the 2002 census data, the city of Martin has a population of approximately 10,200 residents. The majority of the undergraduate and graduate students who attend UT Martin are from the western part of the state. There is an enrollment of approximately 6,800 students.

Mission

The primary purpose of the University of Tennessee, Martin is to provide a quality undergraduate education in a traditional collegiate atmosphere characterized at all levels by close relationships among students and faculty. In addition, the graduate, online, and distance learning programs meet life-long educational needs. Appropriate technologies support research, scholarship, and creative endeavors, which enhance teaching and expand knowledge. As a land grant university, UT Martin is committed to public service and applied research efforts to enhance the economic, educational, aesthetic, and cultural life of the region (catalog, page 1, 2005-06).

B. The Unit: College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Mission

The primary mission of the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences is the preparation of a diverse clientele of candidates through a variety of program offerings that meet state, regional, and national accreditation standards, for either entry into the world of work or further academic study at the graduate level. Those who choose to enter the world of work include those prepared to teach PK-12 students and perform other school service functions, as well as others who may choose to embark upon careers in such public service areas as business, government, social and psychological services, personnel management, and the criminal justice system. Those who continue academic study at the graduate level may pursue a degree leading to leadership

certification in education or an advanced degree in a wide range of occupations related to the behavioral sciences.

Description

The reorganization of the university's academic structure in 1999 resulted in combining the School of Education that housed two departments, Educational Studies and Health and Human Performance, with the departments of Psychology, and Sociology, Anthropology, Social Work, and Criminal Justice. The Dean of the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences (CEBS) serves as the administrative head of the four departments. The Teacher Education Unit at UT Martin is comprised of all faculty involved in the preparation of teacher candidates. This includes faculty from the departments within the college and faculty from other academic units at the university who are involved in teaching the content for the secondary licensure content areas.

Since the last NCATE visit in 2004, the Teacher Education Unit has undergone significant changes in leadership. The Director of Education Student Services returned to the academic department to teach and two administrative positions were created, Director of Assessment/Teacher Education and Coordinator of Field Services. The coordinator's position has been filled by a local school system person who began duties August 1, 2006. The director's position is being filled on an interim basis until a national search is completed during the 2006-2007 academic year. The assessment portion of the director's position is being handled by the dean until the position is filled. The Department of Health and Human Performance has an interim chair and the Department of Educational Studies will have an interim chair (the chair retired effective June 30, 2006) for the next academic year, pending a national search during the 2006-2007 academic year. Since the last NCATE visit, the graduate coordinator's position has changed each year. A faculty member served during 2004-2005 and the Educational Studies chair served during 2005-2006. A tenure-track faculty member has been appointed for the academic year 2006-2007. The current dean has been with the unit since September 2, 2003. In addition to the duties described above, she has served as the NCATE coordinator. In addition to her duties as the dean, she has served as the NCATE coordinator and the assessment coordinator. The current chancellor has led the institution since the fall of 2001. The vice chancellor for academic affairs has been on the campus since the fall of 2002.

The Department of Educational Studies is made up of 23 full-time faculty and offers Bachelor of Science degrees in Education that meet licensure requirements for PK-3, K-6, Middle Grades 5-8, and Secondary 7-12. The Department of Health and Human Performance has 11 faculty, five of whom teach in the Physical Education K-12 and Health K-12 licensure programs. There are four additional full-time faculty members from outside the college representing undergraduate licensure programs in Agriculture, Art, Music, and Family Consumer Sciences. Graduate programs in Education are directed through the Department of Educational Studies and managed by the Graduate Coordinator.

The table on the following page lists initial and advanced programs.

Initial/Advanced Programs in the College of Education & Behavioral Sciences Teacher Education Unit

Program	Award Level	Program Level*	Num. of Candidates Enrolled Spring 06	Agency or Association Reviewing Program	Status
<i>Undergraduate</i>					
Integrated Studies, Prek-4	B.S. Ed	ITP	86	State	Approved
Integrated Studies, K-8	B.S. Ed	ITP	88	State	Approved
Integrated Studies, K-6	B.S. Ed	ITP	119	State	Approved (AWS)
Middle Grades, 5-8	B.S. Ed	ITP	18	State	Approved
Ag Ed/Ag Science, 7-12	B.S. Ed	ITP	31	State	Approved
Visual Arts: Studio	B.F.A.	ITP	13	State	Approved (W-2)
Visual Arts: K-12	B.F. A.	ITP	12	State	Approved (W-2)
Fine Arts: Dance Ed	B.F.A.	ITP	4	State	Approved (W-2)
Basic Business and Accounting, 7-12/Business Technology	B.S. Ed	ITP	9	State	Approved
Biology, 7-12	B.S. Ed	ITP	0	State	Approved (W-2)
Chemistry, 7-12	B.S. Ed	ITP	1	State	Approved (W-1)
Earth & Space Science, 7-12	B.S. Ed	ITP	1	State	Approved (W-1)
Economics, 7-12	B.S. Ed	ITP	0	State	Approved (W-1)
English, 7-12	B.S. Ed	ITP	41	State	Approved (W-1)
Family & Consumer Sciences 5-12/9-12	B.S.	ITP	8	State	Approved
French, 7-12	B.S. Ed	ITP	1	State	Approved (W-1)
Geography, 7-12	B.S. Ed	ITP	3	State	Approved (W-1)
Government	B.S. Ed	ITP	2	State	Approved (W-1)
Health/Physical Education, K-12	B.S. Ed	ITP	45	State	Approved
History, 7-12	B.S. Ed	ITP	43	State	Approved (W-1)
Mathematics	B.S. Ed	ITP	17	State	Approved (W-1)
Music, K-12 Instrumental and Vocal	B.A.	ITP	43	State	Approved (W-2)
Spanish, 7-12	B.S. Ed	ITP	2	State	Approved (W-1)
Special Education, PreK-12	B.S. Ed	ITP	40	State	Approved
Teaching, Elementary	M.S.I.L. Ed	ITP	34	State	Approved
Teaching, Secondary	M.S.I.L Ed	ITP	34	State	Approved
<i>Graduate</i>					
Teaching, Elementary	M.S. Ed	ADV	34	State	Approved
Teaching, Secondary	M.S. Ed	ADV	34	State	Approved
School Counseling	M.S. Ed	ADV	20	State	Approved
Education Administration and Supervision	M.S. Ed	ADV	65	State	Approved

* ITP=Initial Teacher Program ADV=Advanced Teacher Program

Off-Campus Sites

The UT Martin Jackson Center is located on the campus of the Tennessee Technology Center at Jackson. Candidates can earn degrees in Masters of Science in Education for Initial Licensure, Advanced Elementary/Secondary, and School Counseling. Faculty from the unit teach in the off-campus programs. In addition, several of the courses in both programs are offered via distance learning and during summer terms. Registration and advising also take place at both locations under the direction of UT Martin faculty and staff. A new teacher education generalist tenure-track faculty member was hired for the Jackson Center for the academic year 2004-2005. No undergraduate programs in education are offered at this site.

The UT Martin McNairy County Center/Selmer is in its sixth 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.

Online Courses

The faculty in the Teacher Education Unit has developed courses for online delivery. Many of the courses for the special education endorsement are offered online. The Master of Science in Education with a major in Educational Administration is online. The two technology courses required for initial licensure are also offered online, as is the research course, the master's project, and the models of instruction course.

C. The visit: 22 – 24 October 2006

This NCATE review at the University of Tennessee, Martin was a focused visit on Standard 2 at the initial and advanced preparation levels. Tennessee is a partnership state. The visiting team included three NCATE Board of Examiners members, two state team members, one state consultant, and one NEA observer.

STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

Level: (Initial and Advanced)

A. Assessment system

Initial Programs

The unit has two types of initial programs, the traditional undergraduate program and the Master of Science for Initial Licensure (MSIL) program. While these two programs have the same requirements for initial licensure, the graduate MSIL program has additional requirements that are different from the traditional undergraduate program (e.g., 3.0 GPA is required). These additional requirements are applied to the MSIL degree but not to initial licensure. Future references to initial programs include both the traditional undergraduate and graduate MSIL programs.

The University of Tennessee, Martin has developed an assessment system through a collaborative effort with the professional community. During the fall of 2004, UT Martin reorganized its data collection process using Banner, a candidate information system program. The unit created an assessment committee whose functions have been to design a feedback loop to assure that data are collected and analyzed, to report to the professional community, and to serve as an advisor for the assessment process. The data are entered into Banner, where the data are aggregated. Data are exported to Filemaker Pro, a database program, for reporting to the Professional Education Council (PEC) and the Teacher Education Effectiveness Committee (TEEC). The PEC is made up of representatives from each licensure area of the university. The TEEC is made up of Teacher Education faculty, Arts and Sciences faculty, candidates, local teachers, principals, and community representatives. These two groups review the assessment data to provide feedback to unit faculty to institute program improvements and changes in unit operation.

The unit has coded into the Banner data collection system the following key assessments.

- General Information Form
- Teacher Education Interview
- Tracking Professional Growth
- Portfolio Review
- Summative Evaluation Form for Level I, Field Experience
- Mid-session Student Teaching Disposition Indicator
- Student Teaching Performance Assessment
- Comprehensive Assessment - Reflecting Information

Examples were included in the exhibit room, noted in interviews, and demonstrated by computer. An online survey is sent to alumni and administrators every two years. Since it is anonymous, it could not be coded into the Banner system but is tabulated and shared using Filemaker Pro.

According to faculty interviews and minutes of the PEC and TEEC, there is (evidence) that the unit has developed an assessment system for initial programs. Minutes show that these groups analyzed data that were available, provided information for unit faculty to review during their annual retreat, and served as advisors to the dean. Information is used to institute program improvements and changes in unit operations. Review of candidate files verifies the completion of the assessment and application to the initial teacher education programs.

Unit Assessment Plan: Initial Programs

Conceptual Framework “Educators as Facilitators of Learning” Outcomes:

- Candidates will exhibit Knowledge, Skills, and Applications
- Candidates will engage in effective Reflective Practice
- Candidates will demonstrate appropriate Professional and Ethical Behaviors

The initial level assessment system is comprised of the following five checkpoints:

- Checkpoint #1 Admission to the Teacher Education Program; data collected in fall and spring
 - ACT/PPST Scores
 - GPA
 - Interview
 - GRE/MAT/PRAXIS scores
- Checkpoint #2 Admission to student teaching; data collected in fall and spring
 - Field experience I
 - Coursework completion
 - GPA check
 - Portfolio check
- Checkpoint #3 Student teaching; data collected in fall and spring
 - Student teaching evaluation
 - Midpoint dispositions check
 - GPA check
 - Portfolio check
- Checkpoint #4 Program completion; data collected during semester of program completion
 - Exit Interview
 - PRAXIS II
 - GPA check
- Checkpoint #5 Post graduate follow-up; data collected 2 years after graduation
 - Alumni survey (after 2 years)
 - Employer satisfaction survey (after 2 years)

Interviews, evidence found in the exhibit room, and candidate files show that the initial level unit assessment system reflects candidacy outcomes outlined in the conceptual framework.

The key assessment measures (listed above) are used to monitor candidate performance and are administered at specific points in the program. These key assessments align with the proficiencies outlined in the conceptual framework and state and professional standards. They are evident in the candidate files and in evidence found in the exhibit room.

The assessment measures are used to determine admission, continuation, and completion of the program. They are used for placement of candidates in school systems, are predictors of candidate success, and are used to develop survey items to obtain feedback from employers.

Candidates have the opportunity to be admitted through an appeals process using grade point average rather than test scores. The director of student teaching uses education data when meeting with individual candidates who may have been rated as unsatisfactory to determine courses of action. Student teachers who are not meeting expectations must either withdraw from student teaching permanently or be successful in a plan of remediation before being permitted to re-enter the student teaching program.

There was some evidence of training for portfolio development and faculty stated that fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessment procedures are assured. Faculty stated that there is training in the use of rubrics to make sure everyone understands how to use assessment instruments and that assessment instruments are piloted to assure the proper use of the updated forms. These procedures, however, were insufficient or could not be validated by a review of evidence in the exhibit room. It could not be concluded that the unit assures that assessments are fair, accurate, consistent, and free from bias.

The unit determines that assessments are predictors of candidate success based on a history of successful placement of candidates in schools and results of positive feedback from employers in the form of employer satisfaction surveys. UT Martin's Office of Student Employment and Institutional Research conducts a job placement survey. The results of this survey are also used as a predictor of success. Evidence of the number of candidates who took and passed the PRAXIS II exam indicates success of the program and assessments.

Review of information in the exhibit room documents a number of assessments that can be used to manage and improve operations and programs by the unit. These assessments include test scores, course grades, teacher education interviews, portfolio reviews, summative evaluation for field experience, student teaching dispositions, and student teacher performance assessment.

Advanced Programs

Advanced programs are available in School Counseling, Educational Administration and Supervision (EDAS), Elementary Education, and Secondary Education. Documentation of the development process for the unit assessment system for these advanced programs demonstrates that it was a collaborative effort with the professional community. Minutes of the TEEC and the PEC demonstrate the involvement of these two groups in the review and approval of the assessment system for the advanced programs. Evidence from interviews indicated broad participation by arts and sciences faculty and P-12 personnel. Minutes from an October 13, 2006 Educational Administration and Supervision meeting record the suggestion that the November 10, 2006 meeting consider a proposal to develop a graduate program advisory council that will include candidate participation. The unit assessment system for the advanced programs reflects the candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework and professional standards and in state licensure and program approval standards.

Unit Assessment Plan: Advanced Programs

Conceptual Framework “Educators as Leaders and Enhancers of Human Development”

Outcomes:

- Candidates will exhibit Knowledge, Skills, and Application
- Candidates will exhibit appropriate Human Relations Skills.
- Candidates will exhibit evidence of Inquiry-based work.
- Candidates will demonstrate appropriate Professional and Ethical Behavior

Key assessments used to monitor candidate performance and the checkpoints at which they are administered in advanced programs are shown below.

Checkpoint #1 Admission to Program

GRE scores (only beginning fall of 2006)

MAT (before fall of 2006)

PRAXIS PLT, NTE General Knowledge (before fall of 2006)

UG grade point average

Admissions checklist (EDAS and Counseling)

Checkpoint #2 Capstone Experience

Completion of coursework

Application for internship

Counseling Lab

Grade Point Average

Master’s Research Project (Advanced Elementary/Secondary/Subject area)

Checkpoint #3 Program completion

Completion of Internship (EDAS and School Counseling)

Comprehensive Examinations

Completion of coursework

Checkpoint #4 Post-Graduate Follow-up

Employer satisfaction survey

Alumni satisfaction survey

Key assessments are GRE scores, PRAXIS II scores (as applicable), grade point averages, and comprehensive examination results. Checklists and rubrics used to assess performance are adequately aligned with the conceptual framework and program outcomes.

GRE scores and grade point averages were noted as predictors of candidate success on comprehensive examinations. The assessments are used to determine admission, continuance, and completion of programs. Other entry and exit criteria within the unit are typically program-specific. For example, candidate portfolios in the school counseling and school administration programs include course- and program-specific evidence related to the advanced conceptual framework and to professional standards. Portfolios from the advanced elementary and secondary programs were not presented for review but interviews verified a portfolio requirement. When candidate performance does not meet expectations, options include additional coursework or dismissal from the program.

The evaluation of comprehensive examination responses is accomplished with multiple reviewers, providing an opportunity for unit assessment of inter-rater reliability for these

assessments. However, evidence of aggregation and analysis of these data was not provided. Reliance upon extant data such as individual, program-specific assignment grades, course grades, grade point averages, and test scores is common. Thus, insufficient evidence was provided to assure that the unit has taken effective comprehensive steps to eliminate sources of bias in its advanced program performance assessments. Nor was evidence provided to support existence of a strategy for establishing fairness, accuracy, and consistency of unit assessment procedures.

Review of information in the exhibit room documents a number of assessments that can be used to manage and improve operations and programs by the unit. Enrollment numbers, PRAXIS II scores, end of course and program surveys, and teacher/course evaluation results are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit. However, only limited evidence of data aggregation was provided. These assessments and evaluations provide evidence that they are used as tools to manage and improve unit operations.

B. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation

The Dean of the CEBS serves as the assessment coordinator for data collection, analysis, and evaluation for all programs. She is directly responsible for the initial program assessments. A newly appointed graduate coordinator assumes direct responsibility for data collection, analysis, and evaluation for advanced programs. A new Director of Assessment position has been funded and a search is underway. The overall process for data collection, analysis, and evaluation is the same for initial and advanced programs and much of the team findings are reported together.

Initial Programs

Upon application to an education program, candidate qualifications are entered into the Banner system. Once accepted, data on candidate performance checkpoints and assessments are submitted to the appropriate office and entered into Banner on an ongoing basis. The dean of education's office is responsible for collecting and entering initial program data into the Banner system. The dean is also responsible for working with university technology personnel to generate reporting formats in Filemaker Pro. Mean scores were available on key assessments such as field evaluations and ACT scores. However, in one case a specific report was requested on candidate dispositions at the initial level and the report had not yet been built into Filemaker Pro; thus the data were not available in an easily reported format.

Advanced Programs

Advanced program data are submitted to the office of the graduate coordinator to be entered into Banner. Under the direction of the unit head (assessment coordinator), the graduate coordinator is also responsible for reports. Some of the assessment fields for the advanced programs have not yet been built into Banner for data collection. Comprehensive examinations were in the system and data were available in reports by program. Data for other key assessments including the counselor lab projects, the master's research projects, and internships are not collected in the Banner information system to provide feedback on candidate performance. However, it was evident that some analysis and action on these assessments had taken place.

Initial and Advanced Programs

The unit collects data on candidate assessments and unit operations on an ongoing basis. In 2004, the unit recognized that the technology used for compiling and reporting data was not sufficient. After reviewing many commercial programs and discussing their needs with the university's technology department, the unit determined that the Banner student records system could be utilized to meet their needs and would allow them to keep all data in one system. As a result, fields were created in the Banner system to collect data on checkpoints and key assessments.

Banner reports are not easy to read and, therefore, most are translated into readable formats using Filemaker Pro software. In some cases, Banner data are entered into tables using Microsoft Word. Using Filemaker Pro, the unit has created most of its reports and is in the process of creating reports for all remaining assessment system data.

It was reported that in the spring of each year, data are provided to the PEC and the TEEC. A review of these meeting minutes indicates that discussions and decisions are made about changes in unit programs and procedures based upon issues raised by faculty more often than about issues generated from a comprehensive review of unit data. There was no clear evidence that a comprehensive analysis of data is conducted. There were two actions that were clearly based on data from the alumni and employer follow-up surveys--changes in scoring on the portfolios and the need for more field experiences.

Minutes of the PEC and the TEEC indicate that some data were reviewed annually, including the items noted above. The minutes do not reflect that a comprehensive set of all available data were presented and analyzed for program evaluation or unit performance. Interviews with these committees indicate that they received and reviewed reports in spring of 2005 and 2006; however, no copies of the actual reports were available. Faculty reported receiving data annually at a fall retreat. Minutes from the 2005 faculty meeting reflect a discussion of the data from the scoring of the portfolio rubric, but no copies of the actual data reviewed were available.

When asked for examples of programmatic assessments reports, individual course projects and rubrics were usually provided. Data from these assessments are not identified components of the assessment system. The exception was the surveys, initial and advanced programs, of employers and alumni, which are conducted on a two-year cycle using web-based survey software and were reported in clear reports, in aggregated and disaggregated formats.

Candidates with concerns meet with the chair to voice the concerns. The chair completes a "Student Concern Form." The candidate and chair determine a timeline for addressing the concern. The chair talks with the faculty member protecting the identity of the candidates. A follow-up meeting with the faculty member is held if necessary. If the complaint cannot be resolved by the chair it is sent to the next level (e.g. Graduate Committee, administrator, etc.). The process for grade appeals and reinstatements are identified in the catalogue. A summary of candidate concerns brought before the education department for the last three years was available in the exhibit room.

C. Use of data for program improvement

Initial Programs

A variety of measures are used to assess the performances of candidates at the five checkpoints: admission to teacher education, admission to student teaching, student teaching, program completion, and post-graduate follow-up. The unit expects candidates to regularly review their performance throughout the teacher education program using the portfolio process, which is introduced to them prior to acceptance into teacher education and is continued throughout the program. The portfolios are evaluated formally at three of the four checkpoints in the teacher education program, and candidates share the portfolios with advisors each semester. A rubric for scoring the portfolio is used to evaluate progress toward outcomes. Candidates are required to write reflections describing strengths, weaknesses, and means for improvement.

The instructor/course evaluation is a regular, ongoing process that provides data to faculty to assist in making decisions about changes to be made in course syllabi, delivery, and requirements. Faculty members indicate that they reflect on this information and are expected to report plans for improvement during the annual performance reviews. Many faculty use Blackboard online courseware as a means to evaluate courses and use the data to make judgments about course improvements.

In addition to individual faculty members and faculty committees, the PEC and TEEC involve the professional community in reviewing assessment data that were made available. These groups analyze unit data and make recommendations for program improvements to the dean of education. At assessment plan checkpoints, the dean and department chairs review data and identify and share concerns, seeking recommendations and appropriate involvement for the purpose of closing the assessment loop. For example, all initial candidates participate in an exit interview which includes assessment of the effectiveness of advising, courses, field experiences, integration of diversity, and technology. Involving these groups in considering data and recommending changes is routine.

Persons interviewed described changes that had occurred in programs and unit operations. After reviewing evaluations completed by cooperating teachers, the TEEC recommended training on the new field experience form and a collaboration with English faculty to work with student teachers to make them aware of colloquialisms that need to be avoided when speaking standard English in professional settings. Both recommendations were implemented. As a result of concerns of candidates expressed during exit interviews, a management course was added to the education core. The faculty voted to increase the GPA required for admission to teacher education to 2.75 after general concerns about improving quality were discussed and the impact on candidates was considered. As a result of data from graduate and employer surveys, a course in classroom management was placed into the curricula replacing the Group Dynamics course in the MSIL program. While changes did occur in program and unit operation, the verification of the basis for making changes came from interviews of committees, administrators, and faculty rather than from actual data provided to the team. As an exception, the changes that were made were based on the follow-up surveys were data-driven decisions. Some changes were being made based on course- or program-specific evaluations that were not identified in the assessment

system. Also, the evidence does not show a well planned, systematic approach for considering data regularly for the purpose of making program unit operation changes.

Faculty advisors have warm, personal relationships with candidates and communicate regularly with them concerning assessments. The dean of education and department chairs are responsible for communicating with faculty and other stakeholders concerning assessment data. As noted above, in addition to faculty, the Professional Education Council gives oversight to the unit, and the Teacher Education Effectiveness Committee serves an advisory role. Communication from the dean with members of both of these groups is routine. In meetings with stakeholders, there was evidence that they were aware of issues, data, and changes that have been implemented as a result of data analysis.

Advanced Programs

The institutional report states that candidates at the advanced level must show evidence of pedagogical skills, adeptness in human relations, and aptitude for inquiry, and exhibit professional and ethical behavior. The unit assessment plan indicates that the four checkpoints with assessments at each are similar across programs. Depending on the program, advanced candidates complete action research or portfolios in field experiences which include activity logs as well as written reflections. The school counseling program requires a paper on each component of the advanced program conceptual framework. Advanced candidates write papers related to personal goals at admission and complete a self-perceptive reflection about their own biases during a multicultural experience.

The instructor/course evaluation procedure is a regular, ongoing process that provides data to faculty for decisions about changes to be made in course syllabi, delivery, and requirements. Faculty members are expected to reflect on this information and to report plans for improvement during the annual performance review. As an example, one faculty member prepared a pre-test/post-test for candidates to assess teaching methods in an online course. In addition, the unit developed a mid-course evaluation used for courses conducted online.

In addition to the faculty, two groups are involved in reviewing assessment data for advanced programs. The Graduate Education Committee and the university's Graduate Council consider data presented by the dean and department chairs and make recommendations or take appropriate action. One recent example of this routine process resulted from examining scores of advanced candidates on comprehensive examinations. As a result, the faculty rewrote exam questions to better align with the conceptual framework and revised a scoring rubric. The Graduate Council considered and approved the changes in October 2006. Faculty members actively participate in the work required to analyze data and make program changes.

Most of the evidence of the use of data for making program changes at the advanced level came from interviews with candidates, faculty, administrators, and graduates rather than from printed documents. After considering scores reflecting weaknesses in writing skills among graduate candidates, a decision was made to no longer accept the MAT or PRAXIS exams for admission and to require the GRE because of the availability of a writing skills component. As a result of data showing that a significant number of candidates were requesting course substitutions because they were unable to meet licensure requirements, the unit created a new non-licensure degree. After a systematic review of syllabi to identify duplication of content and to assign

ISLCC standards to be addressed in appropriate courses, faculty revised course descriptions in the EDAS program. Consideration of candidates' GPAs in advanced programs resulted in a policy that requires an overall GPA of 3.0 with no more than two C grades. Enrollment data were used to justify successfully a proposal to the provost for hiring two additional faculty members. Examination of data from the Tennessee Board of Regents regarding the market for online programs resulted in a decision to convert the EDAS program to be fully online with the stipulation that only EDAS candidates could be enrolled in the online courses. After reviewing the list of candidates who had been registered for the online EDAS program revealed non-EDAS candidates had been enrolled, the advising process for EDAS candidates was revised. While these represent changes in programs or unit operations, the evidence does not show a well-planned, systematic approach for considering data regularly for the purpose of making program unit operation changes.

Faculty members/advisors have warm, personal relationships with candidates and communicate regularly with them concerning assessment. The dean of education and department chairs are responsible for communicating with faculty and other stakeholders concerning assessment data. As noted above, in addition to faculty, the Graduate Education Committee and the university's Graduate Council have oversight responsibilities for advanced programs, and communication from the dean with members is routine. In meetings with stakeholders, there was evidence that they were aware of issues, data, and changes that have been implemented as a result of data analysis.

Overall Assessment of Standard

At the initial and advanced levels, UT Martin has developed an assessment system to collect and analyze data on applicant qualifications and candidate performance. It is based on state and professional standards and on the conceptual framework. The unit has established a schedule for review and analysis of data. The development of the assessment system itself is complete and implementation is near completion. At the time of the on-site visit, there was insufficient evidence that the unit was ensuring that assessments are fair, accurate, consistent, and free from bias. The improvement in the use of technology for collecting and reporting data using Banner and Filemaker Pro is impressive and nearly complete. All data for initial program assessments are being entered into the system; a few data reports have not been created. At the advanced level, data fields for all key assessments have not yet been created, preventing the creation of a comprehensive set of data reports. For these reasons, not all data were assessable and aggregated in a way that they could be used systematically to make decisions based on data. There was evidence from interviews that changes were being made to improve programs and unit operations and, in the case of follow-up surveys, these were based on data.

Recommendation: Met at the Initial and Advanced Levels

Rationale:

Although the team lists three areas for improvement compared to only one on the NCATE Accreditation Action Report, the Action Report area for improvement comprised an entire standard. In contrast, each of the three new, reworded areas for improvement encompasses only a part of the standard. Additionally, it should be noted that for each of the areas for improvement, the team found evidence that the unit has already made progress toward meeting the area for improvement.

Areas for Improvement:

Original from NCATE Accreditation Action Report

The unit does not have an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

Reworded New

1. For initial and advanced level assessments, the unit has not taken effective steps to examine and eliminate bias and to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency. (Initial and Advanced)

Rationale:

For initial and advanced programs, some guidelines for portfolio development were provided and training in the use of rubric was described; however, such procedures were insufficient or could not be validated.

2. Not all data for initial and advanced programs are regularly and systematically reported and analyzed to provide comprehensive information to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. (Initial and Advanced)

Rationale:

While many data reports for initial and advanced programs were being created and used, some reports needed for the assessment system either were not yet available or were incomplete. As a result data on some components of the assessment system were not being reported and analyzed.

3. The data for some key assessments of the advanced level programs are not currently compiled by means of the information technology used by the unit assessment system. (Advanced)

Rationale:

Data for some key assessments such as the counselor lab projects, the master's research projects, and internships are not collected in the information system used by the unit.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Documents Reviewed

Initial Program Exhibit room documents

Access to Faculty Handbook online through Office of Academic Affairs
Action Report from Tennessee State Board of Education
Adapted Lesson Plan Assignment rubric
Admission to Teacher Education – information for students
Advising concerns
Alumni satisfaction survey data, Spring 2006
Alumni satisfaction survey, Spring 2006
Analyzed data on impact of raising GPA from 2.5 to 2.75
Appeals data – a circle graph showing a breakdown of deficiencies for students admitted on appeals since 2002
Applicants for university admission by colleges and departments, 2002-2006
Application for admission to teacher education
Areas for Improvement –NCATE (March of 2005) field experience concerns
Art and Music Education response to lack of continuum in field experiences addressed during spring of 2005.
Banner of data sets samples
Banner Overview
Blackboard assessment
Budget priority for director position
Budget to show increase in travel for faculty
Candidate's philosophy check
Coding schemata for information in Banner
Comprehensive Assessment Reflective Record
Cooperating Teachers' Focus Group – April, 2006
Course evaluations data
Curriculum Advising and Program Planning samples
Curriculum Advising and Program Planning to verify status of coursework completion
Data (from system) specifically indicating secondary students want more field experiences
Data coded to candidate proficiencies, state standards, professional standards, and conceptual framework
Data for candidates checkpoint #2 (application to student teaching) and checkpoint #3(student teaching), Fall 2005
Demographic data for Fall 2006 students in the unit
Departmental Bylaws address Performance and Planning Review and Tenure and Promotion
Director of Assessment Position description questionnaire
Director of Assessment Positions duties
Dispositions checks during checkpoint t#1, #2, #3
Diversity survey data
Diversity survey developed and given during exit interview process during spring of 2006
Diversity survey results (shared with Professional Education Council, Teacher Education Effectiveness Council)
Dragon Web Surveys

Dragon Web surveys information
 Educational Studies Faculty Meeting Agenda – August 24, 2006; September 22, 2006
 Educational Studies Faculty Meeting Minutes — September 22, 2006
 Elementary education student teaching evaluation data, Fall 2005
 Employer satisfaction survey data
 Employer satisfaction survey data, Spring 2006
 Employer Satisfaction Survey, Spring 2006
 Enrolled Student Survey Date and Special Education Program
 Enrolled Student Survey Report, 2004
 Evidence of portfolio check by advisors
 Evidence of use of field experience in English methods course
 Evidence of use of field experiences in social studies methods classes
 Example of change in unit operations to change the teacher education interview form
 Example of change in unit operations to hire a Director of Assessment/Teacher Education
 Example of data used for the teacher education portfolio review
 Example of how Blackboard is used for reflection and improvement
 Examples of how feedback loop worked for 2005-2006
 Exit Interview data
 Exit Interview data – a chart showing a breakdown of 135 student responses to exit interview questions
 Exit interview data shared with Teacher Education Effectiveness committee
 Exit interview with some students disagreeing that they felt qualified to address issues of diversity in today’s classrooms, Fall 2004
 Exit Interview: Checkpoint #4
 Faculty Awards, FY 2002-2006
 Faculty meeting minutes – September 22, 2005; November 17, 2005
 Faculty ranked for merit pay.
 Faculty using Blackboard each semester
 Faculty vote to include directed field experiences in secondary methods classes in catalog on October 20, 2006 (minutes have not been collated, but can get them for you)
 Field Experience I data
 FileMaker Pro 8.5 information
 Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth aligned with
 GPA data by program, Fall 2006
 GPA/ACT scores for unit
 GPA/Test Score/Interview/Portfolio/field experience information by Program
 GPA/test score/teacher interview data from applicants, Fall 2006
 Grade appeals policy for university
 Grade distribution, Summer 2006
 Handbook criteria for Performance and Planning Review and Tenure and Promotion
 History of Tennessee Framework
 HPER 411 rubric
 Human Performance 308 rubric
 Human Performance 309 rubric
 Human Performance 310 rubric
 Individual course assessments to show use of data from system for course improvement

Initial Assessment System Alignment Chart
Initial Program Data stored in Banner
In-service for faculty presented by Dr. Frank Black
Instructor evaluation survey (used for faculty performance assessment; given fall or spring semester by proctor)
Interview, Portfolio review and Field experience data
ISTE Standards
Job description for advertisement
Job Placement Survey Results
Kindergarten practicum changes (K-6 and preK-3 program), meeting minutes December 14, 2005; October 4, 2006
Leadership Accreditation Team Minutes – January, 2005; March, 2005
Level I Field Experience feedback
Level I Field Experience rubric
Level II Field Experience feedback (course assessments)
Level II field experience report of evaluation results for one semester
Midpoint dispositions check (student teaching)
Midpoint dispositions check data (student teaching)
Mid-Session Dispositions Rubric
Mid-session Student Teaching Dispositions Indicators Aligned with Conceptual Framework
Mission Statement for University and College aligned with conceptual framework
MUED 400 rubric
New Form with questions for consistency and fairness
One sample report for individual student from Banner
Operating increases (budget) July 1, 2004-July 1, 2006
Performance Standards Rubric
Planning and Assessment form used by Department Chairs
Portfolio check by university supervisor
Portfolio check data
Portfolio check for certain classes
Portfolio Check: Checkpoint#1, #2, #3
Portfolio Rubric
PRAXIS II workshop sponsored by STEA and TEA
PRAXIS II: Checkpoint #4
PRAXIS PLT report of results for one off-campus site for one semester
Professional Education Council – data from exit interviews concerning lack of field experiences for secondary education
Professional Education Council discussion of need for secondary field experiences
Professional Education Council Members
Professional Education Council Minutes and feedback – March 23, 2005; December 4, 2005; April 12, 2006
Program checksheet
Recommendation to keep TCED 301 as is
Relationship between Group Forum Participation and Midterm Exam grade in a special education class
Sample check sheets to verify coursework completion

Sample evaluation of special education practicum with class averages
 Sample Student Teacher Folders
 Samples of individual applicant information (undergraduate and graduate)
 Samples of reports (2) showing test scores data and GPA data for students in particular licensure programs for a given semester
 SEDU 414 rubric
 Special Education class evaluation of student products
 Standard 2 Committee Meeting Notes – May 2, 2006
 Standard 3 committee meeting minutes after NCATE retreat
 Standard 3 committee report for September, 2006 NCATE retreat
 Standard 4 (diversity committee) Minutes to address student feedback from the diversity survey
 Standard 4 (diversity committee) Minutes to also survey faculty
 Standards committee chairs
 Student complaints resolutions, 2003-2006
 Student concern form
 Student Teacher Performance Assessment
 Student Teaching Evaluation aligned with Conceptual Framework
 Student teaching evaluation by cooperating teacher rubric
 Student teaching evaluation by university supervisor rubric; sample report of average scores from each rubric for a particular licensure student group
 Student teaching evaluation data (Checkpoint#3)
 Student teaching evaluation feedback sample (cooperating teacher)
 Student teaching evaluation feedback sample (university supervisor)
 Student Teaching Evaluation: Cooperating Teacher: Checkpoint#3
 Student Teaching Evaluation: University Supervisor: Checkpoint #3
 Student teaching evaluations
 Student Teaching Portfolio Rubric
 Students with grades between 2.5 and 2.75 (data used to assist with decision to raise GPA for teacher education program)
 TCED 302 Field Study rubric
 TCED 302 pre/post test results for assessment of pedagogical knowledge
 TCED 302 Unit Rubrics
 TCED 780 Practicum Evaluation rubric
 Video Reflection rubric
 Teacher education admission interview rubric
 Teacher Education Effectiveness Council data – June, 2004; August 29, 2005
 Teacher Education Effectiveness Council Feedback – August 29, 2005; June 5, 2006
 Teacher Education Effectiveness Council feedback and Data from shared with unit faculty at annual retreat
 Teacher Education Effectiveness Council Members
 Teacher Education Effectiveness Council Minutes and Feedback – June 7, 2004, Fall 2006
 Teacher Education interview – acceptable
 Teacher Education Interview form changes
 Teacher Education Interview Questions rubric
 Teacher Education Interview results
 Teacher Education Interview rubric, table showing average scores on 3 items

Teacher Education interview –unacceptable
Teacher Education Program Appeals Information
Teacher Education Program Interview Evaluation Checkpoint #1
Tennessee Professional Education Licensure Standards
Test score and Teacher Education Program interview data
Test scores data and GPA data for students admitted to TEP Fall 2006
Test Scores, teacher education interview scores, field experience I scores, portfolio check scores, student teaching evaluations
Title II Report Card, Institutional Report 2004-2005
Undergraduate curriculum committee considers change to portfolio class, TCED 301
Unit Assessment Plan – October, 2005
Unit Assessment Plan – Spring, 2006
Unit Assessment System Feedback Loop
Unit Faculty Meeting items for discussion at – October 6, 2006
Unit Faculty Meeting Minutes – October 6, 2006
Unit Retreat – September 2, 2005
University Supervisor’s Focus Group – April, 2006

Advanced Program Exhibit room documents

Admissions letter from Graduate Studies office indicating admission, program and admission status
Admissions packets from Office of Graduate Studies showing GPA, TOEFL, admission test score, transcripts and other information that is program specific
Admissions procedures from catalog
Admissions procedures from website
Analysis of data on grades from research course and scores on Inquiry question on comprehensive examinations
Annual evaluation of one faculty chosen course
Banner illustrations of how information is coded
Banner System and example
Blackboard information
Charge to the College Graduate Education Committee to review and update by-laws
Complaints and appeals process (from catalog), UT Martin grade, dismissal, and reinstatement
Completion of program coursework
Comprehensive examination aligned with ISLLC
Comprehensive examination question examples based on Conceptual Framework
Comprehensive examination results for the past three semesters and a review of results
Comprehensive examination scores
Comprehensive examination scores compilation for the past three semesters
Comprehensive examination scoring rubric based on the Conceptual Framework
Comprehensive examinations scoring sample form
Comprehensive examinations suggestions made by EDAS faculty for the program based on data
Conceptual Framework and Standards Alignment Tables
Conceptual Framework Diagram and Framework Summary sheet; also list of state and professional organizations reviewed for or included in Conceptual Framework
Counseling and school leadership admissions sample check sheet rubrics
Counseling and school leadership applicant qualifications information and how stored in Banner

Counseling and school leadership exams data
Counseling and school leadership Internships syllabi that include requirements for portfolios
Counseling and school leadership post-graduate licensure examination pass rate
Counseling and school leadership program applications samples that trigger evaluation of course work and GPA sample internship
Counseling lab and internship forms for evaluating audio and videotapes
Counselor Praxis exam and the school leadership exam passing scores
Curriculum Advising and Program Planning sheet examples
Curriculum Advising and Program Planning sheets and check sheets used by advisors to monitor student progress
Data supporting the search to hire a full-time Director of Assessment/Teacher Education
Dragon Web system and example
EDAS 770 and Counseling 789 and 790 syllabi that include requirements for portfolio
EDAS 770 Internship in School Leadership syllabus; EDPG 789 and 790 School Counselor Internship and EDAS 791 Master Research Project P-12 syllabi,
EDPG 785 Internship in School Counseling syllabus
Enrollment data supporting hiring of two full-time tenure track Educational Administration and Supervision Faculty
Evaluating sites and site supervisors forms for school counseling
Evidence for the increase in travel monies for the College
Example of a faculty member's last year's review and goals
Example of a letter from a faculty member seeking promotion this year
Example of final assessment used for online courses
Example of midcourse assessment used for online courses
Example of professor' use of Blackboard analytical tools
Examples of course assignments and assessment rubrics, including multicultural and research courses (Poster sessions on Research, Multicultural and Technology)
Examples of forms used to assess video/audio tapes in counseling lab and internship
Examples of site supervisor feedback forms showing professional community feedback
Faculty Handbook information regarding annual review for faculty
Faculty Handbook information regarding tenure and promotion process
Faculty produced self-monitoring tools
File Maker Pro and example
GPA entrance scores
GPA information
Information on applicant qualifications including TOEFL scores and how stored in Banner
Information on number of faculty using Blackboard for assessment and analysis of assessment
List of Banner codes from example (SOATEST)
Masters Research Project summary discussing culminating project incorporating the Conceptual Framework
Mentor evaluation of intern
Merit pay explanation and list of professors meeting requirements
Off-campus (not online) evaluation for faculty teaching in off-campus locations
Paperwork trail for the change to the GRE and the change in GRE scores for admissions
Paperwork trail of School Counseling Program Changes
Portfolio evaluations

Post graduate survey
Praxis report sample
Program check sheets listing coursework and Conceptual Framework
Proposed revision of educational administration and Supervision program
Proposed revision of Master of Science in Education program
Review of past three semesters of comprehensive examinations results and proposed changes to the Educational Administration and Supervision exam questions and scoring rubric
Sample advanced candidate files
Sample advanced candidate work
Sample data sheet of information provided to the Graduate Coordinator's Office from online applications
School leadership internships sample syllabi with Conceptual Framework incorporated in course goals, assignments and assessments
Self-rating forms used by candidates in lab and internship courses
Site supervisor and intern evaluation forms
Site supervisor feedback forms on counseling interns
Site supervisors' and faculty rating forms of EDAS and Counseling interns
Standard 2 Committee information and membership
State requirements and professional standards for each program
Student appeal for reinstatement sample
Student concerns actions sample
Student concerns report for Department of Educational Studies form, 2003-2006
Summary of formal complaints for the past two academic years and record of their resolution
Supplemental evidence of data based decisions
Supplemental evidence of data sharing
Supplemental evidence of use of data for program improvement
Teacher Education Effectiveness Council membership slide and comment by Graduate Coordinator regarding the need for a separate and different body to work with the advanced programs (Advisory Board)
TOEFL report
Unit Assessment Plan
Unit Assessment System Chart
Unit Flow Chart for using data
UT Martin web page reports menu for Banner

Persons interviewed

Individual Interviews

Dr. Nick Dunagan, Chancellor
Dr. Tom Rakes, Provost and Vice Chancellor
Dr. Mary Lee Hall, Dean
Dr. Suzanne Maniss, Graduate Coordinator
Joyce Swan, Selmer Site Faculty Member
Jennifer Cook, Coordinator of Field Services
Jenny Hahn, Certification Officer

Assessment Committee, Standard 2

Betty Cox	Educational Studies
Patricia Hewitt	Educational Studies
Jenny Hahn	Assessment Committee/Licensure Officer
Robert Erk	Educational Studies
Karen Greenockle	Health and Human Performance
Suzanne Maniss	Graduate Coordinator - Educational Studies

Department Heads (Outside Educational Studies)

Fred Spano	Music Education
Doug Cook	Art and Dance Education
Joy Roach	Business Education
Jimmy Butler	Agricultural Education
Lisa LeBleu	Family and Consumer Sciences Education
Karen Greenockle	Health and Human Performance

Open Faculty Meeting

Patricia Hewitt
Bob Hartshorn
Jennifer Hill Cook
Cherry Watts
Betty Cox
Sandy Murray
Karen Greenockle
Suzanne Maniss
Joyce Swan
Ginny Esch
Ann Duncan
Robert Erk
Crystal Whitlow

PEC (Professional Education Council)

Bob Hartshorn	Educational Studies
Ann Duncan	Educational Studies
Beverly J. Hearn	Educational Studies
Lisa LeBleu	Family and Consumer Sciences Education
Daniel Pigg	Department of English
Cris Whitlow	Special Education: Educational Studies
Jennifer Hill Cook	Field Placement Coordinator & Learning Resource Center Director
Carol Eckert	Art Education
Phillip H. Davis	Department of Chemistry
Joy Roach	College of Business and Public Affairs

Teacher Education Effectiveness Committee

Daniel Pigg	Department of English
Leah Simpson	Graduate Student and GA
Dee Pritchett	Real Estate
Debbie Dane	Martin Elem., Classroom Teacher
Phil Davis	Department of Chemistry
Athalia Donaldson	Martin Primary Principal

Karen Greenockle Department HHP-Ex-Officio State BOE
Lynn Brasfield Dresden Middle School

Cooperating Teachers

Debbie Barner Martin Primary, Weakley Co.
Lea Ann Crowe Martin Primary School, Weakley
Teresa Wainscott Dresden Elem. School, Weakley Co.
Debbie Dane Martin Elementary, Weakley Co.
Carolyn Doss Martin Primary, Weakley Co.

University Supervisors

Lynn Gibson Educational Studies
Bob Hartshorn Educational Studies
Martha Glover Educational Studies
Mary Newson Educational Studies
Kay Smith Educational Studies
Billy Dowell Educational Studies

P-12 Administrators Meeting

Micheal Poore Obion County Schools Central Office
Athalia Donaldson Principal, Martin Primary
Teresa Ross Principal, Martin Elementary School
Micheal Laughrey Dresden Elementary Weakley Co.
Deloris Wilson Gibson County Schools

Student Teachers

Jessica Sarno K-8
Linda Farmer Secondary Math
Janet Hughes Elementary Education: K-6
Bradley Nanney Health & Human Performance K-12
Persempathy Harrell PreK-3

Initial Candidates

Tiffany Tameka Tross Undergraduate
Jennifer M. French Undergraduate
James Orr Undergraduate
Megan King Undergraduate
Teresa Craig Undergraduate
Michelle Gallien Graduate MSIL
Lindsey Mazzetti Graduate MSIL
Paul O'Neal, Jr. Undergraduate
Terrance Moore Undergraduate

Advanced Candidates and Interns

Tracy Bell EDAS
Nichole Claybrooks Graduate-Advanced Elementary
Jane Hudgins EDAS
Andrew Hart EDAS
Jennifer Weddington Advanced Secondary
Elizabeth Jenkins School Counseling
Kelly Knott School Counseling

CORRECTIONS TO THE INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

There are no corrections to the institutional report.