



**Offsite BOE Feedback Report:
University of Tennessee at Martin
8/9/2010 1:00:00 PM - 8/9/2010 5:00:00 PM**

Offsite BOE Team Members

Dr. Deborah E. Bordelon, Chair
Dr. Elazer James Barnette, Member
Dr. David C. Bell, Member
Ms. Brenda DeRamus-Coleman, Member
Dr. Susan Gore, State Member

Offsite BOE Team Observers

Mr. Martin Nash, State Consultant
Dr. Donna M. Gollnick, NCATE Staff

The following report indicates areas of concern on which the Onsite BOE Team will focus during the upcoming visit. In addition, the last section for each standard is a list of evidence that the team plans to validate during the visit to ensure that the standards continue to be met. This validation will occur as the team interviews faculty, administrators, school-based partners, and other members of the professional community. Validation could also occur in the visits to schools and observations on campus. The validation list also includes some specific documentation that the team would like to review during the onsite visit. In some cases, the Offsite team members could not locate a document or open a link and have requested that the Onsite Team review those documents.

Conceptual Framework

Statement about the evidence: 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.

Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

None

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.

Statement about the evidence: 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, so the pass rates for the institution were not reported. These tests are required of initial candidates to apply for certification. The Title II report for 2008-2009 will be available in October 2010; however, the institution has noted that it appears the pass rates will continue to surpass the 80 percent required passage 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. There were less than 10 program completers in 2007-2008. The institution reports that the testing pass rate for Other School Professionals (educational leadership and school counseling) was 100 percent for 2007-2008. The data for the other school professionals’ pass rates are reported on another form in the exhibit room.

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. 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.

The unit submits its programs for review by the state. Currently, there is conditional state approval for the ESL, Reading Specialist, Gifted Education (PreK-12), Math/Physics (7-12), and Chemistry/Physics (7-12) programs. Program review documents were not available to review in the exhibit center at the time of the Offsite Review.

The unit provided samples of rubrics and assessments. Many of the assessments and rubrics are tied to key courses throughout the programs of study. Student teaching and other clinical experiences rubrics and data are identified as tools to assess candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions. It is unclear, however, how the assessments are aligned with the conceptual framework. Data were not available for all the rubrics listed, so it is unclear how candidates are performing on the respective assessments, especially those tied to the courses. Data that were reported also did not indicate the number of candidates assessed at that time. Examples of candidates work at the exemplary, acceptable, and unacceptable levels were provided, but the scored rubrics were not included, so it was difficult to see the types of feedback provided to the candidates. It is unclear how the unit is using these data for program and unit improvement.

Data from program completers and employers indicate that candidates are well prepared in content. Overall alumni and employers are satisfied with the program preparation. 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. Exit interview data are available from 2007-2009. Alumni and employer data are available for 2009. Response rates for the alumni and employer surveys were not provided.

Professional dispositions are examined through use of the Professional Dispositions Rubric and a Dispositions Survey. 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; however, no examples were provided in the exhibit room. The average scores on the Professional Dispositions Rubric are between "Clearly Exhibited"- 4 and "Exhibited Most of the Time" - 3.

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 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 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.

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 be better prepare candidates 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 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 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard: Not applicable to this standard

1.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs):

AFIs continued from last visit:

AFI	AFI Rationale
Assessments of clinical practice have not been systematically aggregated and analyzed. (ADV)	It appears that the unit is making progress in addressing this area; however, additional information is needed on the assessment system and data charts.
Key assessments identified in the assessment system have not been systematically aggregated and analyzed.(ITP)	It appears that the unit is making progress in addressing this area; however, additional information is needed on the assessment system and data charts.

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard:

- (1) Key assessments at both the initial and advanced levels need to be systematically aggregated, analyzed and used for program/unit improvement.

Rationale: It appears that the unit is making progress in addressing this area; however, additional information is needed on the assessment system and data charts. Documentation is needed to show how data are being used for program and unit improvement.

1.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit:

- (1) Pass rates on licensure tests. What are the pass rates for programs with less than 10 completers? What differences exist between the most recent Title II report and the one available in the exhibits at the time of the Offsite Review? What official document indicates the pass rates for other school professionals?
- (2) Updates on state program reports. What has the state teams learned from its review during the onsite visit?
- (3) Examples of rubrics and data on candidates' performance on them. How do the completed rubrics match an assignment? What type(s) of feedback are provided to candidates based on their performance on the rubrics?
- (4) Response rates on the alumni and employer surveys. What are the response rates? What is the unit doing to improve response rates?
- (5) Data from the Advisor Rating form. A blank Advisor Rating form is provided in the exhibit center; however no data are provided. How is the information used with candidates?
- (6) Samples of candidates' TEP portfolios. How do candidates use the portfolios? What feedback is provided?
- (7) Portfolios in Educational Leadership. Since candidates are given multiple opportunities to achieve a score of "5" on portfolio elements, what is the range of attempts to complete the portfolio successfully?
- (8) Examples of dispositions remediation plan. The IR references this plan; however, no examples are provided. How are these plans developed, implemented, and monitored?

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 Statement about the evidence

The unit continues to use the Unit Assessment System (UAS) to collect, analyze, evaluate, and use data for unit and program continuous improvements. Data are collected during spring and fall semesters and are reported and presented to the Professional Education Council (spring and fall semesters) and to the Teacher Education Effectiveness Committee (yearly annual meeting in June). The Professional Education Council and Teacher Education Effectiveness Committee analyze the data and provide the unit head a report. The unit head presents findings to unit faculty during a fall retreat. Feedback from data is used by the faculty to make decisions about changes in programs and unit operations for the new academic year.

The assessment system provides detailed requirements of key assessments used at various transition points and is aligned with the conceptual framework at the initial and advanced levels. The assessment system is designed to assess candidate performance at the various transition points, but data are missing in several tables presented. For example, the IR describes how the

UAS collects data at the initial level on three key domains (1) Knowledge, Skills, and Application, (2) Reflective Practice, and (3) Professional and Ethical Behavior. The checkpoints are (1) Admission to the Teacher Education Program with data collected in fall and spring, (2) Admission to student teaching with data collected in fall and spring, (3) Student teaching with data collected in fall and spring, (4) Program completion with data collected during the semester of program completion, and (5) Post graduate follow-up with data collected two years after graduation. Only two of the 28 data tables (4-8 and K-6) in the exhibits had complete data across the identified checkpoints. The other data tables had no data or incomplete data across the defined transition points. Additionally, summary data were not available to determine candidates' average performance at each transition and check point.

At the advanced level, the UAS collects data on four key domains (1) Knowledge, Skills, and Application, (2) Human Relations, (3) Inquiry, and (4) Professional and Ethical Behavior. Evidence was presented showing the assessment system collects, analyzes, evaluates and uses data from four checkpoints at the advanced level where the unit can make decisions about candidate performance. The advanced level checkpoints are (1) Admission to Program, (2) Capstone Experience, (3) Program Completion, and (4) Post-Graduate Follow-up. A review of selected summary data tables found in the exhibits provided support that the UAS is assessing the defined transition and check points.

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. Procedures presented in the IR and supported in the exhibits include:

- Initial undergraduate and advanced candidates are informed of all requirements in the education program when they attend registration and orientation sessions.
- The unit emphasizes the use of the Education Student Services website.
- Candidates are made aware of unit and program requirements in the application process for admission as a part of the interview process.
- Field experience assessments are distributed to all candidates as part of their course introductions and are also available online.
- Advanced candidates are informed of the requirements upon meeting with their program advisor and in their orientation course.
- Candidates are provided a handbook, which is also on Education Student Services Website.
- Cooperating teachers and supervisors are trained to increase rating consistency and reliability.
- Candidates and employers are asked the same questions on the "Exit Survey," "Graduate Follow-Up Surveys," and "Employer Satisfaction Surveys."

To ensure that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used to make improvements, the unit has a full-time Director of Assessment. The director meets with unit faculty regularly to update them on assessment procedures.

The unit has policies in place and available for candidates related to the process of filing complaints related to unit programs and faculty/staff. Located in the electronic exhibits is a sample of the Student Complaint Policy and Department of Educational Studies Student Concern Form.

Since the last NCATE visit, the following represents significant program and unit changes as a result of data collection from the assessment system and analysis at all transition points:

- (1) Entrance requirements for the minimum GPA was raised from 2.5 to 2.75.
- (2) Examination of field experience data resulted in a revision of the Field Experience I evaluation rubrics to more closely match the TEP candidate expectations as *Facilitators of Learning*.
- (3) Revamping of the TCED interview rubric and process because interview survey data collected from candidates and faculty indicated inconsistency in the interview questions and scoring process.
- (4) M.S. Initial Licensure Programs for Elementary, Secondary and Comprehensive K-12 has undergone significant revisions in course requirements and sequencing.
- (5) The comprehensive exam process was further revised incorporating a “blind” grading system using random number assignments known only by the Education Graduate program Staff Assistant.
- (6) M.S. in Education-Teaching: Curriculum and Instruction candidates have entry and exit requirements with a disposition check.
- (7) The revised program includes a Level I Field Experience (TCED 705) with a dispositions check.
- (8) An oral presentation and defense of the Master’s Research Project and a grade of B or higher in the course, satisfies the comprehensive exam requirement.
- (9) In fall 2007 the unit began offering the M.S. in School Counseling entirely online.
- (10) M.S. in Educational Leadership candidates have similar course level key assessments including dispositions and maintenance of a 3.0 GPA prior to applying to the culminating clinical supervision experience taken in the candidate’s final semester.
- (11) Candidates are required to submit a portfolio containing key assessments from each course charting the candidate’s development as an integral part of the EDLD 780-Clinical Supervision course.

2.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard: Not applicable to this standard

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs):

The unit had a focused visit in 2006. Based on the BOE Report for the focused visit, the recommendation for Standard Two was “Met” with three new reworded AFIs as listed below:

AFIs corrected from last visit

AFIs Number & Text	AFI Rationale
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.	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 for initial and advanced programs are regularly and systematically reported and analyzed to provide	The unit is using the UAS to provide reports related to candidate, program, and unit performance regularly and systematically. (Advanced Only)

comprehensive information to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.	
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.	Data tables reveal assessment of advanced level programs are compiled using the unit assessment system and related software to produce reports.

2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard:

Not all data for initial programs are regularly and systematically reported and analyzed to provide comprehensive information to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. (Initial)	The unit is using the UAS to provide reports. However, candidates, program, and unit performance could not be determined because data were limited and missing in some programs. (Initial)
---	--

2.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) Steps to examine and eliminate bias and to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency. How are the identified procedures being implemented by the unit?
- (2) Compilation of data for key assessments of the initial and advanced level programs. How are data compiled utilizing the UAS?
- (3) Summarized data for initial programs. The exhibit data tables provided individual programs with missing data sets. What summarized data exists?
- (4) Use of assessment data for improvement. Over the past three years, how many unsuccessful candidates were advised into a non-licensure program that leads to graduation with a Bachelor of Science in Education (non-teaching)?
- (5) Function of the Teacher Education Effectiveness Committee. Who are the members? What is their involvement in the assessment system? How do they interact with the Director of Assessment?
- (6) The operation of the unit assessment system. What data are being collected and when? What data are being collected, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed? How are the data being used and by whom? Why are data cells empty on some of the reports in the exhibits?

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 Statement about the evidence

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 unit and its school partners deliver and assess a variety of field experiences and clinical practice 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 diverse placements in public schools for a total of 75 days of 1500 contact hours. The IR states that in fall 2009 the program in School Counseling reorganized the internship’s activities to align with CACREP standards in completing the 600 hours requirement. The Internship in Elementary School Counseling (COUN 790) requires 300 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. 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.

3.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard: Not applicable to this standard

3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs):

AFIs corrected from last visit:

AFI	AFI Rationale
Planned involvement of the unit’s school partners, P-12, 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 minimal communication via email to arrange meetings to discuss specific assignments.

<p>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).</p>	<p>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. For the initial licensure program at the graduate level, the Department of Education Studies standardized 45 hours of level I field experiences and added 3-5 hours of level II field experiences in Reading 638.</p>
---	---

3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard: None

3.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit:

- (1) Candidate records prior to clinical practice. How does the unit know that the candidates have successfully completed assessments prior to entering clinical practice?
- (2) Candidates' portfolios and reflections. To what extent do the portfolios indicate that candidates are able to help students learn? What have candidates learned about the assessment of student learning? How are their abilities to help students learn being assessed during clinical practice?
- (3) Field experiences for advanced programs. What are the required field experiences for advanced teaching candidates and other school professionals?
- (4) In correcting the AFI regarding planned involvement of P-12 partners, can the unit provide agendas, programs, notes, showing planning and implementing collaborative activities.
- (5) Syllabus shows 300 hours for Counseling internship, but the IR notes 600 hours as the CACREP requirement. How are the other 300 hours earned?
- (6) The IR addresses collaboration with Union City, Weakley County, and Obion County school districts. What agreements have been made and signed between the unit and the districts.
- (7) The graduate program in school counseling indicates collaboration among specific partners for the Jackson campus, the Selmer campus, the Ripley campus, and the Parsons campus. Additionally the report notes that there are "numerous" districts with which the unit collaborates (50). Are there signed agreements for these relationships and interactions with districts?
- (8) Tracking of candidate placements in schools. How are school partners involved in the placement of candidates? How does the unit track placements?
- (9) Candidates' use of technology in clinical practice. How does the unit ensure that candidates are developing skills for the use of technology in instruction?
- (10) Orientation of school-based and university faculty for supervising field experiences and clinical practices. What type of orientation does the unit provide? How have supervisors evaluated this training?

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 Statement about the evidence

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 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 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 given to all candidates before program exit. The data collected since 2008 shows a positive score 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% are Asian, 5.0% are Black, and 0.8% are Hispanic. No specific demographics of the unit faculty were available. The unit acknowledges its efforts to recruit faculty from diverse backgrounds.

Student demographics for the university as a whole show 81.1% of students identifying as white, 14.7% identifying as Black, and less than 4% Hispanic and Asian. No data were provided for candidates in the unit. However, evidence was provided as to the unit's efforts to recruit and retain high-achieving African American students (Young Scholars Academy). Project STEP is another initiative to help recruit, prepare, and retain teachers from underrepresented groups who embrace diversity as an instructional tool.

The IR addresses the demographics of the P-12 students where candidates have field and clinical experiences. There are 12 school systems with which the unit has partnered for candidate placements. Six of those systems have less than 75% white students. No data were supplied to

show the number of candidates who completed field experiences or clinical practice in these schools. All 12 systems have 50% of their students listed as economically disadvantaged.

4.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard

Diversity is interwoven throughout the curriculum to ensure that all candidates gain the knowledge, skills and dispositions to help all students learn. Candidates are given the opportunity to participate in variety of on-campus professional development workshops focused on diversity and exceptionalities.

4.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs): No areas for improvement were cited for this standard at the previous visit.

4.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard:

- (1) No demographics of the unit faculty are given.

Rationale: Based on the lack of diversity at the institutional level, it is likely that the unit lacks diversity as well.

4.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit:

- (1) Examples of candidate work samples. How are proficiencies related to diversity being addressed and assessed?
- (2) Mid-session student teaching progress report. How are diversity proficiencies addressed on this report? How are candidates performing on these assessments?
- (3) Demographics of the unit faculty. How diverse is the unit faculty?
- (4) Demographics of the teacher education candidates. How diverse are the candidates in educator preparation?
- (5) Placement of candidates in diverse P-12 settings? What is the process for placing candidates in those systems that show the greatest racial diversity? How does the unit track placements to ensure that all candidates gain experiences working with students from diverse groups?
- (6) Process if a candidate is not performing at an acceptable level on the dispositions assessment. How are candidates assessed for dispositions related to diversity throughout the program? The unit has several avenues to assess professional dispositions related to diversity; however they appear to be assessed mainly before exiting the program. What safeguards are in place for those candidates identified as having problems with diverse learners?

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 Statement about the evidence

Electronic artifacts provided by the unit reveal that professional education faculty members in the unit are 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. 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.

The Institutional Report cites an artifact that indicates the unit faculty members are involved in self-assessment of their own teaching, which is a part of the annual performance evaluation and also of the tenure review at the university level.

Full-time faculty members in the institution are engaged in scholarly or creative activity. Faculty vitae reveal 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 represented consistent effort over a number of years.

Artifacts reveal that unit faculty is involved in service to the school community in a useful fashion. There were many examples cited in the individual faculty vita.

According to exhibit documents, faculty is 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.

Unit faculty is supported with opportunities for professional development. The STEM Center for Learning, which was created in the fall of 2009, will provide many opportunities for development.

5.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard: Not applicable to this standard.

5.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs): No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit

5.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard: None

5.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) Adjunct faculty. How many adjunct faculty are being used? How are adjunct faculty selected and evaluated?
- (2) Criteria for school based faculty (cooperating) teachers. What are the criteria? How long have they been working in schools as professional educators?
- (3) Links for item 6 under Standard 5 exhibit, "Evaluation documents" and item 7, exhibit "Professional Development Activities: Area Wide" and "Professional Development Activities: Unit Wide." Links could not be accessed.
- (4) Integration of technology and diversity in instruction. How are these areas reflected in teaching?
- (5) Service activities of faculty. How is faculty involved in service activities?
- (6) Professional development of faculty. In what activities are faculty involved? How does faculty access professional development funds for travel and other activities?
- (7) Faculty research award. What are the criteria? How is it funded? What faculty members have received the award?
- (8) Civic learning and engagement. What does the receipt of this recognition by the University of Tennessee System mean for the unit and its faculty?

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 Statement about the evidence

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 an 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. Additional meetings such as the annual NCATE retreat are held with unit faculty. The Teacher Education Effectiveness Committee (TECC) 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 are 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 appears to be comparable to budgets of other units on campus. The budgets for the Social Work program and the Nursing program are used as comparable budgets. Evidence indicates that funding is adequate to support curricular programs and support the preparation of candidates to meet standards. Additional information is needed to confirm this assertion. Approximately \$60,000 was spent on unit faculty travel and professional development; however, the year for this expenditure was not indicated on the evidence.

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. 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. The link for the faculty load summary data was not active in the Exhibit Center.

The unit is housed in Gooch Hall. The links on the Exhibit Center focused on facilities were not active. Additional information is needed to fully describe the facilities available for candidates.

6.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard:

The unit has developed and implemented several processes to facilitate unit operations. It appears that the unit is making progress toward the target level for leadership and authority. Additional information through interviews and documents is needed to confirm the progress the unit is making toward target for Standard 6.

6.1 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs): No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit

6.2 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard: None

6.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Involvement of campus and professional community educators in program development, implementation, and evaluation. How are members of the professional community involved?

- (2) Comparison of budgets and allocations across programs. How are professional development funds allocated? How does the unit budget compare to the budgets of other units on campus with clinical components?
- (3) Workload policy implementation. How are faculty members engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service at the expected level?
- (4) Part-time faculty's knowledge of unit-wide documents, such as the conceptual framework, and how their particular course and/or supervision fits into the broader picture. Who mentors and evaluates part-time faculty to ensure their effectiveness?
- (5) Involvement of the Professional Education Council, Provost and other deans. What are their involvement in the governance in the unit?
- (6) Involvement of the Teacher Education Effectiveness Committee. How is the committee engaged in the feedback loop? What input does the committee have in curriculum, field experiences, and review of data?
- (7) Types of resources (books, databases, other materials) in the library that are dedicated to programs in the unit.
- (8) The links for the faculty load summary data, facilities, and distance learning resources. These links were not active in the Exhibit Center.

Sources of Evidence

University of Tennessee at Martin's Institutional Report
Annual Reports and Program Reports in NCATE's Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS)
Website and Exhibits of University of Tennessee at Martin