Ohio University-NCATE Institutional Report
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

In this Institutional Report (IR), you will find responses to each of the NCATE standards and elements. There are 11 required tables for this report. Table 11 is located on the AIMS website.

OVERVIEW
A.   The Institution

A.1 What is the institution's historical context?

Established in 1804, Ohio University is the oldest institution of higher learning in the state. Located in the college town of Athens, in southeastern Ohio, the University has earned a reputation for its rich educational tradition and outstanding academic programs. The main campus population of more than 19,000 includes students from nearly every state and about 100 nations. Five regional campuses extend access to the University to additional students across central and southern Ohio.

A.2 What is the institution's mission?

As a public university, Ohio University provides a broad range of educational programs and services. As an academic community, Ohio University holds the intellectual and personal growth of the individual to be a central purpose. University programs are designed to broaden perspectives, enrich awareness, deepen understanding, establish disciplined habits of thought, prepare for meaningful careers, and, thereby, to help develop individuals who are informed, responsible, productive citizens. OU's one-page defining statement can be found here.

A.3. What are the institution's characteristics [e.g., control and type of institution such as private, land grant, or HBI; location (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban area)]?

Ohio University offers more than 250 undergraduate programs, grants masters degrees in nearly all of its major academic divisions and doctoral degrees in selected departments.

Ohio University is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools and is designated as a high activity (Research II) research university by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. OU has been cited for academic quality by such publications as *U.S. News and World Report* (ranked 116th) and *Washington Monthly* (ranked 40th). *U.S. News and World Report* ranked OU as 4th in actual versus predicted graduation rates. The John Templeton Foundation also has recognized OU as one of the top character-building institutions in the country. Also, the state's first kindergarten opened on our campus in 1907.

Ohio University enjoys exceptional natural beauty. Nestled in the foothills of Appalachia, OU is embedded in a rich cultural heritage that is often undervalued and invisible by comparison with other cultures in the state and country. The Appalachian region has a very high percentage of families living below the poverty line, with Athens County being the poorest. Candidate demographics in the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) mirror those of the University, with 10% of the Unit's candidates coming from the federally identified 32 Appalachian counties, 31% from other rural counties, 52% from metropolitan areas and 7% from out of state. This provides opportunities for a diverse learning experience for the preparation of education professionals at OU.

B.   The Unit

B.1   What is the professional education unit at your institution and what is its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators?

Ohio University's Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) spans four colleges, with the primary being the College of Education (COE). Programs in Music Education and Art Education (now in moratorium) are in the College of Fine Arts (FAR). The Modern Languages programs, as well as several methods courses in the arts and sciences disciplines (Mathematics, English), are in the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S). The College of Health and Human Services (HHS) includes Physical Education (PE), Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS), and our joint Early Childhood Education (ECE) program, as well as other school professional programs in Speech and Language Pathology and School Nursing. It is important to note that while candidates in ECE can be assigned to either COE or HHS, it is truly a shared program and candidates receive the same experience regardless of the college or campus assignment. As noted in B.6 of this IR, the University is currently engaged in academic restructuring and plans to move the ECE, PE, FCS, and Family Studies programs into the COE.

The Early Childhood and Middle Childhood Education programs at the initial level are also offered at five regional campuses: OU-Chillicothe, OU-Eastern, OU-Lancaster, OU-Southern, and OU-Zanesville. In addition, two Centers, the Pickerington Center (associated with OU-Lancaster) and the Proctorville Center (associated with OU-Southern), increase candidate accessibility to Ohio University and increase the Unit's opportunity to recruit diverse candidates from urban settings. While Athens remains the academic home for all graduate programs, the locations at which these programs are offered change according to rotation plans established by each program. For example, at any given time the EDAD faculty offer the Principal program to 3 cohorts, one in Athens and two on regional campuses.

B.2. How many professional education faculty members support the professional education unit?

Table 1 includes the full- and part-time faculty in the professional education unit including all tenure and tenure-track (Group I) faculty members who have taught for the Unit in any of the years in the three-year period between 2005-06 and 2007-08 as well as all part-time faculty members (Groups II, III, and clinical supervisors) who have taught or supervised for the Unit in all three of the years between 2005-06 and 2007-08. Ohio University and UPEP define full-time faculty as tenure-track and visiting (Groups I & IV) and part-time as Groups II, III, and clinical supervisors.

Table 1-Professional Education Faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants

Academic Rank	# of faculty who are full-time in the unit	# of faculty who are full-time in the institution, but part-time in the unit	# of faculty who are part-time at the institution (often called adjunct faculty)	# of graduate teaching assistants teaching or supervising clinical practice
Professors	5	8	5	NA
Associate Professors	13	14	0	NA
Assistant Professors	9	6	0	NA
Instructors	0	6	112	3
Lecturers	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other (Visiting Professor)	0	0	0	NA
TOTAL	27	34	117	3

B.3. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare candidates for their first license to teach?

Table 2 is a list of all programs offered at the initial level. Initial programs are offered at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. All programs have received either National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions. The majority of these programs have shared assessments and common rubrics for both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Because at the time of SPA submission the AIMS site was not able to "link" programs, separate SPA reports for undergraduate and graduate programs were submitted to NCATE; this resulted in some programs receiving different recognition decisions.

Table 2- Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status
(2007-2008 enrollment data from Institutional Research)

Program	Award Level (Bachelor's or Master's)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Review Submitted (Yes/No)	State Approval Status	National Recognition Status by NCATE
Early Childhood Education	Bachelor's	758	NAEYC	Yes		Recognized
Middle Childhood Education	Bachelor's	744	NMSA	Yes		Recognized
	Master's	24				Recognized
Adolescent to Young Adult (AYA) Integrated Science	Bachelor's	34	NSTA	Yes		Recognized
	Master's	1				Recognized
AYA Physical Science	Bachelor's	7	NSTA	Yes		Recognized
	Master's	0				Recognized
AYA Life Science	Bachelor's	15	NSTA	Yes		Recognized
	Master's	2				Recognized
AYA Earth Science	Bachelor's	9	NSTA	Yes		Recognized
	Master's	0				Recognized
AYA Integrated Social Studies	Bachelor's	211	NCSS	Yes		Recognized with Conditions
	Master's	7				Recognized
AYA Integrated Language Arts	Bachelor's	177	NCTE	Yes		Recognized
	Master's	3				Recognized
AYA Integrated Mathematics	Bachelor's	117	NCTM	Yes		Recognized with Conditions
	Master's	7				Recognized with Conditions
Multiage Foreign Language: French	Bachelor's	10	ACTFL	Yes		Recognized with Conditions
	Master's	1				Recognized with Conditions
Multiage Foreign Language: Spanish	Bachelor's	32	ACTFL	Yes		Recognized with Conditions
	Master's	1				Recognized with Conditions
Multiage Foreign Language: German	Bachelor's	6	ACTFL	Yes		Recognized with Conditions
	Master's	0				Recognized with Conditions
Multiage Physical Education	Bachelor's	50	NASPE	Yes		Recognized with Conditions
Intervention Specialist (M-M)	Bachelor's	111	CEC	Yes		Recognized
	Master's	31				Recognized

Intervention Specialist (M-I)	Bachelor's	63	CEC	Yes		Recognized
	Master's	3				Recognized
Early Childhood - Intervention Specialist	Master's	9	*CEC-NAEYC (*CEC)	Yes		Recognized with Conditions
Family & Consumer Sciences	Bachelor's	26	State	Yes	Approved	
Programs Accredited by Other Accrediting Bodies						
Multiage Music-(Choral Or Instrumental)	Bachelor's	105	NASM	Yes		Not Applicable
	Master's	0				
Multiage Visual Art	Bachelor's	48	NASAD	Yes		Not Applicable
Associate Degree						
**Pre-K Associate	A.S.	36	State	Yes	Approved	
**Interpreter for the Hearing Impaired	A.S.	DORMANT	State	Dormant		

* It was determined that this program does not meet the criteria for a NAEYC-CEC blended program. The revised SPA report will be sent to CEC in fall, 2009.

** Associate Degree programs are listed although NCATE does not include associate degree programs.

B.4. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals?

Table 3 is a list of all programs at the advanced level for teachers and other school professionals. In 2007-2008, the University and College of Education (COE) underwent a review of all graduate programs. The review process identified two key issues, low enrollments and limited faculty capacity. That combined with the upcoming transition from quarters to semesters (Q2S) resulted in a decision that as of fall 2008, the following advanced programs would stop admitting candidates: AYA non-licensure, Middle Childhood, Special Education non-licensure, Special Education-inclusion, and Curriculum and Instruction (C&I).

Concurrently, the Unit piloted a Teacher Leader program in fall 2008. This innovative pilot program was developed under the auspices the General Educational Administration program as a prescribed set of required and elective courses. The General Educational Administration program has been offered for at least 15 years with full approval of the Ohio Board of Regents (BOR). Because the Teacher Leader sequence is offered on regional campuses, it also has the approval of the BOR's Regional Advisory Committee on Graduate Study (RACGS).

Table 3
Advanced Preparation Programs and Their Review Status
(2007-2008 enrollment data from Institutional Research)

Program	Award Level	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (State or SPA)	Program Review Submitted (Yes/No)	State Approval Status	National Recognition Status by NCATE
Programs for the Continuing Education of Teachers						
**Middle Childhood Education	Master's	1	NMSA	Yes		Recognized
**Special Education	Master's	14	NA	NA	Approved	NA
**Special Education-Inclusion	Master's	6	NA	NA	Approved	NA
**AYA non-licensure	Master's	0	NA	NA	Approved	NA

**Curriculum and Instruction	Master's	6	NA	NA	Approved	NA
French or Spanish Education	Master's	DORMANT	NA	NA	Approved	NA
Music Education	Master's	9	NASM	Yes		Accredited
*General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader)	Master's	25	NA	NA	Approved- Board of Regents	NA
Programs for Other School Professionals						
School Principal	Master's	65	ELCC	Yes		Recognized
School Superintendent	Post-Master's	20	ELCC	Yes		Recognized
Reading Education (Reading Specialist Endorsement)	Master's	18	IRA	Yes		Recognized
Computer/Technology (Technology Facilitator Endorsement)	Master's	21	ISTE	Yes		Recognized
Programs Accredited by Other Accrediting Bodies						
School Counselor	Master's	27	CACREP	Yes		Accredited
School Speech-Language Pathologist	Master's	28	ASHA	Yes		Accredited

*This program is being piloted and just began in the 2008-2009 academic year. Admissions data were not available from the Ohio University Institutional Research department.
**Not currently admitting candidates to this major.

B.5. Which of the above initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are offered?

It is important to note that Ohio University and its' regional campuses are considered to be one university. Therefore, while programs may be offered at multiple campuses, they are not considered to be "off-campus" programs.

Ohio University comprises the main campus (Athens) and five regional campuses (Chillicothe, Eastern, Lancaster, Southern, and Zanesville). The early childhood education and middle childhood education programs are the only two stand-alone programs offered at the regional campuses. Some of our graduate programs are designed around cohorts where classes are offered on one or more of the regional campuses. To date, the faculty who teach those graduate cohorts are typically Athens campus faculty members.

The Instructional Technology master's program is hybrid in nature and combines an online and face-to-face format. Also, beginning in summer 2009, the Unit has an online Early Childhood Generalist endorsement program that prepares already licensed early childhood graduates the ability to add grades 4 and 5 to their license. This endorsement is only 5 courses. According to the BOE update from spring 2008, "Endorsements that require only a few courses and short-term professional development programs should not be included in the NCATE review."

B.6. (Continuing Visits Only) What substantive changes have taken place in the unit since the last visit (e.g., added/dropped programs/degrees; significant increase/decrease in enrollment; major reorganization of the unit, etc.)?

Substantive changes since the last NCATE visit are listed in three categories listed below.

Ohio University and Education Unit: Following the 2007 NCATE visit, the College went through a one-year College Renewal process. OU is transitioning from quarters to semesters beginning in 2012. OU is also engaged in the academic restructuring of HHS, which will result in Early Childhood being housed solely in the COE. Proposals to move Physical Education and Family and Consumer Sciences in the COE have also been accepted by the Provost.

The Unit significantly revised its conceptual framework, and, to increase opportunities for candidates to work with diverse populations, the Unit has partnered with Ohio State and Ohio Dominican to conduct a field placement exchange program. Additional Professional Development School (PDS) partnerships have been established.

The Unit of Student Affairs now has an Office of Field Experiences and Professional Internships and has hired three full-time academic advisors.

Curriculum: As noted in Table 3, based on the graduate program review, the Unit has stopped admitting candidates into five advanced programs (AYA non-licensure, Middle Childhood Education, Special Education non-licensure, Special Education- inclusion, and Curriculum &Instruction).

Based on data review, four Design Teams have been established by the Communications and Connections group. Each team has one of the following foci: Assessment Competencies in Teacher Education Programs, Linking High Quality Teachers with Pre-service Teachers, Developing a Teacher Residency Program Model, Technology.

In fall 2008, the Unit piloted an advanced program for teachers called the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) Program.

Multi-age Music Education-Choral & Instrumental are now listed as one program with two emphases. The Modern Languages (Spanish, French, and German) at the graduate initial level have been reviewed and approved by ACTFL and are listed on Table 2. French and Spanish Education (advanced) have not had any program completers in the last three years and are listed as "dormant." The Family and Consumer Sciences program has been added to Table 2.

In fall 2008, the COE started an Honors Track for education majors, and in summer 2009, piloted the Early Childhood Education Generalist Endorsement, offered online, which is designed for licensed early childhood education graduates who wish to extend their licenses from P-3 to include grades 4-5.

Leadership: At the Unit level, since 2007 the following positions have been filled or replaced: Associate Dean for Outreach & Undergraduate Studies; Interim Director of the Curriculum & Technology Center; Director, Distance Learning & Online Resources; Chair, Department of Teacher Education; Chair, Department of Educational Studies; Chair, Counseling and Higher Education; Director, Center for Professional Development School Partnerships; and Director, Literacy Center. At the University level a new Executive Vice President & Provost; a new Graduate Dean, and a new Vice President for Research are in place.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

C.1. How does the unit's conceptual framework address the following structural elements?
   a. the vision and mission of the unit
   b. philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit
   c. knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit
   d. Candidate Proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards
   e. summarized description of the unit's assessment system

Mission and Vision of the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP)

Reflecting the primary mission and vision of Ohio University, the mission of the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) is to provide learning-centered experiences that foster a diverse academic community. This community serves the economic and cultural needs of the region and benefits the state, nation, and world by generating new knowledge and educating future citizens and leaders. The Unit promotes the efforts of participants who, in concert with our educational partners, design and experiment with new practices, evaluate their impact, and share the results in all relevant arenas. Our proud 120-year history brings a collective responsibility to continue our Unit's legacy of academic excellence in teaching, research, and service-oriented outreach. To honor and extend our legacy, we commit ourselves to the following aims:

1. Public Education: To supply America's children, adolescents, youth and adults with the tools they need for a successful future;
2. Access: To ensure that all segments of our society have, in Abraham Lincoln's words, "the right to rise up";
3. Economic Advancement: To act as an engine for economic growth in our state's emerging knowledge economy;
4. Scientific & Applied Research: To conduct studies that assess and seek solutions to societal problems that inhibits learning;
5. Citizenship Education: To strengthen our democracy by producing civically engaged citizens;
6. Accountability & Leadership: To maintain the quality of our graduates and lead the way in education reform that meets our nation's ever-evolving needs.

We operate from a framework for and commitment to serving society responsibly as change agents, meeting diverse human and social needs and showing a full commitment to lifelong learning. Today, our programs seek to distinguish themselves by offering increasing academic rigor, preparation in using assessments and data to drive change, and authentic professional internship experiences in low-resourced settings.

Conceptual Framework

The Unit's philosophy and purpose are grounded in a set of identified core values. We believe that educator preparation should prepare educators to be leaders in their fields; that candidates prepare for, and engage in, the changing needs of education; that candidates meet the diverse human and social needs of those with whom they interact; and that candidates value and participate in lifelong learning. From this philosophical base, as a Unit, we prepare leader-educators/practitioners who share our commitment to serve society responsibly as change agents in meeting diverse human/social needs and in lifelong learning. This commitment captures the essence of the mission and vision of Ohio University and UPEP. The Conceptual Framework, with its foundation being the four Conceptual Cores (leader-educator/practitioners, change agents, diversity, lifelong learning), provides direction for the programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. Each of the four Conceptual Cores is grounded in theory, research, and/or educational policy. An extensive literature review illustrating the knowledge bases will be available at the time of the visit.

Leader-Educators/Practitioners: The Unit prepares expert, ethical, and reflective leader-educators/practitioners and decision-makers who are committed to holistic learning, and engage in collaborative and professional service to society.

Diversity: The Unit prepares leader-educators/practitioners who appreciate the variety of human cultural expression, employ multiple approaches to inquiry, use knowledge and practice for the benefit of a diverse society, and promote social equity and justice for effective civic engagement.

Change Agents: The Unit prepares leader-educators/practitioners who address the changing human/social needs through inquiry, research, assessment, critical thinking, problem-solving, and proactive use of technology.

<u>Lifelong Learning</u>: The Unit prepares leader-educators/practitioners who engage in self-reflection and professional development for continuous personal growth, and who inspire such practices in those whom they serve.

Based on our philosophy and purpose, we have identified the following Candidate Proficiencies (unit standards) to demonstrate the values that have been adopted by UPEP. We use our Unit standards to hold candidates accountable for being **leader-educator/practitioners**, committed to **diversity**, **change agents**, and **lifelong learners**. The Candidate Proficiencies are organized around each of the four cores. These proficiencies represent what we expect candidates to achieve in terms of their knowledge, skills, and dispositions at both the initial and advanced levels. In addition to the proficiencies, UPEP has outlined four distinct Professional Dispositions that further guide the practice and development of our faculty, candidates, and staff. The Candidate Proficiencies and Dispositions are similar, and align to the proficiencies; however the proficiencies primarily address candidate knowledge and skills.

Our Candidate Proficiencies are aligned throughout the curriculum and assessments in the Unit and to state and professional standards. Exhibit CF-v provides an alignment chart of state, professional, and institutional standards. These standards and proficiencies are at the heart of the key assessments that have been developed by each program. Candidates are expected to master these standards and proficiencies through coursework and completion of key assessments, each reported through our Unit Assessment System (UAS). Their mastery is shown through data that are collected on these key assessments. We apply this process to hold our candidates accountable for becoming **leader-educators/practitioners** who share our commitment to serve society responsibly as **change agents** in meeting **diverse human/social needs** and in **lifelong learning**.

Finally, the Cycle of Unit Assessment Data for Program Improvement (the Unit Assessment System, UAS) is implemented on a quarterly basis. All data from key assessments are required to be entered on LiveText, a data management tool. Quarterly, the Office of Assessment and Academic Improvement organizes and distributes unit and program data in aggregate and disaggregate (by program and campus) form to programs. The Unit data are also reported to the appropriate Assessment Council (AC) subcommittee. Based on the annual data reporting calendar, the designated AC subcommittee reports the data analysis to the AC and provides recommendations for improvements and/or changes. These recommendations are then sent to the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) for first reading. Following the first reading, members of UPEP share the recommendations with their respective stakeholders (e.g., cooperating teachers, university supervisors) for feedback and input into the revisions. At the next UPEP meeting, decisions about changes and improvements are made based on the feedback and put into implementation stage. The UAS illustration and UAS narrative explanation provide additional information about our UAS.

C.2. (Continuing Visits Only) What changes have been made to the conceptual framework since the previous visit?

Understanding that the conceptual framework is a living document and needs continuous evaluation, in fall 2008, a Conceptual Framework College Renewal Committee of 15 COE members, was charged with reviewing and updating the existing Unit Conceptual Framework. The Committee worked on this task by taking several proactive steps to establish the shared vision and engage the broad education community in this conversation. The Committee conducted an electronic survey among faculty members, staff members, and candidates on the Athens and regional campuses, other colleges at OU involved with teacher preparation, and administrators and faculty in local P-12 school districts where candidates are placed for clinical experience. This survey was designed to evaluate the relevance and clarity of the existing conceptual framework.

After data collection and analysis, the Committee interpreted the results and revealed redundancies in the existing Conceptual Framework and its components, including the core values, unit standards, characteristics of graduates, and the 38 candidate proficiencies. Discussions with the wider education community were conducted; these

focused on what we value most in education and what knowledge, skills and dispositions are needed by the region we serve. Vision Ohio (Ohio University's Strategic Plan), missions and visions of the Unit, needs of education in the changing 21st century and the region, NCATE, and other professional standards were taken into consideration. Four over-arching *Conceptual Cores* were articulated: Leader-Educators/Practitioners, Diversity, Change Agents, and Lifelong Learning.

During spring 2008, the College Renewal Committee presented a draft of the revised Conceptual Core to faculty, staff, candidates and the education community. Feedback from the various constituents again was collected and integrated and in fall 2008, the Conceptual Core was endorsed for permeation by the Unit. The four main Conceptual Cores have been translated into 18 Candidate Proficiencies and integrated in the program and Unit Assessment Systems.

STANDARD 1:   CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS

1a.   Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

1.a.1. What are the pass rates of teacher candidates in initial teacher preparation programs on state tests of content for each program and across all programs?

Table 4 provides the 2007-2008 Praxis II content test pass rates for tests taken by candidates in all initial teacher preparation programs. Pass rates for additional years will be available at the time of the visit. This table indicates a 95.8% overall pass rate.

Table 4
Pass Rates on Content Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation
For Period: 2007-2008

Program	# of Test Takers	% Passing State Licensure Test
Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all initial teacher preparation programs)	747	95.8%
Early Childhood Education	240	99%
Biology and General Science	10	100%
English Language Arts Content Knowledge	28	93%
Middle Childhood English	67	93%
Middle Childhood Science	68	96%
Middle Childhood Social Studies	98	89%
Middle Childhood Mathematics	53	98%
Integrated Mathematics	27	85%
*Chemistry, Physics, and General Science	4	NA
Social Studies Content Knowledge	47	96%
Biology Content Knowledge	6	100%
*Chemistry Content Knowledge	1	NA
*Physics Content Knowledge	2	NA
Earth Science Content Knowledge	10	100%
*French Content Knowledge	3	NA
Spanish Content Knowledge	7	85.7%
Physical Education Content Knowledge	17	100%
Special Education Content Knowledge	39	92%
Family and Consumer Sciences	6	100%
Music Content Knowledge	13	100%
*Visual Arts	1	NA

*Data not reported with fewer than 5 test takers

1.a.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards?

All initial teacher preparation programs have submitted programs for national review by NCATE or the Ohio Department of Education and have received either National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions. Additional data exists to demonstrate candidates' content knowledge. At the time of the visit, these data collected across the unit and disaggregated by program will be available.

1.a.3. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teaching candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards?

Based on data and very small enrollments, the Unit has stopped admitting candidates into the following advanced programs for the continuing education of teachers: Adolescent to Young Adult (AYA) non-licensure, Middle Childhood Education, Special Education non-licensure, Special Education-inclusion, and Curriculum and Instruction. Also, other advanced programs are either dormant (French/ Spanish Education) or accredited by another agency (e.g., NASAD, NASM). Therefore, at this point, the Unit is accepting candidates for only one program for the continuing preparation of teachers, the new General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program. As such, responses to questions for the advanced preparation of teachers are only in reference to the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program.

The General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) non-licensure program is being piloted this year and has its first cohort of candidates. During the development of this program, the faculty worked to integrate competencies from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) and the Unit's Candidate Proficiencies into both the curriculum and the assessment system. Key Assessment 1, "How to be a Curriculum Leader", requires candidates to work collaboratively to design and model the use of curricula that effectively enhances the academic achievement of all students; critically evaluate their own curricula and that of their peers in the school; and design and participate in a workshop for parents, community members, and other educators about a current or proposed curriculum in their classroom or school. The first administration of this assessment will take place in fall 2009.

1.a.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in the content area? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

Initial Programs

Four follow-up studies are used by the Unit to determine graduates' preparation in the content area: the Career and Further Education Survey (CFES) sent by OU's Institutional Research (IR), the Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) In-service Evaluation, Praxis III, and employer surveys. The CFES questions are written by IR and are general in nature; however, several questions align to graduates' preparation in their content area. The most recent data available for the CFES is from 2006 with a response rate of 42%. Exhibit 1.a.4.v provides data from the last three administrations of the survey. For one year, the Unit sent surveys directly to graduates however, due to the cost and low response rates, it was decided to discontinue those surveys and revise the surveys used by IR. Data from the one year will be available at the time of the visit. Data from the revised program surveys will not be available from IR until fall 2009. The Unit and IR also developed an alumni survey that is sent out to undergraduate candidates five years post graduation. Data from that survey are currently being analyzed by IR and will be distributed to colleges in fall 2009.

Data from the TQP In-Service Evaluation, a survey sent by The Ohio State University (OSU) to all universities in Ohio reflects that graduates have the necessary content knowledge. OSU does not provide response rate data for the TQP. The Praxis III evaluation is a required assessment of all first-year teachers in Ohio and is conducted by Praxis III trained evaluators. Data from the Praxis III show an average pass rate of 99.6% over the last three years (2005-06 n=303; 2006-07 n=336; 2007-08 n=400). On the two items (A3 and C2) measuring content knowledge, our graduates average 2.78 on a 3-point rubric (Exhibit 1.a.4.v). Unfortunately, as of fall 2009, Ohio will no longer be conducting the Praxis III assessment. Finally, the employer survey showed that over the past two years, graduates averaged 2.31 (on 3-point scale) for mastery of content knowledge over the last two years. The response rate was not collected during the 2007-08 administration; however, the response rate for 2008-09 was 14%.

<u>Advanced Program</u>

Because the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program is new, there are no graduates with whom to follow up.

1b.   Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

1b.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards?

All initial teacher preparation programs have submitted programs for national review by NCATE or the Ohio Department of Education and have received either National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions. Additional data exists to demonstrate candidates' content knowledge. At the time of the visit, these data collected across the unit and disaggregated by program will be available.

1.b.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teaching candidates know and apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, including the use of a range of instructional strategies and the ability to explain the choices they make in their practice.

As previously mentioned, the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) non-licensure program is being piloted this year and has not completed a full cycle. Key Assessment 2, "How to be an Instructional Leader", requires candidates to evaluate their own effectiveness and the effectiveness of their peers in the use of various theory of learning and diverse strategies that facilitate the academic development of all students, design individualized professional development plans responsive to interests and needs in regard to the use of such strategies, and promote a positive school culture that supports the academic achievement of all students. Exhibit 1.b.2.i provides this data.

1.b.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

<u>Initial Programs</u>

Three instruments provide data about our initial graduates' preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills: Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) In-service Survey, Employer Survey, and the Praxis III Performance Assessment. These data are found in Exhibit 1.b.3.i.

The items from the TQP In-Service Survey reflect teacher beliefs and their preparation in pedagogical content knowledge. (The Ohio State University does not provide response rate data for the TQP and the number of responses varies by question.) Data over the past three years show ratings from 3.50 to 3.88 on a 5-point scale. While there is some fluctuation, the data show a consistent sense of preparedness. This also holds true for the items targeting the graduates' own beliefs about knowing what to do in the classroom given a variety of contexts. For the same three years, graduate data range from 7.11 to 7.89 (on a 9 point scale) and 4.04 to 4.82 (on a 6 point scale), again demonstrating consistent data.

Data from 2007-08 showed that employers (response rate was not collected) rated graduates at 2.00 or "demonstrating competence," for their ability to design and implement effective instruction. In 2008-09 (response rate 14%), employers rated graduates at 2.14, above the "demonstrating competence" level, for the same item. These data indicate that because our graduates have the necessary pedagogical content knowledge, they are able to apply their knowledge to effective instruction. The Employer Survey subcommittee of the Assessment Council is

currently investigating strategies to increase the response rate. Further, the subcommittee is working on a revised survey to make the alignment to Pedagogical Content Knowledge clearer.

The Praxis III performance assessment data related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills reflect strong and consistent performance for our graduates. On a scale of 1 to 3, over the past three years (2005-06 n=303; 2006-07 n=336; 2007-08 n=400) our candidates score consistently in the 2.59 to 2.91 range. We are pleased by these results, which demonstrate that our candidates are succeeding in their initial teaching experiences.

<u>Advanced Program</u>

Because the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program is new, there are no graduates with whom to follow up.

1c.   Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

1.c.1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning?

<u>Initial Programs</u>

Six instruments provide aggregated Unit data on OU's initial teacher preparation candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills: Professional Internship Final Evaluation, the Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) Pre-service Survey, the Diversity Pre-Post Assessment, the Technology Assessment, the Lesson Planning Assessment, and the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). Exhibit 1.c.1.i outlines the data discussed below. At the time of the visit, data for each of these assessments, with the exception of the TQP state-administered assessment, will be disaggregated by campus and program.

Items on the Professional Internship Final Evaluation measure professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills that are identified as proficiencies in the Conceptual Core. Over the past three years (2006-07 to 2008-09), candidates have received scores ranging from 2.35 to 2.84 (range score from 0-3) for these items.

Several items on the Teacher Quality Partnership Pre-service Survey ask candidates to rate their perceptions and beliefs about professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills as they relate to creating a multicultural curriculum and addressing the needs of diverse students. Data from three years (2005-06 to 2007-08) show that candidates feel they are prepared in these skills (on a 5 point scale, 2005-06 mean score 3.48; 2006-07 mean score 3.67; 2007-08 mean score 3.64) and also believe they have the ability to implement appropriate strategies (on a 9 point scale, 2005-06 mean score 7.04; 2006-07 mean score 7.27; 2007-08 mean score 7.32).

The Diversity Pre-Post Assessment is conducted in one of the Diversity courses required of candidates at the initial level. Data from this assessment indicate that over the past three years (2006-07 to 2008-09) mean scores increased by a minimum of 1 point (on a 4-point scale) from candidates exhibiting a "rudimentary" or "developing" understanding to a "proficient" or "accomplished" understanding from the pre test administration to the post-test.

Candidates complete a Technology Portfolio that is aligned to the NETS-T standards. This standards-based portfolio assesses candidates' abilities to articulate, use, and reflect on technology in the classroom including: (a) planning; (b) teaching, learning, and the curriculum; (c) assessment and evaluation; (d) productivity and professional practice; and (e) social, ethical, legal, and human issues. Candidates' overall mean scores from the past three years (2006-07 n=258; 2007-08 n=463; 2008-09 n=425) ranged from 8.58 to 9.69 (on a 10-point scale).

Finally, both the Lesson Planning and the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) assessments evaluate technology. In the past three years (2006-07 n=278; 2007-08 n=430; 2008-09 n=448) candidates' overall mean score was 2.68 on a 3-point scale. Similarly, in the same time frame the TWS data revealed high mean scores in 2006-07 of 2.84 (3-point scale n=373) and 2007-08 of 2.87 (3-point scale n=393). Data on the revised TWS rubric for 2008-09 showed a mean score or 3.54 (4-point scale n=459).

Advanced Program

During the development of the key assessments in the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program the faculty intentionally aligned the assessments to professional, state, and institutional standards. This program designed the assessment, "Data Applications for Teachers", to demonstrate candidates' ability to both facilitate and assess student learning. The "Data Applications for Teachers" requires candidates to frame pertinent questions about instructional, curricular, or professional development issues that can be answered through data collection and analysis; select and analyze data to evaluate student, teacher, or school performance and progress related to the issue; apply those data in evaluating the allocation of school resources in light of candidates' understanding of state and local educational objectives; and use those data and data analyses in facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. The first administration of this assessment will take place in summer 2009.

The General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program plans to collect data specific to our Candidate Proficiencies by assessing each proficiency at their admission, midpoint, and endpoint. Several of the Proficiencies are directly aligned to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Admissions data for these candidates are available in Exhibit 1.c.1.ii.

1.c.2. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs consider the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings? If a licensure test is required in this area, how are candidates performing on it?

Five instruments provide data on OU's initial teacher preparation candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills: Professional Internship Final Evaluation, Lesson Planning Assessment, the Teacher Work Sample, the Teacher Quality Partnership Pre-service Survey, and the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) test. Exhibit 1.c.2.i provides a more extensive illustration of the data discussed below. At the time of the visit, data for each of these assessments, with the exception of the TQP state-administered assessment, will be disaggregated by campus and program.

Twenty items on the Professional Internship Final Evaluation (and 15 on the revised evaluation) measure professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills that are identified as proficiencies in our Conceptual Core. Over the past three years (2006-07 to 2008-09), candidates' mean scores on the items, as rated by their cooperating teachers and university supervisors, range from 2.20 to 2.84 (on a 0-3 scale) with overall mean scores in 2006-07 (n=425) at 2.53; 2007-08 (n=417) at 2.50; and 2008-09 (n=470) at 2.71.

Candidates are assessed Unit-wide with the Lesson Planning assessment. This assessment is designed around the Praxis III domains of Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning, Creating an Environment for Student Learning, Teaching for Student Learning, and Teacher Professionalism. Over the past three years (2006-07 to 2008-09), candidates' mean scores have ranged from 2.52 to 2.94 (1-3 scale) with overall mean scores in 2006-07 (n=278) at 2.75; 2007-08 (n=430) at 2.82; and 2008-09 (n=448) at 2.74.

Teacher Work Sample items completed during candidates' professional internship demonstrate that candidates consider the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own

practice; knows major schools of thoughts about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings. Data from 2006-07 (n=373) and 2007-08 (n=393) show candidates' mean scores ranging from 2.82 to 2.97 (3-point scale) and in 2008-09 (n=459) ranging from 3.60 to 3.80 (4-point scale).

The Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) Pre-service Survey provides evidence of candidates' ability to consider contextual experiences; reflect; know major schools of thought as it relates to schooling, teaching, and learning; and analyze research findings. Data from three years (2005-06 to 2007-08) show that candidates feel they are prepared in these skills (on a 5-point scale, 2005-06 mean score 3.76; 2006-07 mean score 3.97; 2007-08 mean score 3.97). Candidates believe they can assist families in helping children do well in schools (on a 9-point scale, 2005-06 mean score 7.04; 2006-07 mean score 7.27; 2007-08 mean score 7.32).

Finally, all candidates applying for licensure in the state of Ohio must take the appropriate Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) test. Ohio University candidates take the following tests: PLT Early Childhood, 5-9 (middle childhood) or 7-12 (Adolescent to Young Adult). Overall Unit data results for three years (2005-06 to 2007-08) reflect a pass rate ranging from 86% to 99%.

1.c.3 What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates reflect on their practice; engage in professional activities; have a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work; collaborate with the professional community; are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices; and can analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their own practice and the profession?

Currently, the Unit has only one advanced program for teachers, General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader). The General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) is a new program that began in fall, 2008. During the development of this program, the faculty worked to integrate competencies from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) and the Unit's Candidate Proficiencies into both the curriculum and the assessment system. Key Assessment 4, "Final Master's Project", requires candidates to develop pertinent and valid inquiry-interventions—action research projects that can inform their collaborations with others in making knowledge accessible to all students and ensuring equity of educational programs. Collaborative and individual teacher leader inquiry-intervention projects include (1) recording and reflecting on their practice; (2) collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative assessment data, (3) interpreting their findings and determining the implications of their results, and, based on their inquiries and reflections, (4) developing recommendations that show promise to improve their own practice and that of other educators in their school or district. The first administration of this assessment will take place in fall 2009. Exhibit 1.c.3.i provides additional information about this assessment.

Finally, the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program plans to collect data specific to our Candidate Proficiencies by assessing each proficiency at admission, midpoint, and endpoint. At this point in the program only admissions data are available. Exhibit 1.c.3.ii provides this data.

1.c.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

<u>Initial Programs</u>

Three follow-up studies provide information about graduates' preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills: Employer Survey, Teacher Quality In-service Evaluation, and Praxis III testing. Exhibit 1.c.4.i provides data from these instruments.

Eight items on the employer survey provide evidence of our graduates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Mean data from 2007-08 showed that employers (response rate was not collected) rated our graduates between 2.05 (with 2.00 as "demonstrating competence") and 2.41 (score range 0-3). In 2008-09 (response rate 14%), employers rated graduates between 1.92 (with 1.00 developing skill) and 2.27. These data indicate that our graduates demonstrate the necessary professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. The Employer Survey subcommittee of the Assessment Council is currently investigating strategies to increase the response rate.

Ratings on the Teacher Quality Partnership In-service Evaluation survey related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are broken down into two categories: preparation and teacher beliefs. In-service teachers rate themselves as being more than adequately prepared. They also believe in their ability to implement the skills they have learned. The Ohio State University does not provide response rate data for the TQP and the number of responses varies by question. Data over the past three years show ratings from 2.83 to 3.98 (on a 5-point scale). While there is some fluctuation, the data show a consistent sense of preparedness. This also holds true for the items targeting the graduates' own beliefs about knowing what to do in the classroom given a variety of contexts. For the same three years, graduate data range from 4.33 to 4.70 (on a 6 point scale).

Praxis III data on items related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills reflects consistent performance for our graduates. On a scale of 1 to 3, over the past three years (2005-06 n=303; 2006-07 n=336; 2007-08 n=400) our candidates score in the 2.50 to 2.93 range. It is satisfying to see such strong results in candidates as they move into the teaching force.

Finally, there are several new assessments that have not yet yielded data. In conjunction with OU's Institutional Research, data from program-specific graduate surveys and alumni surveys will serve to inform the Unit regarding candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Advanced Program

Because the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program is new, there are no graduates with whom to follow up.

1d.   Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

1.d.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn?

Initial Programs

All initial teacher preparation programs have submitted programs for national review by NCATE or the Ohio Department of Education and have received either National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions. Additional data exists to demonstrate candidates' impact on student learning. At the time of the visit, these data collected across the unit and disaggregated by program will be available.

1.d.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teaching candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning and regularly apply them in their practice?

As previously noted, the Unit has only one advanced program for teachers, General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader). The General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) is a new program that began in fall 2008. That program does not have an identified SPA. Based on the nature of the program, key assessments are

designed to align to ELCC standards, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and the Candidate Proficiencies.

As mentioned in section 1.c.1, the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program designed the assessment, "Data Applications for Teachers", to demonstrate candidates' ability to both facilitate and assess student learning. The "Data Applications for Teachers" requires candidates to frame pertinent questions about instructional, curricular, or professional development issues that can be answered through data collection and analysis; select and analyze data to evaluate student, teacher, or school performance and progress related to the issue; apply those data in evaluating the allocation of school resources in light of candidates' understanding of state and local educational objectives; and use those data and data analyses in facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school vision of learning supported by the school community. The first administration of this assessment will take place in summer 2009.

The General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program plans to collect data specific to our Candidate Proficiencies by assessing each proficiency at admission, midpoint, and endpoint. At this point in the program, only admissions data are available. Exhibit 1.d.2.i provides this data.

1.d.3. What do follow-up studies of employers and graduates indicate about graduates' ability to help all students learn? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

Initial Programs

Three follow-up studies provide information about graduates' preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills: Employer Survey, Teacher Quality In-service Evaluation, and Praxis III observations. Exhibit 1.d.3.i provides data from these instruments.

Two items on the employer survey provide evidence of our graduates' ability to impact student learning. Mean data from 2007-08 showed that employers (response rate was not collected) rated our graduates between 2.12 (with 2.00 as "demonstrating competence") and 2.31 (score range 0-3). In 2008-09 (response rate 14%), employers rated graduates between 2.00 (with 1.00 developing skill) and 2.22. These data indicate that our graduates impact student learning. The Unit realizes the small response rates and the Employer Survey subcommittee of the Assessment Council is currently investigating strategies to increase the response rate. That subcommittee is working to revise the survey instrument to more clearly assess candidate impact on student learning. Also, Design Team I is specifically examining the best ways to incorporate knowledge about, and skills related to, assessment in our education preparation programs.

The Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) In-service Survey is roughly consistent with the pre-service survey. Items about teacher use of standardized proficiency tests and preparation for helping P-12 students prepare for them are rated much the same as in the pre-service instrument. The Ohio State University does not provide response rate data for the TQP and the number of responses varies by question. Data over the past three years show ratings from 2.80 to 3.98 on a 5-point scale. Graduates' overall mean scores for the past three years on using various assessment strategies was 7.52 on a 9-point scale. We would like to improve candidates' preparation in this area. We have given them a foundation, but we will need to monitor and improve on this area. As noted above, Design Team I of the Communications and Connections group is currently identifying ways to better integrate assessment into the curriculum.

The Praxis III evaluation indicate that our candidates, as beginning teachers have a strong skill set in the area of impact on P-12 student learning. On items related to P-12 student learning, over a three year timeframe (2005-06 n=303; 2006-07 n=336; 2007-08 n=400) candidates earned an average score of 2.72 on a 3-point scale.

<u>Advanced Program</u>

Because the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program is new, there are no graduates with whom to follow up.

1e.   Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

1.e.1. What are the pass rates of other school professionals on licensure tests by program and across all programs?

As indicated in Table 5, the candidates in Educational Administration (the Principal program), Reading, and School Counselor programs have 100% pass rates on the Praxis II content test. Exhibit 1.e.1.i provides additional data.

Table 5
Pass Rates on Content Tests for Other School Professionals
For Period ___2007-2008___

Program	# of Test Takers	% Passing at State Cut Score
Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all programs for the preparation of other school professionals)	64	100%
Educational Administration- Principal	33	100%
Reading	16	100%
School Counselor	15	100%

1.e.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that these candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards?

We have the following programs and/or endorsements for other school professionals: Educational Administration- Principal, Educational Administration- Superintendent, Technology Facilitator endorsement and Reading Education. Ohio University was one of the last universities in Ohio to officially change its program approvals from the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) to NCATE. During the transition, ODE had trained SPA reviewers from ELCC to review and approve programs in Ohio. Since that transition, the Educational Administration programs have not been reviewed under the current NCATE 6 to 8 assessment structure. The programs are currently revising their assessment structures to fit that model. Currently those programs use a series of integrated portfolio assessments spread across the curriculum to assess candidate performance. An alignment to the new ELCC standards is presently being reviewed by ODE, and implementation of the 6-8 assessment structure will begin with the fall 2010 cohort. The Technology Facilitator endorsement was also reviewed and approved in 2006 under the old ODE and NCATE approval process; however, it has been revised to fit the NCATE 6 to 8 assessment structure. The Reading Education program received National Recognition by the International Reading Association (IRA) in 2009. Therefore, the following section will only include information from those programs that were approved more than one year ago including the Educational Administration Principal and Superintendent programs and the Technology Facilitator endorsement. Data from the IRA assessments and SPA report are available on AIMS. Exhibit 1.e.2.i provides data for the Principal, Superintendent, and Technology Facilitator programs.

The Principal Preparation program received national recognition by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) in 2006. A series of four integrated portfolios are used to demonstrate candidates' professional knowledge and skills. Portfolio I provides evidence of candidates' ability to gather and analyze demographic, organizational, and academic performance data. Portfolio II provides evidence of candidates' ability to develop a school vision that

is strategically framed to promote the success of all students. Portfolio III provides evidence of candidates' ability to develop and/or revise a comprehensive school improvement plan. Portfolio IV provides evidence of candidates' ability to collaborate with families and community to identify resources and create responsive policy contexts.

The Superintendent program received national recognition by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) in 2006. A series of four integrated portfolios are used to demonstrate candidates' professional knowledge and skills. Portfolio I provides evidence of candidates' ability to gather and analyze demographic, fiscal, and academic performance data. Portfolio II provides evidence of candidates' ability to deploy effective strategies for managing district operations. Portfolio III provides evidence of candidates' ability to plan for district-wide improvement. Portfolio IV provides evidence of candidates' ability to deploy understandings of human behavior, group behavior, political processes, and conflict management to lead district efforts.

The Technology Facilitator endorsement, a part of the Instructional Technology program, is approved by the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). Three key assessments are used to demonstrate candidates' professional knowledge and skills. Key assessments 1- "Portfolio", 2- "Master's Portfolio", and 5- "Internship: Theory into Practice" provide evidence of meeting the knowledge and skills identified by the ISTE professional standards- Technology Facilitation, the Ohio Technology requirement for teachers to meet ISTE NETS*T standards upon graduation, and the candidates' proficiencies related to technology knowledge and skills. Assessment 2 is the Masters Portfolio which demonstrates knowledge and content within the ISTE Technology Facilitator standards framework and evaluates the professional, state, and institution standards.

The Reading Education (Specialist) program is approved by the International Reading Association (IRA). Data from key assessments are located on the AIMS website.

The programs for these other school professionals also have assessed their candidates on the Unit's Candidate Proficiencies at each of the three identified transition points (entry, midpoint, endpoint).

1.e.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to professional knowledge and skills? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

Data from three sources provide information about graduates' preparation related to professional knowledge and skills: the Career and Further Education Survey, the Conceptual Core Candidate Proficiencies Survey of Graduates and an Employer Survey. Exhibit 1.e.3.i provides data from these instruments.

Data from the Career and Further Education Survey conducted by Institutional Research (IR) are available through 2006 (response rates for Educational Administration were 2006- 42%; 2005- 22%; 2004- 52% and for Instructional Technology were 2006- 30%; 2005- 10%; 2004- 50%). A program-specific survey developed by the Educational Administration programs was sent to 2004 and 2005 graduates, and 2005 Reading Education graduates. However, due to leadership changes and cost factors, the surveys were not distributed to 2006 graduates. Data from those surveys will be available during the onsite visit. The Unit has partnered with IR to revise many of the program-specific surveys to reflect both the SPA standards and the updated Conceptual Core. The Unit will receive data from IR for the 2007 graduates in the fall of 2009.

The Conceptual Core was revised and implemented in fall 2008. In addition to collecting candidate proficiency data on current candidates, the Instructional Technology and Educational Administration programs sent surveys that covered the core proficiencies to recent graduates. Data revealed that graduates primarily rated their professional knowledge and skills, as defined by the candidate proficiencies, in a positive manner. The response rate for Educational Administration was collected over the past three years of cohorts and was 27%. The response rate for Instructional Technology graduates in the last two-year cohort was 67%.

Finally, an employer survey was sent to the Coalition of Rural and Appalachian Schools (CORAS) because a fairly large number of CORAS members employ our Educational Administration graduates. Employers rated 100% of candidates as either "Excellent" or "Good" at using data to improve school performance. Similar results were reported for managing school procedures such as those relating to personnel and student discipline. The response rate was 20.3% for this survey.

1f.   Student Learning for Other School Professionals

1.f.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates can create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work?

As previously noted, because the Reading Education program received National Recognition by IRA in 2009, the following response will only pertain to the Educational Administration Principal and Superintendent programs and the Technology Facilitator endorsement. Exhibit 1.f.1.i provides data for these assessments.

Data from the four Principal portfolio assessments demonstrate that candidates are able to create positive environments for student learning. Portfolio I provides evidence of candidates' ability to gather and analyze demographic, organizational, and academic performance data to better understand the current environment. Portfolio II provides evidence of candidates' ability to develop a school vision strategically framed to promote a positive environment for student learning. Portfolio III provides evidence of candidates' ability to develop and/or revise a comprehensive school improvement plan to create and sustain a positive environment for student learning. Portfolio IV provides evidence of candidates' ability to develop policy contexts that are responsive to needs and support a positive environment for student learning.

Data from three of the four Superintendent portfolio assessments demonstrate that candidates are able to create positive environments for student learning. Portfolio I provides evidence that candidates can gather and analyze community and school district data to inform policy and practice with regard to student learning. Portfolio II provides evidence of candidates' ability to manage district operations to support student learning. Portfolio III provides evidence of candidates' ability to plan for district-wide improvements in student learning outcomes, including strategies to identify and address issues of educational equity within the district.

Data from several key assessments demonstrate that candidates seeking the Technology Facilitator endorsement can create positive environments for student learning. Exhibit 1.f.1.i provides data for these assessments. Candidates' projects that have been evaluated using an ISTE-standards-based rubric in key assessments 3- "Leadership and Professional Development in Technology Programs", 5- "Internship: Theory into Practice", and 7- "Addressing and Evaluating Technology Use in School Settings" provide the data to support candidates' ability to create positive environments for student learning based on the developmental levels of students and the diversity of students, families and communities. Assessments 3 and 7 specifically prepare the candidate to examine school policy around technology use through active research on student learning in candidate classrooms, then distributing this information to school administrators as a means of creating change within the school system when needed. Assessment 5 demonstrates the candidates' ability to communicate with the larger community of the school district in examining student learning and the integration of technology by teachers in the district.

1.f.2. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to create positive environments for student learning? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

Programs for other school professionals have used various ways to follow up with graduates and employers about ways graduates create positive environments for student learning. Exhibit 1.f.2.i provides data from these instruments.

The Conceptual Core was revised and implemented in fall 2008. In addition to collecting proficiency data on current candidates, the Instructional Technology and Educational Administration programs sent surveys that covered the Candidate Proficiencies to recent graduates. Data revealed that graduates primarily rated their ability to impact student learning, as defined by the candidate proficiencies, in a positive manner. The response rate for Educational Administration was collected over the past three years of cohorts and was 27%. The response rate for Instructional Technology graduates in the last two-year cohort was 67%.

An Employer Survey was sent to the Coalition of Rural and Appalachian Schools (CORAS) because a fairly large number of CORAS members employ our Educational Administration graduates. Employers rated 100% of candidates (response rate, 20.3%) as either "Excellent" or "Good" at providing leadership that supports student learning. Similar data were reported for their ability to work with assessments and make data-based decisions.

Graduate surveys have been developed and sent by OU's Institutional Research to all advanced candidates including those in Reading Education. Data from those surveys will be available in fall, 2009. The Reading Education faculty are also in the process of developing an employer survey to more systematically follow-up with their graduates' employers.

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

1.g.1. What professional dispositions are candidates expected to demonstrate by completion of programs?

The Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) has identified four Core Dispositions: (a) commitment to social justice; (b) commitment to ethics; (c) commitment to the well-being of students, families, and communities; and (d) commitment to professional competence and ongoing professional development. Candidates in initial teacher preparation, advanced preparation of teachers, and other school professionals are expected to develop and demonstrate these dispositions throughout their respective programs.

1.g.2. How do candidates demonstrate that they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn?

Based on the revised NCATE standards, the Dispositions subcommittee of the Assessment Council (AC) reviewed the Education Professionals Dispositions Assessment to determine whether the dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn were already addressed in the assessment. It was concluded that the first disposition, the commitment to social justice, included language that was inclusive of these topics. The revised assessment was approved by the AC and UPEP in fall 2008. It is important to note that in winter 2007, this assessment was revised from qualitative to quantitative. Therefore, the data reported below are only for 2007-08 and 2008-09 only. Data from winter and spring 2007 will be available to the team during the visit. In additional several of the Candidate Proficiencies align to our Core Dispositions.

<u>Initial Programs</u>

Candidates in initial programs are assessed at three points in time using the Education Professionals Dispositions Assessment. The first point is during an Introduction to Education course. During this course, information about the Unit's dispositions is presented to candidates. At the end of the course candidates are assessed on each of the dispositions as a way for the Unit to gather baseline data. Candidates are assessed again during a selected methods course that involves a field experience. By assessing candidates at the beginning of the program and again around the middle, candidates demonstrate that they can and do develop the professional dispositions during their field experience. Finally, candidates are assessed a final time near the end of their professional internship. Exhibit 1.g.2.iii provides data for each of these points in time.

<u>Advanced Programs</u>

Candidates in the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program are assessed on professional dispositions at three points in time: admission, a midpoint, and near the end of their program to enable candidates to develop the professional dispositions throughout their program. Data are available for admissions and midpoint and are provided in Exhibit 1.g.2.iii.

Candidates in programs for other school professionals are also assessed at three points in time: admission, midpoint, and an endpoint. Beginning in fall 2009, the Graduate Recommendation Form, which includes items that align to the Unit's dispositions, will be a part of the admissions documents. Candidates will be required to have a principal or other supervisor complete this form as part of the program application process. The underlying assumption is that teachers practicing in the field have the necessary dispositions. However, individual cases may indicate otherwise, and we see this as a way to screen candidates who do not have the dispositions we have identified. Exhibit 1.g.2.iii provides data for other school professionals.

If candidates' dispositions are rated at "below expectations", there is a protocol for both initial and advanced programs. Beginning in spring, 2009, the Dispositions subcommittee of the Assessment Council (AC) revised the protocol for tracking dispositions, raising a concern, and advising alternatives to make the procedures clearer to all stakeholders. Based on the diversity of the Unit's advanced programs, the protocol is program-specific. However, if candidates' dispositions are rated as "below expectations", they have a discussion with the program faculty to determine the next appropriate steps. Faculty members in both initial and advanced programs note their intervention plan on the assessment and require the candidate to sign the assessment.

1.g.3. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions listed in 1.g.1 as they work with students, families, colleagues, and communities?

One of the Unit's dispositions specifically states that candidates are "committed to the well-being of students, families, and communities." As such, data from the Educational Professional Dispositions Assessment directly align to this question. The data below are for the Unit and are in aggregated form. The data will be available disaggregated by campus and program at the time of the visit.

<u>Initial Programs</u>

Two key assessments specifically demonstrate the Unit's professional dispositions: the Education Professional Dispositions Assessment and the Professional Internship Final Evaluation. Other data are collected across the Unit that align to the dispositions, however these two instruments are the most explicit. Exhibit 1.g.3.i provides data from these instruments.

The Education Professionals Dispositions Assessment is used across the entire Unit. Dispositions are assessed at three points in time for all candidates, near the beginning of the program, midpoint, and endpoint.

Data from the Professional Internship Final Evaluation also provides evidence of professional dispositions. Candidates' mean scores over the past three years (2006-07 n=425; 2007-08 n=417; 2008-09 n=470) ranges from 2.24 to 2.90 (on a 0 to 3 scale) indicating that our candidates demonstrate appropriate dispositions.

<u>Advanced Programs</u>

As previously stated, beginning in fall 2009, the Graduate Recommendation Form will be part of the candidate admissions documents. All candidates in advanced programs are at the graduate level so data will be collected using this form in the future.

At this point, data are available for General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) candidates at two points: admission and midpoint. Exhibit 1.g.3.i provides data from these two points. After the first cohort has completed a full cycle, the program will be able to review the data and determine candidates' ability to demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions as they work with students, families, colleagues, and communities. At this point, candidates seem to be meeting the expectations outlined in the dispositions assessment.

Candidates in other school professional programs are assessed at three points in time. Candidates in these programs consistently demonstrate dispositions that meet the expectations determined by the Unit. Exhibit 1.g.3.i provides these data.

1.g.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' demonstration of professional dispositions? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate?

Initial Programs

Two key assessments provide follow-up data regarding graduates' demonstration of professional dispositions. Exhibit 1.g.4.i provides data for these assessments.

The Praxis III evaluation provides us with information about how our initial level teacher candidates perform once they get a teaching job. Over for three years reflects an overall mean score of 2.74 on a 3-point scale. Data are consistent each year with 2007-08 as 2.75 (n=400), 2006-07 as 2.76 (n=336), and 2005-06 as 2.72 (n=303). Candidates are demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of these dispositions.

Employer survey data indicate an overall mean score for dispositions including items of graduates' "ability to create an effective learning environment and the disposition to do so", "demonstrating ethical behaviors as practitioners and citizens", and a "commitment to lifelong learning" of 2.25 in 2008-09 (response rate 14%) and 2.30 in 2007-08 (no response rate taken).

Overall, our assessment instruments confirm that our initial teacher preparation candidates are demonstrating the dispositions our Unit has identified.

Advanced Programs

Programs have used various ways to follow up with graduates and employers to learn about ways graduates exhibit professional dispositions. Exhibit 1.g.4.ii provides data from these instruments.

Because the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program is new, there are no graduates with whom to follow up.

The Conceptual Core was revised and implemented in fall 2008. In addition to collecting Candidate Proficiency data on current candidates, the Instructional Technology and Educational Administration programs sent surveys that address the Candidate Proficiencies to recent graduates. Data revealed that graduates primarily rated their professional dispositions, as defined by the Candidate Proficiencies in a positive manner. The response rate for Educational Administration was collected over the past three years of cohorts and was 27%. The response rate for Instructional Technology graduates in the last two-year cohort was 67%.

An Employer Survey was sent to the Coalition of Rural and Appalachian Schools (CORAS) because a fairly large number of CORAS members employ our Educational Administration graduates. Employers' ratings in 2008-09 provided an average of a 2.75 on a 3-point scale (response rate, 20.3%) for professional dispositions including supporting the learning of all students, providing fair treatment of individuals, believing in the value of life-long learning and acting as change-agents.

Graduate surveys have been developed and sent by OU's Institutional Research to all advanced candidates, including Reading Education. Data from those surveys will be available in fall 2009. The Reading Education program is in the process of developing an employer survey to more systematically follow up with their graduates' employers.

Optional

1.   What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 1?

Involving P-12 educators in the work to improve learning experiences provided by the Unit is a key strength. With representatives of UPEP and school districts in the region, the Communications and Connections group undertook a strategic planning initiative (the I-Wheel process) led by Design Team I. This initiative was designed to result in an agreed-upon vision statement for the future preparation of professionals for the region's schools and a strategy for achieving that vision. The group identified the following as the overarching statement of need: To create an aligned, agile, regional system of professional learning that meets the unique educational needs of the children and broader demands of a global society. Following the I-Wheel process and related activities, Design Team I directed its attention to the three most serious needs for improvement in the Unit's educator preparation programs: (1) cultivation of knowledge about and effective use of assessment strategies, (2) cultivation of knowledge about effective use of classroom management strategies, and (3) cultivation of knowledge about diverse student populations and effective use of strategies productive of high-level learning among students from all populations. The priority placed on P-12 partners continues to enrich the Unit's work to prepare teachers and other education professionals. In fall 2009 Design Team I will continue its path of continuous improvement on behalf of the Unit as it works with professional education faculty to create a systematic alignment of the teacher education curriculum with agreed upon standards relating to assessment.

2.   What research related to Standard 1 is being conducted by the unit?

Members of the special education faculty (Roth, Noel, & Oswald) are investigating ways in which the undergraduate Special Education Selective Admission measures can predict Teacher Self-Efficacy measures at program endpoints. Also, influences on self-efficacy development are being viewed to ascertain which types of influences, applied how and when, can promote greater gains in efficacy beliefs. Additional faculty publications and presentations demonstrate Unit engagement in research related to candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. For example, Math Education faculty member Dr. Foley offers a workshop on using handheld technology and genuine data to enhance preparation for calculus. Instructional Technology faculty member Dr. Franklin researches and presents on using games created in Second Life to teach middle school science content. Educational Administration faculty member Dr. Johnson has conducted research on the relationship between leadership role perceptions and student achievement outcomes. Information Technology faculty member Dr. Moore researches the role of graphics in creating practice sequences, as well as designs for online learning and the role of educational radio and television. English Education faculty members Drs. Glasgow and Rice have published and presented on best practices for connecting Language Arts with active learning, multiple intelligences, standards-based assessment, and young adult literature. Teacher Education faculty members, Drs. Wan and Gut research the roles of media and literacy in the lives of adolescents.

STANDARD 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

2a. Assessment System

2.a.1. How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on Candidate Proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards?

The Unit Assessment System (UAS) is driven by the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) and the Assessment Council (AC). The 6 to 8 key assessments developed for program review aim to demonstrate that programs meet the standards of the SPAs. All SPA assessments are aligned to the Unit's Conceptual Core and Candidate Proficiencies, which in turn are aligned to state and professional standards. All programs at the initial level have received either National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions by their respective SPAs, which requires that program assessments be aligned to the standards. Further, all assessments conducted across the Unit are aligned to our Candidate Proficiencies. A standards alignment chart outlines how programs meet the proficiencies and standards to which they are held accountable. Course syllabi also include the appropriate standards as a means to help candidates see how standards are a central focus of the in coursework.

2.a.2. What are the key assessments used by the unit and its programs to monitor and make decisions about candidate performance at transition points such as those listed in Table 6?

Table 6 provides the requirements and key assessments for each initial and advanced programs' transition points.

Table 6
Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments

	Professional Education	Advanced Standing	Professional Internship	Graduation/ Licensure	Follow-Up
Initial Teacher Preparation Programs					
Early Childhood (ECE) Middle Childhood (MCE) Adolescent to Young Adult (AYA) Integrated Science AYA Physical Science AYA Life Science AYA Earth Science AYA Integrated Social Studies AYA Integrated Language Arts AYA Integrated Mathematics Multi-Age Modern Languages: French, Spanish, and German Multi-Age Physical	2.75 GPA (Overall) C or better in PSY 101, C or better in Tier I freshman composition and mathematics, C or better in COMS 103 (Fundamentals of Public Speaking) Passing scores on PRAXIS I (reading 172, writing 172, mathematics 173) OR ≥ 21 ACT/ ≥ 990 SAT Special Requirement for ECE • Selective Admissions • C or better in one Science course w/lab • C or better in two ≥ Math 120	2.75 GPA (Overall and in all teaching fields) Assessments Completed after achieving Advanced Standing • Lesson Planning • Dispositions • Diversity Assessment • Technology Assessment • Candidate Evaluations of Field Experiences	2.75 GPA (Overall and in all teaching fields) C or better in Junior English composition, Special Requirements for ECE Completion of ECE Practicum Special Requirements for MCE and Special Education • Completion of all content area requirements • Completion of all Methods and Reading courses • In Sp. Ed., Pre-professional internship review and recommendation	• Completion of at least 192 quarter hours with an overall GPA of 2.75 • 2.75 GPA in all teaching fields for which licensure is sought Assessment •Exit Survey •Praxis II State Licensure Test	Assessments • Passing score on PRAXIS III • Graduate Survey • Employer Survey • TQP (for in-service teachers)

25

| Education

Intervention Specialist (Mild-Moderate and Moderate- Intensive and Early Childhood)

Family & Consumer Sciences

Multi-Age Music

Multi-Age Visual Arts | <u>Special Requirements for Sp. Ed.</u>
Selective Admission Application

Education Professional Dispositions Assessment | | <u>Requirements for AYA and Multi-Age</u>
• Completion of all Professional Education requirements including Methods courses

<u>Assessments</u>
• Dispositions
• Teacher Work Sample
• Professional Internship Final Evaluation
• TQP (for pre-service teachers)
• Candidate Evaluation of Professional Internship | | |

Advanced Program for Teachers

	Admissions	Mid Point	End of Program	Graduation/	Follow-Up
General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader)	▪ GRE or MAT of 2.98 GPA or 3.25 on last 90 hours of undergraduate work ▪ If GPA is 2.70-2.99 or 3.0-3.24 on last 90 hours: must have 45 on MAT or 900 on GRE ▪ If GPA is 2.5-2.69 or 2.7-2.99 on last 90 hours: must have 48 on MAT or 1000 on GRE ▪ If master's degree is already obtained, if GPA is 3.5-4.0 admittance is granted without the GRE or MAT ▪ 3 letters of recommendation ▪ Autobiography and professional goals statement <u>Assessment</u> ▪ Dispositions ▪ Candidate Proficiency Survey	<u>Assessments</u> ▪ Reflective project on differentiated instruction ▪ Observation report on differentiated instruction ▪ Case study on school culture ▪ Dispositions ▪ Candidate Proficiency Survey	<u>Assessments</u> ▪ Completion of Clinical Experience ▪ Dispositions ▪ Candidate Proficiency Survey	<u>Assessments</u> Final Master's Project	▪ Graduate Survey ▪ Employer Survey

Advanced Programs for Other School Professionals

	Admissions	Mid Point	End of Program	Licensure	Follow-Up
Educational Administration Principal & Superintendent	▪ GRE or MAT of 2.98 GPA or 3.25 on last 90 hours of undergraduate work ▪ If GPA is 2.70-2.99 or 3.0-3.24 on last 90 hours: must have 45 on MAT or 900 on GRE ▪ If GPA is 2.5-2.69 or 2.7-2.99 on last 90	<u>Assessments</u> ▪ Principal Portfolio ▪ Superintendent Portfolio ▪ Dispositions ▪ Candidate Proficiency Survey	<u>Assessments</u> Successful completion of internships ▪ Principal Internship ▪ Superintendent Internship ▪ Dispositions ▪ Candidate Proficiency Survey	<u>Assessment</u> ▪ Praxis II State Licensure Test	<u>Assessment</u> ▪ Graduate Survey ▪ Employer Survey

	hours: must have 48 on MAT or 1000 on GRE ▪ If master's degree is already obtained, if GPA is 3.5-4.0 admittance is granted without the GRE or MAT ▪ 3 letters of recommendation ▪ Autobiography and professional goals statement <u>Assessment</u> ▪ Dispositions ▪ Candidate Proficiency Survey				
Reading Education	▪ GRE or MAT of 2.98 GPA or 3.25 on last 90 hours of undergraduate work ▪ If GPA is 2.70-2.99 or 3.0-3.24 on last 90 hours: must have 45 on MAT or 900 on GRE ▪ If GPA is 2.5-2.69 or 2.7-2.99 on last 90 hours: must have 48 on MAT or 1000 on GRE ▪ If master's degree is already obtained, if GPA is 3.5-4.0 admittance is granted without the GRE or MAT ▪ 3 letters of recommendation ▪ Autobiography and professional goals statement <u>Assessments</u> ▪ Dispositions	GPA <u>Assessments</u> ● Course Work with associated IRA Assessments ● Dispositions	Completion of Clinical Experience <u>Assessments</u> ●Final Seminar Paper ●Dispositions	Master's Research Project <u>Assessments</u> ●Praxis II State Licensure Test	● Graduate Survey ● Employer Survey (in development)
Computer Education and Technology (ISTE Technology Endorsement)	▪ GRE or MAT or 2.98 GPA or 3.25 on last 90 hours of undergraduate work ▪ If GPA is 2.70-2.99 or 3.0-3.24 on last 90 hours: must have 45 on MAT or 900 on GRE ▪ If GPA is 2.5-2.69 or 2.7-2.99 on last 90 hours: must have 48 on MAT or 1000 on GRE ▪ If master's degree is already obtained, if GPA is 3.5-4.0	<u>Assessment</u> ▪ CET Internship ▪ Dispositions ▪ Candidate Proficiency Survey	<u>Assessments</u> Successful completion of CET internship ▪ Master's Portfolio ▪ Dispositions ▪ Candidate Proficiency Survey		<u>Assessment</u> ▪ Graduate Survey ▪ Employer Survey (in development)

admittance is granted without the GRE or MAT ▪ 3 letters of recommendation ▪ Autobiography and professional goals statement Assessment ▪ Dispositions				

2.a.3. How is the Unit Assessment System evaluated and continuously improved? Who is involved and how?

The Unit's Assessment Council (AC, Exhibit 2.a.3.i) supports a culture of dialogue on behalf of continuous program and pedagogical improvement. The AC is a representative subcommittee of the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP, Exhibit 2.a.3.ii), which is a group that represents the Unit and its stakeholders. (UPEP includes faculty representatives from the colleges on campus that are a part of the Unit as well as other stakeholders, including faculty from the regional campuses, OU administrators, College of Education students, and educators from area P-12 schools.) The AC oversees the planning, development, administration, analysis, evaluation, and reporting of assessments used to monitor the performance of the Unit and its candidates and programs. The Cycle of Unit Assessment Data for Program Improvement provides an illustration of the Unit's Assessment System. In addition, a narrative exists that more clearly describes each step in the UAS. This cycle is implemented on a quarterly basis with data reports beginning at the level of the AC subcommittees and moving through the entire AC, then going to UPEP for final recommendations. The calendar for reviewing unit assessments and data is available here. To provide a systematic presentation of the data, each respective AC subcommittee uses the same Unit Assessment Data Reporting Form.

In addition to AC reviews of the various assessments conducted across the Unit, the AC has also begun reviewing the processes of the Unit Assessment System. The review of the system is a standing agenda item for the AC during every spring quarter meeting. This systematic review, beginning in spring 2009, enables the Unit to ensure that the system itself is reliable and valid and produces useable and meaningful data for improvement.

2.a.4. How does the unit ensure its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?

The Unit ensures its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias in a number of ways. First, having rubrics for the assessments ensures that all assessors use the same criteria for all candidates. This holds true not only across assessors and candidates assessed, but also across different quarters and different campuses. Rubrics list both the criteria for assessments and provide guidance for assessors in determining their ratings. Having descriptors for the rating levels of each criterion and for all assessment tasks increases the consistency of assessors' ratings.

Second, no decisions about candidates' progress throughout the program are made on one single source of evidence; but rather, decisions are made holistically via multiple assessments. For several assessments (e.g., Education Professional Dispositions Assessment and Professional Internship Final Evaluations), each candidate is assessed by more than one assessor. This ensures that decisions include input from people with multiple perspectives. An additional measure of fairness is the sharing of assessments with candidates. Candidates receive a copy of the assignment and a copy of the rubric at the same time. The rubric clearly outlines what candidates must do to be successful on the assignment. Many assessments also include a specific template to follow as candidates complete their assignments. This ensures candidates are aware of the assessment tools and how they will be used.

In addition to establishing and maintaining fairness, we have sought to foster accuracy in our assessments. First, all assessments are aligned with professional and state standards, which are reflected in our Unit's Conceptual Core. This ensures that assessments and ratings focus on the criteria that are important to Ohio University's UPEP. Second, faculty members are integrally involved in AC, which is charged with the development and implementation of assessments. As previously mentioned, Assessment Council is a subcommittee of UPEP.

Finally, we have sought to enhance consistency by providing training for assessors on the use of the rubrics and the content of the assessments. Each quarter, the Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement meets with the University Supervisors to review assessment procedures and/or revised assessments conducted during the Professional Internship. In addition, each Unit assessment and its respective data are reviewed annually at the AC using the Unit Assessment Data Reporting Form, which specifically asks subcommittees to discuss the data's reliability and validity. If questionable trends in data are observed, the specific subcommittee of AC and/or program is alerted to discuss and decide on next action steps. These data and decisions are discussed at quarterly UPEP meetings.

2.a.5. What assessments and evaluations are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?

The College of Education (COE) conducts an evaluation of the Unit with annual reports at the faculty, program, and department level. Faculty members in the COE are required to submit reviews of scholarship, teaching and advising, and service activities for each calendar year. Annual reports are reviewed by the department chairs for merit pay, tenure, and promotion decisions (where appropriate). Department chairs are required to consolidate their faculty reports into a Departmental annual report that is submitted to the Dean for review. The Dean compiles the annual review information from the departments to develop the College's Annual Report that is submitted to the Provost and President for review. At all levels of review, the data are evaluated for trends of improvement or areas of concern that need improvement. Yearly goals are developed from these annual reports and re-evaluated each year. The COE report is also shared with the faculty as a whole. Therefore, the annual review serves as a continuous loop of evaluation and goal setting addressing trends in the data.

Also, the Unit employs several evaluations to manage and improve our overall operations and programs in the unit. During all early field experiences as well as during professional internship, each candidate is asked to complete the Candidate Evaluation of Field Experience or Professional Internship. This survey asks candidates to assess their cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and their overall experience during either field experiences or professional internship. Each quarter, the data are analyzed by the 'Surveys Of' Subcommittee of Assessment Council and are shared with the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs and Academic Advising and the Office of Early Field Experiences and Professional Internships (OFEPI). Quarterly, the coordinators of field placements and professional internship produce reports to the Assistant Dean for Advising and Student Affairs. These reports include information about placement sites and numbers of candidates placed, as well as data from the Candidate Evaluation of Field Experience or Professional Internship.

Upon completion of the professional internship, the Unit asks candidates to complete an Exit Survey. After graduation, the Unit sends surveys to alumni and employers of our graduates. In 2009, the Unit also sent a Candidate Satisfaction Survey to a representative sample of current candidates to assess their experiences. Exhibit 2.a.5.vi provides data from this survey.

Finally, the Operational Assessment and Improvement Cycle is used to assess the Unit's operations and to review issues such as faculty development, service and outreach, admissions and retention, and student support services including advising and field placements.

2b.   Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

2.b.1.   What are the processes and timelines used by the unit to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, unit operations, and program quality?
- How are the data collected?
- From whom (e.g., applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty) are data collected?
- How often are the data summarized and analyzed?
- Whose responsibility is it to summarize and analyze the data? (Dean, assistant dean, data coordinator, etc.)
- In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? (Reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)
- What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?

Prior to the beginning of each quarter, the Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement sends data collection schedules to all faculty who teach a course with an identified key assessment. Key Unit and Program assessments are submitted via LiveText, an E-portfolio tool that helps the Unit manage its Unit Assessment System. All Education candidates are required to purchase LiveText at the beginning of their programs. All key assessments are shared from the central administrative account. When faculty or supervisors assess candidate work, the data are automatically entered into the central account. From that account, the Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement compiles data reports and begins the assessment cycle.

Each quarter, typically around the second week after grades are due, the Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement runs and reports all Unit and Program data that have been collected using LiveText. All Unit data are organized and assembled for distribution at the aggregate and disaggregate level by program and campus. The data are reported to the appropriate Assessment Council (AC) subcommittee and distributed to the respective program coordinator for program-level review.

Annually on a rotating calendar the AC subcommittees review and report on Unit data. During the review, each subcommittee is to consult with the appropriate faculty, programs, or departments. The subcommittees produce written reports of the data that were examined, who reviewed them, the date(s) of review and analysis, the current status of the data, and recommendations for program improvement including recommended action steps. These recommendations are discussed at the quarterly AC meeting.

At each quarterly meeting of the AC, the subcommittees present their data analyses and recommended action steps with the overall group. The AC reviews the subcommittees' analyses and action steps and responds to the recommendations. If AC responds that the recommendations need revision, they are returned to the subcommittee(s). If the feedback is for ongoing program interventions and/or review, it is returned to the program for continued improvement. If the recommendations require a major change in the Unit or a change in policy, they are forwarded to the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) for a first reading. Regardless of whether a change is proposed, all recommendations are discussed at that quarter's UPEP meeting.

Next, at each quarterly UPEP meeting, AC subcommittees report to the group for a first reading. Following the first reading, feedback is given to the subcommittees about the analysis and recommended action steps. Members of UPEP are asked to discuss the recommendations with the appropriate faculty, programs, or departments prior to the subsequent UPEP meeting. If the recommendations need to be revised, the plan goes back to the respective subcommittee for modification. If the recommendations are approved, they are presented at the next meeting for a second reading. At the next UPEP meeting, the recommendations and the garnered feedback are presented to the group for a second reading. The recommendations are moved forward to the next stage of the review/ improvement cycle. The approved plan is sent for implementation to the appropriate faculty, programs, or departments.

Once UPEP delivers an approved plan for program/Unit improvement, the appropriate faculty, programs, and departments implement the plan. Official communication with UPEP stakeholders (K-12 partners, regional faculty,

Athens faculty, administrators, and candidates) is provided from the Unit head and an opportunity for feedback is given. Quarterly, the implementers provide feedback to UPEP about the progress of the improvement plan, which is documented at the UPEP meeting.

Within and across the Unit's programs, data are collected from various sources including applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and other relevant stakeholders. The Unit collects data from a variety of assessments conducted both internally and at the state level. We receive data once a year from the Teacher Quality Partnership Survey (TQP), which is conducted by The Ohio State University. Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching results are also collected once a year. The Praxis content test data are collected as part of the program key assessments. In addition to these two Praxis sources, we also receive data from the state of Ohio for the Praxis III. The Praxis III is a performance assessment modeled after the Pathwise domains that all entry-level teachers in Ohio must pass in order to receive a professional license.

2.b.2. How does the unit disaggregate candidate assessment data for candidates on the main campus, at off-campus sites, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs?

Because data from key assessments are shared from the central administrative account on LiveText, the Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement collects, analyzes, and prepares aggregated data reports, as well as reports that are disaggregated by campus and program. Reports are located and organized in the LiveText Exhibit Center in this way.

2.b.3. How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?

Candidates may raise complaints by contacting an individual professor, the candidate's advisor, Department Chair, the Director of Student Affairs, or the Associate Deans. We advise students to start with the person most closely related to the area of concern. When a formal complaint arises, the person who receives the contact schedules an appointment to hear the candidate's concern. If the concern is not rectified in that meeting, the candidate may be referred to the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs or one of the Associate Deans. The appropriate department chair or dean meets with the candidate to hear the candidate's concern. Sometimes concerns are about grades; other times concerns may be about some aspect of fair treatment in the classroom. The person hearing the concern (Department Chair, Assistant Dean for Student Affairs, Associate Dean for Outreach and Undergraduate Education, or Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies) will then contact people pertinent to the concern for a more thorough investigation of the issue or complaint. In gathering information about the candidate's complaint, the contact person (Department Chair or appropriate Dean) determines how to proceed. Candidates may also address their concerns through an official Petition to the Credential Review and Candidate Progress Board. The Petition is available on the Student Affairs website as is the statement of Policy and Procedures followed by the board. Depending on the nature of the concern and the level to which higher administrators have been involved, the pertinent Department Chair, Director of Student Affairs, or the Associate Dean for Outreach and Undergraduate Studies keep records of formal complaints and their resolution.

Records of petitions are maintained in the Unit of Student Affairs whereas records of second judiciary offenses are maintained by the office of the Associate Dean for Outreach and Undergraduate Studies.

2c.   Use of Data for Program Improvement

2.c.1. In what ways does the unit regularly and systematically use data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences?

Our Unit Assessment System requires the Unit to regularly and systematically use data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to our courses, programs, and clinical experiences. As previously mentioned, data from Unit assessments and the assessment tools themselves are reviewed on a rotating calendar. Data reports, analyses,

and recommendations are brought forward from the Assessment Council (AC) subcommittee, to the whole AC and then to UPEP for readings and feedback.

At the end of every course, candidates complete evaluations that ask them to provide feedback about the faculty member, the course content, strengths and weaknesses, and how they believe both the course and instructor's methods could be improved in the future. These data do double duty: they evaluate the efficacy of the courses and may also be used to initiate changes in course delivery. These data are reported to the respective department and are used as a part of the faculty members' annual dossiers for promotion and tenure and merit review. Each faculty member meets with the department chair at least annually to discuss and review possible plans for improvement.

Since the implementation of Unit and program assessments, programs have been tweaking assessments to more accurately reflect the standards they are designed to meet. In addition, rubrics have been revised to more clearly state expectations for meeting standards. This is an on-going process. Faculty members are able to see how candidates perform on the key assessments. By using multi-dimensional rubrics aligned to standards, faculty are able to determine candidates' strengths and weaknesses as demonstrated by sub-scores on the rubrics. This can lead to examining the curriculum, instruction, assessment, and rubric to begin to determine what needs to be changed to improve candidate performance on all aspects of the rubric.

Each program and/or licensure band systematically meets to review program SPA data and unit data that have been disaggregated by program. During this review, programs make recommendations for changes and/or improvements. Minutes from program meetings where data are discussed are documented in the College of Education and Education Unit document on LiveText.

An integral part of our Unit Assessment System is the idea of continuous improvement. To this end, the college through Unit data review and recommendations, and programs, through disaggregated and program data, strive toward assuring that programs, courses, and program processes address needs of candidates in meeting or exceeding standards and ensure standards evolve to address recommendations from our constituent groups. Through these ongoing conversations as subcommittees of AC, of the full AC, and through UPEP, all members of the Unit's community are thinking and acting in ways that reflect a culture of continuous improvement.

In response to feedback from the Unit's faculty, four committees were established to revisit our Conceptual Core, faculty workload policy, the college's niche, and how we address rural education. These committees worked throughout the 2007-08 academic year and developed plans that have been or are currently being implemented. Furthermore, based on triangulated data from focus groups, stakeholders, key assessments, and other mechanisms, the Unit has developed four Design Teams that represent various stakeholders and have the following charges: Design Team I for integrating assessment competencies into the curriculum; Design Team II for identifying the role of K-12 schools in supporting an aligned, agile, regional system of professional learning; Design Team III for developing a Teacher Residency Program; and Design Team IV for technology for our region's educators, the infrastructure challenges, and the efficient use of resources available in Ohio.

In 2008-09, the University required that all graduate programs put together self-studies to document program efficacy within the university. The College also engaged in an internal review of its graduate programs.

2.c.2. What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years?

Numerous data-driven changes on the Unit and program levels have occurred over the past three years.

Unit
Data from employers, graduates, and current candidates showed that candidates needed increased exposure to and competency with diverse students. As a result, the Unit has begun a new initiative, the Rural Urban Collaborative, first conceived in 2007. The Collaborative is a joint effort between Ohio University, The Ohio State

University, Ohio Dominican University, Columbus City Schools, and the Logan-Hocking and Southern Local School District. The purpose of the Collaborative is to enhance candidates' understanding of the similarities and differences between rural and urban education. Its goal is provide candidates from Ohio University with a field experience in an urban setting and to offer the reverse opportunity for candidates from Columbus in a rural setting.

The Unit also formed the Communication and Connection group with the goal of creating an *aligned, agile, regional system of professional learning that meets the unique educational needs of children and the broader demands of a global society*. This group, formed in 2006, includes superintendents, teachers, faculty, staff and other educational partners. This group has been instrumental in creating and analyzing data from focus groups of graduates and employers. As a result of those data, four design teams have been created: Design Team I for integrating assessment competencies into the curriculum; Design Team II for identifying the role of K-12 schools in supporting an aligned, agile, regional system of professional learning; Design Team III for developing a Teacher Residency Program; and Design Team IV for technology. Exhibit 2.c.2.ii provides minutes from the Communications and Connections group.

Through the Assessment Council, multiple assessments have been revised based on feedback and data from supervisors and candidates. One example is the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). The TWS was originally seven sections long with a three level rubric (indicator not met, partially met, or met). Data revealed that nearly all candidates were meeting all expectations with little variance in the data. Also, candidates and faculty expressed the desire to have the seminar portion of the professional internship, which includes the TWS, be assigned a grade. In spring 2008, UPEP approved the revision of the rubric to four levels and the revision of the assessment tool to reduce redundancy. In spring 2009, another review of the TWS data took place and while there was more variance in the data, a motion was made to revisit and revise the grading option for the seminar portion. Other Unit assessments are currently being revised to be less like evaluation tools and more objective and measureable.

Program
Use of the TWS has caused many programs to be more intentional about addressing the topics it covers and to cover the topics earlier in the curriculum. For example, some programs have begun to introduce the ideas from the TWS in their methods courses (e.g., Family and Consumer Sciences, Adolescent to Young Adult Social Studies).

Early Childhood Education faculty are working on revising the process by which the mid-level portfolio is structured and have worked to increase consistency with regional campuses by holding weekly program meetings that utilize the distance learning classroom technology. This enables the Early Childhood faculty to attend the program meetings via distance technology.

Quarterly, Special Education faculty members review candidate performance in meeting Unit and program standards. This review is shared with candidates and becomes one source of data from which they develop a Professional Development Plan (PDP) for subsequent quarters or movement into the Professional Internship.

As new standards for Instructional Technology have been developed, the rubrics used in the key assessments have been revised. An example is the recent change in the ISTE NETS*T standards for pre-service teachers. Presently, the program is revising the technology portfolio to better meet these standards.

2.c.3. What access do faculty members have to candidate assessment data and/or data systems?

All faculty members have access to the LiveText Exhibit Center to review all Unit and Program assessment data. The Exhibit Center on LiveText is organized into two folders: Unit and program data. Each program's SPA assessments and data are located in the program data folder, and each Unit assessment and data (aggregated and disaggregated by program and campus) are located in the Unit data folder. Additionally, each faculty member has editing privileges to the College of Education and Education Unit document on LiveText. This document serves as a central location for posting meeting minutes, data-driven decisions, useful resources, and many other important

documents for faculty. Both the Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement and a graduate assistant provide training to faculty so they can maneuver through LiveText to complete, review, and analyze assessments and data.

2.c.4. How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders to help them reflect on and improve their performance and programs?

As previously mentioned, faculty in the Unit have access to the LiveText Exhibit Center to review Unit and Program data. Assessment data are also consistently shared at the Assessment Council (AC) and UPEP meetings where candidates, faculty, and stakeholders are present. The Unit has made a concerted effort to include candidates in the AC, AC Subcommittees, and UPEP, as well as other college-wide committees. Minutes of the AC and UPEP meetings are posted on LiveText for faculty to review. Individual faculty members also discuss assessment data with candidates in their courses.

Quarterly, the COE dean hosts "Dinner with the Dean" to provide candidates with opportunities to share feedback about their experiences. During this time, the Dean shares with the candidates some examples of recent data-driven decisions that have been made in the Unit. The Unit is also working on utilizing other sources to share data with candidates, including using Facebook, the Digital screen in the COE lobby, and other technological tools available in the COE.

To inform employers, the cover letter that accompanies the employer survey indicates data-based changes. In addition, data are also shared via the four Communications and Connection Design Teams.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 2?

Associated with the Unit is The Institute for Democracy in Education (IDE), housed in the College of Education. Responsive to the needs of the Unit and its desire to maintain a path of continuous improvement, IDE has recently refocused its mission. Specifically, the mission of the Institute is "to provide research and consultation services to agencies serving historically underserved K-12 students, as well as their families and other caregivers. The institute conducts, sponsors, and supports culturally responsive research, program evaluation, and other related work such as providing technical assistance to educators, parent groups, and community organizations." The work envisioned for the repurposed IDE reflects commitments identified in the original mission with regard to ensuring opportunities for substantive involvement by varied stakeholders. Specifically, while IDE will conduct research and evaluation that meets rigorous scientific standards and is empirically sound, relevant findings will be disseminated in formats and language accessible to practitioners and other non-researchers (e.g., by preparing separate popular versions of research projects) and will involve participants in project development and implementation to the extent that is appropriate and practical. In addition, the Institute can provide technical assistance to educators (e.g., help translate research to practice, engage in forms of action research, and facilitate linkages between education groups) with the intent of promoting best practices that are appropriate and responsive to the challenges and strengths of the resident population and promoting the capacity needed to evaluate practice. When appropriate, the Institute may help education groups express their needs to policymakers. The Institute's work will become an increasingly important part of the Unit as, in conjunction with the Design Teams (see Optional question 1 for Standard 3), it deepens its connection with its P-12 partners.

2. What research related to Standard 2 is being conducted by the unit?

The IDE Center endeavors to conduct research and evaluation with a focus on underserved and special needs populations. It is co-directed by Drs. Jerry Johnson and John Hitchcock, both of whom have extensive experience with grant and contract-based research. Dr. Johnson has expertise in policy-based research that supports the

needs of rural schools, and has prior connections to organizations such as the Rural Trust. Dr. Hitchcock currently serves as a principal investigator on research funded by the Institute for Education Sciences at the U. S. Department of Education. In additional, Unit faculty have presented and published their research in the areas of assessment and evaluation. Some examples include, "Survey delivery method and differential item functioning" (Johanson, Franklin, & Brooks, 2006, presented at AERA); A multi-year analysis of literacy scores among Reading First schools in Kentucky" (Johnson, 2008, presented at National Council of Professors of Educational Administration); "Sustaining school improvement" (Bower, 2006, published in Complicity: An International Journal of Complexity in Education); "Embedding OGT items in learning-cycle lessons" (Dani, 2007, published in Ohio Resource Center online journal); "Diagnostically supported teaching strategies to reduce school failure: An evaluation of selected schools in Ghana" (Godwyll, 2008, presented in Saarbrucken, Germany); "Children's Media Use and Implications for Media Literacy Education" (Wan & Gut, 2008, presented at AERN); "Partnerships: Designing and Evaluating the Umbrella of Services" (Beam & Gut, 2007, presented at Association of Teacher Educators); "Connecting mathematics education and community: First findings of a national study" (Klein, Howley, & Howley, 2009, presented at AERA).

STANDARD 3:   FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

3a.   Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

3.a.1. Who are the unit's partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?

Initial Programs

The Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) has representation from four colleges (College of Education [COE], College of Health and Human Services, College of Fine Arts, and College of Arts and Sciences) and coordinates university-wide efforts in initial and advanced programs for teachers and other school personnel. UPEP monitors all professional education programs offered by Ohio University (OU) and is responsible for ensuring that state and national standards for professional education are met.

The Coalition of Rural and Appalachian Schools (CORAS), in partnership with the OU COE, is an organization composed of 134 school districts, institutions of higher learning, and other educational agencies in the 32-county region of Ohio designated as Appalachia. School districts in neighboring counties, institutions of higher education, and related organizations may become members of the Coalition.

The Office of Field Experiences and Professional Internships (OFEPI) is responsible for planning, arranging, and tracking field experiences for teacher candidates in initial programs. This is done in collaboration with area schools. The OFEPI works closely with university faculty, school administrators, cooperating teachers, and clinical supervisors.

Clinical supervisors, consisting of professional education faculty and part-time supervisors, play an essential role in our candidates' success during their clinical and field experiences. The Unit employs 15 to 20 clinical university supervisors who are hired and viewed as our partners in preparing future educators; these supervisors typically work with us for many years and constitute a critical component of our professional internships in both training and evaluating interns.

Advanced Programs

Candidates in the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) will have their first clinical experience in EDAD 691- Seminar in Education in fall 2009. The candidates themselves are the primary partners, along with school personnel, including principals, mentors, and university supervisors in the design, delivery, and evaluation of this program's field and clinical experiences. As with many other education professional preparation programs, much of the impetus for the program derives from both informal input and systematic input (such as UPEP) from administrators and teachers in public schools within the university's service area.

Candidates in the Principal program are expected to engage in a minimum of 700 hours (350 hours per academic year) of clinical practice. Mentor principals partner with program faculty in designing and delivering relevant field experiences, and in conducting formative and summative evaluations of the clinical experience.

Candidates in the Superintendent program are expected to engage in a minimum of 270 hours (50 hours per quarter during the academic year plus 120 hours in the summer) of clinical practice in direct service to the school districts where they are employed. Mentor superintendents (current practitioners) partner with program faculty in designing and delivering relevant field experiences, and in conducting formative and summative evaluations of the clinical experience.

The primary partners in the Reading Education program are the program faculty, candidates, the Helen Robinson Reading Clinic and the individual schools in which the candidates work to complete their field work. The Reading Clinic is associated with EDTE 522 Diagnosis: Reading/ Language and EDTE 523 Reading/Language: Laboratory; therefore, this experience is designed, delivered, and evaluated by the program faculty. The Clinic is housed in the basement of the College of Education.

Candidates seeking the Technology Facilitator endorsement are expected to participate in a minimum of 35 contact hours of clinical practice within the school districts where they are employed. Candidates who are not employed work with their advisors and a variety of established partners to establish a clinical practice. The comped@listserv.ohio.edu is used in an advisory function to help identify new partner schools, to gain feedback on the clinical practice experience, and to gain new collaborations and growth within the program. It is the advisor's responsibility to evaluate the clinical practice. However, the Listserv provides suggestions and advice on programmatic changes such as the clinical practice.

3.a.2. In what ways have the unit's partners contributed to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?

Initial Programs

An Exchange of Services agreement is entered into by the OU COE and each participating school districts to confirm the cooperative relationship between the University and the school districts, with the understanding that the quality of the entire educational system is enhanced by a system of exchanging services. The Agreement articulates a set of beliefs and values held in common by the Unit and school district personnel. The Dean of the College of Education and a team of Superintendents from CORAS convene a meeting once every two years to review and, if needed, revise the Agreement. Also, Design Team II, a part of the Communications and Connections group, is specifically examining the best ways to ensure that the best teachers are matched with OU's candidates during field and clinical experiences.

Based on feedback from our University Supervisors, the Teacher Work Sample, a key assessment completed during professional internship was revised. The Assessment Council, tasked with developing assessments for the Unit, includes members from the Unit's partners. Also, some programs use Advisory Boards as ways to increase the Unit's partners' contributions to field and clinical experiences.

The Unit has Professional Development School (PDS) Partnerships that are designed to improve P-12 education for all students, enrich field and clinical experiences, build mentoring capacity, and support continuing professional development. Partners are an integral part of the design, delivery, and evaluation of the field and clinical experiences. The Director for the Center for PDS Partnerships coordinates this effort.

Advanced Programs

Candidates in the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program will develop their own inquiry-intervention, an action research project designed to allow them to take a leadership role in using research-based strategies to meet a need within their classroom or school; to collect and analyze data showing the results of their intervention; and to reflect on the effectiveness of their leadership as expressed through the intervention. Candidates do, and will continue to, evaluate the usefulness and the quality of each course, including the field and clinical experiences, through end of course surveys. They will participate in an exit interview with their faculty advisor and provide feedback in regard to the internship and other field-based experiences in the program. School personnel, including principals and mentors, will be asked to evaluate the candidate in follow-up evaluation conducted after the candidate has completed the program.

Mentor principals and mentor superintendents partner with program faculty to design and deliver relevant field experiences, and to conduct formative and summative evaluations of the clinical experience. Suggestions for improvements in the program emerge as a result of the collaboration between mentors and faculty in assessing the quality of clinical experiences for individual candidates.

The Reading Clinic is a 10 quarter-hour experience associated with EDTE 522 Diagnosis: Reading/ Language and EDTE 523 Reading/Language: Laboratory and the design, delivery, and evaluation are conducted by the program faculty. The Clinic experience is designed to meet the International Reading Association (IRA) standards. A one-to-one tutoring experience takes place at the University during an after-school experience; during the summer; or during a combination of the two. While staff members in the Helen Robinson Reading Clinic help to recruit students who would benefit from tutoring, these staff members do not contribute to the design, delivery, or evaluation of Reading candidates. EDPL 692 Internship: Theory into Practice is a course taught as an independent study class. Faculty and candidates work together to design and deliver the experience within the confines of the required IRA assessment. The candidate's advisor is the primary evaluator. In addition to successfully completing the IRA assessment, the advisor visits each school, meets with the candidate and possibly other school administrators to make a holistic evaluation of the candidate's performance.

Graduates who have earned the Technology Facilitator endorsement remain members of the comped@listserv.ohio.edu and become part of a larger network of advisors to the Instructional Technology (IT) Program. This electronic means of reaching our graduates and their interaction with our new candidates has served the IT program well. The network enables candidates to contact and collaborate with graduates. This has provided interesting internships, employment opportunities, and oversight to our program. When asked if candidates wish to be removed from the listserv upon graduation, the answer is always "no".

Exhibit 3.a.2.vii illustrates the design, delivery, and assessment of the Unit's field and clinical practice experiences.

3.a.3. What are the roles of the unit and its school partners in determining how and where candidates are placed for field experiences, student teaching, and internships?

<u>Initial Programs</u>

The Office of Field Experiences and Professional Internships (OFEPI) has placement procedures for matching candidates to schools; candidates are not permitted to place themselves. Although protocols vary by school, the OFEPI in consultation with program faculty works through a liaison (usually the principal) to secure placements. Each school ultimately determines how many teacher candidates it hosts each quarter. Care is taken to ensure that candidates are given the opportunity to experience a variety of settings so that they will be prepared to teach in any setting.

Candidates may participate in a school-university partnership program. There are four Early Childhood partnerships: Chauncey Literacy Partnership, East R.E.A.D. Partnership, West Partnership, and The Plains Partnership. Middle Childhood candidates may apply for the East R.E.A.D. Partnership. Candidates in Middle Childhood and Adolescent to Young Adult (AYA) programs are also eligible for the CARE Partnership (Creating Active, Reflective Educators). Special Education candidates are eligible for the Alexander Partnership. All are within the scope of a Professional Development School (PDS) framework, and all may be considered developmentally "at standard" on each of the five NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools. Each partnership program is recognized in the Unit's Exchange of Services Agreement as a valued sub-set of field-based experiences for candidates for an initial teaching license. Exhibit 3.a.3.ii provides specific information about each partnership, including descriptions of the character and quality of field experiences provided for Initial candidates.

Partnerships are designed through individual agreements with designated personnel in the partner schools and partnering school districts. Both the Partnerships and the traditional teaching training programs are oriented to the

improvement of teaching and learning for P-12 students, candidates, cooperating teachers and the OU faculty. The alternative compensation agreement for cooperating teachers in partnership programs was established nearly 20 years ago through an internal grant from the Office of the Provost to the Center for Partnerships.

In summary, various partners are involved in determining early field and professional internship placements. The involvement takes place formally in biannual meetings to revisit the Exchange of Service Agreement with area partners. Support for field experiences in partnership programs also comes from on-going collaborations between school personnel and partnership coordinators.

Advanced Programs

In the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program, these roles are primarily cooperative and ad hoc in nature. Each candidate's placement is in the school at which he or she is employed. For some clinical experiences, candidates may visit other public or private schools because of the nature of a particular learning experience that is in keeping with particular candidates' interests or needs. The Clinical Manual provides guidelines for the Clinical Experience.

To enable Principal and Superintendent candidates to gain practical clinical experience while maintaining their current job assignments, placements are made in the candidates' own schools or districts. In addition, candidates in the Superintendent licensure program are required to engage in a minimum of 10 hours of field experience in a school district other than their own. University faculty and practitioners in the candidate's own district collaborate to determine field experience placements that are practical (e.g., in terms of geography) and that present opportunities for diverse experiences (e.g., in a larger district).

Candidates in Reading Education do their Clinic experiences in the Helen Robinson Reading Clinic located within the College. The candidate works on an individual basis with their advisor for their internship to determine how and where the candidate is placed.

For the Technology Facilitator endorsement, candidates identify possible locations for the clinical practice and prepare a proposal that is presented to the advisor for approval. Upon approval, an Internship Form is given to the candidate and arrangements are made to meet with a school administrator who will mentor and supervise the clinical practice. A mentor may be a principal, superintendent, technology coordinator or specialist, or curriculum coordinator in the school where the candidate is employed. Once the candidate has met with the school mentor and explained the proposed internship, approval is requested of the school through a signature to the Internship Form. The Internship Form is then returned to the advisor to give final approval and to make contact with the school mentor as necessary. Typically, the advisor contacts the clinical practice location to confirm and identify any possible issues before the clinical practice begins.

3.a.4. How do the unit and its school partners share expertise and resources to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice?

Initial Programs

The sharing of resources and expertise is an integral part of the partnership between the Unit and the schools. This sharing benefits the schools and the Unit, and can be characterized as on-going and flexible. This flexibility gives the partnership the ability to respond to needs that arise at the Unit or school level.

School partners provide resources and expertise to the Unit in a variety of ways. One way is by responding to the need for quality placements for the Unit's early field and professional interns. Teacher candidates are placed with highly qualified cooperating teachers who are selected based on their professional expertise and qualifications. Teacher candidates are supported while in schools by the opportunity to work closely and be supervised by a

mentor teacher and often receive professional development opportunities. Another resource provided to the Unit is a lab for research.

School partners provide the Unit with information and feedback that are considered in the decision-making process. School partners are members of Assessment Council and UPEP, as well as other committees such as the Communication and Connection Group's Design Teams I, II, III,IV which are involved in the on-going cycle of improvement.

The Unit shares resources and expertise by providing professional development opportunities for teachers. Recent opportunities have included Pathwise training, Better Math Through Literacy (summer workshop for elementary teachers blending children's literature, communication, reasoning, hands-on materials, and active problem solving), and MaSCoT (Math and Science Coordination Teams, designed to assist middle and secondary math, science, and intervention specialist teacher teams to collaborate, analyze, and improve student performance on the Ohio Graduation Test).

In additional, the Unit can provide fee waivers to teachers to apply to graduate study at Ohio University. Schools that are involved in PDS Partnerships also receive the benefit of a Teaching Fellow. The Fellow receives a graduate assistantship and teaches one-half day in a school, which allows the school-based faculty to creatively use the release time provided by the Fellow to enhance their educational mission.

Advanced Programs

Candidates in the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program serve as an intermediary between the school and the Unit. During their clinical experience, the mentor will be in regular contact with the candidate and the candidate's faculty advisor to support field-based learning. The school building principal supports field-based learning experiences by offering assistance and resources that are in keeping with his/her responsibilities to students, school, district, and community. The Unit will provide guidance and instruction to the candidate; establish and maintain communication with the school principal and mentor through a school visit(s) and regular email communication; and serve as liaison between university and the clinical practice sites.

Every candidate in the Principal program keeps a reflective journal to record connections from theory to practice that are relevant to the domains framework guiding the clinical experience. It is expected that the candidate share reflections with the supervising mentor and with administrators and teachers in the school district. Candidates are also expected to share insights from their clinical experiences with other members of the cohort within the context of program course work.

Superintendent candidates are required to engage in clinical experience activities outside their current districts and to participate in state or national conferences that address an educational policy. In both cases, candidates are expected to draw on those experiences to inform work within their current districts (e.g., several assessments require a presentation to other district employees based on information obtained from non-district sources).

In Reading Education, conversations between school faculty and administrators and university faculty provide opportunities for sharing professional knowledge. This helps university faculty to be more aware of the requirements, problems, curriculum, and teacher-student relationships in the school. It also helps the teachers to better understand the university faculty members' perspectives on curriculum, pedagogy, and teaching. The Reading program recognizes the need to develop an advisory group made up of public school people, university faculty, and candidates to address some of these issues and to provide input when planning new courses or revising old ones. This is a major component of the revisions of the Reading program. During the Reading Clinic and internship, candidates have access to reading assessment materials to use on students.

Technology Facilitator candidates keep a journal and write a paper that connects theory to practice within their clinical practice experiences. It is expected that the candidates share the experiences with the supervising mentor and with other school administrators and teachers in the school district. Candidates share the clinical experience with other cohorts in the IT Program during the final quarter, when they share their Masters Portfolio.

3b.   Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3.b.1. What are the entry and exit requirements for clinical practice?

Initial Programs

The entry requirements for initial programs' clinical practice are as follows: Admission to Professional Education and Advanced Standing (minimum 2.75 GPA overall and, in areas of concentration, all methods courses completed; C or better in Junior English Composition; 75% of content completed with grade of C or better; program-specific requirements; criminal background check; TB test). Teacher candidates apply for their professional internship in teaching by December 1 of the year prior to the clinical experience. Qualified candidates in some programs may also apply for "out-of-area" assignments if they meet the specified criteria: (1) a cumulative GPA of 3.0, (2) major GPA of 3.5, (3) typed request including a rationale, (4) faculty recommendations, and (5) payment.

Exit requirements for teacher candidates who are completing their professional internships in teaching include receiving credit for the internship experience and the seminar. Seminar credit includes the acceptable completion of the Teacher Work Sample and acceptable Dispositions.

At the advanced level, candidates in the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program are required to complete all key assessments at an acceptable level prior to clinical practice. Exit requirements include successful completion of EDAD 691 and the master's research project.

Requirements for other school professionals differ among programs but all require that a specified amount of course work be completed at a satisfactory level prior to beginning the internship. The exit requirements include successful completion of either a portfolio or internship assessment. Candidates in the Principal and Superintendent programs must complete a comprehensive portfolio. Reading Education candidates must complete required key IRA assessments as a part of the reading clinic and internship. Technology Facilitator Endorsement candidates must complete ISTE Assessment 5, a Theory into Practice portfolio.

3.b.2. What field experiences and clinical practice are required for each program or categories of programs (e.g., secondary) at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels, including graduate programs for licensed teachers.

Table 7 provides a list of all field experiences and clinical practices for all initial and advanced programs.

Table 7
Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program

Program	Field Experiences	Clinical Practice	Total No. of Hours
Early Childhood	(1) HCCF 260L: Clinical: Diversity in ECE-(30 hours) (2) EDEC 319: Reading and Literature in the Early Childhood Classroom- (20 hours) (3) HCCF 361L: Clinical: Guidance and Classroom Management in EC-(30 hours) (4) EDEC 330L: Teaching Young Children Mathematics-(20 hours) (5) EDEC 340L: Teaching Science for Young Children-(20 hours) (6) EDEC 350L: Teaching Social Studies in EC-(20 hours) (7) HCCF 363L: Creative Experiences in Early Childhood- (30 hours) (8) EDTE 371C: Instructional Adaptations for Learners with Exceptionalities and Diverse Needs (20 hours) (9) EDEC 421L: Observing Young Children for Reading Strategies and Skills-(40	(11) HCCF 474 Student Teaching in EC (Pre-Primary- 247 hours) (12) EDPL 458/459 (Primary-400 hours)	290 (early) + 247 pre-primary + 647 primary = 867 hours

Program	Field Experiences / Courses	Clinical Practice	Total Hours
	hours) (10) HCCF 455L: Clinical: Curriculum and Teaching Strategies in EC-(60 hours)		
Middle Childhood	(1) EDTE 202: Field Experiences-(40 hours) (2) EDMC 300: MC Instructional Process and Curriculum-(20 hours) (3) EDMC 301: MC Education and Curriculum-(20 hours) (4) EDTE 371A: Instructional Adaptations for Exceptionalities-(20 hours) (5A) [1]EDMC 310L: Teaching Language Arts in the MC Grades-(20 hours) (5B) [1]EDMC 330L: Teaching Mathematics in MC Grades-Field- (20 hours) (5C) [1]EDMC 340L: Teaching Middle-Level Science Lab-(20 hours) (5D) [1]EDMC 350L: Teaching Social Studies in MC-Lab-(20 hours) (6) EDTE 325 Developmental Reading Instruction (20 hours) (7) EDTE 420 Teaching Reading in the Content Area (20 hours) (8) EDTE 421 Reading Instruction, Diagnosis and Remediation (40 hrs)	(9) EDPL 461/ 462	220 (early) + 400 (student teaching) = 620 hours
Adolescent to Young Adult (AYA)	(1) EDTE 202: Field Experiences-(40 hours) (2) EDSE 350: Secondary School Planning and Instruction-(20 hours) (3) EDTE 371B: Instructional Adaptations-(20 hours) (4A) [2]ENG 451L & ENG 452L: Field Experience-(20 hours each) (4B) [2]EDSE 440L/EDCI693L: Secondary School Science Methods Lab-(40 hours) (4C) [2]MATH 320L: Teaching of Math in Secondary Schools-(20 hours) (4D) [2]EDSE 479/EDCI 693L: Teaching Social Studies in Junior and Senior High Schools-(20 hours)	(5) EDPL 463/464 (400 hours)	100 (early) + 400 (student teaching) = 580 hours
Special Education	(1) EDTE 202: Field Experiences-(40 hours) (2) EDEC 330L:Teaching Young Children Mathematics-(20 hours) (3) EDSP 260: Field Experiences in Special Education-(80 hours) (4A) [3]EDSP 360: Field Experiences with Mild-Moderate Education Needs- (80 hours) (4B) [3]EDSP361: Field Experiences with Moderate-Intensive Education Needs-(80 hours) (5A) [3]EDSP460: Field Experiences with Mild-Moderate Education Needs- (80 hours) (5B) [3]EDSP461: Field Experiences with Moderate-Intensive Education Needs-(80 hours) (6) EDTE 325 Developmental Reading Instruction (20 hours) (7) EDTE 420 Teaching Reading in the Content Area (20 hours) (8) EDTE 421 Reading Instruction, Diagnosis and Remediation (40 hrs)	(6) EDPL 463/464 (400 hours)	380 (early) + 400 (student teaching) = 780 hours
Multi-Age Education -Music Education -Physical Education -Modern Languages -Family & Consumer Sciences	(1) EDTE 202: Field Experiences-(40 hours) (2) EDSE 350: Secondary School Planning and Instruction- (20 hours) (3) EDSE 371B:Instructional Adaptations- (20 hours) (4) [4]MUS 362L: Teaching Instrumental Music in the Elementary/Middle School Laboratory Band-(6 hours) (4) [4]PESS 310: Principles, Theories and Methods of Teaching EC Physical Education- (40 hours) (5) [4]PESS 330: Principles, Theories and Methods of Teaching MC Physical Education- (40 hours) (6) [4]PESS 370: Principles, Theories and Methods of Teaching AYA Physical Education- (40 hours) (4) [4]ML435: Teaching Foreign Language in the Elementary Schools-(20 hours) (5) [4]ML 445: Teaching of Modern Foreign Language-(12 hours) (4) HCCF 399: Junior Practicum- (75 hours community service) (5) HCCF 462F: Family Ties and Aging- (45 hours service learning)	(6) EDPL 461/463 (400 hours) (7-PE) EDPL 461/463 (400 hours)	MUS: 86 (early) + 400 (student teaching) =486 hours PESS: 200 (early) + 400 (student teaching) = 600 hours ML: 112 (early) + 400 (student teaching) = 512 hours
General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader)	Only participate in clinical practice	EDAD 691: Internship	=80 hours
Reading Education	Only participate in clinical practice	EDTE 522: Diagnosis: Reading/Language- (40 hours) EDTE 523: Reading Lab Practicum- (40 hours) EDPL 692- Internship: Theory into Practice (80 hours)	=160 hours
Educational Administration-Principal	Only participate in clinical practice	EDPL 560 (350 hours) EDPL 561 (350 hours) =700 hours	=700 hours
Educational Administration-Superintendent	Only participate in clinical practice	EDPL 760 (100 hours) EDPL 761 (170 hours)	=270 hours

Technology Facilitator	Only participate in clinical practice	EDCT 692 (45 hours)	=45 hours

EC: Early Childhood; ECE: Early Childhood Education; MC: Middle Childhood; MCE: Middle Childhood Education; AYA: Adolescent-to-Young Adult; PE: Physical Education; ML: Modern Languages
[1] Middle Childhood Candidates are required to take two Methods courses from the following (EDMC 310L, 330L, 340L, 350L)
[2] Adolescent-to-Young Adult select one content area with one or more Methods courses
[3] Special Education candidates select either mild-moderate educational needs or moderate-intensive educational needs
[4] Multi-age candidates include Music Education, Physical Education, Modern Languages, or Family and Consumer Sciences

3.b.3. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards through field and clinical experiences in initial and advanced preparation programs?

Initial Programs

Planned sequences of field experiences and clinical practice are part of the Unit's professional preparation programs. Candidates in initial programs have at least four courses that require some type of field experiences prior to the professional internship experience. Clinical and field experiences within the Unit have been designed and developed to reflect institutional, state, and professional standards and serve to transform the Conceptual Core from application of theory to practice. The Office of Field Experience and Professional Internship (OFEPI) maintains a record of all field and clinical experiences.

Table 7 provides an overview of the required field and clinical experiences in the programs, sequenced from the least intensive, which include observation experiences, to the most intensive. Supervision during early field experiences is conducted by the Cooperating Teacher and the instructor-of-record.

Assessments used in the early field experiences have been revised to reflect our updated Conceptual Core. The College's Conceptual Core is aligned with state and national standards. The Professional Internship Final Evaluation has already been aligned with the Unit's Conceptual Core, and, as a result, is also aligned with state and national standards. Furthermore, there is a second program-specific final evaluation that is completed collaboratively by University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers. This evaluation varies by programs and incorporates the standards of the applicable SPA. Additionally, professional interns submit a Teacher Work Sample (TWS) that is aligned with our Conceptual Core.

Advanced Programs

Each advanced program structures its clinical experience in a different way; however, in the same way as initial programs, assessments of clinical experiences for advanced programs are aligned to the Unit's Conceptual Core which, in turn, is aligned to state and professional standards. Therefore, by successfully completing the clinical experiences and the required assessments, candidates are demonstrating the proficiencies outlined in our Conceptual Core, state standards, and professional standards.

3.b.4. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences and clinical practice?

One of the Candidate Proficiencies of the Unit's Conceptual Core specifically requires candidates to "integrate technology into curricular experiences" (Change Agent 3.2). Therefore, supervisors, cooperating teachers, and faculty are systematically assessing the quality with which candidates integrate technology into their field and clinical experiences.

The Unit assures that candidates in early field experiences and professional internship are well prepared to use technology in their field placements, and Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors look for evidence of

their competence. Prior to participating in the professional internship in teaching, candidates are required to take EDCT 203/501: Technology Applications in Education. This course focuses exclusively on the use of technology to increase the effectiveness, efficiency, and appeal of instruction with diverse learners.

In addition, candidates on the Athens campus have access to technology resources in the College's Curriculum and Technology Center. Regional campuses too, each have technological resources available for candidates. These resources can facilitate the preparation of teaching and learning and prepare the candidate for using technology in P-12 classrooms. Candidates use technology to plan effective lessons for enhanced student learning via the TWS and lesson plans. Opportunities to use technology exist in both field and clinical experiences, but depend on the range of technology within each district where candidates are placed

In all of the advanced programs, candidates are required to use technology to complete key assessments. In the Principal and Superintendent programs, candidates learn to access the state's website for standards, school report cards, and other information related to schooling, and learn how to use this information to meet objectives they have established as part of their work. Reading Education candidates are required to utilize a wide range of curriculum materials including electronic materials. Naturally, candidates seeking the Technology Facilitator endorsement have a vast knowledge of using technology as an instructional tool. The application of technology to learning permeates those courses.

3.b.5. What criteria are used in the selection of school-based clinical faculty? How are the criteria implemented? What evidence suggests that school-based clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals?

Initial Programs

All Cooperating Teachers (CT) are licensed in the state of Ohio and screened by the school principal, superintendent, or approved contact person prior to being permitted to accept candidates into their classrooms. The Office of Field Experiences and Professional Internships (OFEPI) maintains a database of the credentials of CTs. The COE partners with stakeholders (superintendents, principals, teachers, and candidates) to strengthen criteria for the selecting of school-based clinical faculty. Design Team II is working collaboratively with P-12 partners to recommend methods for identifying outstanding mentor teachers.

In order to supervise professional interns, all University Supervisors (US) and CTs are required to have at least three years of experience as teachers in P-12 schools. Many districts in the area also require that CTs who work with professional interns have a minimum of five years of experience, a master's degree, and training in Pathwise. (Pathwise is a framework to use with entry year teachers as a basis for discussion about teaching practice.) Ohio requires that all entry year teachers pass a PRAXIS III assessment. In addition, at the beginning of each quarter, the OFEPI has a meeting for University Supervisors to review their requirements and to review the required assessments, such as the PI Final Evaluations and TWS that take place during the internship. Furthermore, two of our Teacher Education faculty members provide Pathwise training to faculty and teachers in our school districts.

Advanced programs

In addition to program faculty, advanced programs utilize existing principals, superintendents, and other relevant and qualified professionals to serve as clinical supervisors. For these programs, candidates work with program faculty to identify appropriate and qualified mentors in the schools who work with our candidates throughout their clinical experiences. Because the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program is new, and the internship has not yet been offered, no data have been collected on mentors for candidates' internship. These mentors will typically be teachers (or administrators with teaching experiences) who have demonstrated leadership ability as well as shown other evidence of high quality professionalism, as indicated on the unit's list of criteria for teacher mentors.

3.b.6. What preparation do school-based clinical faculty receive for their roles as clinical supervisors?

School-based faculty members are prepared for their roles in a variety of ways. Unit faculty members provide others who host and mentor early field students or professional interns with [information](#) that outlines the responsibilities and expectations for both teacher candidates and the cooperating teacher. This may take the form of the [Middle Childhood Field Experience Handbook](#), [Special Education manual](#), the [Professional Internship (PI) Handbook](#), or a packet of information sent either electronically or hand-delivered by the teacher candidate.

School-based faculty members who are working with professional interns receive training and support with required key assessments. Other preparation includes the opportunity to participate in the Pathwise training presented by Unit faculty. The most recent Pathwise training presented by the Unit for school-based faculty was in October 2008.

For advanced programs, a faculty member meets regularly with the school-based faculty members and the interns to provide support and to prepare the individuals for their roles. The General Education Administration program ([Teacher Leader](#)), the [Principal](#), and the [Superintendent](#) Programs have internship manuals that provide information to the school-based clinical faculty about their roles as supervisors.

The Graduate Reading Program does not require clinical supervisors because University faculty oversee the Clinic and internship and conduct the evaluations. In addition, school-based faculty routinely serve as mentors to candidates as they study the professional development needs of a school and design a professional development program aimed at enhancing students' achievement through effective literacy instruction.

3.b.7. What evidence demonstrates that clinical faculty provides regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing graduate programs, and other school professionals?

At the Initial level, clinical faculty are engaged in and focused on providing continuous support for teacher candidates in the field. Student teachers (professional interns) are assigned to a clinical faculty member whose responsibilities include developing strategies to facilitate the appropriate development of the intern, conferring with the school-based faculty member, and evaluating the intern. Throughout the clinical experience, professional interns consult and discuss their ideas for lessons and the Teacher Work Sample with their clinical supervisors. Moreover, many supervisors require activities such as weekly reflections, journaling, regularly scheduled seminars and individual conferences to ensure that professional interns receive the support they need. A complete list of candidate and supervisor responsibilities can be found in the [Professional Internship in Teaching Handbook](#).

For licensed teachers and other school professionals completing advanced programs in a field in which they are already fully licensed, the character of regular and continuous supervision in clinical field experiences differs considerably from what is provided for those seeking the initial teaching license. The number of teachers involved in advanced programs is small, and they are typically enrolled part-time while also teaching full-time. For the one advanced program as well as the other school professionals programs, clinical experiences for these candidates generally are conducted in their own classrooms and/or schools. Supervision is conducted by an identified mentor who works closely with the candidate throughout their experience. Like candidates enrolled in initial programs, candidates enrolled in advanced programs for teachers and other school professionals engage in assignments and course work designed to support reflection, self-assessment, and sharing of their teaching and/or leadership practices and the impact of their practices on students' learning. These assignments and assessments are discussed during regularly scheduled meetings with the candidate and the clinical faculty.

3.b.8. What structured activities involving the analysis of data and current research are required in programs for other school professionals?

Structured activities involving the analysis of data and current research play a substantive role in the Educational Administration Principal and Superintendent programs. Each of these programs features a required course or

courses that specifically focus on (1) developing knowledge and skill sets that allow candidates to become critical and astute consumers of extant research, and (2) building capacity to effectively translate extant data into knowledge and understanding that informs policy and practice. While specified courses explicitly focus on analyzing data and current research, the relevant knowledge and skills are taught, and practices are reinforced, throughout all other course work. In addition, candidates complete clinical experiences that require them to analyze data and research to enact changes in policy and practice to improve schooling outcomes. Of note, program leaders expect that original research projects conducted by students will have the potential to impact schooling policy, practice, and outcomes, most particularly public schools in the Appalachian Ohio region.

Candidates in the Reading Masters program have a minimum of three structured activities or courses that require data analysis and current research. In EDTE 520 Foundations of Reading, candidates write a Synthesis paper which requires them to be aware of the research in the field and to be able to discuss how that research impacts current practice and instruction and contributes to the knowledge base regarding best practices. During the Clinic, candidates are required to conduct assessments on students, analyze data, and use current related research to justify the instructional practices that have been used with the students. Finally, all candidates in the reading masters program are required to take the standard research courses associated with a master's degree.

Candidates seeking the Technology Endorsement are required to take EDCT 605 Assessment and Evaluation for Technology Use, which involves the assessment of technologies' impacts on student learning and the evaluation of technology use in the schools where they are employed. A research paper discussing the action research implemented, data collected, analysis, conclusion, and recommendation is part of the final project. Also, while not required, about 99% of those seeking the endorsement take EDRE 501 Introduction to Research Methods, which provides a solid theoretical foundation in which practice activities can be interpreted.

3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

3.c.1 On average, how many candidates are eligible for clinical practice each semester or year? What percent, on average, complete clinical practice successfully?

Initial Preparation Programs

Ohio University has approximately 200 professional interns eligible for clinical practice every quarter. It is rare for any candidate not to successfully complete a clinical experience. Over the past three years, only three candidates did not complete their professional internship.

Advanced Programs

There have been no candidates in the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program to enter or exit clinical practice.

Principal and Superintendent candidates are engaged in clinical experiences throughout their respective programs. Approximately 50 Principal candidates enter clinical practice per year with more than 90% completing the experience. Approximately 15 to 20 Superintendent candidates enter clinical practice each year, with more than 90% successful completing. In both of these programs, the transition from clinical observation to clinical practice is a continuous one with the mentor, the program faculty member, and the candidate collaboratively making decisions about the types and levels of responsibility that are practical and the level of support that is needed.

While Reading candidates have extensive field work in EDPL 692, the official clinic of experiences is completed by taking EDTE 522 Diagnosis: Reading/ Language and EDTE 523 Reading/Language: Laboratory. Approximately 15 candidates enter and successfully complete their clinical experiences annually.

On average, there are 10 to 15 Technology Facilitator candidates eligible for clinical practice every two years, due to the two-year cycle of the program, and these candidates have a 100% successful completion rate.

3.c.2. What are the roles of candidates, university supervisors, and school-based faculty in assessing candidate performance and reviewing the results during clinical practice?

<u>Initial Preparation Programs</u>

Assessments conducted during clinical practice (professional internship [PI] in teaching) demonstrate that candidates possess knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. During these experiences, candidates complete weekly logs, which are reviewed and discussed with the supervisor and/or cooperating teacher. Candidates also complete mid-term and final assessments that include self-assessments. During the PI, all candidates complete the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), an assessment designed to challenge the candidates to synthesize their pedagogical strategies and use data to design instructional experiences that result in student learning. The results of the TWS, along with the other mid-term and final assessments, are discussed collaboratively between the candidate and the university supervisor. Cooperating teachers are also required to complete a minimum of five evaluations of the candidate, which include mid-term and final assessments and discuss these evaluations with the candidate.

<u>Advanced Programs</u>

Candidates in the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program will conduct self-assessments in regard to standards at the beginning, midpoint, and end of the internship. The university supervisor will also evaluate candidates' performance at these three points. The mentor will provide summative feedback on the candidates' performance by completing the internship assessment, and will provide informal, formative assessment to the candidate and faculty advisor by email during the internship.

For candidates in the Principal and Superintendent programs, at least once a quarter, meetings occur between the candidate, the faculty supervisor, and mentor in the school/district setting in which the clinical practice is being conducted to discuss and assess the candidate's performance and the outcomes of the practice in light of their performance expectations outlined in the respective internship manuals. The mentors are school principals in the Principal Program and district superintendents in the Superintendent Program. Each candidate submits, with the input of her/his mentor, ongoing written assignments to her/his university supervisor, which are assessed in a formative and summative manner. The formative assessments typically are focused upon providing reactions to the submissions and directions regarding ways in which to enhance the clinical practice. The summative assessments lead to rubric scores and letter grades. In addition to the summative assessments of the written assignments, the domains of each clinical practice are assessed by a candidate's mentor and the faculty supervisor. The candidate typically is provided an opportunity for input to the assessment by the mentor, particularly the portion developed by the mentor.

All Reading candidates are supervised by a program faculty member during the Clinic experience. This supervision includes regular observations while the candidate is working with a child, feedback from the faculty member, follow through observations, group work in which observed needs and problems are discussed in a general way, and group work in which student needs are discussed and appropriate ways to follow through for those needs are suggested. Candidates are required to complete a case study of the work they have completed with their student(s). This study is evaluated according to specific criteria represented in a written rubric and based on the International Reading Association's standards. During the internship, the advisor meets with the candidate at least bi-weekly to assess their performance in the field and process the candidates' development.

The Technology Facilitator candidates are supervised by their advisor, as well as a school-based supervisor. Candidates are required to submit a proposal to their advisors describing how they will implement the knowledge and skills they have learned in the program. Once approved, each candidate maintains a journal of daily activities and submits a final report summarizing the experience. The advisor periodically contacts the school-based supervisor to ensure progress. To increase oversight, the Instructional Technology program is moving the clinical experience to a formal class with weekly meetings to ensure appropriate progress and encourage the candidates to share successes and challenges with colleagues and assess the value of the experience.

3.c.3. How is time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty incorporated into field experiences and clinical practice?

Initial Programs

In courses with field experiences, candidates often peer teach in small groups, and as a class, immediately debrief to discuss strengths and provide suggestions for improvement. Other courses require that candidates videotape one of their field lessons to be critiqued. If actual lessons are required in an early field experience, candidates must clear the lesson with the cooperating teacher. After the lesson, candidates reflect on the lesson in both written and oral format with the supervisor and cooperating teacher.

Other times for reflection and feedback include the Professional Internship seminar, where candidates reflect on their experiences by sharing experiences and debriefing with their site supervisor and peers. Some seminars require written reflections as ongoing assignments. During the final professional internship evaluation, a three-way meeting (supervisor, cooperating teacher, professional intern) is designed to provide final feedback to the intern.

In addition, the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) has sections that require reflection and self-evaluation; in these candidates are asked to reflect on their performance as a teacher and link that performance to specific student learning outcomes, and to identify further actions for improved practice and professional growth. After completing field experiences and professional internships, candidates evaluate those experiences by completing the Candidate Evaluation of Field Experience or Professional Internship. One question on that form read, "I was able to reflect on my teaching abilities and make improvements." Data for this past year (2008-09) showed an overall mean score of 4.83 (on a 5-point scale). Exhibit 3.c.3.i provides additional data from this survey as well as the TWS data.

Advanced Programs

Because the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program is new, candidates have not been exposed to any clinical practice. Opportunities for reflection and for providing and receiving feedback will be embedded in their key assessments.

Programs for other school professionals incorporate opportunities for reflection and feedback. Clinical experience seminars in the Educational Administration programs include extensive time for reporting experiences and providing peer feedback. Candidates in both the Principal and Superintendent programs are required to provide reflective journals as a part of their internship portfolios and to discuss their reflections with peers during class.

Candidates in Reading and those seeking the Technology Facilitator endorsement demonstrate reflection as part of their key assessment 5 and during their internships. For example, IRA key assessment 5 "Final Remediation Report" requires that Reading candidates show and explain how they have adapted instruction to meet individual needs of the students with whom they work. They also must use multiple approaches and materials according to students' needs. In the internship, they provide a detailed journal explaining all of their field activities, their reflections on the activities, and their explanations as to why the activity fulfills specific criteria and requirements. They then do an in-depth reflection of the entire experience. Each candidate's faculty advisor has weekly conferences with the candidate and makes a variety of visits to observe the candidate during some of these

activities. These experiences are discussed with the faculty and peers in the corresponding class to promote development throughout their experience.

3.c.4. What data from multiple assessments provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field experiences and clinical practice?

Initial Programs

Multiple assessments, including the Dispositions assessment and the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field and clinical experiences. Exhibit 3.c.4.i provides data from these assessments.

Dispositions are assessed a minimum of three times, with the second and third time occurring during field experiences. The TWS is the key assessment done during professional internship and it requires candidates to use data to design instructional experiences that result in student learning. The TQP provides evidence that candidates have opportunities to work with teachers who have inclusive classes and classes that contain children with and without disabilities. Data from the PI Final Evaluation also demonstrate that candidates exhibit the knowledge, skills, and dispositions for helping all students learn.

Advanced Programs

Multiple assessments at the advanced level provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field and clinical experiences. Exhibit 3.c.4.i provides these data.

Because the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program is new, candidates have not been exposed to any clinical practice.

As in the initial programs, dispositions are assessed at the advanced level.

Principal candidates are assessed on their ability to use relevant data to identify opportunities and align them with appropriate strategies for improving student learning. Candidates are assessed on their ability to develop and communicate an action plan for achieving their strategic objectives.

Superintendent candidates demonstrate their ability to help all students learn by engaging in activities across six leadership domains that directly and indirectly impact student learning. For example, candidates conduct a meeting with representatives of another district or agency to formulate a shared agenda for meeting the needs of the districts' students.

IRA key assessment 5 "Final Remediation Report" demonstrates that Reading Education candidates can develop a clinical report based on a battery of assessments and then a second report based on instructional objectives developed to meet identified needs of the student.

Key assessment 5 "Internship: Theory into Practice" demonstrates that candidates seeking the Technology Facilitator endorsement create positive environments for student learning by providing communication with the larger community of the school district in examining student learning.

3.c.5. What process is used that candidates collect and analyze data on student learning, reflect on those data and improve student learning during clinical practice?

<u>Initial Programs</u>

The Teacher Work Sample, conducted during professional internship, requires candidates to provide evidence of their ability to facilitate learning by using information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment. After teaching a unit, candidates analyze student learning and reflect on and evaluate their teaching as related to student learning. Exhibit 3.c.5.i provides data from this assessment.

Data from the past three years of the Professional Internship Final Evaluation reflect averages of 2.34 to 2.88 (on a 3-point scale) on items related to understanding and using assessments, impacting student learning, and acting with the belief that all students can learn.

<u>Advanced Programs</u>

Exhibit 3.c.5.i provides data for candidates in advanced programs for the assessments described below.

Because the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program is new, candidates have not been exposed to any clinical practice.

Principal candidates are assessed on their ability to use relevant data (e.g., assessment data, demographic data, organizational data) to identify opportunities and align them with appropriate strategies for improving student learning.

Superintendent candidates demonstrate their ability to analyze data by engaging in activities across six leadership domains, each of which makes use of data to inform policy and practice. One activity calls for candidates to plan and facilitate a meeting with constituents in which disaggregated achievement data are shared. In another activity, candidates develop enrollment projections for the next five years and a staffing plan to address those projections.

Candidates in Reading Education complete a Case Report that requires them to develop a clinical report on one student's reading skills based on a battery of assessments, and then a second report based on instructional objectives developed to meet identified needs of the student.

Candidates seeking the Technology Facilitator endorsement complete a Theory-to-Practice portfolio wherein they plan, apply, and implement curriculum that includes methods and strategies for teacher use of technology to maximize student learning. All curriculum planning requires justifying the implementation plan with current research on student achievement. Results indicate effects on student learning of candidate facilitation of teachers' use of technology in the classroom.

3.c.6. How does the unit ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice that includes students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups?

<u>Initial Programs</u>

The Office of Field Experiences and Professional Internships (OFEPI) has the responsibility for overseeing field placements. The OFEPI has developed a database that is used to track placements of candidates. This database is used to see what classrooms, schools, and districts early field candidates have experienced, and to ensure that placements expose candidates to as many diverse experiences as possible. The Professional Internship (PI)

Coordinator consults with the Field Placement Coordinator when making placements for PIs with the same intent of providing the candidate with diverse placements.

The composition of the school population in southeastern Ohio ensures that each candidate will have a field experience or clinical practice with at least one student with exceptionalities and students from diverse gender and socioeconomic groups. To increase the opportunities for all candidates to have experiences with students from diverse ethnic/racial and linguistic groups, the Unit has initiated the *Rural Urban Collaborative*. Its goal is provide candidates from Ohio University with a field experience in an urban setting and to offer the reverse opportunity for candidates from Columbus in a rural setting. During fall 2008, 13 OU candidates participated in a field experience.

OU candidates also have the opportunity to complete their Professional Internship in an international setting. Since fall 2004 the Unit, as a member of the *Consortium of Overseas Student Teaching*, has sent 60 candidates overseas to student teach in countries such as Mexico, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Germany, England, Ireland, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. During the 2009-10 academic year, 14 students are scheduled to complete their professional internships (student teach) abroad.

Advanced Programs

For the General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) program, both EDAD 642 "How to Become an Instructional Leader" and EDAD 691 "Final Master's Project" require reflection on the candidates' instructional practices in working with students with exceptionalities and/or who come from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups. The composition of the school population in southern Ohio ensures that each candidate's classroom will have at least one student with exceptionalities and students from diverse gender and socioeconomic groups. Offering clinical experiences to ensure ethnic/racial and linguistic diversity may, for some candidates, require visiting other classrooms or, in rare cases, other schools.

The schools and districts in which Principal and Superintendent program candidates have field experiences/clinical practice serve, on average, student bodies where 15.3% students have exceptionalities, 7.5% are minority students, 0.4% are English Language Learner (ELLs), and 36.9% are economically disadvantaged. This student population has a higher poverty rate and percentage of exceptional students than Ohio as a whole (33.8% and 14.9%, respectively), but lower rates of minority and ELL students (23.5% and 1.6%, respectively). Forty-four of the districts are designated as rural, small town (distant), or small town (remote); thus, approximately 80% of the candidates serve in school districts in geographically isolated communities.

Candidates in the Principal program engage in clinical practices in their current schools. Superintendent candidates, on the other hand, are required to engage in 40 hours of field experience/clinical practice outside their home districts. Efforts are made to provide candidates with diverse experiences, but geographic isolation is a limiting factor.

Reading candidates are usually practicing teachers who are working in the environment of their school and district. Because of this, their field work is completed within their work environment. This, of course, will have gender representation and a variety of students with exceptionalities. The variety of ethnic/racial and linguistic representatives will vary according to each district's demographics. Because the field work required in the Reading program (EDPL 692 Internship: Theory into Practice) requires that the candidate work with different classrooms, he or she will have interactions with the diversity represented in the school. The Clinic experience, by IRA requirements, is a tutoring experience. Candidates consequently work in a one-on-one environment. Based on the requirements of the grant that funds the Helen Robinson Reading Clinic, 100% of the students served have to be "below grade level" as it relates to reading.

Candidates seeking the Technology Facilitator endorsement work within their own school districts and therefore are subject to the environments in which they currently work. All candidates are required as part of clinical practice to

create professional development and curriculum plans that incorporate differentiated learning, meeting the needs of students with exceptionalities, and working with diverse groups.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 3?

In harmony with NCATE's new approach of "simultaneous renewal," the unit has been proactive in finding ways to involve P-12 educators and faculties in regional colleges and universities in professional development that aims to improve knowledge of evidence-based practice (e.g., value-added assessment, inquiry, differentiated instruction, responses to intervention). Leaders and faculty members from other colleges and universities in the region have been important collaborators. To develop an aligned system of professional development for educators across the span of their careers, the Unit has formed a series of four Design Teams (DT) that are working on strategies to prepare the next generation of teachers and other school personnel. Design Team I, composed primarily of faculty members with representation from P-12 leadership, addressed program weaknesses identified through focus group interviews and corroborated through other sources of evidence. Design Team II, composed primarily of P-12 educators with representation from Unit faculty, has worked to expand the capacity of regional educators to serve as partners in the preparation of the next generation of educators. DT-II's work involves (1) finding ways to identify the P-12 educators who would be the most effective mentors, (2) providing incentives to encourage the most effective mentors to play roles in the preparation of the next generation of education professionals, and (3) expanding the professional competence of practicing P-12 3educators in order to align professional preparation with effective practice across the region. Design Team III, responsive to Governor Strickland's Education Plan, is developing a model "teacher residency" program. DT-III will be presenting a draft version of its model in fall 2009. Design Team IV will be addressing technology in regards to (1) the needs of the region's educators, (2) the infrastructure challenges in the region, and (3) the efficient use of resources available in Ohio.

2. What research related to Standard 3 is being conducted by the unit?

Because Unit faculty members work so closely with the Unit's P-12 partners, there is a great deal of research related to Field Experience and Clinical Practice. Evidence of this engagement includes findings shared through a range of professional publications and presentations. Some examples follow: Math Education faculty Dr. McKeny wrote "Examining the critical features of field experiences that encourage the reflective development of secondary mathematics pre-service teachers" (2008, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics). Educational Administration faculty members, Drs. Larson, Howley, and Burgess' chapter titled "Preparing school leaders to support rural communities of the future" (2007 in *At the tipping point: Navigating the course for preparation of educational administrators*). Professional School Development Partnership faculty members, Drs. Weade, Romano, Godwyl, and Middleton gave a presentation titled "Learning to Teach in CARE: Observations on Building Capacity in PDS Partnership" (2007, Holmes Partnership Conference). Teacher Education faculty member Dr. Wan wrote "A partnership beginning: An evolving PDS" (2007 in School-University Partnerships: *A Journal of the National Association of the Professional Development Schools*). Information Technology faculty member Dr. Franklin wrote "Mobile math: Math educators and students engage in mobile learning" (2008 in the *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*). Social Studies Education faculty member Dr. Doppen wrote "Citizens of today and tomorrow: An exploration of pre-service teachers' knowledge and their professors' experiences with citizenship" (2008 in *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*).

STANDARD 4:   DIVERSITY

4a.   Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

4.a.1. What proficiencies related to diversity are candidates expected to develop and demonstrate?

Proficiencies related to diversity are aligned to our Conceptual Core and include the following: (a) D 2.1 Follow codes of ethical conduct, including acting with integrity and fairness; (b) D 2.2 Differentiate instruction to address students with diverse and special learning; (c) D 2.3 Demonstrate knowledge of the influences of context and culture on behavior; and (d) D 2.4 Foster students' self-esteem, motivation, character, civic responsibility and respect for individual, cultural, religious, class, and racial differences.

Through curriculum, required key assessments, field experiences, and clinical practice, candidates examine the knowledge bases for diversity and inclusion, interact with diverse learners and colleagues, and differentiate instruction to support the learning of all students. The richness of diversity found in rural Appalachia provides candidates a unique opportunity for learning in a diverse rural context.

The Education Professional Dispositions Assessment, required of all candidates, states that candidates are *committed to social justice (i.e., ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn),* which is defined as: (a) incorporating multicultural and international perspectives; (b) respecting the dignity of all stakeholders in the education environment; (c) attending to issues of social, economic, and political equity for individuals and groups that differ by gender, race, social class, disability, and sexual orientation; and (d) creating a challenging, student-centered learning environment that makes use of multiple approaches.

4.a.2. What required coursework and experiences enable teacher candidates and candidates for other professional school roles to develop:

- Awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning; and
- The knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to adapt instruction and/or services for diverse populations, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities?

The Department of Teacher Education recently surveyed its faculty to list the diversity experiences its candidates encounter in their undergraduate and graduate programs. Exhibit 4.a.2.i provides a complete list of diversity experiences in that department.

Initial Programs

All undergraduate candidates are required to take EDTE 150 Introduction to Teacher Education. In this course, candidates are introduced to such diversity concepts as family structures, exceptionalities, racial diversity, social class, and language background.

All sophomores are required to take EDTE 201 Characteristics of Learners with Exceptionalities. In this course, candidates are required to differentiate between the kinds of programming that have been historically provided for students with cultural, linguistic, and diverse learning needs. Multiculturalism, multicultural education, and bilingual education are defined. Factors that contribute to over- and under-representation in special education programming, including talented and gifted programming, are discussed with implications for practice. In addition, a guest speaker addresses parental struggles and concerns related to the inequalities and inconsistencies in the educational system for students with special learning needs.

During the junior year, all general education candidates are required to take EDTE 371 Instructional Adaptations, which addresses IDEA categories of disability, students at-risk and with diverse needs, interventions for students

who are English Language Learners, cultural differences for consideration in lesson planning, poverty's influence on learning, and Universal Design and differentiation of instruction to meet the needs of all learners. Candidates also take EDSP 271 Introduction to Education of Exceptional Children.

General curriculum courses in Early, Middle, AYA, and Special Education address issues of culturally relevant pedagogy, cultural competency, sociopolitical consciousness, academic achievement gaps, and the characteristics of different language proficiencies and strategies that teachers can use to work with English Language Learners. Furthermore, as detailed in Exhibit 4.a.2.i during the junior year, all candidates are confronted with additional issues related to diversity in their methods courses.

Finally, two additional required courses in initial undergraduate programs enable teacher candidates to develop an awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning and of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to adapt instruction and/or services for diverse populations. These two courses, EDCS 301 Cultural Diversity and Education and EDCS 400 School, Society, and Professional Educator, are required of all candidates, except Early Childhood Education candidates who are required to take HCCF 260 Diversity in Early Childhood Education. In these courses, candidates are encouraged to explore their own position as it relates to diversity and understand that teachers bring their own, often invisible, values, culture, beliefs, and expectations into the classroom. Furthermore, learn ways to become more culturally competent educators and citizens; to develop a commitment to diversity and anti-bias education; to understand that education always represents a given social-cultural context; to identify themes of social-cultural change that impact education today, such as power, language, culture, gender, ethnicity, class, family structure, and poverty, to identify issues that impact education today, such as tracking, diversity, high-stakes standardized testing, school choice, school funding, curriculum choices, and safety; and to recognize why and how educators can respond to these changing social conditions and their implications for education.

At the graduate level, all candidates take EDSP 570 Nature and Needs of Children and Adults with Exceptionalities, EDTE 510 Principles of Curriculum and EDTE 612 Middle School Curriculum or EDTE 613 High School Curriculum. These courses include multiple assignments and assessments that specifically address developing various culturally appropriate curricula that specifically address student diversity. Graduate candidates are also expected to take a cultural diversity course and have the option of EDCS 501 History of Education in the United States, EDCS 503 Philosophies of Education, or EDCS 504 Social Structure and Change in Education. These diversity courses specifically address how the act of teaching is both personal and political and challenges the candidates to reflect on fundamental questions such as, "Who is marginalized by the way we 'do' education?" or "What is my responsibility in building a learning community?"

Advanced Programs

Coursework and experiences vary by program. While specific courses are listed below, diversity proficiencies are integrated throughout advanced programs curricula. Course syllabi will be available for the site team at the time of the visit.

The General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) curriculum requires EDCS 504 Social Structure and Change in Education. Diversity proficiencies are also addressed in EDAD 642 How to be an Instructional Leader and EDAD 691 Final Master's Project. The EDAD 691 course will be taught this fall, 2009. The syllabus will be available at the time of the site visit.

Reading Education candidates are required to take one course from EDCS 500 to 504 Social Foundations of Education and EDSP 570 Nature and Needs of Children and Adults with Exceptionalities.

Candidates in Educational Administration Principal program are required to take EDCS 504 Social Structure and Change in Education, and Superintendent Candidates take EDAD 683 Human Relations at the District Level.

Required courses that do not explicitly focused on diversity (e.g., EDAD 640 The Principalship) nevertheless emphasize meeting the needs of diverse students as a substantive element of course material and assessments.

Candidates seeking the Technology Facilitator endorsement are required to take EDCT 636 Media and the Young Adult and EDCT 603 Visual Literacy for Educators. Both courses examine the media and imagery related to individual and cultural differences.

4.a.3. What key assessments provide evidence about candidates' proficiencies related to diversity? How are candidates performing on these assessments?

Initial Programs

Seven instruments are used to collect data about how initial preparation candidates demonstrate the proficiencies outlined in the Conceptual Core. These instruments are the Diversity Pre-Post Assessment, the Professional Internship (PI) Final Evaluation, the Teacher Work Sample, Dispositions Assessment, TQP Survey, Employer Survey, and Praxis III. Exhibit 4.a.3.i provides data for each of these assessments.

The Diversity Pre-Post Assessment is based on a service learning activity in which candidates seek out and interact with diverse peers. The rubric for this assessment was recently revised to more clearly assess the required proficiencies.

Candidates' diversity proficiencies, aligned to the revised Conceptual Core, are also assessed on the PI Final Evaluation. Because the revised Conceptual Core was implemented in the fall quarter of 2008, only one year's data are available for the current Candidate Proficiencies. Further, the Candidate Proficiencies were revised after fall quarter to increase the ability to more accurately measure the proficiencies.

Issues related to diversity are also embedded in the Teacher Work Sample, in which candidates describe their knowledge of student characteristics in terms of understanding student differences and the impact they may have on student learning.

Candidate Dispositions are collected a minimum of three times throughout the initial programs. One of the Dispositions addresses candidates' commitment to social justice and another specifically relates to ethics.

The TQP Pre-service Instrument contains a number of items that align with our diversity competencies. Two items specifically relate to working with K-12 students with language differences. Changes are being made to the curriculum as we transition to semesters as well as meet the new requirements of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA). The results reported in Exhibit 4.a.3.i on the TQP In-service Instrument align with the results of the pre-service instrument.

Follow-up data from employer surveys and the Praxis II and III also demonstrate our graduates' proficiencies related to diversity.

Advanced Programs

Several assessments demonstrate our advanced candidates' proficiencies related to diversity. Exhibit 4.a.3.ii provides data for these assessments.

General Educational Administration (Teacher Leader) candidates develop a reflective paper in which they consider their use of differentiated instruction. This process involves reviewing a videotape of themselves delivering a lesson and focusing explicitly on five students they have identified as demonstrating intellectual, social, or affective

characteristics that distinguish them from their peers. Each candidate develops a plan of action for acquiring the knowledge and skills needed to fully implement differentiated instruction.

Portfolios IIIa and IV for Principals provide evidence of candidates' ability to develop and/or revise a comprehensive school improvement plan. Portfolio IV provides evidence of candidates' ability to collaborate with families and community to identify resources and create responsive policy contexts.

Portfolios III and IV for Superintendent candidates provide evidence of candidates' ability to plan for district-wide improvement and deploy understandings of human behavior, group behavior, political processes, and conflict management to lead district efforts.

IRA key assessment 3 Literacy Kit for Reading candidates provides evidence of using students' backgrounds, language, and cultural in determining instruction.

ISTE key assessment 3 Leadership and Professional Development in Technology Programs for candidates seeking the Technology Facilitator endorsement provides evidence of awareness of technology pedagogies to support the diverse needs of learners including assistive technology.

The Unit's advanced programs for both teachers and other school professionals have also assessed their candidates on the Unit's diversity proficiencies at the three identified transition points: admissions, midpoint, and endpoint.

Follow-up data from the graduate survey of Candidate Proficiencies provides evidence for the Educational Administration programs and the Technology Facilitator endorsement candidates as it relates to diversity proficiencies. Finally, an employer survey sent to the Coalition of Rural and Appalachian Superintendents (CORAS) provides evidence about the Educational Administration graduates' proficiencies related to diversity.

4b.   Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

4.b.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning programs) have to interact with higher education and school-based faculty from diverse groups?

Exhibit 4.b.1.i provides demographic data for Ohio University faculty as well as faculty in the four colleges and five regional campuses that make up UPEP.

Candidates have a variety of experiences with faculty from diverse backgrounds within the Education Unit. The Cultural Studies program, located in the Educational Studies department, offers the two required diversity courses for all candidates except the Early Childhood program. The Cultural Studies program is composed of three full-time faculty members. Of those, one is female and two are persons of color. In addition, the primary faculty member(s) who teach(es) the diversity course for Early Childhood candidates are persons of color.

Finally, with new hires, the College has increased the diversity of faculty. Specifically, one third of the nine new faculty members (Group I, II, and IV) in the Education Unit are from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds. Exhibit 4.b.1.ii provides descriptions of Group I, II, III, and IV faculty.

In the surrounding school districts, the degree of racial and ethnic diversity among area teachers reflects those of the Appalachian region (see Table 10).

4.b.2. What knowledge and experiences do faculty have related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups?

Unit faculty have multiple avenues for gaining insights about new approaches related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse cultural backgrounds and students with exceptionalities. Nearly all faculty attend one or more professional conferences each year. At these conferences, they typically choose from a range of concurrent sessions and workshops that invariably include consideration and discussions about working within contexts of cultural difference and differing learning abilities.

As of May 2009, 15 Unit and clinical faculty successfully completed Pathwise training, an ETS-developed mentoring program. Specific domains in the Pathwise Series focus on preparing candidates to work with students from diverse cultural backgrounds and students with exceptionalities. Many Cooperating Teachers in area school districts are also required to successfully complete Pathwise training to become eligible to supervise a professional intern.

One of Dean Middleton's top priorities is the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty and student body. The Dean's Advisory Council on Diversity (DACD) continues to sponsor campus and college-wide seminars. Topics vary and recently included discussions related to our newly elected African American president. Nationally prominent diversity experts such as Peggy McIntosh and Tim Wise have also met with faculty and candidates in the Unit. These events are specifically designed to help faculty and candidates take the necessary strides toward social justice and equity and to increase their multicultural competencies. Exhibit 4.b.2.ii provides detailed information about recent DACD activities.

4.b.3. How diverse are the faculty who work with education candidates?

Table 8 provides data for professional education faculty in initial and advanced programs, and the combination of both, and compares it to all faculty members at Ohio University and the school-based faculty who supervise clinical practice.

Table 8- Faculty Demographics

	Prof. Ed. Faculty in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs	Prof. Ed. Faculty in Advanced Programs	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach in Both Initial Teacher Preparation & Advanced Programs	All Faculty in the Institution	School-based Faculty Who Supervise Clinical Practice
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native	1 (0.7%)	0	0	9 (0.5%)	0
Asian	6 (4.4%)	0	1 (5.0%)	106 (5.7%)	0
Black or African American	7 (4.8%)	1 (9.1%)	1 (5.0%)	68 (3.7%)	7 (1.5%)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	NA	0
Hispanic or	0	0	0	30	1

	Prof. Ed. Faculty in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs	Prof. Ed. Faculty in Advanced Programs	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach in Both Initial Teacher Preparation & Advanced Programs	All Faculty in the Institution	School-based Faculty Who Supervise Clinical Practice
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Latino				(1.6%)	(0.2%)
White	132 (89.8%)	10 (90.9%)	14 (70.0%)	1431 (76.9%)	467 (98.3%)
Two or more races	0	0	0	NA	0
Race/ethnicity unknown	0	0	0	157 (8.4%)	0
International	1 (0.7%)	0	4 (20.0%)	60 (3.2%)	0
Total	147	11	20	1,861	475
Female	121 (82.3%)	4 (36.4%)	11 (55%)	750 (40.3%)	309 (65%)
Male	26 (17.7%)	7 (63.6%)	9 (45%)	1,111 (59.7%)	166 (35%)
Total	147	11	20	1,861	475

4.b.4   What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain a diverse faculty?

The Unit continues to recruit, hire, retain and promote diverse faculty. The Unit embraces and adheres to the President's Faculty/Staff Diversity Initiative, which provides guidelines for achieving greater diversity among faculty and staff at Ohio University. In addition to adding components to the current hiring protocol for faculty and administrators, the President's Diversity Initiative requires that the annual merit reviews for all supervisory employees include an evaluation of their diversity efforts. An EEO/AA Appraisal Form is available to assist in identifying these efforts. Prior to each search in the College of Education, the Dean requires each search committee to undergo training from University Human Resources or Office of Institutional Equity. Staff members from either office attend the first meeting of every search committee to provide training and information about the hiring process, and to help generate methods for enhancing the diversity of the applicant pool, such as advertising in publications targeted to members of underrepresented groups. Faculty members make personal contacts with individuals at conferences (such as the Holmes Conference, of which OU is a member) and professional meetings, and pursue relationships with Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) to identify prospective candidates. The College uses Visiting Professorships as opportunities to build diversity. Visiting Professors are provided contracts up to three years. Upon approval by the Office of the Provost, candidates are encouraged to apply for the tenure track position.

Since the last NCATE visit, we have hired one full-time tenure track faculty member and three Visiting Professors from members of underrepresented groups. Each faculty member is given a mentor, as is each new faculty hire. The mentor assists with the person's research and scholarship and with making progress toward attaining tenure and promotion.

4c.   Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

4.c.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning programs) have to interact with candidates from diverse groups?

Every effort is being made to increase the diversity of our candidate body. From fall 2006 to fall 2008, the College saw a 59% increase of master's candidates from diverse groups. The numbers of freshman and transfer candidates with diverse backgrounds increased by 55.6% from fall 2006 to fall 2007 and remained the same for fall 2008.

The Unit has initiated the *Rural Urban Collaborative*. This collaborative was first conceived in 2007 and is in its pilot phase. The collaborative is a joint effort between Ohio University, The Ohio State University (OSU), Ohio Dominican University (ODU), Columbus City Schools, and the Logan-Hocking and Southern Local School District. The purpose of the collaborative is to enhance candidates' understanding of the similarities and differences between rural and urban education. Its goal is provide candidates from Ohio University with field experiences in an urban setting and to offer the reverse opportunity for candidates from Columbus in a rural setting. This experience provides an additional opportunity for our candidates to interact with OSU candidates; some of these candidates themselves are from diverse groups.

4.c.2.   How diverse are candidates in the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs?

Table 9 provides demographic data from Ohio University's Institutional Research from fall 2008 on our initial and advanced candidates and compares that with all students at Ohio University. Table 9 also provides the diversity data taken from the Ohio Census Bureau of the geographical area served by OU.

Table 9: Candidate Demographics
Fall 2008-09 from OU's Institutional Research & Ohio Census Bureau

	Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs	Candidates in Advanced Preparation Programs	All Students in the Institution	Diversity of Geographical Area Served by Institution
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	(%)
American Indian or Alaska Native	5 (0.2%)	1 (0.4%)	121 (0.4%)	0.3%
Asian	4 (0.2%)	1 (0.4%)	277 (0.9%)	0.4%
Black or African American	51 (2.2%)	11 (4.4%)	1356 (4.6%)	2.4%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA	NA	NA	0.03%
Hispanic or Latino	30 (1.3%)	1 (0.4%)	467 (1.6%)	0.7%
White	2,191 (95.8%)	199 (79.9%)	26,029 (87.6%)	95.4%
Two or more races	NA	NA	NA	1.0%
Race/ethnicity unknown	NA	NA	NA	NA
Foreign/ Non-Resident Alien	3 (0.1%)	36 (14.5%)	1463 (4.9%)	NA
Total	2,287	249	29,713	
Female	1,622	162	16,533	48.9%

	(70.9%)	(65.1%)	(55.6%)	
Male	665 (29.1%)	87 (34.9%)	13,180 (44.4%)	47.7%
Total	2,287	249	29,713	

4.c.3. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups?

The College of Education is actively involved in the following initiatives to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups:

- Ohio University's Urban Scholars Program recruits outstanding minority students from urban schools.
- The fall Multicultural Visitation Program brings outstanding candidates from diverse groups to campus. During their visits, potential candidates receive information about College of Education programs and services and about OU application waivers.
- The spring Cultural Connections Program offers admitted students from diverse groups and their parents an opportunity to see Ohio University up close. The College of Education offers sessions to inform students and their families about programs and services and opportunities to meet directly with faculty in their areas of interest.
- Letters are sent to all multicultural students at various points in the admissions process. Such points include when potential students indicate an interest in the College of Education and at the beginning of the year. Letters are also sent to encourage students' application to Ohio University and the College of Education, to congratulate them on their admission, and to encourage them to attend Cultural Connections. This program, hosted by Ohio University's Admissions, recognizes the academic achievements of minority students. Cultural Connections gives university officials a final chance to encourage students from diverse cultural backgrounds to attend Ohio University.
- The LINKS program welcomes all new students from diverse groups to Ohio University's campus. The College also supervises LINKS peer advisors who work directly with these students in the College of Education to ensure their successful transition from high school to college.
- The Retention Strategies Committee is coordinated by the Multicultural Student Access and Retention Office.
- The College is a member of the Holmes Scholars Programs.

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

4.d.1. How does the unit ensure that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experience and clinical practice?

Through curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practice, candidates examine the knowledge bases for diversity and inclusion, interact with diverse learners and colleagues, and adapt instruction to support the learning of all students. Candidates are provided with many opportunities to work with exceptional learners when they are in field experience classrooms. Field experiences are available for all candidates through all preparation programs and through specific courses offered through the Special Education program area. Candidates also have experiences with students from a variety of different socioeconomic groups. Candidates who participate with the Child Development Center interact with many children for whom English is a second language.

Few schools near Ohio University provide field placements that include experience with racial diversity. The number and small sizes of the schools in the region pose a challenge for ensuring a field experience that expands beyond Appalachian diversity to include racial diversity. However, two significant programs, the Rural Urban Collaborative (RUC) and the Consortium for Overseas Teaching (COST) offer candidates unique opportunities to gain experiences in racially and ethnically diverse settings.

As mentioned in Standard 3, one of the Unit's Core Dispositions is the "commitment to diversity", which incorporates multicultural and international perspectives, attending to diverse issues, and utilizing multiple

60

approaches in a learning environment. For initial programs, this Disposition is assessed during a candidate's methods course and during the professional internship whereas in advanced programs for teachers and other school professionals, this disposition is assessed during the midpoint and endpoint of their respective program.

Elements of diversity are also integrated into assessments completed during professional internship, including the PI final evaluation and the TWS.

In advanced programs for teachers and other school professionals, diversity elements are incorporated throughout the respective program and into the required assessments and portfolios completed by candidates during their clinical practice and final portfolio presentation.

4.d.2. How diverse are the P-12 students in the settings in which candidates participate in field experiences and clinical practice?

Diversity is noticeable within the region with respect to Appalachian culture, which exhibits differing levels of socioeconomic status and numbers of students with disabilities. In this region, a high percentage of families live below the poverty line. Specifically, as indicated in Table 10, 80% of area school districts, where candidates participate in many field experiences and clinical practice, have at least 30% of their students coming from economically disadvantaged families.

In addition, several area schools have a large number of students from international families, generally those of faculty and students affiliated with Ohio University. One notable example is East Elementary School in Athens which enrolls students from more than 30 countries. The formal East READ Partnership for Early Childhood and EAST Partnership for Middle School offer candidates unique field experiences, including working with English Language Learners. Also, as previously mentioned, the Child Development Center includes many children for whom English is a second language.

In addition, the CARE [Creating Active and Responsible Educators] Partnership program for Middle Childhood, Adolescent to Young Adult, and Multi-Age sophomores and Chauncey Literacy Program offer candidates opportunities to be part of a yearlong cohort and to apply theoretical concepts in the diverse socioeconomic context of four different schools in two rural school districts.

Table 10 provides the demographics on sites for clinical practice in initial and advanced programs including the name of each school, the racial and ethnic diversity present in that school, the percentage of students receiving free/reduced price lunch, the percentage of English language learners, and the percentage of students with documented disabilities.

4.d.3. How does the unit ensure that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups?

Initial programs

As previously mentioned, one of the Unit's Core Dispositions is the "commitment to social justice". Candidates discuss the meaning of the Core Dispositions in the introduction to education courses prior to beginning their field experiences. These discussions are intended to engage the class, including candidates' peers, about the meaning of social justice and what it looks like when working with students from diverse groups. These dispositions are assessed by the Education Professionals Dispositions Assessment during one of the Content Methods courses that includes a field experience and during the PI experience. Candidates are made aware of their ratings on the Dispositions Assessment with the goal of enabling candidates to reflect and use their ratings to further refine their skills in working with diverse populations.

During all field and clinical experiences, initial candidates develop and practice their knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity in a variety of ways. For example, University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers collaboratively complete the Professional Internship (PI) Final Evaluation, which is based entirely on the Unit's Candidates' Proficiencies including proficiencies related to diversity. This evaluation is shared with candidates so they can utilize this feedback to improve their skills in working with students from diverse groups. Candidates in PI also complete the Teacher Work Sample, which includes items related to diversity. This assessment requires candidates to be intentional about addressing the contextual factors associated with student learning. Furthermore, all of the assessments are shared with candidates to increase their awareness, knowledge, and skills, and to help them reflect on those skills as they relate to students from diverse backgrounds. In addition to assessments, the PI seminars allow time for peers and supervisors to help candidates discuss and reflect on working with students from diverse groups.

Advanced programs

For advanced programs, course discussions allow candidates to interact with peers and faculty (who serve as supervisors) to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse backgrounds. Similar to initial programs, assessments of candidates in advanced programs also embed elements related to diversity into their culminating clinical experiences and portfolio requirements as related to their respective SPAs. These assessments are discussed in the corresponding courses which allow candidates to receive feedback from peers and faculty about working with students from diverse backgrounds. Furthermore, the Core Dispositions are also assessed by the respective faculty during field experiences and internships.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 4?

The Unit hosts special events to enrich candidate opportunities related to diversity. For example, the Dean's Advisory Council on Appalachia brings in guest speakers who are experts in diversity as it relates to Appalachia, rural life, and rural poverty. Professor Dr. Doppen and two local historians teach an interactive workshop titled, Southeast Ohio: The Appalachian Experience. The workshop examines coal mining, the environment, education, local history, Appalachian culture, heritage tourism, outdoor activities, and service learning. The Unit sponsors "Soup and Substance," a series of lunch hour conversations that focus on a broad range of current issues that impact the university community, nation, and world. Faculty Forums are open to all candidates and feature a broad range of research, some of which is directly related to diversity; samples include Catherine Cutcher's "Popular Education and Development Among Women's Organizations in Kenya," Dr. Robinson's "Cultural Diversity and Treatment of Veterans Diagnosed with PTSD and TBI," Dr. Mather's "Service Learning in Honduras," and Dr. Hitchcock's "Applying Mixed Methods in Cross-Cultural Intervention Research." Several of the McCracken Lecture Series talks have focused on issues of diversity. For example, Charlotte Westerhaus, Vice President of Diversity Inclusion at the NCAA, spoke on "Finders Keepers, Losers Weepers: The Dichotomy of Diversity Lost," and Dr. Connie Calloway, Superintendent, Detroit Public Schools, addressed the challenges of teaching, learning, and leading in inner city schools. The Deans Council on Diversity has hosted a series of dialogues with the following foci: LGBTQ Community; Racial and Ethnic Diversity; Pluralism and Inclusion, Multicultural Competencies, Appalachian Culture, Hiphop, and White Privilege (featuring nationally-renowned speaker, Tim Wise).

2. What research related to Standard 4 is being conducted by the unit?

A broad range of publications demonstrate faculty engagement in research related to diversity. For example, English Education faculty members authored a book titled *Exploring African Life and Literature: Novel Guides to Promote Socially Responsive Learning* (Glasgow & Rice, 2007). Social Studies Education faculty member, Dr. Doppen authored a chapter titled "Social studies and diversity education: Methods for teachers and teacher educators". Cultural Studies faculty member authored a chapter titled "Education at the crossroads: The Ghanaian

dilemma and puzzle" (Godwyll, 2008); A Teacher Education faculty member authored a book titled *The Education of Diverse Student Populations: A Global Perspective* (Wan, 2008); A Special Education faculty member authored "Multicultural practices in developmental disabilities" (Sparks, 2008) in the professional edition of Research-Based Practices in Developmental Disabilities. Two Teacher Education faculty members authored an article "Media Use by Chinese and U. S. secondary students: Implications for media literacy education" (Wan & Gut, 2008) in Theory Into Practice. Faculty members have also presented their research on diversity at national and international conferences. For example, Educational Administration faculty members presented "Culturally responsive leadership among principals of exemplary schools" (Howley, Woodrum, & Turner, 2006) at the American Educational Research Association. An Information Technology faculty member presented "Preparing technology proficient teachers in Jordan: An examination of the ICTE program," (Franklin, 2008) at AERA. An Education Research faculty member presented "Speak the Truth and Shame the Devil: African American Women in Higher Education" (Ward-Randolph, 2008) at AERA.

STANDARD 5:   FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT

5a.   Qualified Faculty

5.a.1. What are the qualifications of the full- and part-time professional education faculty (e.g., earned degrees, experience, and expertise)? What do the data in Table 11 tell the unit about the qualification of its faculty?

The full- and part-time faculty listings included in Table 11 represent all tenure and tenure-track faculty members who have taught for the Unit in any part of the three-year period between 2005-06 and 2007-08 as well as all part-time faculty members who have taught for the Unit in all three of the years between 2005-06 and 2007-08. Information in the Table reveals that the Unit includes faculty members who hold appropriate degrees and whose experiences have prepared them well for the higher education teaching for which they have been employed. In addition, these data (and supporting information in faculty vitae) reveal that tenure and tenure-track faculty members routinely contribute to teaching, research, and service. Moreover, their contributions to research fit with the expectations that are typically held of faculty members at research intensive institutions.

Table 11, the Faculty Qualification Summary, is located on the NCATE AIMS website.

5.a.2. What expertise qualifies faculty members without terminal degrees for their assignments?

Faculty members who do not hold the terminal degree are employed because of their relevant professional expertise in schools. In general they have experience both as teachers and as educational leaders (either in formal leadership positions or in less formal roles as "teacher-leaders"). In the few instances where faculty members who lack terminal credentials are employed on a full-time or close to full-time basis, their contributions to the profession include such activities as (1) development and delivery of professional development workshops, (2) grant writing and the coordination of sponsored programs, (3) membership in (including leadership positions in) professional associations, and (4) research and related scholarship. Several of them also hold certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Excerpts from the vitae of three faculty members who worked in the unit over the past two years but who lacked terminal degrees are provided as Exhibit 5.a.2.i. Moreover, those faculty members who lack terminal degrees but who are asked on repeated occasions to teach maintain a record of strong student evaluations and have demonstrated outstanding performance in K-12 classrooms and schools with children and/or young adult learners.

5.a.3. How many of the school-based faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or are supervising? How does the unit ensure that school faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or are supervising?

The COE employs a Coordinator of Professional Internships in Teaching who uses information about school faculty members' professional licensure to determine the match between school faculty and professional interns. Supervisory assignments are based on the match between the supervisor's licensure fields and the candidate's fields, so that, for instance, a candidate seeking an ECE license will not be assigned a supervisor whose field is primarily AYA. When a supervisor's field is Elementary Education, the supervisor may be assigned to supervise candidates in either Early Childhood or Middle Childhood. An excerpt from the school-faculty-member data base kept by the Coordinator of Professional Internships is provided as Exhibit 5.a.3.i. A similar process applies to students in early field experiences. The Coordinator of Early Field Experiences relies on principals to provide appropriate teachers for the candidates who are being placed. The Coordinator also has access to a data base from the Ohio Department of Education that lists every school where OU--its Athens and five regional campuses--places students for early field experiences. She uses the data base to determine (a) the percentage of teachers at each school who are highly qualified, (2) the percentage of teachers who are licensed in the subjects and levels to which they are assigned, and (3) the percentage of teachers who hold provisional licenses. (Exhibit

5.3.a.ii) The Coordinator does not typically place students for field experiences in schools with low percentages of highly qualified teachers or high percentages of educators teaching out of field. The Office of Early Field Experiences has also started to keep a data base of teachers (not just schools) with information about each teacher's licensure fields and levels. (Exhibit 5.a.3.iii) By using this data base, the Coordinator of Early Field Experiences can properly match pre-service teachers with appropriate school faculty.

5.a.4. What contemporary professional experiences in school settings does higher education clinical faculty have?

Higher education clinical faculty members have a strong record of direct involvement with personnel in school settings, and all of them have had extensive experience as classroom teachers. Their involvement in school settings includes (1) development and delivery of professional development workshops; (2) grant writing and coordination of sponsored program; (3) membership (including leadership positions) in professional organizations; (4) research and related scholarship; (5) assessment, data analysis, and program evaluation; and (6) district- and state-level P-12 curriculum development and diffusion projects. Higher education clinical faculty who serve as instructors-of-record for campus-based coursework that includes an early field experience component are also in direct contact with the cooperating teachers who sponsor candidates in their classrooms for the early field experience. In these cases the direct contact initiated by the higher education faculty member typically includes (a) direct mail or e-mail and (b) on-site visitation for direct observation of candidates in the field setting. Moreover, clinical faculty members have the opportunity to demonstrate with children and adolescents the different strategies they are teaching about in their pedagogy classes. These faculty members also have the opportunity to try new strategies and methods with K-12 pupils in the field. Exhibit 5.a.4.i provides a list of clinical faculty who are employed on a regular basis by the Unit along with examples of their direct involvement with K-12 schools. Evidence used in the exhibit comes from a survey of clinical supervisors as well as from a review of their resumes, which are included among the Unit's collection of exhibits.

5b.   Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

5.b.1. How does instruction by professional education faculty reflect the conceptual framework as well as current research and developments in the fields?

The faculty teaches about and models pedagogies that reflect the Unit's conceptual framework and current research. The Conceptual Core has four foci—leadership, change agency, life-long learning, and diversity—which are evident in the programs' curricula as well as in the methods faculty use. For example, all candidates complete at least one course related to teaching or leadership with diverse pupils. Exhibit 5.b.1.i provides syllabi for three of these courses and comments from faculty about how they address diversity and assess knowledge and dispositions relating to it. All students in these programs also learn to become reflective practitioners, valuing on-going professional development and life-long learning. An assessment that illustrates this focus comes from an advanced program in the Unit—the Teacher-Leader program (Exhibit 5.b.1.ii). A critical assessment in the initial programs, the Teacher Work Sample, demonstrates the focus on teachers' roles as leaders of curriculum and instruction and on their engagement with reflective inquiry (Exhibit 5.b.1.iii). Implicit in most courses in the Unit is an emphasis on change agency on behalf of student learning, school reform, and social justice. Commentary provided by faculty in response to a recent survey shows how these concepts are presented and assessed Exhibit 5.b.1.iv). Similarly, courses in the Unit explicitly address knowledge and dispositions pertinent to the core principle of lifelong learning. (See Exhibit 5.b.1.v for illustrations based on faculty comments.)

Four themes in contemporary education research have a key influence on the content presented and instructional methods used in the Unit: inquiry, collaboration, differentiated instruction, and distributed leadership. These themes fit well with the Unit's Conceptual Core. Notably, constructivist principles describe a conceptual domain that informs inquiry models of teaching, cooperative learning, and life-long learning, as well as providing a compelling motive for change agency. Scholarly work on distributed leadership supports both change agency and a collaborative

approach to instructional improvement, and ultimately emerging literature on distributed leadership supports the development of leader-practitioners. Research on differentiated instruction provides the basis for a culturally responsive way to address diversity. Comments from a survey of faculty (Exhibit 5.b.1.vi) show how these evidence-based approaches are presented, modeled, and assessed.

5.b.2. How does unit faculty encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions?

Faculty members use a variety of activities to cultivate these habits of mind, intellectual capabilities, and dispositions. Exhibit 5.b.2.i—developed from information supplied by faculty in response to a recent survey—provides illustrations of these practices (both activities and assessments).

(1) To encourage *reflection*, faculty members give assignments in which they ask candidates to analyze their own teaching or other professional practice. For example, candidates in Initial Programs are required to keep reflections journals in which they analyze each lesson they teach by considering students' responses to instruction. On the basis of their reflections, candidates make plans for future lessons as well as identifying ways to improve their original lessons. The Teacher Work Sample, which serves as a culminating assessment for all teacher candidates, embeds various opportunities for reflection. (See Exhibit 5.b.1.iii) Similarly internships in Advanced Programs also include activities requiring reflection (e.g., the gap analysis in the Principal Program). (2) For *critical thinking*, faculty in both Initial and Advanced Programs assign case studies of various sorts. In addition, Initial Program candidates experience a range of activities in their required Cultural Studies classes that encourage them to think critically. Advanced program candidates all complete some type of action research project, which helps them develop critical thinking skills. (3) To hone *problem-solving* skills, faculty members assign team projects—such as a "design a school" project used in one course, the "Tri-fold Project" assigned in all sections of EDTE 200 and completed by all Initial Program candidates, and the data-analysis portfolio required of all Principal and Superintendent candidates. (4) In Initial Programs professional dispositions are cultivated most fully in early field placements, in the professional internship, and in the seminar that accompanies the professional internship. In Advanced Programs, a new application procedure (specifically the use of a new candidate recommendation form) enables faculty to evaluate candidates' professional dispositions as a condition for admission to the programs (see Exhibit 5.b.2.ii), and these programs also continue to work with candidates during their clinical experiences to help them maintain and refine appropriate professional dispositions. The Teacher Leader Program, for example, assesses dispositions prior to admission and then twice again before the candidates graduate.

5.b.3. What types of instructional strategies and assessment do unit faculty model?

Faculty members use—and thereby model—various authentic and powerful instructional strategies: cooperative learning, discussion boards, project-based and inquiry learning, service learning, and culturally-relevant and place-based pedagogy. They also use (and through their use, model) a number of different types of authentic performance assessments including observation of teaching and other performance, development of relevant products (e.g., lesson plans, professional development plans, codes of ethics), and action research. Table 5.b.3 shows the frequency with which faculty in the Unit use various innovative instructional and assessment strategies. These data come from a recent survey to which 63 faculty members (i.e., 38%) responded. Although it is an inference, one might reasonably conclude that the approaches reported to be used most frequently serve as the models of instructional and assessment practice to which candidates are most likely to attend. Exhibit 5.b.3.i provides illustrative narrative, elicited via the recent survey, which characterizes the instructional and assessment strategies that Unit faculty members use.

Table 5.b.3

Instructional Strategies	Frequency of Use Among 63 Faculty Members
Cooperative Learning	32 (51%)
Blackboard Discussion, Chat Rooms, Discussion Boards	18 (29%)
Project/Problem Based Learning	15 (24%)
Discovery/Inquiry Based Learning (including student research projects)	14 (22%)
Place-Based and Culturally-Relevant Learning	9 (11%)
Field-Based Learning	8 (13%)
Creation of Products (instructional materials, lesson plans, assessments)	7 (11%)
Lectures	6 (10%)
Readings	5 (8%)
Arts-Based Approaches using dance, music, film	4 (6%)
Individualized Instruction	3 (5%)
Theoretical and Conceptual Learning	3 (5%)
Case Study Analysis	2 (3%)
Peer Teaching	1 (2%)
Simulations	1 (2%)
Autobiographical Inquiry	1 (2%)
Assessment Strategies	Frequency of Use Among 63 Faculty Members
Rubrics (including Live-Text rubrics)	18 (29%)
Projects (individual and group)	11 (17%)
Tests or Exams (face-to-face and on-line)	8 (13%)
Assessment of Writing Projects (e.g., literature reviews, book reviews, reflections, case studies)	6 (10%)
Performance Assessment (including face-to-face observation and assessment of video recordings of performance)	6 (10%)
Lesson Plan Review	5 (8%)
Student Self-Assessment	5 (8%)
Cooperative Learning Assessment	5 (8%)
Peer Review	4 (6%)
Portfolios	3 (5%)
Non-Graded and Open-Ended Assessment	3 (5%)
Mastery Learning Approach	1 (2%)
Review of Service Learning Plans	1 (2%)
Pictorial Assessment	1 (2%)

5.b.4. How does unit faculty members incorporate the use of technology into instruction?

In a broad definition we can say that faculty in the College use technology for the instructional purposes of communication and connection. In particular, they make use of three strategies for using instructional technology: (1) technology tool use, (2) technologically mediated communication, and (3) technologies for making connections to academic content.

For example, as part of *tool use*, faculty members model and involve candidates in using computers for word processing, data analysis, development of lesson plans and other learning materials, photography, videography, and production of materials for dissemination (e.g., newsletters to be sent to parents). To deliver instruction and thereby *demonstrate technologically mediated communication*, they use course-ware such as Blackboard and Moodle as well as blogs, wikis, discussion boards, Google Docs, and e-mail. And for *presenting and giving access to content*, all faculty use technologies such as PowerPoint, Live-Text, films (DVDs) or audio recordings (CDs), and Internet search engines and libraries. Some also use podcasts, You Tube movies, and streaming video. Faculty also reported using the following technological applications for assessing student work: electronic portfolios and scoring rubrics (e.g., via Live-Text), on-line quizzes, and student-developed videos (e.g., of their teaching in field placement sites).

The use of technology has been a major focus for the past two or three years, and faculty members reported on the technology applications they routinely use in a recent survey of practices (N=63). A summary of findings from the survey is provided below in tabular form. Illustrative narrative from the survey is provided in Exhibit 5.b.4.i.

Table 5.b.4

Technological Application	Examples	Number (and Percentage) of Faculty (N = 63) Describing Use of the Application
Communication and connection using technologically based tools	hardware (e.g., computers, PC labs, mobile laptop labs, flash drives, SMART boards); software (e.g., Geometer's Sketchpad, semantic mapping software, data analysis software, AirLiner slate)	61 different uses by 97% of responding faculty
Communication and connection using technologically mediated communication channels	e-mail, course ware (e.g., Blackboard, Moodle), blogs, wikis, discussion boards, Google Docs, e-pals)	36 different uses by 57% of responding faculty
Communication and connection in accessing content	PowerPoint, Live-Text, films on video and DVD, internet libraries, audioclips, You-Tube, pod-casts, i-Movies)	71 different uses by 100% of responding faculty

5.b.5. How does unit faculty systematically engage in self-assessment of their teaching?

At Ohio University assessment of teaching is tied to the annual merit review process, in which both full- and part-time faculty participate. The process is described in the *Faculty Handbook* as follows:

> Annually, departmental chairpersons shall evaluate all members of their faculty with regard to salary. Each chairperson shall employ a departmental committee or committees in the evaluation process, which shall conform to the department's established written procedures.

In each department in the Unit, policy requires department chairs to incorporate faculty self-assessment into their evaluation processes. Each department in the COE and in other colleges where Unit faculty are employed has developed and routinely uses a course evaluation form, which is completed by candidates in each course and which provides a systematic way for faculty members to assess their teaching. Department chairs also review the course evaluations of all faculty members in their respective departments and discuss each faculty member's course evaluations with him or her in the annual merit-review meeting. (See Exhibit 5.b.5.i for copies of each College of Education department's course evaluation form.) In meetings with department chairs, faculty members discuss ways to improve their teaching, connect it more closely to their scholarship, and expand their teaching

repertoires. Some faculty members also provide written reflections about their teaching in the dossiers they submit each year for the annual merit review. Similar, though more extensive, self-reflections are included in the materials that faculty members prepare for tenure and/or promotion. (See Exhibit 5.b.5.ii for examples of such reflections.)

Less easy to document, but pervasive nonetheless, are the conversations faculty members have during the quarter with students about what is going well and not so well in their classes. Throughout our preparation programs, we ask our candidates to reflect on their own practice and to make appropriate adjustments, and many of our faculty members use (and thereby model) this approach.

5c.   Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

5.c.1. What types of scholarly work are expected as part of the institution's and unit's mission?

The departments within the Unit subscribe to a version of the Boyer model, in which the scholarship of discovery is considered to be important, as are other kinds of scholarship (i.e., scholarship of integration, application, and teaching). Exhibit 5.c.1.i provides the sections of COE departments' tenure and promotion guidelines that show how the Unit construes scholarship. In recent years, moreover, the vision of the University as a whole has shifted and now departments across the Unit place greater emphasis on scholarship. In particular, departments now tend to construe non-refereed publications (e.g. newsletter articles), workshop, and conference presentations and the award of grants as steps along the way to the production of scholarship rather than as highly weighted scholarship in their own rights. At present , departments' tenure guidelines do not specify the number of publications needed for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Evidence of prevailing standards, however, is provided in the Dean's memorandum to the Special Education faculty in which she outlines what is needed for the program to meet COE standards. (See Exhibit 5.c.1.ii.) Two other expectations are worth mentioning: (a) the expectation that many faculty members will work collaboratively on research and other scholarly products and (b) the expectation that faculty will engage their graduate students in research projects that lead to the presentation and publication of scholarly products. The value placed on engaging graduate students in scholarship is seen in Exhibit 5.c.1.iii, which highlights relevant excerpts from the letters that Dean Renée Middleton sent to programs in response to the self-studies completed in 2007-2008 and the University and College Graduate Program Reviews conducted in 2008-2009.

5.c.2. In what types of scholarship activities are faculty engaged? How is their scholarship related to teaching and learning? What percentage of the unit's faculty is engaged in scholarship?

Information collected for Graduate Program Reviews in the summer of 2008 revealed that, in most years, approximately 80% of the tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the Unit produce research and creative works that fit with the NCATE definition of scholarship. Exhibit 5.c.2.i lists the 2006-2009 peer-reviewed publications and presentations that faculty in the Unit reported in their recent vitae. In addition to the scholarship produced by tenured and tenure-track faculty, the Unit benefits from the scholarly contributions of part-time and visiting faculty members whose assignments do not require them to engage in scholarship but who engage in this type of work nonetheless (Exhibit 5.c.2.ii).

Faculty in the Unit produce scholarship of various types, representing the variability described in the Boyer model (Exhibit 5.c.2.iii). Within each program, for example, are faculty who primarily engage in scholarship of discovery (e.g., by conducting research projects that analyze large data sets, employ experiments and quasi-experiments, and incorporate various qualitative designs) and others who primarily engage in scholarship of integration (e.g., by developing textbooks, chapter- and article-length syntheses of extant research, and policy briefs). Several faculty members also engage in scholarship of application through the development, use, and evaluation of research-based practices in schools and professional-development settings. A few faculty members study their own practice in rigorous and systematic ways that result in the production of scholarly works on teaching (i.e., the scholarship of

teaching). Several faculty members in the Unit undertake scholarship of various types, and the vitae of a few faculty members demonstrate productivity across all of the Boyer domains.

When teaching and learning are construed broadly (e.g., as activities related to human development and the contexts for human development), almost all research conducted by faculty in the Unit can be said to focus on teaching and learning. For example, faculty members in Instructional Technology study the efficacy of various technological innovations while faculty members in Educational Administration investigate instructional leadership in various contexts. Exhibit 5.c.2.iii, which was cited above, presents a catalogue of faculty research over the period 2006-2009; it shows both Boyer categories and dissemination venues. A summary of the information presented in the exhibit is included in Table 5.c. Boyer categories are highlighted in green, and dissemination venues in blue.

Table 5.c

Category	Discovery	Integration	Application	Teaching	Book	Book Chapter	Journal Article	Conference Paper	Conference Proceedings	Other
N	118	123	93	36	21	41	101	185	19	10

5d.   Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

5.d.1. What types of service are expected as part of the institution's and the unit's mission?

The University expects faculty members to participate in service, although not all departments across campus construe service as broadly as do departments in the College of Education and other departments affiliated with the Unit. As the *Faculty Handbook* indicates:

> The obligations of the teacher are self-evident. They include teaching, research, and service. The assessment of these activities should be an on-going process and is the responsibility of the faculty, duly supported by the administration.

Faculty members across the Professional Education Unit are expected to participate in a number of different professional, community, and institutional service activities that contribute to their own leadership and life-long learning as well as the leadership and life-long learning of those they serve. Their service is also positioned to promote needed change within the profession; nurture a commitment to positive change among students, colleagues, and partners; and provide opportunities to engage in collaborative work with diverse populations. Faculty members are expected to participate in shared governance at the department, college, and university levels, and to provide service beyond the University that helps shape the profession in the wider arena. Service represents an important component of the tenure and promotion process. Exhibit 5.d.1.i provides the sections from departments' tenure and promotion policies that show the service expectations of the different departments. In the Educational Studies Department, for example, contributions to a broadly construed service mission carry the same weight as contributions to teaching, on the one hand, and scholarship, on the other.

5.d.2. In what types of service activities are faculty engaged? Provide examples of faculty service related to practice in P-12 schools and service to the profession at the local, state, national, and international levels (e.g., through professional associations). What percentage of the faculty is actively involved in these various types of service activities?

Service expectations differ across faculty groups. For tenure/tenure-track (i.e., full-time) faculty service is typically expected to represent about 1/3 of the workload and to involve both service to the institution and service to the profession. For part-time and visiting faculty, service expectations are negotiated in individual contracts.

Faculty members participate in various types of service in different levels of the profession: department; college; university; local schools and districts; and local, regional, state, national, and international professional

organizations. This service is exemplified through involvement with partnerships, work on committees and task forces, performance of leadership roles in professional organizations, delivery of professional development workshops, delivery of other types of training sessions, support for recruitment efforts, delivery of talks at service clubs and other organizations, mentoring new faculty, and judging entries (e.g., science fair projects, research posters) at public school and university competitions. See Exhibit 5.d.2.i for excerpts from faculty vitae illustrating various types of service and outreach. Based on data from a survey of faculty with 59 respondents, Table 5.d.2 shows the percentage of faculty participation in various service activities. Highlighted are the types of service in which more than 50% of faculty reported participating during at least one of the three years. These include (1) involvement in curriculum development, (2) membership on department committees, (3) membership on College committees, (4) membership on University committees, (5) participation in partnerships with schools and agencies, (6) workshop presentations and talks to community groups, (7) other types of community service, and (8) contribution of manuscript reviews. Relatively few faculty serve as guest editors and as department chairs. Exhibit 5.d.2.ii presents these data in a bar graph.

Table 5.d.2

Types of Practice- and Profession-Related Services	06-07	07-08	08-09	Average
Involvement with PDS Partnerships	13.56%	15.25%	22.03%	16.95%
Evaluations of Programs Sponsored by the Unit or its Partners	35.59%	33.90%	44.07%	37.85%
Membership on Editorial Boards	28.81%	28.81%	32.20%	29.94%
Guest Editorships	5.08%	6.78%	10.17%	7.34%
Manuscript Reviews	44.07%	54.24%	49.15%	49.15%
Proposal Reviews	32.20%	32.20%	28.81%	31.07%
Chair and Discussant Roles at Conferences	32.20%	33.90%	30.51%	32.20%
Leadership Roles in Professional Organizations	38.98%	35.59%	35.59%	36.72%
Participation in and Leadership of Standard-Setting and Regulatory Boards	16.95%	13.56%	20.34%	16.95%
Participation in and Leadership of Curriculum Development Efforts	38.98%	42.37%	54.24%	45.20%
Membership on University Committees	50.85%	44.07%	35.59%	43.50%
Leadership of University Committees	16.95%	13.56%	13.56%	14.69%
Membership on College Committees	64.41%	54.24%	61.02%	59.89%
Leadership of College Committees	22.03%	15.25%	23.73%	20.34%
Membership on Department Committees	57.63%	50.85%	54.24%	54.24%
Leadership of Department Committees	30.51%	25.42%	25.42%	27.12%
Service as Department Chair	5.08%	5.08%	5.08%	5.08%
Service as Program Coordinator	20.34%	23.73%	25.42%	23.16%
Mentorship of a Pre-Tenured Faculty Member	25.42%	18.64%	22.03%	22.03%
Participation in Partnerships with Schools and Agencies	49.15%	50.85%	54.24%	51.41%
Community Service	57.63%	59.32%	57.63%	58.19%
Workshop Presentations and Talks to Community Groups	59.32%	54.24%	47.46%	53.67%

5e.   Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

5.e.1. How are faculty evaluated? How regular, systematic, and comprehensive are the faculty evaluations for adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as for graduate teaching assistants?

All tenured, tenure-accruing and continuing adjunct faculty participate in formal performance review processes each year. Systematic procedures for annual evaluation of continuing adjunct faculty are established in Ohio University Faculty Senate Policy C.2.b.ii, to "employ a departmental committee or committees in the evaluation process, which shall conform to the department's written procedures and demonstrate peer review as a part of the merit process."

The same is presumed by Faculty Senate policy for tenured and tenure-accruing faculty members. Variations in procedure and criteria across departments and colleges are expected, but domains for evaluation are common (teaching, scholarship, service) and have remained stable over time. Tenured and tenure accruing faculty are subject to all three domains; evaluation of continuing adjuncts is limited to teaching and curriculum development. Each faculty member submits a dossier for peer-review at the department/school level. Assessment ratings and narrative recommendations are then forwarded for a department-level review that culminates in preparation of an annual letter of performance evaluation for the faculty member, with complimentary copy to the Dean. (See Exhibit 5.e.1.i, Sample: Letter of annual performance evaluation with merit ratings for tenured and tenure accruing faculty, and Exhibit 5.e.1.ii, Sample: Letter of annual performance evaluation with merit ratings for continuing adjunct faculty).

Faculty appointed for term-limited contracts are not subject to annual performance evaluation, due to irregular patterns of employment and the resulting limits in opportunity to systematically assess their work. Graduate Teaching Assistants in the Professional Education faculty are few in number; the Graduate College expects them to receive annual performance evaluations developed by their immediate supervisors.

All Professional Education faculty members provide opportunities for candidates to rate their teaching performance (see response to item 5.b.5, above, including Exhibit 5.b.5.i). The rating instrument consists of items in each of three domains (Instruction, Course, and Overall Evaluation), as well as open-ended response items. Rating forms are collected for machine scanning to produce a statistical summary for each section of each course. In the Teacher Education Department, for example, a grand mean is calculated to develop characterization of teaching performance as either "at or above the mean" or "below the mean," and a letter of commendation is sent to each faculty who is rated "at or above the mean." Original rating forms and statistical summaries are returned to faculty for self-assessment and documentation for annual performance evaluation.

5.e.2. How well do faculty perform on the unit's evaluations?

The table below provides aggregated faculty evaluation data from fall, 2006 through winter, 2009. Spring 2009 data will be added as soon as they become available. Note that two of the departments use items that require response choices between 1 and 5, whereas one department (Counseling and Higher Education) uses items that require response choices between 1 and 7. For all departments, however, higher ratings on the scale signify higher levels of performance. The data reveal that (1) faculty across the departments routinely receive ratings above the mid-point on the course evaluation instruments, (2) the instruments do discriminate across faculty members, and (3) there is some variability across quarters with summer-quarter courses tending to receive the highest ratings.

Quarter	Department	Mean	Min	Max
Fall, 2006	Teacher Education	4.31	3.02	4.95
	Educational Studies	4.29	3.34	4.96
	Counseling & Higher Ed	6.32	5.93	6.61
Winter, 2007	Teacher Education	4.42	2.88	5.00
	Educational Studies	4.43	3.80	4.98
	Counseling & Higher Ed	6.33	6.01	6.59
Spring, 2007	Teacher Education	4.35	2.81	4.96
	Educational Studies	4.32	3.15	4.84
	Counseling & Higher Ed	6.32	6.02	6.60
Summer, 2007	Teacher Education	4.54	3.40	4.92
	Educational Studies	4.45	3.75	4.93

Quarter	Department	Mean	Min	Max
	Counseling & Higher Ed	6.66	6.43	6.87
Fall, 2007	Teacher Education	4.39	2.57	4.95
	Educational Studies	4.29	2.91	4.91
	Counseling & Higher Ed	6.16	5.73	6.57
Winter, 2008	Teacher Education	4.43	2.98	4.99
	Educational Studies	4.29	3.14	4.88
	Counseling & Higher Ed	6.39	5.95	6.67
Spring, 2008	Teacher Education	4.41	3.05	4.49
	Educational Studies	4.3	3.60	4.83
	Counseling & Higher Ed	6.34	5.78	6.62
Summer, 2008	Teacher Education	4.49	3.78	5.00
	Educational Studies	4.38	2.99	4.97
	Counseling & Higher Ed	6.7	6.47	6.90
Fall, 2008	Teacher Education	4.49	3.27	4.97
	Educational Studies	4.35	3.09	4.96
	Counseling & Higher Ed	6.21	5.57	6.61
Winter, 2009	Teacher Education	4.45	3.45	4.93
	Educational Studies	4.37	2.80	4.95
	Counseling & Higher Ed	6.41	5.97	6.73
Spring, 2009	Teacher Education			
	Educational Studies			
	Counseling & Higher Ed			
Summer, 2009	Teacher Education			
	Educational Studies			
	Counseling & Higher Ed			

5.e.3. How are faculty evaluations used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service?

Faculty members in Professional Education have grown accustomed to a regular, predictable, comprehensive and increasingly transparent system of policies and procedures designed to bring about improvements in teaching, scholarship and service. Faculty members formulate improvement goals each year in tandem with the annual evaluation process. To ensure alignment between faculty members' goals and their workloads as part of the College Renewal process, a faculty work group approved by the Dean has drafted a *Faculty Workload Policy*. The faculty approved the policy and sent it forward to the Dean for her consideration, and the Dean has approved the policy.

Direct, individualized feedback about performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service is provided in the annual letter of evaluation from the department chair and in individual conferences with the chair. With regard to teaching, faculty members also receive statistical summaries of the candidates' ratings of their teaching performance for each course taught in the preceding quarter, as well as original Scantron forms that contain candidates' written responses to standard open-ended questionnaire items. Increasingly, Professional Education faculty members are encouraged to make use of additional improvement strategies, including instructional development opportunities offered through the Ohio University Center for Teaching and Learning, peer-assisted

coaching, peer-observation of instructional performance, co-teaching and various other available forms of collaborative engagement in improving teaching and the scholarship of teaching. In cases where a faculty member is receiving particularly or consistently low evaluations, the department-level peer-review committee has recommended development of an improvement plan that engages assistance of the department chair. In rare cases, specific suggestions have been outlined, including regular meetings with the chair over an extended period of time to monitor progress.

5f.   Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

5.f.1. How is professional development related to needs outlined in faculty evaluations? How does this happen?

Department chairs meet annually with faculty members in their respective departments to discuss merit evaluations and goals for the subsequent year. These goals are written and included as one basis for the annual evaluation in the subsequent year. Through this process, chairs assist faculty members in identifying needs and finding professional development activities that meet those needs. Often the professional development that chairs recommend is offered on campus. For example, the University's Faculty Commons offers programs to help faculty members improve their teaching (see Exhibit 5.f.1.i); and the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs offers workshops relating to grant writing and grant management (see Exhibit 5.f.1.ii). Faculty members whose evaluations reveal needs in the area of scholarship are often directed by their department chairs to colleagues (both within and outside the Unit). Brokering such research collaborations is the responsibility of both the department chair and the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies. Such collaborations are, in fact, supported formally for pre-tenured faculty members through the COE's mentoring program (see Exhibit 5.f.1.iii). Annual evaluations also point to workload issues that may be keeping some faculty members from performing at high levels in all three domains of faculty work, and a new faculty workload policy in the College of Education provides department chairs with greater flexibility for negotiating workload arrangements that support optimal performance in all three domains (see Exhibit 5.f.1.iv).

All faculty (and staff) members are required to attend quarterly Colloquia where professional-development activities related to the Conceptual Core are routinely provided. In recent years activities at Colloquia have focused on (a) the alignment of program curricula with the Conceptual Core, (b) diversity, (c) health and safety, and (d) technology.

5.f.2. What professional development activities are offered to faculty related to performance assessment, diversity, technology, emerging practices, and the unit's conceptual framework?

The unit provides funding that permits each faculty member to pursue professional development that relates to his or her own teaching assignment. This approach is particularly useful in helping faculty remain current with emerging ideas and practices in their respective fields. In consideration of this approach to learning about emerging trends—an approach used by faculty across the Unit—Unit leaders have chosen to devote proportionally less attention to in-house workshops on such topics. Department budgets reveal that most tenured and tenure-track faculty members receive approximately $1000 annually for professional development of this sort.

Systematic professional development is also provided through activities specifically offered by the Unit. These include: (a) quarterly colloquia, (b) research forums, (c) the McCracken lecture series, (d) workshops sponsored by the Diversity Committee, and (e) workshops and one-one-one sessions promoting the development of technological competence. In addition, representative faculty members are invited to participate in special professional development events offered by state agencies, professional associations, and national organizations. These faculty members share what they learn with colleagues in formal sessions (e.g., department meetings) and informal interactions. Education agencies in Ohio, for example, have been paying close attention to value-added assessment over the past several years. And the Unit has sponsored faculty members' attendance at statewide events related to this form of performance assessment. Similarly, the education community in Ohio has been

focusing considerable attention on the use of data for school improvement (e.g., the Ohio Leadership Advisory Council initiatives), and several faculty members have participated in this work.

Table 5.f.2 shows the numbers and categories of activities provided by the Unit in the past three years to address professional development needs. Exhibit 5.f.2.i provides a complete list of these activities.

Table 5.f.2

Focus	Number of Sessions
Conceptual Core—General	8
Diversity	12
Diversity/Emerging Trends	1
Emerging Trends	2
Leadership	4
Leadership/Diversity	1
Leadership/Emerging Trends	2
Life-long Learning	3
Performance Assessment	1
Research	9
Research/Change Agency	2
Research/Diversity	5
Research/Life-long Learning	4
Research/Technology	6
Technology (one-on-one)	51
Technology (group)	10

5.f.3. How often does faculty participate in professional development activities both on and off campus?

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members, on average, attend one national conference per year, but considerable variability exists across this group. In addition, all of these faculty participate in the three annual COE Colloquia, and most attend three or more other on-campus activities sponsored by the COE (e.g., Research Forums, events sponsored by the Diversity Committee, McCracken lectures, research workshops, the Hick's Executive in Residence lecture, Quarterly CORAS workshops), as well as one or two other state-level activities. Many faculty with teaching appointments only (what at OU are called Group II and Group IV faculty) attend as many national, state, and on-campus professional development activities as their tenured and tenure-track colleagues; but adjuncts (what at OU are called Group III faculty) participate less frequently. Graduate teaching assistants (and other graduate students) are funded to participate in national conferences when they have papers accepted, and an increasing number of them apply for and receive this support (21 in 2006-07, 25 in 2007-08, and 28 in 2008-09). Graduate students (including teaching assistants) are invited to all of the workshops, special talks, and training sessions offered in the COE; and they represent the largest segment of the audience for some of these events (e.g., the Research Forums). Drawing on data from a recent survey of faculty, Exhibit 5.f.3.i presents a table showing faculty involvement in various professional development activities.

Optional

1.   What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 5?

The Unit has placed particular emphasis on giving support to faculty as they move into the role of teacher-scholar. This role involves a dual (and, in the best case, synergistic) focus on teaching excellence, on the one hand, and active pursuit of scholarship, on the other. Initiatives in the Unit to provide such support include (a) enactment of a generous, but balanced, policy for awarding research release time (Exhibit 5.OP.1.i); (b) development of a

mentoring program for pre-tenured faculty in which these faculty get support from a research mentor for a two-year period (Exhibit 5.f.1.iii); (c) use of the Graduate Program Review process for making strategic decisions about graduate programs based on faculty involvement with research, scholarship, and creative activities (Exhibit 5.OP.1.ii); (d) greater attention to and celebration of faculty members' teaching performance and scholarly productivity (Exhibit 5.OP.1.iii); (e) a series of meetings of tenured and pre-tenured faculty respectively to discuss the research climate in the Unit (Exhibit 5.OP.1.iv), and (g) provision of funds through the Research Committee to seed faculty research initiatives (Exhibit 5.OP.1.v). As a result of these efforts, faculty members and groups of faculty have made explicit plans to increase scholarly productivity. For example, the Special Education faculty developed a plan for increasing their scholarly productivity as a contingency for reinstatement of their doctoral specialization (Exhibit 5.OP. I.vi).

In addition to supporting faculty within the Unit, recent work to connect faculty across colleges and universities in Southeast Ohio has resulted in increased service to the region (e.g., the receipt of a Choose Ohio First grant award) and innovative plans for establishing an aligned system of professional development for P-20 teachers. These efforts are taking place under the auspices of the Southeast Ohio Teacher Development Collaborative (Exhibit 5.OP.1.vii).

2.   What research related to Standard 5 is being conducted by the unit?

A number of faculty members in the Unit are conducting research related to faculty work (i.e., teaching, research, and service), professional development of faculty, and the engagement of partners from P-12 education in clinical roles within the Unit. For example, Dianne Gut, Associate Professor of Special Education and Pam Beam, Instructor of Secondary Education are currently working on a research study related to clinical supervision of professional interns in teaching (i.e., student teachers). Teresa Franklin and several of her students and faculty colleagues have studied the applicability of technological applications to the work of preparing teachers. Several Unit faculty members (among them Francis Godwyll, Rosalie Romano, Ginger Weade, and Guofang Wan) have written about PDS partnerships at Ohio University and at teacher education programs at other universities. In addition, one scholarly focus of the newly appointed Chair of the Teacher Education Department relates to faculty production of activities and assessments that encourage the critical thinking and reflective inquiry of pre-service teachers. Exhibit 5.OP.2.i provides a list of research publications from Unit faculty that relate to Standard 5. Exhibit 5.OP.2.ii presents the curriculum vitae of new department chair, John Henning. The work of faculty is also the research focus of Valerie Martin Conley, whose appointment as Associate Professor of Higher Education in the College of Education (though not in U-PEP per se) gives her opportunities to share her expertise with colleagues engaged in the preparation of school personnel. Dr. Conley, for example, chaired the faculty task force that, between 2007 and 2009, produced a Faculty Workload Policy that was approved by the faculty in the COE and by the College's Dean. A list of Dr. Conley's relevant publications (2006-2009) and presentations is provided in Exhibit 5.OP.2.iii.

STANDARD 6:   UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

6a.   Unit leadership and authority

6.a.1. How does the unit manage or coordinate the planning, delivery, and operation of all programs at the institution for the preparation of educators?

The Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) is the structure responsible for planning, delivering, and operating all programs that provide initial and continuing education of teachers and other professional personnel for P-12 schools. The Unit spans fours colleges, with the primary being the College of Education (COE). Education programs such as Physical Education, Family and Consumer Sciences, and our joint Early Childhood Education program, as well as the other school professional program in Speech and Language Pathology, are housed in the College of Health and Human Services (HHS). Initial programs in Music Education and Art Education (now in moratorium) are in the College of Fine Arts (FAR). The Modern Languages program, as well as faculty members who teach methods courses in the arts and sciences disciplines (Mathematics, Sciences, English) are in the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S). The Early Childhood and Middle Childhood Education programs at the initial level are also offered at five regional campuses: OU-Chillicothe, OU-Eastern, OU-Lancaster, OU-Southern, and OU-Zanesville. Two Centers, the Pickerington Center (associated with OU-Lancaster) and the Proctorville Center (associated with OU-Southern) increase candidate accessibility to Ohio University and increase the Unit's opportunity to recruit diverse candidates from other settings.

The Dean of the College of Education, Dr. Renée A. Middleton, heads the Unit and has ultimate responsibility for the overall administering programs and for facilitating communication and collaborative decision-making among the other Colleges in UPEP. Key to this specific administration are the workings of the three academic departments in the College of Education: Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education. Each department is led by a department chair, who is selected by volunteering or being nominated, being voted on by Group I faculty, and ultimately receiving approval from the Dean. Academic Leadership Team (ALT) meetings are held every other week; team members include the Dean, Associate Deans for Research and Graduate Studies, the Associate Dean for Outreach and Undergraduate Studies, the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs and Academic Advising, three department chairs, the Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement, and the Administrative and Financial Officer. Each program within a department has a program coordinator who is a faculty member from the program. These coordinators work with the department chairs and, in appropriate cases, Graduate Student Services on admissions decisions, lead the process of curriculum development with their faculty colleagues; oversee advisement for students in their programs; and serve on Assessment Council, a subcommittee of UPEP. The coordinators report to their department chairs at monthly meetings.

6.a.2. What are the unit's recruiting and admissions policies? How does the unit ensure that they are clearly and consistently described in publications and catalogues?

The Unit relies on the University's recruitment and admissions policies. Policies for undergraduate programs are found in the undergraduate catalog. Because of differing requirements, graduate admission policies are determined by the department and college.

In addition to University wide recruiting, the Assistant Director of Student Affairs works to recruit new undergraduate and graduate students. Exhibit 6.a.2.i provides information about the Unit's recruitment and retention policies.

6.a.3. How does the unit ensure that its academic calendars, catalogues, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current?

The Unit uses the same academic calendar as the University. The departments and programs work with the Unit of Student Affairs to ensure that all College publications and catalogs are accurate and current. To ensure the

accuracy of advertising, the College holds weekly public relations meetings that include the Dean, Associate Dean of Research and Graduate Studies, Assistant Dean for Student Affairs, the Director of Public Affairs, and the College's Instructional Designer. The primary goal of these meetings is to debrief regarding the previous week's events and prepare for upcoming events and/or projects. For advertising, the College uses *Athenaeum*, a yearly alumni publication; the *Educator*, a quarterly electronic alumni newsletter, *E-news*, a weekly electronic newsletter for COE students, faculty, and staff; the COE website; FaceBook; Twitter; and an electronic bulletin board located in the lobby of McCracken Hall, which houses the COE. For news stretching beyond the College, the COE uses Ohio University Outlook, a University-wide electronic news source, as well as local, regional, state and national media outlets.

6.a.4. How does the unit ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling?

The Unit relies heavily on the contributions of support offices to ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling. The Unit of Student Affairs assists candidates in the College of Education and the Educational Unit (graduate and undergraduate) as well as candidates in all teacher preparation programs on all Ohio University campuses. To efficiently and effectively meet the needs of candidates, services are categorized in the following ways: Walk-in appointments (for issues that require administrative attention but take less than 15 minutes); Scheduled appointments (for issues that require administrative attention and that may take more than 15 minutes); Information desk services (for issues that require completing and submitting a form); Advising (for issues that involve initiating and updating records or clarifying University and/or College policies and procedures); Distribution of information, including DARS (Degree Audit Reporting System) reports; and Group advising meetings. The Unit of Student Affairs has three full-time undergraduate and graduate advisors who are knowledgeable of the College's and the University's resources to assist students. In addition to the Athens campus, a designated advisor visits each regional campus once per quarter.

Students who require assistance or counseling are referred to Hudson Health Center's Counseling and Psychological Services, the Dean of Students' office, or the Office of Disability Services.

To apprise candidates and faculty of updates, deadlines, and the like, the Unit of Student Affairs prepares and distributes a weekly electronic newsletter. This newsletter, the College of Education E-News , provides information about important deadlines for dropping and adding courses, group advising dates, workshops, student organization meetings, and general college information.

6.a.5. What members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation? In what ways do they participate?

The major vehicle to ensure collaboration and communication between departments and within the Unit is the UPEP. UPEP is composed of Deans or Associate Deans from the four Colleges in the Unit, representatives from area school districts, faculty members, regional campus representatives, and students. At quarterly UPEP meetings, the Dean provides the group with updates from the ODE and NCATE. Representatives from Assessment Council present data reports and recommendations for program improvements. All UPEP and AC documentation is located on the College of Education and Education Unit LiveText document. Further, the University's organizational chart and the COE Organizational Chart delineate the organizational structure of the unit.

The COE also works regularly with the professional community via the Coalition of Rural and Appalachian Schools (CORAS), and the Communications and Connections group. Dean Middleton and other faculty representatives meet monthly with CORAS to fulfill their mission of providing continuous improvement of educational opportunities to the region's children. CORAS has also been used as a "sounding board" for curricular changes in the Educational Administration programs.

The Communications and Connections group, formed in 2006, includes superintendents, teachers, faculty, staff, and other educational partners. The group's mission is to establish an aligned, agile, regional system of professional learning that meets the unique educational needs of children and the broader demands of a global society. This group was instrumental in creating and analyzing data from focus groups of graduates and employers. As a result of those data, four design teams have been created: Design Team I- integrating assessment competencies into the curriculum, Design Team II- identifying the role of K-12 schools in supporting an aligned, agile, regional system of professional learning, Design Team III- developing a Teacher Residency Program, and Design Team IV- technology.

6.a.6. How does the unit facilitate collaboration with other academic units involved in the preparation of professional educators?

As previously stated, the Unit for the Preparation of Education Professionals (UPEP) is composed of members from four colleges: Education, Arts and Sciences, Health and Human Services, and Fine Arts. At a minimum, the UPEP meets quarterly to ensure appropriate collaboration among all education stakeholders. Further, members from each of the four colleges serve on the Assessment Council and have key responsibilities to create, monitor, analyze, and report Unit assessments and data.

A comprehensive living document, titled the College of Education and Education Unit, which is located on the Unit's Live Text account, help each program in the Unit to stay current regarding the Unit, the Ohio Department of Education, and NCATE. It also gives each program area an opportunity to post meeting minutes, information regarding program assessments, and any other relevant information. Program meetings also occur with faculty from multiple locations, whether it be different colleges in the case of the Early Childhood Education joint program with the Colleges of Education and Health and Human Services, or secondary and multi-age programs where candidates' preparation occurs across multiple colleges or campuses.

6b.   Unit Budget

6.b.1. What is the budget available to support programs preparing candidates to meet standards? How does the unit's budget compare to the budgets of other units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other institutions?

The Education Unit has the necessary budget available to support programs preparing candidates to meet NCATE standards. However, given the state of the economy, the funding from the State of Ohio has decreased in the last fiscal year.

Ohio University Budget				
FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2004
$304,240,194	$320,895,000	$311,535,000	$283,083,000	$267,139,000

The College of Education's operating budget as compared to the budgets of the seven colleges of Ohio University, for fiscal years 2005 to 2009 is below.

FY	Arts & Sciences	Business	Communication	*Education*	Engineering	Fine Arts	Health & Human Services
2009	57,874,000	11,148,000	14,052,000	*8,384,000*	15,156,000	14,998,000	12,884,000
2008	57,116,000	11,344,000	13,821,000	*8,724,000*	14,865,000	14,903,000	12,362,000
2007	54,532,000	10,654,000	13,352,000	*7,944,000*	14,310,587	14,495,000	11,881,000
2006	54,582,000	10,498,000	13,717,000	*7,772,000*	14,377,000	14,669,000	11,436,000
2005	53,255,000	10,560,000	12,428,000	*7,571,000*	14,168,000	14,199,000	11,139,000

One-time money, in the amount of $200,000, was allocated to the academic departments to assist in developing programs that would reach out to the community by funding more field experiences for undergraduate and graduate students. Positive outcome measures of the effectiveness of these partnerships may provide for permanent funding in the future.

6.b.2. How adequately does the budget support all programs for the preparation of educators? What changes to the budget over the past few years have affected the quality of the programs offered?

As can be gleaned from the figures above, Ohio University has been affected by the economy. The College of Education has had to search for other revenue opportunities and these efforts have included offering more graduate programs on the regional campuses and investigating ways to put courses online. These entrepreneurial ventures have supported growth of the College in spite of reduced budgets. One of these ventures includes the development of the Early Childhood Generalist Endorsement program that began in summer 2009. This endorsement includes a five-course series and is offered solely online. Further, travel award funds were set aside from the Dean's office to encourage faculty to include undergraduate and graduate candidates in conference attendance and research presentation.

The College's operational or base budget has been set from an historical perspective causing us to be dependent on one-time funding each year. The Model (Resource Distribution Plan) for how the College receives revenue from engaging in teaching on regional campuses changes over time. It is set to change again in 2009-10. We anticipate that the model will be endorsed and supported by the University and will provide the College with the ability to retain and enhance the current quality of its academic programs. Further, we anticipate that we will be able to meet the reforms contained within the Higher Education Opportunity Act as reauthorized as well as reforms that are required by the Governor's Reforms in Education.

6c. Personnel

6.c.1. What are the institution's and unit's workload policies? What is included in the workloads of faculty (e.g., hours of teaching, advising of candidates, supervising student teachers, work in P-12 schools, independent study, research, and dissertation advisement)? How do workload policies differentiate between types of faculty positions?

The College of Education Faculty Workload Policy mirrors that of the University which states that full-time tenure-track faculty members (Group I) have a maximum teaching load of 12 credit hours per quarter. It is assumed that each credit hour requires at least 2 hours of out-of-class time for grading, class preparation, and other overhead activities. Most tenured/tenure-track faculty are expected to teach these 12 credit hours, and to dedicate themselves to research and service/outreach. Faculty members in non-tenure-eligible lines (e.g., Group II-yearly contract with instruction as the primary focus, Group III-quarterly contract, and Group IV-three-year visiting professor) are, in most cases, expected to teach 12 credit hours per quarter because their primary mission is instructional. Modifications of the 12 credit hour load may be made on a case-by-case basis in response to other responsibilities, such as project coordination, or for exclusive graduate teaching assignments. That decision would be left to the discretion of the Department Chair.

Group I faculty have the major responsibilities for designing, delivering, assessing, and modifying highly effective professional education programs. However, Group II, III, and IV faculty also play a vital role in the preparation of the Unit's candidates. Part-time faculty and Clinical Supervisors are selected for their experience and expertise, including current assignments in P-12 schools, and to enhance our professional preparation efforts. Non-tenured track faculty may teach selected "core" courses, provide clinical supervision, and implement Program and Unit assessments.

In accord with University requirements, the College adopted a faculty workload policy approved by the Dean in spring, 2009.

Consistent with Ohio University's workload policy, the activities valued as elements of faculty workload include such items as contact hours, class size, weighted student credit hours, degree level, graduate student advising, committee membership, service leadership, and research or creative activity with measurable results (performance, publications, proposals for grants).

6.c.2. What are the workloads of faculty for teaching and clinical supervision?

Workloads of clinical supervision are extended for faculty listed as instructor-of-record for courses including an early field experience. These faculty members prepare assignments and communicate expectations about required assignments to candidates and to field-based cooperating teachers. Faculty members are also expected to make direct, face-to-face connections with cooperating teachers and candidates in the school settings, to the extent possible.

Some faculty members engage in clinical supervision roles as Professional Development Schools (PDS) Partnership *Faculty Coordinators*. Each Coordinator is assigned to one PDS, to carry out on-site PDS development activities with PDS candidates and their cooperating teachers. Workload compensation is provided in the form of a choice of one course-release/year or a monetary stipend placed in an individual professional development account at the end of the spring term.

Faculty members may choose to participate in clinical supervision activities in a variety of ways, including membership on the Professional Internship (PI) in Teaching Steering Committee, PI seminar, grading of a key assessment, the Teacher Work Sample, orientation for out-of-areas interns, supervision of out-of-area interns, supervision of interns, coordinating placements with the Office of Early Field Experiences and Professional Internships, and working on a related Assessment Council subcommittee. Exhibit 6.c.2.i shows the PI in Teaching Participation Request Form

For those individuals who are not faculty but who supervise professional interns, the number of professional interns is not to exceed 18 per quarter for any given clinical supervisor.

6.c.3. To what extent do workloads and class size allow faculty to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service (including time for such responsibilities as advisement, developing assessments, and online courses)?

Promotion and tenure decisions are based on the Boyer model of scholarship, service, and teaching; therefore, it is a priority for faculty to engage in these activities. To assist, the College has made intentional efforts to invest in professional advisors, administrators, and support staff. Specifically, the Unit of Student Affairs employs three full-time professional advisors who work primarily with freshman and sophomore students and help them with scheduling, program requisites, and general education requirements. This reduces the faculty advising loads. The College also employs a Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement who assists faculty in creating and implementing unit and program assessments. Finally, the College's Director of Distance Learning and Online Resources provides assistance to faculty who are interested in developing online courses.

6.c.4. How does the unit ensure that the use of part-time faculty contributes to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the unit and its programs?

Part-time faculty (by definition Group II, III, and IV) play a vital role in the preparation of the Unit's candidates. Part-time faculty and University Supervisors are selected for their experience and expertise, including current

assignments in P-12 schools, and to enhance our professional preparation efforts. Non-tenured track faculty may teach selected "core" courses, provide clinical supervision, and implement Program and Unit assessments.

Prior to hiring part-time faculty, the Department Chair reviews their credentials to ensure they are sufficient and consistent with the goals of the department. Part-time faculty members at both the main and regional campuses are provided with the Teacher Education handbook, which outlines the department's policies and procedures. Albeit on a smaller scale, part-time faculty are also utilized in the Educational Administration program to teach. These faculty are engaged in implemented courses that have required NCATE assessments and stay in regular contact with the respective program coordinators to ensure continuous integrity, coherence, and quality of those programs.

6.c.5. What personnel provide support for the unit? How does the unit ensure that it has an adequate number of support personnel?

The Unit has an adequate number of support personnel to provide quality programming. The following chart outlines the support personnel in the College of Education

Position	Number
Administrative Associate	6 FTE
Administrative Assistant	5 FTE
Records Management Assistant	2 FTE
Executive Assistant to the Dean	1 FTE
Director of Distance Learning and Online Resources	1 FTE
Student Affairs Advisors	3 FTE
Assistant Director of Student Affairs (Recruitment & Retention)	1 FTE
Director of Development	1 FTE
Director of Assessment & Academic Improvement	1 FTE
Undergraduate & Graduate Support	13 students

Since the last NCATE visit, three full-time academic advisors have been hired to increase opportunities and candidate retention.

6.c.6.What financial support is available for professional development activities for faculty?

Financial support for professional development and technology is provided in a lump sum annually to each department from the Dean's office and it is left to the department's discretion to determine how the monies are allocated. In the Teacher Education department, each Group I tenure-track faculty and Group IV visiting professor receives $1500 per year. Group II faculty, whose primary responsibility is instructional receives $1000 per year. The Educational Studies department and faculty decided to distribute the monies equally regardless of faculty group or rank. Faculty members in that department are permitted to spend as they determine, as long as the purchases are within University policy and are an appropriate use of the department's funds. Departments that generated revenue with regional higher education programs may receive higher amounts of professional development monies or funding to support faculty's special events.

The Unit also encourages faculty to participate in professional conferences as a vehicle for disseminating their scholarly work and enhancing their own professional development. To support that goal, the College gives modest financial support to assist faculty who attend conferences. It is important to note that while we address similar goals, the procedures for allotting money for professional development are a little different this year than in the previous years. This is due to a change in our College's administration. Examples of support provided are listed below:
▪ Professional development funds totaling $1,000 per full-time faculty member per year are made from the College operating budget to each of the academic departments. Starting this academic year (2006-2007), the Dean appropriated funds to departments where they were distributed as needed by Department Chairs.

- Faculty may apply for additional professional development funds through the College of Education Dean's Office.
- To support faculty members' scholarship, research grants may be awarded for up to $1000 through the College's Research Committee.
- Additional funds are distributed at the departmental level at the discretion of the Department Chair.

6d.   Unit facilities

6.d.1. How adequate are unit facilities—classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, the technology infrastructure, and school facilities—to support teaching and learning?

The College of Education houses the majority of the Unit's programs and is located in McCracken Hall on the Athens campus. A resolution to the Board of Trustees asks for the renovation of McCracken Hall. At this time, phase I of the renovation project is scheduled for 2014. Data from a recent candidate satisfaction survey support the need for this renovation.

The building consists of three stories of classrooms, including a distance learning site, faculty and staff offices, conference rooms, the Dean's Office, Office of Early Field Experiences and Professional Internships, the Unit of Student Affairs, and the following centers: Helen M. Robinson Tutoring Center, Center for Higher Education, Upward Bound, Curriculum and Technology Center (CTC), George E. Hill Counseling Center, and the Edward Stevens Literacy Center as well as a Science Education Lab and a Math Education Lab.

The College of Education works aggressively to secure resources necessary to the successful workings of our departments and programs. The CTC includes curriculum materials such as course reserves for COE Faculty, K-12 textbooks for a variety of subjects, reading books for early readers and adolescent-to-young adult readers, books dealing with educational theory and practice, and books dealing with technology applications in education.

We are currently reviewing the curriculum materials in the center to identify which should be kept and to determine, the nature of curriculum materials that we want to continue to provide. A report concerning the future look of this part of the CTC is being prepared. There is a strong need to continue the curriculum materials but not to replicate services or materials that are available in Alden Library.

The environment at McCracken Hall and Ohio University as a whole provides an additional opportunity for candidates to use technology. Ohio University, including all regional campuses, is a wireless university so candidates have Internet access in all campus classrooms and offices. Classrooms are outfitted with a variety of technology tools. All of the instructional environments in the College of Education and regional campuses are equipped with an instructor's computer cart, DVD/VCR players, and an LCD projector. Beyond the two full-size computer labs in the building, instructors also have multiple mobile laptop carts (64 computers) at their disposal to use in classrooms when students require hands-on computer access. A full-time Director of Distance Learning and Online Resources and a number of graduate assistants are located within the state-of-the-art Curriculum and Technology Center (CTC) on the Athens campus for candidate and faculty assistance. Regional campuses each have a minimum of 2 Instructional Technology support personnel. Faculty and candidates are able to check out an array of multimedia devices from the CTC and regional campuses to use in their courses, and field and clinical experiences. The software in computer labs and on classroom computers is commonly found in K-12 schools where candidates have field experiences and clinical experiences.

Each of the Unit's five regional campuses also provides adequate facilities to support teaching and learning including classrooms, faculty offices, and school facilities. Further, each regional campus has its own library and media center as well as access to all services available at the main campus (e.g., OhioLink, Interlibrary loans, advising, counseling services, disability services, etc.).

6e.   Unit resources including technology

6.e.1. How does the unit allocate resources across programs to ensure candidates meet standards in their field of study?

The Unit allocates funding to departments in accordance with needs for tenured and tenure-track faculty, non-tenured track but continuing faculty, and adjunct faculty. When a faculty line is vacated, a data-based planning process reviews department and program productivity to determine whether a replacement faculty member will be hired or resources will be redirected. The Unit also allocates resources to the Student Affairs Unit in the College of Education to support students' field experiences and internships and to support the advising of freshmen and sophomores. Standards-based programs depend on adequate support for faculty and student support services and also rely on resources for staff to assist with departmental operations, equipment, instructional materials, supplies, and professional development. The budget in the College has several different revenue streams to support these activities. For example, support personnel are primarily funded through the monies in the COE's operating budget; funds for technology come in part from a House Bill allocation, in part from the technology fees that students pay, and in part from profit-sharing arrangements related to graduate teaching on regional campuses. These funds are allocated to the various personnel and offices that require them through a combination of formula-based and needs-based approaches. Occasionally, extra funds to support standards-based instruction are allocated using competitive processes. For example, a portion of House Bill technology funds is often set aside to meet needs that faculty present in proposals to a selection committee. The allocation of graduate assistantships provides one example of a formula-based allocation. Except for special earmarks designed to meet University needs, graduate assistantships are allocated proportionally to departments based on the magnitude of each department's efforts toward providing graduate education in the COE.

Within departments, chairs discuss the needs of each program with program coordinators and allocate funds accordingly. For some activities (e.g., faculty professional development), providing equal allocations to each individual tends to be the approach used. For other activities (e.g., the start-up of a new program), within-department allocations are based on need.

6.e.2. What information technology resources support faculty and candidates? What evidence shows that candidates and faculty use these resources?

The Curriculum and Technology Center (CTC), located on the Athens campus, contains three state-of-the-art computer labs with PC and Apple capabilities. These computers are refurbished every other year. The CTC is led by an Interim Director who gets strong technology support from the Director of Distance Learning and Online Resources, plus seven graduate students and three undergraduate students who are available for technological support during operating hours.

The environment at McCracken Hall and Ohio University as a whole, provides an additional opportunity for candidates to use technology. Ohio University, including all regional campuses, is a wireless campus so candidates have Internet access in all campus classrooms and offices. Classrooms are outfitted with a variety of technology tools. All of the instructional environments in the College of Education and regional campuses are equipped with an instructor's computer cart, DVD/VCR players, and an LCD projector. Instructors are encouraged to bring their digital materials with them to the classroom on external media, retrieve the material from the University's network storage space, or easily connect their own laptops to the LCD projector. Beyond the two full-size computer labs in McCracken Hall (Athens campus) and the computer labs at each regional campus, instructors also have multiple mobile laptop carts (64 computers) at their disposal to use in classrooms when students require hands-on computer access. As mentioned in a previous response, a full-time Director of Distance Learning and Online Resources with a number of graduate assistants work in the state-of-the-art Curriculum and Technology Center (CTC) for candidate and faculty assistance. Regional campuses each have a minimum of 2 Instructional Technology support personnel. Faculty and candidates are able to check out an array of multimedia devices (e.g., digital audio recorders, digital

cameras, digital video cameras, LCD projectors, laptop computers) from the Center to use in their courses and clinical experiences. The software in computer labs and on classroom computers is commonly found in K-12 schools where candidates have field experiences and students teach. Logs displaying faculty use of the computer labs for classes will be available at the time of the visit. Data have also been collected on weekend usage of the CTC.

Candidates can, and do, use these tools to create educational materials for in-class projects and materials for their field experiences. In addition, the CTC has three SMART Boards, which are located in the Social Studies classroom, Math Lab, and Science Lab.

6.e.3. What resources are available for the development and implementation of the unit's assessment system?

The Unit currently uses LiveText as the primary technological tool to maintain our Unit Assessment System. Resources are available for the Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement to employ one full-time graduate assistant (20 hours per week) and an hourly worker who helps to organize and analyze program and Unit data. Further, monetary resources in the Director of Assessment and Academic Improvement's budget enable both her and the graduate student to attend the annual LiveText conference.

6.e.4. What library and curricular resources exist at the institution? How does the unit ensure they are sufficient and current?

In addition to the resources available in the College of Education, Ohio University offers a variety of state-of-the-art resources for candidates. Alden Library, Ohio University's main library, is a seven-story building constructed between 1966 and 1969. It opened in February 1969 with 550,000 volumes. The east and west wings, added to floors four through seven, were completed in June, 1972. Alden Library's capacity of 1.4 million volumes was exceeded in 1985; the Library Annex opened in 1996 to house lesser used materials. For items that may not be located in the CTC library, a designated librarian from Alden Library is available as a bibliographer and a resource for faculty and candidates in the Unit. Alden Library resources are accessible to all candidates regardless their campus. Further, though independently operated, five libraries are located on Ohio University's regional campuses in Chillicothe, Lancaster, Southern, Eastern, and Zanesville.

Ohio University, including each regional campus, is a part of the Ohio Library and Information Network, Ohio LINK , which is a consortium of Ohio's college and university libraries and the State Library of Ohio. Ohio LINK's membership includes 17 public universities, 23 community/technical colleges, 44 private colleges and the State Library of Ohio. Ohio LINK offers faculty, students, and researchers access to more than 45.3 million library items statewide, 300 electronic research databases, and an electronic journal center containing more than 6,900 scholarly journal titles from 90+ publishers across a wide range of disciplines.

6.e.5. How does the unit ensure the accessibility of resources to candidates, including candidates in off-campus and distance learning programs, through electronic means?

As previously stated, all Ohio University students, including those on regional campuses, have access to Ohio LINK a consortium of Ohio's college and university libraries and the State Library of Ohio as well as have access to the electronic resources at Alden Library. Ohio LINK's membership includes 17 public universities, 23 community/technical colleges, 44 private colleges and the State Library of Ohio. Ohio LINK offers faculty, students, and researchers access to more than 45.3 million library items statewide, 300 electronic research databases, and an electronic journal center containing more than 6,900 scholarly journal titles from 90+ publishers across a wide range of disciplines.

Optional

1.   What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 6?

Communication lay at the heart of three particular areas of strength (UPEP, Workload Policy, and Publications & Website) related to Standard 6. First, as alluded to earlier in this standard, UPEP brings together professional personnel from P-12 schools and faculty and administrators spanning four colleges: Education, Health and Human Services, Fine Arts, and Arts & Sciences. UPEP provides a structure for the planning, delivery, and feedback pertinent to all programs that provide initial and continuing education of teachers and other school professionals. The diversity of perspectives inherent in UPEP greatly enriches the Unit and its path of continuous improvement.

Communication was crucial to the development of the Faculty Workload Policy mentioned in 6.c.1 as approved by the Dean in spring, 2009. Faculty spent well over a year developing the workload policy in a manner that would be consistent with the university's workload policy while simultaneously being in tune with the unique expectations of education-related faculty and incorporating room for negotiation on a year-to-year basis. Faculty communication in developing the policy resulted in a policy with flexibility in which the following are considered as part of workload: contact hours, class size, weighted student credit hours, degree level, graduate student advising, committee membership, service leadership, and research or creative activity.

Finally, the unit does an exceptional job when it comes to publishing brochures to promote programs and events and keeping the website up-to-date. A visit to http://www.coe.ohiou.edu/ provides an easy-to-navigate journey through initial and advanced programs, helpful information to candidates and faculty, and an extensive News & Events section. A quick scroll through http://www.coe.ohiou.edu/news-events/index.htm will show the active, current, and archived nature of the online publications featuring News & Events related to the Unit.

2.   What research related to Standard 6 is being conducted by the unit?

A faculty member is examining the role optimism plays in helping college students overcome academic failure/challenges. First-year students on academic probation at the end of their first quarter were identified, given an Optimism Questionnaire, and tracked over the course of a year to see if optimism related to their subsequent success. The researcher is meeting with Institutional Research to see about the results; if a connection is found, the next step will be to put interventions in place with probationary students to see if optimism-boosting instruction fosters success.

Also, the recently funded $1 million Choose Appalachian Teaching (CAT) scholarship will develop and mentor 75 additional AYA math and science teachers for Southeast Ohio. The project will provide scholarships for first-generation Appalachian Ohio college students to obtain undergraduate degrees with licensure and will prepare and support them to become successful career-long teachers within the 173 school districts of Appalachian Ohio. Ohio University, the lead partner and fiscal agent, will collaborate closely with other colleges and universities in the region and share proven practices across institutions. During 2007-2008, these five institutions formed the Southeast Ohio Teacher Development Collaborative (SEOTDC), and the CAT project will operate within this structure. The CAT scholarship incorporates educational innovation through its use of inquiry for math and science learning and for reflective instructional practice.

The project's intellectual merit arises from the Southeast Ohio Center for Excellence in Mathematics and Science's (SEOCEMS) research in teacher professional development and student STEM learning, focusing on rural Appalachia within the larger context of statewide needs. Scholarships will help to recruit and retain teachers in Ohio's most underserved region. These teachers will increase high school students' access to high-quality, inquiry-based mathematics and science experiences.