



National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

******Report*

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:

Dr. Mark B. Goor
Dr. Gary E. Martin
Ms. Elizabeth A. Mason

State Consultant:

N/A

NEA or AFT Representative:

N/A

Accreditation Visit to:

TEXAS TECH
UNIVERSITY

3008 18th Street
Lubbock, TX 79409-1074
4/26/2009-4/28/2009

Type of Visit:

Focused visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Focused visit - Advanced Preparation

Board of Examiners Report

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Institution:

Texas Tech University

Team Findings:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Standard Met	Standard Met
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
4. Diversity	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
6. Unit Governance and Resources	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Provide a brief overview of the institution and the unit.

Texas Tech University (TTU), founded in 1923, is the largest comprehensive higher education institution in the western two-thirds of the state. TTU is located in Lubbock, population 200,000, in the vast Southern Plains of West Texas. TTU is a major university with a law school and medical school on the same campus. The university, with 28,000 students, is rated a research extensive university by the Carnegie Foundation. Texas Tech was first accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) in 1928 and has been accredited continuously since.

The College of Education, with associated programs in eight other colleges, is the unit for preparation of educators. This unit has been continuously accredited by NCATE since 1963. The unit has 1,516 candidates, with 614 at the undergraduate level and 902 at the graduate level. In spring 2009, 1104 candidates prepared for initial teaching credentials and 202 were enrolled in advanced programs.

The previous NCATE visit in 2007 resulted in “Not Met” for Standard 2 with three areas for improvement: 1. The unit assessment system is not fully developed and implemented; 2. There are no plans to evaluate the assessment system to determine if it is fair, free from bias, and reliable; and 3. Data are not regularly and systematically compiled, summarized and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. The unit was given two years to address the requirements of Standard 2.

According to the University Office of Planning and Assessment, coincidentally, the university received feedback from SACS that the university needed to improve its data collection and use of data for improvement. In response, the university invested significant resources into assessment in the spring of

2008. They purchased software and implemented the use of data for program improvement across all colleges in the university. This offered new resources to the College of Education.

2. Describe the type of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This is an NCATE-only visit with no representation or participation from the state. This is common practice in Texas.

3. Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

This visit focused on Standard 2 only and was conducted by teleconference and video. No visits were made to any campuses. The unit reports that some courses in special education and educational leadership programs are delivered through distance learning. Instructional technology is offered entirely online. Currently, a pilot program in the Texas Hill Country offers undergraduates opportunities to earn certificates in elementary ESL or elementary bilingual education and special education. Department chairs explained that they examine data collected from courses off campus to determine whether candidates in all settings are receiving the same quality instruction.

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

This was a virtual visit. We tested the teleconference twice in order to overcome glitches and incompatibilities of phone systems. By the time of the actual teleconferences, the phone system worked well. TTU presented an institutional orientation through an online site with video, audio, and PowerPoint. The college tech support was excellent in overcoming many challenges, including a disconnect with the NCATE Eluminate site on the day of the presentation.

The TTU NCATE coordinator and dean expressed concern that the virtual systems might not allow the unit to present all of its extensive work to its best advantage. To compensate, the college sent hard copies and discs of everything to the BOE members and communicated frequently.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

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

In an online presentation, the university provided a comprehensive overview of the university history, mission, values, and programs offered to students. Support for this visit was evident from the

participation of the provost, dean, associate dean, certification officer, and NCATE coordinator. The overview emphasized the mission of the institution and its values. The presentation organized around the theme “opening doors to the future.” This theme allowed a presentation of programs, highlights, and strengths.

The university mission was evident in quotes from the first college president. The college mission flows naturally from the university mission. The college mission and vision were approved by the faculty prior to the last NCATE visit. Annually, the COE faculty review the conceptual framework. According to the Assessment Team, two years ago, the faculty decided to shift from the “reflective practitioner” theme to “professionals opening doors.” The college leadership wanted a more proactive approach to its educator preparation and college activities.

Charts show how the program goals are aligned with state and professional goals. Although Texas does not require programs to achieve national recognition, most of the programs have sought recognition from specialized professional associations (SPAs). Two have achieved recognition and the remainder plan to take advantage of the aggregated candidate data now available from the assessment system.

The last NCATE visit included a review of the conceptual framework. The focus of this visit is on the assessment system. The assessment system shows evidence of alignment with the conceptual framework with core values statements; philosophy toward diversity; and concerns for the needs of society, schools, and students. According to the Assessment Team, assessment data are at the foundation of the conceptual framework. The types of data collected and assessment activities are clearly directed toward the values of the college.

III. STANDARDS

In its responses to each standard, the team should indicate when differences exist among the main campus, distance learning programs, and off-campus programs.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1. Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes

No

jñ

jñ

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
--	----------------------

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
---	----------------------

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
---	----------------------

Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
--	----------------------

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

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

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
--	----------------------

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
---	----------------------

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

Student Learning for Other School Professionals

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation

Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Preparation

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

--

Overall Assessment of Standard

--

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

--

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation	<input style="width: 90%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Advanced Preparation	<input style="width: 90%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

--

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 2 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes

No

jn

jn

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

--

2a. Assessment System

Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Assessment System – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit has a comprehensive, systematic assessment system that reflects the conceptual framework and national and state standards. The Educator Preparation Assessment System (EPAS) includes an integrated set of evaluation measures used to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve unit operations and programs. The unit's assessment system was developed in December 2006, with a two-year development and implementation involving software acquisition of TracDat and Digital Measures for assessment of candidate outcomes and faculty productivity and effectiveness. The assessment system is accurately described in the Focused Institutional Report and verified by virtual campus interviews and the 2008 Assessment Report, the 2007-2008 Certification Report, and the Strategic Planning Assessment Report. The EPAS provides for the collection, analysis, and use of data to make decisions about initial and advanced candidates, programs, and unit operations.

The Assessment Team, a diverse group of faculty, administrators, and staff, meets twice per month to evaluate progress on data collection and share findings with all parties in the unit. The Assessment Team is supported by the University Office of Planning and Assessment and the Teacher Education Council (TEC), a council formed by the provost's office that includes representatives from eight other colleges involved in teacher preparation and representatives from local schools. The TEC is given oversight of all education programs, sends reports, gathers feedback, shares best practices, and has the final approval on the assessment system. Other groups evaluating the assessment system include the COE Leadership Council, Faculty Council, and various advisory groups. Evidence of ongoing evaluation and use of data for decisions was found in the Assessment Team minutes and in virtual campus interviews.

The assessment system includes a very comprehensive and integrated set of evaluation measures for assessing candidate performance, faculty effectiveness, and unit operations. Evaluation measures include focus groups, surveys, course and advising evaluations, pre- and post-tests, and graduate and alumni meetings. University faculty and school supervisors periodically assess candidate performance at each transition point, including a mid-year and end-of-the-year program assessment. Advanced programs collect data on courses, content, and applicability of the curriculum. Initial programs collect data on candidate performance from candidate self-assessment, cooperating teachers, and university

supervisors. Data are used to inform decisions on candidate advancement and improve instruction and assessment.

One result of the extensive collection of data by the COE was a finding that candidates were below the national norm on multicultural awareness, skills, and dispositions. Since a key COE goal is diversity and multicultural awareness, this finding resulted in placing awareness and competencies as a top priority in preparation programs. An emphasis on diversity has also resulted in faculty diversity that is much higher than national norms, and effort in meeting the needs of diverse candidates is integrated in course expectations with additions of bilingual faculty and courses taught in Spanish. This commitment to diversity and freedom of bias was evidenced in syllabi, faculty interviews, data tables in the 2008 Assessment Report, and the Texas Education Agency's validation of bias prevention.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

as above

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Initial Teacher Preparation

Acceptable ▼

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Advanced Preparation

Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit collects data at several different times and in several different ways. Assessment reviews are set on an annual to biannual basis. Some of the unit's data collection is based on the academic year, while other data are collected based on the calendar year. Candidates' evaluations of the course and instructor, candidate self-evaluations, as well as program evaluations are collected at the end of each course. These surveys are disaggregated, and the data are stored in a web-based system called TracDat where faculty can access the information. The use of TracDat provides the unit with the ability to consolidate evidence and compile reports in a systematic way, as well as providing a central place for archiving data that can be easily accessed. TaskStream is the web-based system candidates use to upload and maintain their electronic portfolio, and the College of Education (COE) faculty has access to the candidates' work. An Assessment Team consisting of faculty, deans, chairs, the planning and assessment analyst, the coordinator of student teaching, and the Texas Tech University (TTU) certification officer reviews and monitors the collected data regularly to ensure that the information collected is current and complete. The data collection process begins with the Certification Office, which gathers and analyzes data; next, the Assessment Team, the COE Leadership Council, and the Teacher Education Council further analyze the collected data, then publish the Annual Certification Report, which outlines the findings and subsequent actions that may be taken based on those data. Unit changes in programs occur following data collection and analysis by focus groups, surveys, and evaluations. By having all faculty involved in the process, the COE is leading the institution in communicating among all the colleges of the university.

Under the unit's operating policy/procedure (OP), specific guidelines are laid out for handling candidates' formal complaints. Procedures are in place for issues ranging from grading practices to academic regulations concerning candidate performance. Formal complaints are handled through steps beginning with the faculty member involved. If a resolution is not reached then the next level is the department chair or office administrator. If needed, the dean of the college will get involved to attain resolution. At the point of resolution, documentation is placed in the candidate's file.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

as above

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation

Acceptable

Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation

Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit uses a variety of methods to assess candidates' performance while they are in the program. Data from coursework, midterm and end of course evaluations, and informal and formal feedback from supervising teachers during field experiences, as well as results from the state practice exams (TExES), provide candidates with data to help improve their performance. Faculty members receive an annual review that includes candidate feedback from the end-of-course evaluations, which allows faculty to adapt their lessons to increase candidate learning, and also includes a review of the faculty annual report. Through this review process, faculty can use collected data to determine what changes are needed within the program to improve instruction. Changes in unit programs--such as additional courses in the bilingual program, modified instruction in special needs courses, and general refinement of course content--have all occurred as a direct result from the various data collected. For the distance learning programs, more face-to-face time has been added as a reflection of feedback from course evaluations. The COE uses TracDat in evaluating the advanced programs as well. Other data-driven changes include bringing faculty together to change, tweak, or shift courses and instruction to better meet the needs of the candidates. Communication among the faculty and colleges has improved and enhanced development of courses and growth of the programs. Assessment data have helped the special education program in attaining grants and extra funding, as well as providing collected data to the existing funding sources for continuation. Review of the data collected helps pinpoint where an issue may exist; for example, with the course, the instructor, or the program itself. It has provided a standardized manner of putting together the state's standards and allowing the unit to align courses to those standards. According to the Assessment Team, the assessment data are shared with candidates through their TExES data, while faculty and other stakeholders have the annual Certification Report as well as the Strategic Planning Assessment Report to rely on for reviewing the assessment data.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

as above

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has a comprehensive, systematic assessment system that reflects the conceptual framework and national and state standards. Many systems collect a wide range of data. Documents available online and interviews verified all statements in the IR related to the assessment system. The Assessment Team and the Teacher Education Council have worked hard to develop an assessment system that informs faculty and administration about candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The unit uses a variety of methods to assess candidates' performance while they are in the program. Diversity is a key goal, and assessments of candidates' attitudes and competencies led to significant changes in programs. Many committees, departments, and teams review data regularly to monitor progress and improve programs.

There is a high level of faculty buy-in and leadership involvement with assessment.

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

The university embraced the collection and use of data for program improvement in spring 2008, investing significant resources in software and personnel. In this context, the College of Education is seen as a leader and innovator within the university in the use of data collection systems and the use of data to improve programs.

The College of Education has demonstrated a strong commitment to diversity and assisting students from diverse backgrounds through assessment and the use of data to better serve those populations.

The Teacher Education Council reports a collaborative relationship across eight colleges. A sense of community and open communication is evident.

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number &Text	AFI Rationale
1. The unit assessment system is not fully developed and implemented. 2. There are no plans to evaluate the assessment system to determine fairness, freedom from bias, and reliability. 3. Data are not regularly and systematically compiled, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.	The unit has developed a comprehensive assessment system and implemented it systemically. The unit has developed an assessment system and received feedback from many sources about the fairness, freedom from bias, and reliability. Data are now collected regularly and systematically in many data systems that aggregate the data. Many committees, departments, and teams analyze and use the data for program improvement.

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
none	

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
none	

Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 3 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes

No

jñ

jñ

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Advanced Preparation	▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

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

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Advanced Preparation	▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

--

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

Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Initial Teacher Preparation	▼
Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation	▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

--

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

--

Overall Assessment of Standard

--

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

--

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

--	--

Recommendation for Standard 3

Initial Teacher Preparation	<input style="width: 90%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Advanced Preparation	<input style="width: 90%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 4 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes	No
jn	jn

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

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

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input style="width: 90%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Advanced Preparation	<input style="width: 90%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
--	----------------------

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation	<input type="text"/>
---	----------------------

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
---	----------------------

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation	<input type="text"/>
--	----------------------

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

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

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
---	----------------------

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation	<input type="text"/>
--	----------------------

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Overall Assessment of Standard

--

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

--

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 4

Initial Teacher Preparation	<input style="width: 90%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Advanced Preparation	<input style="width: 90%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

--

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty

performance and facilitates professional development.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 5 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes

No

jñ

jñ

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

Empty text box for explanation.

5a. Qualified Faculty

Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation	<input type="text"/>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Empty text box for findings.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation	<input type="text"/>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Empty text box for findings.

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation	<input type="text"/>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Empty text box for findings.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Blue horizontal bar at the bottom of the page.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation	<input type="text"/>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation	<input type="text"/>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation	<input type="text"/>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Overall Assessment of Standard

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

--	--

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs:

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 5

Initial Teacher Preparation	<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Advanced Preparation	<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

--

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources
The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 6 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)

Yes	No
jñ	jñ

If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.

--

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

Unit Leadership and Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Unit Leadership and Authority – Advanced Preparation	<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced

Preparation):

6b. Unit Budget

Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation	<input type="text"/>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

6c. Personnel

Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
Personnel – Advanced Preparation	<input type="text"/>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

6d. Unit Facilities

Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation	<input type="text"/>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

6e. Unit Resources including Technology

Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation	<input type="text"/>
Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation	<input type="text"/>

Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Overall Assessment of Standard

--

Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]

--

Areas for Improvement and Rationales

AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

Recommendation for Standard 6

Initial Teacher Preparation	<input style="width: 90%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Advanced Preparation	<input style="width: 90%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]

--

IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

You may either type the sources of evidence and persons interviewed in the text boxes below or

upload files using the prompt at the end of the page.

Documents Reviewed

see uploaded sources of evidence

Persons Interviewed

see uploaded persons interviewed

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

Sources of evidence
Persons interviewed

See **Attachments** panel below.

(Optional) State Addendum: