



National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

***** *Report*

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:

Dr. Barbara L. Nourie
Dr. Paula Summers Calderon
Dr. B. Joyce Stallworth
Mr. Bob Thesman
Mrs. Paula K. Davidson
Dr. Timothy Letzring

State Consultant:

Ms. Patricia L. Hardy

NEA or AFT Representative:

Mr. Andrew F. Morrill

Accreditation Visit to:

NORTHERN ARIZONA
UNIVERSITY

P.O.Box 5774

Flagstaff, AZ 86011

3/28/2009-4/1/2009

Type of Visit:

First visit - Initial Teacher Preparation

First visit - Advanced Preparation

Board of Examiners Report

SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Institution:

Northern Arizona University

Team Findings:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Standard Met	Standard Met
2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Standard Met	Standard Met
3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Standard Met	Standard Met
4. Diversity	Standard Met	Standard Met
5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Standard Met	Standard Met
6. Unit Governance and Resources	Standard Met	Standard Met

Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

I. INTRODUCTION

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

Northern Arizona University is located in Flagstaff, a town founded in 1894 as a stop along a pioneer trail. Flagstaff, the largest city in northern Arizona, is the county seat for Coconino County, the second largest county by area in the 48 contiguous states. Northern Arizona University (NAU) is classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a large, comprehensive doctoral, high undergraduate, primarily residential university with a high level of research activity. Founded in 1899 as Northern Arizona Normal School, the school was renamed Northern Arizona State Teachers' College in 1925 and renamed again Arizona State Teachers' College at Flagstaff in 1929. In 1966, the college received university status and became Northern Arizona University. NAU was re-accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association in 2007. According to the NAU website ("at a glance"), with 809 faculty members, NAU serves a student population of approximately 22,500 (16,787 of whom are undergraduates) at its campus in Flagstaff and at 37 sites across the state. Of the student body, 24 percent are classified as ethnic minorities, according to the IR. NAU offers 93 undergraduate, 46 master's and eight doctoral degrees. NAU is one of three public universities in the state, along with the University of Arizona and Arizona State University.

The mission of the university is to: "Provide an outstanding undergraduate residential education strengthened by research, graduate and professional programs, and sophisticated methods of distance learning." The seven strategic goals of the university are: (1) learning centered education; (2) student access, learning, persistence, and affordability; (3) sustainability and stewardship of place; (4) global engagement; (5) a culture of inclusion; (6) a commitment to Native Americans; and (7) innovative, effective, and accountable practices.

The professional education unit (PEU) spans four colleges (Education; Engineering, Forestry and Natural Sciences; Arts and Letters; and Health and Human Services) and 15 departments across the university. The unit offers 35 initial programs, plus an additional two (mathematics and science) certification-only programs for individuals with a bachelor's degree through AZUN – the Arizona University Network. Interviews confirmed, however, that most candidates in the AZUN programs do complete an M.S.Ed. as well. Of the 37 initial certification programs, 20 are at the undergraduate level and 17 are at the master's degree level. The unit lists career and technical education (CTE) (business, family and consumer sciences, and industrial technology) as a single program, but the total count reflects each of the CTE programs separately. In addition, the unit lists the bilingual multicultural education (BME) program, with bilingual and ESL emphases, as an initial program at the master's level, but for this report the BME program is included in advanced programs for teachers.

The unit offers five advanced programs for teachers (elementary, secondary, science, BME, and ECE); five advanced OSP programs at the master's level (principalship, one technology, school psychology, school counseling, speech pathology), three advanced programs for OSP as a post-degree certificate (two in educational leadership, one in educational technology), and three doctoral degrees for OSP (one in educational leadership, one in curriculum and instruction, and one in school psychology). The IR does not list the doctoral degrees.

The team found the most consistency across faculty numbers in the FY 2008 NCATE institutional report. That report lists 117 full-time faculty (COE) in the unit, five full-time in the unit (COE) with no teaching assignment, 513 part-time faculty (supervisors) in the unit, and three graduate teaching assistants, plus 36 full-time faculty in the university/part-time in the unit in secondary education and ten part-time faculty in secondary 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 was an NCATE-only visit, with one representative from the Arizona Department of Education attending along with a representative of the Arizona Education Association serving as an observer of the process. There were no deviations from the state protocol.

Prior to the late 1980s, NAU, Arizona State University, and the University of Arizona were NCATE accredited. According to historical memory, a change in leadership across the three universities coupled with financial concerns resulted in all three universities withdrawing from the NCATE accreditation process. Current State Board rules for the professional preparation approval process were adopted by the Arizona State Board of Education in summer 2006. NAU's Flagstaff campus initial professional preparation site visit occurred October 22-24, 2006 with State Board approval under the "new" rules granted April 23, 2007.

NAU is the first of all Arizona institutions to return to the NCATE process. The president of NAU, who also sits on the Arizona State Board of Education, emphasized how important he believes this accreditation is for the university and for the children of Arizona whose teachers are prepared in institutions of higher education in the state and many of whose teachers are prepared at NAU.

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

The team talked with candidates and faculty from several off-campus sites at the Saturday afternoon showcase, through two-way video conferencing, and by telephone conference calls. The large numbers

of off-campus sites, however, prohibited interviews with representatives from all sites. The Office of Extended Campuses/Distance Learning provides a director for each off-campus site and handles faculty hires for those sites, in consultation with the unit. Expenses, including salaries, for off-campus sites are also covered by this office.

According to the preconditions document, NAU offers professional education programs at these off-site campuses: Apache Junction; Yavapai/Prescott; Bullhead City; Chandler-Gilbert/Phoenix; Chinle; East Valley/Phoenix; Fort Defiance; Ganado; Glendale/Phoenix; Globe; Holbrook; Kayenta; Keams Canyon; Kingman; Lake Havasu City; Mesa/Phoenix; Nogales; North Valley/Phoenix; Page; Paradise Valley/Phoenix; Payson; Prescott; Scottsdale/Phoenix; Show Low; Signal Peak; South Mountain/Phoenix; Tuba City; Tucson; Tucson North; Verde Valley; West Valley; West Valley/Phoenix; Whiteriver; and Yuma. Data for off-campus programs other than Tucson and Phoenix are often grouped as “rural.”

Four programs are offered only through distance learning technologies: the advanced educational technology facilitator program, the advanced educational technology leader program, the initial career and technical B.S.Ed. program, and the initial career and technical M.Ed. program. Other programs are delivered through a combination of online, interactive television, and face-to-face classrooms at distance sites. The team collected information about these programs through two-way video interviews and telephone conversations. In addition the AZUN certification programs in science and mathematics are also online programs.

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

There were no unusual circumstances that affected the visit.

NCATE received one letter of third-party testimony from a second grade teacher who participates in an “incredible partnership program” with the College of Education at NAU. The writer’s students (all white) participate in the Fridays on-campus program, working with NAU candidates and with children from other second grade classrooms with large numbers of Spanish-speaking and Native American students. The writer describes the partnership as “win/win” for all stakeholders.

The team noted that the IR was a total of 141 pages, not including all attachments or all embedded tables.

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 brief, the history of the development of the conceptual framework is that the administrative team learned of the need for a conceptual framework at an NCATE workshop in September 2004. The College of Education Standing Committee on College Priorities (SCCP) agreed, in January 2005, to take a leadership role in assisting with the development of the conceptual framework. On March 20, 2005, the unit's vision, mission, and philosophy statements were distributed as a web-based survey to all secondary education faculty members in the unit. In September 2005 the framework was shared with the NCATE Steering Committee, a university-wide committee appointed by the provost. In June 2006, the framework was submitted to the Arizona State Board of Education as part of materials required for the new state program approval process. Exhibit CF 2 summarizes the development of the framework with some inconsistencies in the timeline; faculty members from across the unit describe the development process as "iterative" and "re-iterative; they feel that their input was sought and considered.

The vision statement for the unit is: "We develop educational leaders who create tomorrow's opportunities." The mission is to prepare competent and committed professionals who will make positive differences for children, young adults, and others in schools. This is consistent with the university mission: "to provide outstanding undergraduate education strengthened by research, graduate, and professional programs and sophisticated methods of distance delivery."

The unit also has developed a guiding image: at the center of the image is the statement, "Learning professionals committed to student success in changing environments." At the initial meeting with the team, the head of the unit explained that "learning professionals" has a dual meaning: professionals in the field of learning and professionals who are learning. The guiding image includes eight principles, in a circle, so there is no particular priority. The principles include: innovation and inquiry; technology; field-based experiences blended with theory and personal reflection; active engagement, learner-centered experiences, increasing responsibility for their own learning, and effective modeling; understanding human development; the idea that learning professionals must be confident, open to new ideas and cultures, ethical and caring (the dispositions); strong content knowledge; and the idea that education is a process of growth that enables democratic life to thrive and provide opportunities for individuals and communities to flourish.

Unit faculty embrace the dignity and inherent worth of all people in the central role of education in a democratic society. The educational leaders developed in the unit "gain their authority through thoughtful and ethical actions, which include problem-posing and solving, the use of evidence in decision making, advocacy for all learners, and seeking opportunities for personal growth. Faculty members further believe that effective educators must have strong content background, professional competence, and dispositions to be confident, open-minded, ethical, and empathic.

The university has articulated values that include: excellence in education, student success, educational access, diversity, integrity, and civility. The unit embraces these values along with core values for the unit: learner-centered education, commitment to diversity, innovation and inquiry, advocacy, and life-long learning.

Initial and advanced programs in professional education are designed: (1) to prepare candidates who will effectively serve as professionals in existing education organizations; (2) to prepare professionals who will lead education organizations in ongoing improvement; (3) to further the development of knowledge through the synergistic relationship between professional preparation programs and innovation and inquiry; and (4), to serve education organizations through preparing personnel and providing relevant knowledge.

The unit has articulated goals for all programs. Goals for initial programs are: (1) to prepare professionals with the content knowledge necessary to enhance student learning; (2) to prepare

professionals with the skills needed to enhance student learning; and (3), to prepare professionals with the dispositions needed to be confident, open-minded, ethical, and empathic practitioners. Goals for advanced programs are: (1) to prepare professionals with the content knowledge to function effectively in their professional role; (2) to prepare professionals with the skills necessary to function effectively in their professional role; and (3), to prepare professionals with the dispositions needed to be confident, open-minded, ethical, and empathic practitioners.

The conceptual framework is aligned with the unit assessment system and with individual program standards. Conversations with candidates indicated that some, but not all, were able to articulate the overriding theme of developing educational leaders who create tomorrow's opportunities. Faculty members, on the other hand, were typically well aware of the framework. School-based faculty, however, were not as familiar with the terminology of the framework. The unit provided a template for syllabi, and most syllabi acknowledged the vision statement.

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.

Information collected through the onsite process was used to correct, update, and supplant information from the institutional report. There were inconsistencies in the numbers of programs as well as in which programs were considered advanced for teachers and which were advanced for other school professionals. Doctoral programs were not included in the IR.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation

Acceptable ▼

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation

Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit offers 37 programs at the initial level. Of those 37 programs, two are nationally accredited by NASM and 30 were submitted to specialized professional associations (SPAs) for review. Among those programs submitted, the unit received national recognition for the following programs: (1, 2) biology education at the bachelor's and master's levels; (3, 4) chemistry education at the bachelor's and master's levels; (5, 6) earth science education at the bachelor's and master's levels; (7, 8) elementary education at the bachelor's and master's levels; (9, 10, 11) English education at the bachelor's and two at the master's level; (12, 13) physical science education at the bachelor's and master's levels; (14, 15) physics education at the bachelor's and master's levels, and (16) the AZUN post-degree program in science. The unit received national recognition with conditions for the (17) early childhood education program at the bachelor's level program, (18) dual major in elementary education/special education; (19) French education at the bachelor's level; (20) German education at the bachelor's level; (21) mathematics education at the bachelor's level; (22) physical education at the bachelor's level; (23, 24) social studies education at the bachelor's and master's levels; (25) Spanish education at the bachelor's level; and (26) special education with certification at the master's level. The unit was not recognized for programs in (27) French education at the master's level, (28) German education at the master's level, (29) physical education at the master's level, and (30) Spanish education at the master's level. Feedback in SPA reports suggested a general lack of data to support stated results of candidate performance assessments. Finally, the unit provided limited evidence that it is in the process of revising programs in response to conditions and further development requirements cited in SPA reports. This information is based on Table 2 Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status: An Addendum (an additional document provided during the visit).

Programs with State Board approval are (31, 32) art education at the bachelors and master's levels and three programs (33,34) at both undergraduate and graduate levels in career and technical education: business education, family and consumer science education, and industrial technology education at the bachelor's and master's levels; and (35), the post-degree AZUN program in mathematics education. (36, 37) Music education at the bachelor's and master's levels is accredited by NASM.

One trend in SPA reports was that initial programs offered at the undergraduate level and at the graduate level were exactly the same. Interviews suggested that the NAU graduate council mandates that courses which are co-convened for both undergraduate candidates and graduate candidates must reflect a 30 percent difference in requirements. That difference was not reflected in SPA reports. Although both elementary education programs were nationally recognized, the reviewers noted that the exact same assessments and rubrics were used at both levels and that there was no culminating experience other than student teaching for candidates at the master's level. Reviewers noted that content evidence and content knowledge was insufficient for the graduate program in social studies, particularly in culture and diversity. Of particular concern, however, were the programs offered at the graduate level in modern languages and in physical education; both graduate level programs were determined to need further development beyond the same programs offered at the undergraduate level. For modern languages, the report for the graduate program referred reviewers to the baccalaureate level program. For physical education, the report written by the program states: "The courses master's candidates take in physical education are the same as those required for undergraduate candidates," although in other areas of the report different course requirements were noted. Another confusion in this area was in requirements in physical education and in health education. For Assessment #1 in physical education, there is an open book exam consisting of 23 questions; only 75 percent of candidates passed on their initial attempt. In sum, there is concern about rigor for graduate level initial certification, particularly in modern languages and in physical education.

The unit presented data from the Arizona Educational Proficiency Assessment (presented in Table 4 on page 15 of the IR) for initial candidates in the elementary education, early childhood education, special education, and most secondary subject areas. Additional state licensure data are located in Standard 1.03

tables under 13 Standards. These data show that candidates have sufficient content knowledge. The pass rates for all programs except business education were above 80 percent; the business education pass rate was 67 percent. These findings are consistent with other unit data from key assessments of content knowledge including course-based assignments such as portfolios, student teaching work samples, scope and sequence projects, exit surveys, and employer surveys. There exists no content knowledge examination for physical education, family and consumer science, earth science, and career and technical education. The unit presented some data, primarily through course-based performance indicators, to show that candidates in those programs demonstrate sufficient content knowledge. Additional data which show that these candidates have sufficient content knowledge are located in Standard 1.02 tables under 13 Standards.

Data from the 2008 teacher alumni survey (presented in table 1A.6.1) indicate that 87 percent of unit graduates believe their programs effectively prepared them in their content fields. More specifically, 88 percent of these graduates believed that their programs taught them the "central concepts of their subject areas." However, these data were not disaggregated, and the response rate was only 8.7 percent. Data from the 2008 employer survey indicate that 62 percent of school administrators (based on 216 responses) believe that unit graduates demonstrated above average or outstanding content knowledge and ability to plan instruction.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

The IR states that the unit offers advanced teacher preparation programs in elementary education, secondary education, and science teaching. Information gained onsite through interviews and documents suggest that there are also advanced programs in bilingual/multicultural education and early childhood education. The bilingual/multicultural education program received national recognition through the SPA process. The other programs all have State Board approval. The unit offers five programs at the advanced level. Of those five programs, bilingual/multicultural education has received national recognition.

While there are few common assessments across programs, practicing teachers in advanced level programs demonstrate their content knowledge through a variety of "signature assignments" in courses and through capstone projects, curriculum projects, oral presentations, portfolios, oral examinations, and action research projects.

Advanced teacher education candidates must maintain a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher in all graduate coursework. Additionally, candidates must perform at acceptable levels measured through rubrics on the "signature assignments," action research projects, and in "connection courses" which are used to assess their content knowledge. Some programs including the master of arts in science teaching require oral examinations as measures of content knowledge. Few quantitative data were presented to verify the outcomes of these key assessments. However, anecdotal evidence was provided by faculty during interviews to show that candidates consistently meet or exceed standards related to content knowledge. As a specific example from interviews, faculty in the science teaching program, secondary education program, and elementary education program all report that 100 percent of their advanced teacher candidates were successful on measures of content knowledge during the 2008 academic year. Further, graduation data suggest that advanced teacher candidates are successful in these assessments as they progress through the programs to graduation.

According to the IR (pages 18 - 19), survey results indicate that graduates possess sufficient content knowledge. Data from the teacher alumni survey indicate that 87 percent of graduates believe that they were adequately prepared in the content area/subject area in which they were currently teaching (Exhibit

1A.6.1). Likewise, 88 percent of these respondents reported that they understood the central concepts of the subject areas for which they teach (Exhibit 1A. 6.1). Among the 8,700 survey requests sent, the response rate was only 8.7 percent. There were no specific data provided from employers of advanced teacher candidates.

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates in initial programs which have national recognition demonstrate their pedagogical content knowledge through assessments of lesson plan components, scope and sequence projects, and student teaching evaluations, as reported in SPA reports. Feedback from SPA reports indicates, however, a general lack of data to illustrate results of assessments of candidate performance. Candidates in initial programs which do not have national recognition (i.e., art, family and consumer science, and career and technical education) are assessed by measures similar to those listed above. For example, the family and consumer sciences and career and technical education faculty member presented an extensive 2006 – 2008 program evaluation report during a faculty interview (labeled Additional Exhibit 1). Sufficient data were included in this report to show evidence that these candidates demonstrated appropriate pedagogical content knowledge. For example, two assessments are used to measure candidates' knowledge. Data show that all candidates (N = 5) in these programs met standards delineated in the two common assessments (pages 15 - 17 in Additional Exhibit 1).

During student teaching, candidates are assessed in the following areas: designing and planning instruction, creating and maintaining a positive learning environment, implementing and managing instruction, and assessing learning and communicating results. Data from these assessments show that 100 percent of those candidates demonstrate pedagogical content competency by scoring a 2 (meets standard) or above in each area. Finally, 94 percent of initial program candidates passed the 2008 AEPA Professional Knowledge Examination.

Data from 2008 surveys support these findings as follows: among 393 teacher candidates surveyed, 83.6 percent indicate a higher than moderate degree of planning ability (Exhibit 1B.4.1) and 76.2 percent indicate a higher than moderate degree of instructional abilities (Exhibit 1B.4.1). Among the teacher alumni surveyed, 81 percent believed they were adequately or well prepared to plan and instruct; no N was provided (Exhibit 1B.4.2). Among 104 employers surveyed, 54.81 percent indicated that graduates were above average or outstanding compared to other non-graduates in the area of planning and instructional practices (Exhibit 1B.4.3). Additional data which show that candidates have sufficient pedagogical content knowledge and skills are located in Standard 1.02 tables under 13 Standards.

Candidates in elementary education, special education, and secondary education demonstrate their ability to integrate technology through educational technology courses. For elementary and special education, the course-based assessment changed beginning in fall 2008, when candidates began completing a professional technology portfolio which includes selected artifacts and assignments that best illustrates their abilities to identify and allocate technology resources; evaluate them for accuracy and suitability; apply technology to increase productivity; and identify and use technology resources. Data show that 95 percent of these candidates met or exceeded the technology requirements (IR page

22). These data on technology expertise were confirmed through syllabus review, candidate artifacts, portfolios, field-based projects, and interviews. Secondary education candidates complete a classroom newsletter; specific technology requirements and data supporting these elements were not described. No information was listed for candidates in other initial programs.

In student teaching, all candidates were required to show their abilities to use technology and a variety of instructional resources appropriately. Candidate work samples show that among the 671 candidates evaluated during the spring and fall 2008, 97 percent used technology appropriately. One hundred percent of these candidates used a variety of instructional resources appropriately.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Advanced program candidates exhibit comprehensive understandings of content and apply theories related to teaching and learning through their work in course-based “signature curriculum assignments,” school-based projects/action research projects, final presentations, and portfolios. The curriculum assignment seemed to be the key assessment of candidates’ abilities and is aligned to appropriate NBPTS propositions. According to the IR, 98 to 100 percent of all advanced teacher candidates met or exceeded the criteria for each NBPTS element.

Further, candidates in advanced programs take 12–24 hours of pedagogical coursework (depending on the education or content emphasis) and must maintain a 3.0 GPA in all coursework to graduate. Graduation rates show a high success rate, and anecdotal data from interviews with faculty and candidates corroborated the success of advanced teacher program graduates relative to their abilities to use instructional strategies and technologies which facilitate student learning.

The candidates’ abilities to integrate technology seamlessly are demonstrated and embedded into the curriculum project. Candidates purposely use technology in planning, instruction, student evaluation, and lesson and teaching evaluations throughout their programs.

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

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit assesses candidates’ professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills through course-based assignments and experiences. No consistent unit-wide assessments were presented. However, descriptions of assessments for secondary, elementary, special, bilingual/multicultural, and early childhood education programs were presented; evidence for physical education was aggregated within secondary education statistics. The family and consumer sciences and career and technical education faculty member presented an extensive 2006 – 2008 program evaluation report during a faculty interview (labeled Additional Exhibit 1). Sufficient data were included in this report to show evidence that these candidates demonstrated appropriate professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. For example, three assessments are used to measure candidates’ pedagogical skills. Data show that all candidates (N=5) demonstrated competency on those assessments.

In the other initial programs, candidates demonstrate their knowledge and skills in a "signature assignment" using key assessments in their educational psychology course. The educational psychology assignment uses a key assessment which requires candidates to apply accurately concepts from behavioral, cognitive, motivation, and human development theories to develop strategies to manage specific student situations portrayed in four vignettes. Data provided indicate that overall, 195 candidates (87%) demonstrated a solid understanding of behavioral, motivation, and cognitive learning and human development theories (IR page 26). Data presented show 80 percent and higher rates of understanding the elements. N's were provided by item.

Assessments of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills also occur during student teaching. Candidates complete work samples which are uploaded into Task Stream and are assessed to determine the extent to which candidates can engage in professional development, engage in collaborative conversations with colleagues, and consider various types of diversity among students when conducting instruction. The work samples are also assessed to determine the extent to which candidates design and plan instruction, create and maintain a positive learning environment, implement and manage instruction, assess learning, and communicate results. Summaries of work samples show that candidates meet or exceed all measures.

Data from the 2008 surveys support these findings as follows: the exit survey (Exhibit 1C.3.1) indicates that overall, 389 teacher candidates in early childhood, special education, elementary education, and secondary education believed they were well prepared in four measures of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Employers (N=104; Exhibit 1C.3.3) consistently scored graduates above average or outstanding along several measures including student growth (59%), collaboration (63%), management of records (52%), equity (56%), and reflection (46%). Finally, the survey section, Teacher Alumni Preparation in Professional Skills (Exhibit 1C.3.2), indicates that 434 graduates believe they were adequately or well prepared in the following areas: student growth (64.8%), collaboration (73.6%), management of records (64.8%), equity (60.8%), and reflection (76%).

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

The unit did not present evidence that it assesses advanced teacher candidates using consistent unit-wide measures. There was evidence that the various advanced programs assess their candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in "signature assignments" appropriate for the various content teaching fields. According to the IR (page 27), requirements for these assignments are aligned to National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) propositions. For example, the advanced elementary education candidates demonstrate their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills specifically in assignments where key assessments are used to measure skills based on the NBPTS from the middle childhood/generalist propositions 4, 8, and 10–11 and early adolescence/generalist propositions 6, 8–10, and 12. Candidates' knowledge and skills relevant to these propositions are evaluated through a curricular unit plan project and a culminating presentation project. These projects require that the candidates demonstrate competency in selected NBPTS components. No specific data were presented to explain the outcomes of these key assessments. However, the IR reports that 85 candidates were assessed using NBPTS propositions aligned to "signature assignments" across all programs. Ninety-nine percent of candidates met or exceeded criteria except for reflection/reflective practice. For reflection, 87 percent of the candidates met or exceeded it. These data were in part substantiated through interviews with faculty and via candidate presentations.

According to the IR (page 28), surveys show advanced teacher candidates met or exceeded standards of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Several indicators of the knowledge and skills were

used as questions on alumni and employer surveys. In Exhibit 1C.3.2, results on the teacher alumni survey show 60 percent of the respondents believed that they possessed appropriate knowledge and skills. Employers also rated the graduates highly (Exhibit 1C.3.3). Both surveys combine initial and advanced teacher program graduates.

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates in initial programs which have national recognition demonstrate their abilities to assess and analyze student learning, make adjustments, monitor student learning, and implement meaningful learning experiences through portfolios, course-based “signature assignments,” field based assignments, scope and sequence projects, and portfolios. Additionally, student teaching unit plans and work samples are uploaded into Task Stream and evaluated by appropriate program faculty. These processes and measures were corroborated through faculty and candidate interviews. Candidates in programs without national recognition are assessed in similar ways including candidate work samples (e.g., Exhibit 3C.5.1).

Candidates demonstrate their abilities to impact student learning by completing work samples in student teaching. The work samples include ways in which candidates assess prior knowledge and collect pre-assessment information; plan instruction and include the specific standards and objectives targeted; design instruction/teaching based on the pre-assessment data; make appropriate instructional decisions; plan and implement post assessments and document results; analyze the post assessment information; and reflect on their teaching effectiveness. Additionally in student teaching, candidates are assessed on their abilities to adapt instruction and incorporate strategies based on developmental levels; prior knowledge; and physical, mental, social, cultural, and community differences among learners.

Candidates in the art and career and technical programs demonstrate their ability to impact student learning in student teaching by assessing students' prior knowledge, planning and implementing instruction based on those assessments aligned to targeted standards and objectives, completing and analyzing post assessments, and reflecting on teaching effectiveness (as an example, see Additional Exhibit 1). Data from work samples indicate that these candidates met and exceeded standards for this project. For example, in the area of ongoing analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions, 14 candidates were assessed. Using a four-point rubric, nine candidates assessed scored a 3; four scored a 2; and one scored a 1 (Exhibit 1D1.1).

Survey data from 2008 support these conclusions as follows: student teachers responded to seven measures concerning their abilities to foster learning among their students. The responses indicate that they were moderately prepared. For example, 77.4 percent (N = 185) of elementary majors fostered holistic learning, as did 67 percent (N=20) of early childhood majors, 73.33 percent (N = 31) of special education/elementary education dual majors, and 55.74 percent (N= 67) of secondary majors. Results for the remaining measures can be accessed at Exhibit 1D.3.1. The Teacher Alumni Survey (Exhibit 1D.3.2) asked graduates to rate their levels of preparedness on seven measures of impact on student learning. For example, relative to graduates' abilities to teach according to students' needs, 69 percent (N = 286) of elementary education, 75 percent (N = 52) of special education, and 69 percent (N = 95) of

secondary education graduates believed they were adequately or well prepared. Finally, the Employer Student Learning Responses Survey (Exhibit 1D.3.3) indicate that, at a rate of 88 percent and higher, employers perceived unit graduates to be average or above average in six of seven areas. Only 56 percent of them perceived unit graduates average or above average in the area of adapting instructional strategies. Additionally, comments from administrators during interviews suggested that principals believe program graduates have a positive impact on student learning.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

The unit provided evidence that advanced teacher candidates impact student learning through capstone courses (ECI 675 and ECI 649) which all candidates take. The candidates complete a unit project which they are required to teach in their classrooms. In the first course, the candidates must create a unit which includes the following: (a) a pre-assessment of students; (b) an analysis of the student work which includes how the candidate actually used the student information to inform her teaching; (c) a lesson plan that was modified to address student learning based pre-assessments and analyses; (d) a post assessment of student learning; and (e) an analysis and reflection of the materials and resources in terms of how it informs the candidate's teaching and her students' learning. In the second course, candidates are required to address questions of individual student differences and diversity. They must include how their student demographics and needs are changing as well as the academic climate. This theme is included in the final essay or PowerPoint.

Successful completion of this project provides evidence to the faculty that candidates can plan effectively and appropriately for all students in their class and can create positive learning environments that meet the needs of their students.

Summary data from 2008 (from Exhibits 1.2b02., 1.2b04. and 1D2.1) show candidates (N = 85) demonstrated the ability to impact student learning. Candidates either met (i.e., score of 2) or exceeded (i.e. score of 3) on all measures required in the capstone courses.

Surveys (from Exhibit 1D.3.1) indicate that candidates believed they were prepared to impact student learning. For example, 73 percent of elementary graduates consistently reported being well prepared. Employers shared this same perspective, as 88 percent of them rated unit graduates as average or above average in each indicator of impact (Exhibit 3D.3.3).

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Acceptable 

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Doctoral programs were not included in the IR. According to the website, the unit offers an Ed.D. in educational leadership. One of the three tracks to this degree "focuses on administration at the K-12 and Community College/Higher Education levels." The unit also offers an Ed.D. in curriculum and instruction which "is appropriate if you are seeking advanced preparation in teaching and learning and wish to prepare for professional leadership and participation in public or private schools, community colleges, universities, and other agencies." The NCATE coordinator had been advised in telephone conversations with staff at NCATE that including these programs in the review would not be necessary. The unit offers a Ph.D. in educational psychology - school psychology emphasis, a 109-hour program

that prepares a candidate to “function as a well-rounded generalist in school psychology, a trainer of other school psychologists, and/or as a researcher.” This program is fully approved by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) through 2011 (first approved in 1998). The team did conduct an interview, arranged by the NCATE coordinator, with the department chair. The chair shared the program of studies, a three-year program followed by an additional one-year paid internship, and the use of TaskStream for candidate assessment throughout the program. The chair suggests that this program would readily qualify for APA accreditation.

The unit offers a program leading to the principal certificate in educational leadership. This program is to respond to a conditions report to ELCC by February 2010. Concerns included lack of disaggregated data by delivery site and lack of information on how candidates who are not doing well are remediated. In addition, inter-rater reliability for the 24 different sites at which the program is offered was not addressed in the initial report submission. The program has an 80 percent pass rate on the state licensure test. The unit also offers a master’s in educational leadership for building-level administrators. This program is also responding to conditions cited in the initial ELCC review; data for the principal certificate program were not disaggregated from data for this master’s program. The same concerns apply. Finally, the unit offers a master’s degree in educational leadership for district-level administrators. Again, the program is revising its report in response to conditions cited by ELCC; the report is due September 15, 2009. Concerns expressed by the reviewers included that data were unclear and that assignments and assessments were the same for those in the building-level program in some instances. Data for building-level program candidates were not disaggregated from data for district-level candidates. Alumni in the principal, superintendent, and educational technology programs were surveyed regarding overall effectiveness of their programs. While responses were generally positive, the response rate was 6.6%.

The Arizona Educational Proficiency Assessment (AEPA) is required for licensure of principals and superintendents, but not for completion of programs. Of the 205 candidates who took the principal test, 88% passed. Of the 20 candidates who took the superintendent test, 100% passed. The internship evaluation assesses candidates on the areas of knowing students, families and communities. Using data and research to inform practice and using technology are both also assessed during the internship.

The unit offers a certificate in Educational Technology for the Technology Facilitator and a master’s degree in Educational Technology for the Technology Leader. Both of these programs are recognized by ISTE. There is no state licensure test. Reviewers suggested that it was unclear how candidates in the technology facilitator program assist teachers in using technology to improve learning. The ISTE reviewers commended the reports for both programs as a model for others to follow in the use of data. ISTE standards require that candidates are assessed on their ability to use technology and ability to use research and data to inform practice. Candidates are typically (84%) at the expert level, with others at “master” (11%) or “novice” (5%) levels.

The School Psychologist program is nationally recognized by NASP. The NASP report in Spring 2006 categorizes this as a Specialist program, but the department website clearly states that this is a master’s program with certification. The program is fully approved by NASP and nationally recognized by NCATE for the period January 1, 2007- December 31, 2011. A summary of areas for improvement included: “The program appears to prepare school psychologists for a more ‘traditional’ role... The practicum and internship evaluation measures are too generic to ensure that the broad range of skills required by the NASP domains is assessed adequately... If a course in diversity issues is not required, then infusion of content and training throughout the curriculum is all-the-more important... The program is encouraged to make the modifications in the curriculum in areas of intervention, family systems, and crisis intervention.” This program requires PRAXIS scores for admission.

CACREP accredits the School Counselor program. The on-site visitation for accreditation took place June 5-8, 2005. One concern for the reviewers regarded group counseling. Another concern was that “in emphasizing ‘service provider’ rather than ‘program delivery,’ faculty do not provide students with the opportunity to acquire both knowledge and skills in the areas of program development.” All other standards were met.

ASHA accredits the Clinical Speech Pathology program. At its February 2009 meeting the Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology took action to “remove probation” and “accredit (for) eight years.” Areas for improvement included completing faculty search

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

Student Learning for Other School Professionals

Acceptable

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Alumni in the principal, superintendent, and educational technology programs were surveyed regarding creating positive learning environments for students. While responses were generally positive and candidates from all programs felt prepared, the response rate was 6.6%.

For the school psychologist program, the NASP review stated: “Likewise, the portfolio requirements and scoring rubrics should be examined to assure that required cases reflect a range of practice consistent with NASP standards and program goals, and that candidates are assessed in their ability to provide services that positively impact students and other clients.”

For this element, the IR states that “all of our other school professionals programs have undergone national review,” referring to school psychology, school counseling, and speech pathology (p. 34). No additional information regarding “student learning for other school professionals” was available.

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation

Acceptable

Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Preparation

Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit has developed four key dispositions—confidence, openness, ethics, and empathy—for all candidates, which are aligned with its conceptual framework, vision, mission, guiding image, and philosophy (Exhibit CF b). Further, the dispositions reflect national and state standards and are embedded in coursework, field experiences, and clinical practice. Interviews with candidates suggest uneven knowledge of the tenets of the conceptual framework, but that those dispositions are discussed in some courses. Further, some candidates described dispositional feedback they have received prior to student teaching. In all initial programs, however, dispositions among initial candidates are assessed twice during student teaching. Candidates are assessed on seven dispositional indicators by both their cooperating teacher and university supervisor at the midpoint and final using the "Student Teaching Evaluation Form" (Exhibit 1.9a02 under Std. 1.09). Some programs are piloting assessment instruments

at transition points prior to student teaching, but there is no evidence that dispositions are consistently and regularly assessed prior to student teaching.

The summary data on the Disposition Evaluation of Initial Candidates by Program Grade Level (Exhibit 1G.2.3) indicate that the majority of candidates demonstrated competency in each key disposition as illustrated by their performance on the seven indicators. For example, 72.3 percent of initial candidates exceeded the "confidence" disposition (N = 669). Data were presented for art, physical education, family and consumer sciences, and career and technical education in the aggregate, combined with secondary programs. Alumni surveys were collected from programs in early childhood, elementary, secondary, and bilingual/multicultural education (Exhibit 1G.4.1). These graduates indicated that they developed appropriate dispositions to be effective educators during their programs at rates of 80 percent and higher. Likewise, employers indicated a high level of satisfaction with unit graduates' dispositions for teaching. Employers (N=145) responded that unit graduates whom they currently employ rated above average and outstanding on each measure as follows: 43 percent for confidence; 47 percent for openness; 42 percent for ethics; and 49 percent for empathy (Exhibit 1G.4.2).

Interviews with unit faculty, candidates, and graduates confirm that the unit's dispositions are appropriately aligned, demonstrated, and evaluated in student teaching. Cooperating teachers and PK-12 administrators indicate candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions required to be effective teachers.

Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

The unit uses the same four key dispositions—confidence, openness, ethics, and empathy—for advanced teacher candidates as for initial candidates. While these dispositions are aligned with the unit's conceptual framework, vision, mission, guiding image, and philosophy (Exhibit CF b), there is little evidence that the dispositions are used in the assessment of advanced teacher candidates. There is also little evidence that candidates for advanced teacher preparation are aware of the conceptual framework beyond dispositions. The unit cites the differences among the advanced programs as one reason for the inconsistency in the use of dispositional assessments. Further, common descriptors which operationalize the dispositions at the advanced teacher level have not been developed (IR page 36). The unit, however, provides some information that explains its expectations relative to dispositions for advanced teacher candidates (IR page 36 - 37). Some advanced programs for teachers are piloting dispositional assessment tools (e.g., Educational Specialties as illustrated in Exhibit 1G2.1). In sum, there were no data presented to show that dispositions are assessed at the advanced teacher preparation level. The unit did state that advanced programs are beginning to collect data to assess dispositions of advanced teacher candidates (IR page 37).

The various surveys which communicate information about dispositions apply only to initial program graduates.

Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

The unit uses the same four key dispositions - confidence, openness, ethics, and empathy - for candidates in programs for the preparation of other school professionals. Again, there is little evidence that the dispositions are used in the assessment of candidates in programs for the preparation of other school professionals or that there is much awareness of the conceptual framework among candidates. The unit cites differences among these programs as one reason for the inconsistency in using assessments of dispositions. There were no data to show use of dispositional assessment tools for other school professionals. If Exhibit 1G2.1 applies not only to advanced programs for teachers but also to advanced programs for other school professionals, a tool is in development. However, there were no data available, given that the date for the draft instrument for "advanced programs" was January 12,

2009 and that data would not have been collected and analyzed by the March 2009 on-site visit.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has 19 nationally recognized programs, which is one indicator of overall effectiveness. However, several programs received national recognition with conditions, and several require substantive development, in particular modern languages and physical education at the master's levels. One primary trend from the SPA reports for those programs not receiving national recognition is the lack of data as evidence that the unit is meeting standards. In contrast, additional evidence in the form of campus interviews, candidate presentations, and new documents and exhibits provided sufficient documentation that the unit is meeting criteria relative to Standard 1. Test results from the state-mandated certification tests, at the initial certification level and at the advanced level for some programs, attest that content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for candidates are acceptable. Student teaching and internship evaluations along with alumni and employee survey results suggest that candidates in initial and advanced programs are knowledgeable in assessing student learning. Assessment of dispositions at the initial level is in place.

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
n/a	

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
(Initial) The modern languages program and the physical education program are insufficiently developed at the master's level. (Advanced) The unit does not assess dispositions for candidates in advanced programs for teachers and for candidates in other school personnel programs.	The unit does not have systematic and consistent assessment data to demonstrate that candidates in these programs possess appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The unit provided no evidence that it assesses dispositions in the advanced teacher preparation programs and the other school personnel programs.

Recommendation for Standard 1

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.]

Table 2 - the institution provided a Table 2 addendum to note the following changes in initial programs provided: added career and technical programs at the B.S. Ed. level (business, family and consumer science, industrial technology); added French education and Spanish education at the B.S. Ed. levels.

Table 3 - the IR did not list a master's degree for advanced teacher preparation in early childhood education; the IR did not list doctoral degrees (educational leadership, curriculum and instruction, school psychology) which, according to the website, do prepare other school professionals for continued work in K-12 settings.

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
jñ	jñ

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 assessment system of the professional education unit (PEU) of Northern Arizona University (NAU) was developed by faculty members at the program level including those faculty in other colleges (through USTEC). Its primary function is to measure applicant qualifications and candidate and graduate performance. The assessment system is evaluated and revised by program faculty. There was little evidence that the P-12 partners were involved in the creation of the assessment system or included in the revision/improvement of the unit assessment system.

Interviews confirmed that data are shared regularly with program faculty in aggregate and disaggregate form. There is little evidence showing that P-12 partners receive any data, with the exception of their participation in the student teaching evaluations. Faculty and administration are responsible for aligning assessments with the unit’s conceptual framework and state and national standards. There was little evidence in interviews that candidates know the conceptual framework and how it informs evaluations and assessments.

In the fall of 2006, the unit adopted TaskStream to house candidate work samples, candidate portfolios, and transition point assessments. There are four transition points in the initial programs (admission to the program; admission to the capstone course or internship; completion of the capstone course or internship; completion of the program). The elementary program had been using TaskStream prior to fall 2006 and seems to have a better understanding of the system’s capabilities.

The unit ensures fairness and consistency and avoidance of bias at the initial level through training for new faculty in creating and grading rubrics, and through maintaining standard syllabi. These trainings and the use of standardized syllabi ensures that part-time faculty and faculty at distance campuses are delivering the same content to all candidates.

There is not a general understanding among faculty of unit operations. Usefulness and validity of assessments are determined by individual program faculty. It was unclear how evaluation measures assess unit operations.

The unit assessment system and the steps for maintaining and improving the assessment system for initial teacher preparation programs are limited to the COE main campus and do not include the extended campuses or distance learning programs.

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

There are four transition points in the advanced programs, similar to those in the initial programs (admission to the program; admission to the capstone course or internship; completion of the capstone course or internship; completion of the program).

The unit ensures fairness and consistency and avoidance of bias at both the initial and advanced levels through training for new faculty in creating and grading rubrics, and through maintaining standard syllabi. These trainings and the use of standardized syllabi ensures that part-time faculty and faculty at distance campuses are delivering the same content to all candidates.

The unit points out in its list of factual errors that faculty members in principal and superintendent programs are involved in maintaining and improving the assessment system.

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:

Data collected include candidate performance data, candidate progression data, unit and/or program

effectiveness data, and faculty performance data.

Candidate performance data are collected every semester through coursework. Candidates submit work through their electronic portfolios on TaskStream and are scored by faculty through the use of rubrics developed and approved by the faculty. Department chairs or lead program faculty request this data from the college's TaskStream support staff. Program faculty summarize and analyze the data and report the information to the faculty. For programs based outside of the COE, lead faculty summarize and analyze the data. They provide data not collected in the electronic portfolio or student teaching evaluation system to the COE assistant dean.

Candidate progression data for the initial early childhood, elementary, and special education programs are entered by hand into an older version of Filemaker Pro used only by and managed by the Office of Student Services. The secondary programs do not use this system as they are not housed in the COE. When a candidate is ready to student teach, he/she submits a paper application to the director of field experiences, who monitors all initial candidates' admission to student teaching regardless of program and hand-enters the paper application information into Filemaker Pro. This system is not compatible with TaskStream or other databases.

Unit and program effectiveness data are gathered from alumni surveys and employer surveys administered every three years via electronic survey. The assistant dean summarizes and analyzes the data and reports to the faculty through department chairs or lead program faculty. Scores on licensure exams are also analyzed and reported annually in aggregate and disaggregate form to the faculty. There is no evidence that the P-12 partners receive these reports.

Faculty performance data include feedback from candidates as well as reflections from faculty members regarding their teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, etc. This information is collected in portfolio form and submitted to the appropriate department chair. It is unclear as to whether these portfolios are paper or electronic.

The unit realizes that the current system does not have the capacity to manage candidate progression and completion data. A new system has been under development and is to be implemented in fall 2009. The system will have the capacity to interact with electronic portfolio information, including key assessment data leading to requirements and applications for student teaching through transition point four. It will be fully online and is custom built.

The unit has a system in place for processing formal complaints. The complaint process begins with an online form, then progresses through the appropriate channels as indicated by university protocol. Once a complaint has been entered and investigated, a record of the complaint and resolution must go on file in the provost's office.

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

In the advanced programs, candidate progression data for the advanced programs reside with each individual program. The content area advisor in which the program resides is responsible for ensuring these candidates demonstrate appropriate skills and dispositions as required by their respective professional associations. A faculty member is responsible for ensuring candidates meet transition point criteria. There are no checks and balances among advising faculty members, no central place where these progression data are housed, and no measure of consistency among faculty advisors to ensure candidates are meeting the same criteria at these transition points.

All other aspects of this element are consistent with and listed under the findings for initial programs.

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:

Faculty review candidate data each semester and determine potential weaknesses in courses. Modifications are made as needed. Program faculty make decisions regarding changes to curriculum, content, assessments, or addition/deletion of courses (IR, p. 56). If the data do not accurately depict candidate performance, transition point assessments are modified. If candidates do not demonstrate appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions, modifications are made within course content. There is no evidence of a standardized program improvement plan for initial or advanced programs.

Rubrics and scoring tools used during the student teaching experience have been developed. Assessments in programs cited by SPA reviewers have been modified to show stronger evidence of candidates' professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

The IR states that program changes that have occurred include the fieldwork experiences to reflect clearer articulation to courses and consistency among the other programs' fieldwork. However, it is evident that fieldwork prior to student teaching is inconsistent among all programs (initial and advanced), as fieldwork is not tracked from the early experiences through student teaching. There is no evidence to support "clearer articulation of the relationship to courses" as stated in the IR (p. 56).

There is a well defined process for candidates at the initial and advanced levels who do not meet the requirements of key assessments. Steps are taken to ensure the candidate will be able to demonstrate acceptable performance before the student teaching/capstone semester.

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

The findings for the advanced teacher preparation programs and preparation of other school professionals are consistent with those for the initial programs.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has made great strides toward a comprehensive assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications and performance of candidates and graduates in a very short period of time. The unit has already begun to use existing data to inform curricular changes and to improve the performance of candidates with the ultimate goal of positively impacting students' learning. The unit does not currently have a mechanism by which to assess unit operations. While the unit is chiefly housed in the College of Education, programs outside the COE are less likely to be viewed as essential to a comprehensive review of unit operations. The unit relies on national accreditation for one initial and several advanced/other school professionals programs and does not capture candidate data to include in an overall review of the unit.

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
n/a	

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. (Advanced) The unit does not effectively utilize the assessment system to monitor candidate progress in advanced teacher programs and other school personnel programs.	1. There is a lack of evidence (determined through interviews and exhibits) among the advanced programs of effective, consistent monitoring of candidate progress.
2. (Initial and Advanced) There is not a mechanism by which unit operations are systematically and regularly assessed.	2. There is no evidence of program or unit improvement plans for initial and advanced programs.

Recommendation for Standard 2

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

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

jñ

No

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	Acceptable
Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit has strong ties to schools in the surrounding area and written contracts in place with all schools that host clinical experiences. In addition the unit has partnerships with the Arizona Department of Education; university teaching and clinical faculty (within and outside the COE); program and departmental committees; the University Secondary Education Council (USTEC); the school mentor/host teachers, supervisors, administrators and liaisons; the Office of Student Services; and the candidates (IR p. 59). A review of evidence shows the requirements and standards determined by the Department of Education and the SPAs are built into each program's criteria for field and clinical experiences. The faculty members and cooperating teachers provide information through observation, survey, and evaluations that are utilized by the unit to improve the design and delivery of field and clinical experiences. In the initial secondary programs, the field experiences for methods courses are coordinated by the individual faculty member and school partners. The site-based programs utilize a fieldwork supervisor to coordinate the field experiences. Review of documentation and interviews provided evidence that the elementary program is required to document field experience placement in TaskStream in regard to diversity. Evidence to support this in the other initial programs was not found. The Office of Student Services coordinates the clinical experience for the initial candidates. The unit has created a "triad" approach to sharing resources and expertise to support candidates and cooperating teachers in their field and clinical experiences. The Student Teacher Handbook describes the duties and responsibilities for each of the partners involved in the triad approach. Seminars and meetings are scheduled to share expertise, and faculty offer their service as needed to schools as consultants.

Because only two candidates (from PE) attended the open meeting for candidates, only two student teachers/interns (from PE) attended that session, and only two cooperating teachers (one elementary, one secondary history) attended that session, the team relied heavily on comments from school visits. Administrators and cooperating teachers who had worked with partnership programs (extensive field experiences in the same setting) and traditional programs overwhelmingly agreed that candidates from partnership programs are far better prepared because of over 300 hours of classroom contact time, from the beginning of their programs. One teacher noted that the "traditional program does not allow for as much flexibility." One cooperating teacher noted that when he was a traditional candidate he "lacked the classroom management experience - the comfort of being a teacher." In general, school faculty felt that communication with NAU was strong in early childhood and elementary programs; communication is less open at the secondary level in some areas.

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

In the advanced programs, the program faculty and school-based faculty are partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the field and clinical experiences. Additional partners for the advanced programs for teachers and other school professionals include the Arizona Department of Education and

the specialized professional associations' (SPAs') program teaching and clinical faculty where applicable. The bilingual/multicultural program partners with the Bureau of Indian Education schools and the Office of Indian Education. An action research project is generally used as a field experience for the advanced teacher preparation programs (IR p. 61). Field and clinical experiences in programs for other school professionals vary based on the established requirements for each program.

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

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

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidate progress for the initial early childhood, elementary, and special education programs are entered by hand into Filemaker Pro used by and managed by the Office of Student Services. The secondary programs, in departments outside COE, use their own management methods. When a candidate is ready to student teach, he/she submits a paper application to the director of field experiences, who monitors all initial candidates' admission to student teaching regardless of program and hand-enters the paper application information into Filemaker Pro. This system is not compatible with TaskStream or other databases. Elementary Education, however, now does have an electronic system by which the program tracks field placements to ensure diverse experiences prior to student teaching.

Prior to clinical practice initial candidates are required to submit an application to the Office of Student Services. The Office of Student Services reviews and determines if all criteria are met to allow the candidates to begin clinical practice. Requirements and timelines are documented in the Student Teaching Handbook. The evidence confirms clinical practice for initial candidates is progressive. The progression is documented in the Student Teaching Handbook. During the 2007-2008 academic year the unit had 704 initial candidates eligible for clinical practice. In order to be eligible, these candidates had successfully completed the application and admission process, had a minimum GPA, and had successfully demonstrated professional dispositions through assessments embedded in their coursework. Successful completion of the candidate work sample project is a requirement for all initial candidates; samples included indicate the candidates' ability to evaluate and analyze data, reflect, and develop strategies to improve student learning. The work sample, student teaching notebook/portfolio, and student teacher evaluation forms are used to assess the clinical practice. The candidate is assessed by observations a minimum of five times by the university supervisor and at least twice a semester during a three-way conference (among the candidate, university supervisor, and cooperating teacher) at mid-term and final.

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

Advanced program candidates work as regular employees under supervision of a site mentor. Candidates in advanced programs are evaluated onsite by a local mentor using the triad approach similar to that for initial candidates. They are evaluated on their ability to plan a unit to meet the needs of diverse learners, assessment methods, and indicators of student learning. The candidates, local site mentors, and university supervisor develop a plan including the on-site visits, logs, and other requirements for the

experience. The school administration program's field and clinical experiences are a partnership/internship with experienced school leaders. The summative evaluation is completed through a process of self-evaluation by the candidate utilizing the internship evaluation form. Other school professionals, in the educational leadership and educational technology programs, have a culminating clinical experience that demonstrates the knowledge and skills of their programs.

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

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The evaluation forms in field and clinical experiences for initial programs are aligned to state and professional standards and include variables to evaluate knowledge, skills, and dispositions and the conceptual framework. Review of coursework, interviews, and portfolios confirm candidates use a variety of technologies throughout their programs and in their field and clinical experiences. Review of the field experience evaluations, interviews, and electronic portfolio provide information that field experiences are extensive and include reflection.

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

Candidates in the advanced programs for teachers collect data from their own classrooms and reflect on them. This becomes a part of the curriculum project and formal presentation assessment required for completion of their program. A review of required courses, evaluations, and other requirements for advanced programs for teachers and other school professionals confirm the use of technology during field and clinical experiences.

For advanced programs for teachers and other school professionals, the criteria, roles, and responsibilities of the site mentor and the university supervisor are provided in the programs' internship handbooks. Other school professionals are evaluated through a final capstone project which varies in design. The principals and superintendents, school counselors, and psychologists use a self-reflection instrument as their key assessment for their internship.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Unit and school partners work together to implement field and clinical experiences and the assessment of candidate performance. Initial candidates have extensive field experiences before their clinical experience, which allows candidates the opportunity to directly apply theory to practical applications. Advanced candidates are able to apply coursework in their classrooms as well as analyze data and use research. Substantial opportunities and requirements exist for reflection and feedback related to candidate performance and student learning.

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
n/a	

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
none	

Recommendation for Standard 3

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

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	Acceptable ▼
Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates the content of the curriculum and provides multiple experiences in diverse settings for candidates.

Candidates exhibit an understanding of diversity, including English language learners and students with exceptionalities, as indicated by assessments such as work samples and student teaching evaluations. NAU is located in northern Arizona near Native American and Hispanic populations. Recently, the State of Arizona mandated a six-hour SEI (Structured English Immersion) course sequence for initial and advanced programs. Through interviews with faculty and candidates, it is evident that candidates are successful in developing and teaching lessons that incorporate diversity and connecting their instruction to students' cultures and experiences. Faculty encourage candidates to be active in various cultural organizations (on and off campus). Faculty research and teaching include sensitivity to cultural and gender differences as well as differences in sexual orientation.

The unit presented curricular components for the Ed. Psych. programs and data in Exhibit 4.04 of candidate performance results relative to diverse experiences for: initial programs, the elementary education M.Ed., Ed. Psych., programs, the BME program, the secondary M.Ed., principal programs, and Ed. Tech. programs.

The faculty are committed to ensuring that candidates can demonstrate the appropriate skills and dispositions to help all students learn through sharing their own research and participating in community cultural events with their candidates.

Candidates also have the opportunity to work with diverse university faculty. The university is committed to recruiting faculty and candidates from diverse backgrounds, and the professional education unit has adopted the institution's stance on this issue. Faculty and candidates with varying levels of disabilities are also recruited, as was evidenced in interviews with the university administration.

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

Findings for advanced teacher preparation and preparation of other school professionals are consistent with those for initial teacher preparation.

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation

Acceptable

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation

Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation

Candidates interact with faculty members in classes as well as in practicum settings and out-of-class projects. They interact with program faculty, department faculty, and faculty who teach elective and liberal arts courses. While the majority of the faculty members in the unit are white, the unit and NAU do include members from diverse racial and ethnic groups. In addition, candidates have opportunities to interact with faculty involved with NAU's Multicultural Student Center. There is a course on global and ethnic diversity taught by diverse or international faculty, providing candidates an opportunity to interact with diverse faculty.

According to data supplied by the unit, the unit faculty in initial programs is 85% white, non-Hispanic; 7.45 percent Hispanic; 2.12 percent Native American; 2.12% Asian; and 3.19% unidentified.

Comparable numbers in the institution are 77.24% white, non-Hispanic; 5.07% Hispanic; 3.18% Asian; 3.06% American Indian; 1.41% Black; and 10.02% unidentified. Comparable numbers for school-based faculty are 87.16% white, non-Hispanic; 4.28% American Indian; 1.56% two or more races; 0.38% Asian; 0.38% Black; 0.38% Pacific Islander; and 1.17% unidentified.

Interviews with faculty members revealed that efforts are being made to recruit and retain diverse faculty members. Interviews with department chairs and administrators indicated that efforts are continually made to reach out to minority communities to recruit faculty. Faculty members referenced the SCCP—Standing Committee on College Priorities--that meets to review and update a five-year plan which includes a commitment to Native American and Hispanic education. Also, faculty members explained the Social Justice, Race, Equity and Diversity (SJERD) group, an unofficial committee of COE faculty members who meet to discuss college-wide diversity issues and the status of diversity-related trends. They meet regularly either in person or by email and listserv to discuss a wide range of diversity issues.

Faculty interviews revealed that one way to ensure faculty diversity is to hire non-Southwest US faculty, who bring with them experiences working with a wide array of diverse students and families in the former settings, in particular urban settings. Two such faculty were in the interview sessions.

The Faculty Development Program sponsors a symposium series each year on diversity issues. The 2008-09 series has eight opportunities for faculty to learn about diversity insights from the Hispanic community, the student community, the Native American community, and insights on teaching about race and culture.

In faculty hiring, the unit reaches out to diverse groups through the Affirmative Action office. Interviews with Affirmative Action representatives confirmed that there is a policy--Hiring Process for Faculty and Academic Professionals-- that prioritizes hiring of diverse faculty members.

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

The faculty in advanced teacher programs is 78.21% white, non-Hispanic; 9.9% Hispanic; 3.96% Black; 2.97% American Indian; 2.97% Asian; and 1.98% unidentified.

Comparable numbers in the institution are 77.24% white, non-Hispanic; 5.07% Hispanic; 3.18% Asian; 3.06% American Indian; 1.41% Black; and 10.02% unidentified.

Comparable numbers for school-based faculty are 87.16% white, non-Hispanic; 4.28% American Indian, 1.56% two or more races; 0.38% Asian; 0.38% Black; 0.38% Pacific Islander; and 1.17% unidentified.

The unit has recently begun a system of tracking candidate placements in some programs to be sure they are interacting with diverse faculty and cooperating teachers. Data are not yet available.

The opportunity to interact with diverse faculty is somewhat inconsistent in distance learning sites. Depending upon the location, faculty may well be from underrepresented populations; particular mention was given to off campus-sites on Native American reservations.

Other examples of faculty diversity include many with multiple years of experience working with students with exceptionalities and faculty with extensive experience working with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender students.

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Candidates are predominantly white at the initial (71%) level. This is comparable to the total number of students across campus. The ethnic diversity of the total NAU campus is 26 percent nonwhite. There are more females (79%) enrolled in the initial teacher preparation programs than males (21%). The percentage of Native Americans in the initial teacher preparation programs (seven percent) is greater than the rest of the campus (six percent).

NAU is committed to retaining and recruiting students from diverse backgrounds. It is ranked second in the U.S. in bachelor’s degrees awarded to Native Americans, ninth to Hispanic/Latino students in education, and tenth for education degrees awarded to all minorities. In an effort to retain and recruit candidates from diverse backgrounds, the unit provides many activities to support these candidates. Services are provided through the Student Support Services office. The services range from one-to-one advising to cultural activities and workshops. The university’s Multicultural Student Center also sponsors a variety of outreach programs and activities. Two organizations work with students with learning and physical disabilities. Clubs and organizations have been formed to promote a sense of community for multicultural students. All teacher preparation programs at the initial level require candidates to take two Structured English Immersion courses (six hours).

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

School Professionals:

Candidates are predominantly white at the advanced level (72%). The percentage of Native Americans at the advanced level (six percent) is the same as the rest of the campus (six percent). There are more females (76%) in the advanced preparation programs than males (24%). The number of females in the advanced preparation programs is greater than the number of females enrolled in the institution (64%). The number of Hispanic candidates in the advanced programs (15%) is slightly higher than the number of Hispanics in the university (13%).

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

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

A review of the demographic data of the P-12 sites and interviews with candidates indicated that most candidates have the opportunity to work with P-12 students from many diverse backgrounds. Candidates self-select some placement sites and keep track of the demographics of the school sites where they are placed for clinical practice in their electronic portfolio. The fieldwork supervisor can track placements of candidates. Most candidates in the traditional and the distance learning program are provided opportunities to work with students of diverse backgrounds, including English language learners and students with disabilities. All candidates are required to complete a course on diversity as a part of their program. At this point, only the Elementary Education program has a system for tracking placements to ensure that each candidate has had experiences with diversity in the classroom.

Faculty, supervisors, cooperating teachers, and the candidates use a common evaluation form (ECI 308) to reflect on knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity for their field experience. The work sample is used in clinical practice and contains evaluation criteria regarding diversity. Candidates must meet or exceed the standard in order to complete clinical experience.

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

The advanced program candidates are assessed by a curriculum project and presentation on elements regarding diverse students. These projects are typically based on "action research" in which the candidate has actual experiences with diversity. Most field experience takes place in the candidate's home school or district; if, however, a diverse population is not readily available, exchanges with other school settings take place to afford diverse experiences. The assessment in the principal/superintendent internship also includes elements relative to diversity. Assessments for other schools professionals also include specific items related to diversity; examples include: (1) Demonstrates the ability to combine impartiality, sensitivity to student diversity, and ethical considerations in interactions with others; (2) Is familiar with the range of instructional programs and policies that can promote academic learning for all students and the ongoing dialogue with the schools community; (3) Understands approaches to organizational change, diversity, school-based management, and school restructuring as relates to communicating a vision and use of data-based strategies to monitor, evaluate, and revise the vision; and (4) Understands research on federal, state, and municipal laws and regulations affecting schools, staff, and students, including laws on disability, civil rights, diversity, poverty, social justice and responsibilities, issues of liability, and the requirements of due process. All programs, initial and

advanced, include reflection elements regarding diversity in their key assessments of internship experiences.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has adequately addressed issues of diversity in its design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and field experiences for candidates. Candidates have the opportunity to interact with a diverse P-12 population. The candidates have opportunities to work with a diverse higher education and school faculty. The unit has a variety of efforts underway to increase the diversity of teacher candidates and faculty to increase the opportunities provided for the candidates. The unit efforts are consistent with those of the university, particularly in efforts to reach out to the state's large Native American population.

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
n/a	

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
(Initial) The unit does not have a system in place to insure all candidates have diverse field placements, other than for the elementary education program.	There is no evidence the unit has a tracking system in place for candidates' field experiences in regard to diversity prior to clinical practice. One program, elementary education program, has a tracking system.

Recommendation for Standard 4

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

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
jn	jn

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

<p>The number of faculty members as reported by the unit varied within the IR tables, and numbers were not the same as those that had been previously reported on the NCATE institutional report. After many attempts to justify the figures, the team decided to use the numbers that had been reported to NCATE in the FY 2008 annual report. Subsequently, the team was unable to use some of the data that were provided by the unit regarding location of faculty and other demographics.</p>

5a. Qualified Faculty

Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

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

<p>The professional education faculty is qualified to prepare teachers and other school personnel. According to the NCATE institutional report for FY 2008, there are 158 full-time faculty members in the unit (117 full-time in the unit, another five in the COE currently with no teaching assignment, and 36 full-time university/part-time unit in secondary education). These are the most consistent sets of numbers that were available to the team. Of the full-time faculty, 112 are tenured or on a tenure track, and 46 are not on a tenure track. Evidence exists that all tenure-track faculty members have been involved in recent scholarly activities relative to the field in which they prepare candidates. A review of summarized full-time faculty vitae provided by the unit showed evidence of experience as teachers or school administrators in their fields of instruction. (See corrections to the IR.)</p>

<p>All non-tenure track full-time faculty have a minimum of a masters’ degree in the field in which they serve. This information was not available to the team until late in the visit; the summaries of faculty qualifications initially showed 10 faculty members for whom terminal degree information was not available, but by the end of the on-site visit, this information had been located. The SPA report on</p>

physical education, offered at the initial level in both undergraduate and graduate programs, also noted that only two faculty cite experience at the K-12 level and that eight of the faculty mentioned have doctorates in a variety of specialties other than physical education, including computer education, English, and educational psychology. Evidence of three years of teaching experience in their field was found for all but two non-tenured faculty.

The unit reports 194 part-time faculty for the most recent semester, with 59 (31%) holding doctoral degrees, 131 (68%) holding masters degrees, two (one percent) holding bachelor’s degrees, and two (one percent) with degrees not reported/no degrees found. Evidence was provided of experience teaching in their field or administrative experience, with a broad range of years of experience.

A review of a summary of faculty vitae provided by the unit shows proof of faculty degrees and certifications. The department chairs are responsible for verifying faculty qualifications. The director of student services has the responsibility of checking credentials for university supervisors and cooperating teachers.

Clinical faculty in both initial and advanced programs show evidence of a minimum of three years of teaching experience. Based on interviews with faculty and vice presidents, clinical faculty take advantage of professional development opportunities.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

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

A review of syllabi provides evidence faculty are knowledgeable in their content areas and relate course objectives to the components of the conceptual framework. Most syllabi include a statement of the conceptual framework, but candidates do not know the relationship of the framework to their study and field experiences. Syllabi which do not include a statement of the framework are generally for courses located in colleges outside of COE. However, evidence reveals instruction is aligned with state and professional standards, theories, and current developments within the field.

The review of course requirements and interviews indicate technology is infused into instruction at the initial and advanced levels. Examples of technology include video casting, PowerPoint, Vista, TaskStream, and Blackboard.

The review of syllabi and interviews with faculty indicate faculty understand and model best practices such as differentiated learning styles, varied instructional strategies, project-based assignments, and multiple forms of assessments including performance assessment.

Faculty encourage use of reflection, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills with candidates by assigning case studies, action-based research projects, peer review and completion of electronic portfolios. The review of syllabi, candidate portfolios, interviews, and a review of “student opinion of teaching survey” results confirm these skills are part of the instructional program.

Faculty make use of reflection and self assessment to ensure best practices in teaching. Faculty annually

complete a statement of expectations, a self reflection statement, to assess teaching effectiveness and use the data to inform and improve practice.

Faculty members are also given summary course rating data for each course they teach in a given academic term. Department chairs meet with faculty members to discuss issues that arise in the course of the reflection process.

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

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

There is an expectation that all tenured/tenure-track faculty members will engage in scholarship related to their field of specialization and in accordance with the university and college mission, best practices of the profession, and the conceptual framework. The unit provides definitions for scholarly work in the COE Criteria for Faculty Performance Review. Those definitions can be found in the IR page 110. All tenured/tenure-track faculty members were productive in some type of scholarly activity during the past two years based on vitae summary provided by the unit, producing one or more publications and/or presenting at one or more conferences.

Recent articles or journals published by faculty and available as exhibits included publications on the use of Native Mascots in higher education, developing a leadership identity, student activism in African Higher Education, rethinking schoolwide discipline, issues for new Native Teachers, attitudes toward diversity among first- and second-year college students, and blame for the American dropout rate. Books published by faculty and available as exhibits include a large number of texts for elementary-level reading, Problem-Based Learning for Teachers in Grades 6-12, Research Essentials, No Child Left Behind and the Illusion of Reform, Indigenous Language Revitalization, Locating and Correcting Reading Difficulties, Working at the Margins—Moving off Welfare in America, Environmental Print in the Classroom, Creating a Classroom Community of Young Scientists, and American Indian Education—A History.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

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

The unit serves the state by providing research, instruction, partnership activities, and outreach services to both rural and urban communities across Arizona. All full-time faculty are expected to engage in service activities in their respective department and college. Faculty serve on university committees and task forces. For most members of the unit, service comprises 15-20 percent of their faculty workload, as documented by exhibits and interviews. All full-time faculty are evaluated annually for their service activities and their level of involvement and accomplishments. The COE distinguishes service from

citizenship, service consisting of application of disciplinary expertise to problems or issues of some community or entity.

Documents provided by the unit show evidence of a pattern of service as a requirement for tenure track promotion. Examples of service provided by faculty members, as documented by a review of exhibits and interviews, include leadership in the local chapter of Phi Delta Kappa; leadership in the Arizona School Counselor Association; finance and grants director for North American Society for Adlerian Psychology; board member of Arizona Rural Schools Association; NAU Commission on the Status of Women co-chair; board member of Arizona Milken Educators; Founder of Arizona Teacher Forum; leadership in Alpha Delta Kappa; numerous contributions to school districts in Flagstaff, Sedona, Prescott, and others; member of the Arizona Department of Education Committee to Revise the Reading Specialist Endorsement; American Indian Language Development Institute at the University of Arizona; coordinator of Big Brothers Big Sisters Bowl for Kids; leadership in The Guidance Center; and chairing the steering committee for Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Conferences.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

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

All full-time faculty members go through the annual review and retention process. Only tenure-track faculty members go through the tenure process. Evidence shows that written criteria for the evaluation of tenure-track faculty members were approved by the COE faculty members in December 2006. There is some variation in the promotion and tenure process across the colleges/departments within the unit.

Each faculty member files an annual Statement of Expectations with the immediate unit administrator. Current curriculum vitae are attached to the report, and the report contains references to materials that relate to the evaluation of teaching and student-related responsibilities, as well as scholarship, research, and/or creative activity, professional development, and service. All full-time faculty members file the Statement of Expectations, which is used to review the previous year and to set goals for the coming year. The statement also provides a beginning basis for evaluation, and is the result of negotiations between the faculty member and the department chair.

The information obtained from conducting annual faculty evaluations is used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service by providing feedback to the faculty member and setting goals for the future. As part of the annual review process, faculty members also receive written feedback from their department chair regarding their performance. Faculty who excel may be nominated for teaching and/or advising awards available at NAU or within a professional organization. Faculty members who are not meeting expectations may be asked to engage in some type of professional development activity to improve their performance.

A review of the COE Faculty Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Performance Summary provided by the unit reveals a vast majority of ratings of 4 on a 4-point scale where 4 is greatly exceeding expectations. Only a few 3 ratings and an occasional 2 rating were found. In all cases of a 2 rating, the rating for that faculty member was improved the next year.

A review of The Cooperating Teacher Feedback on University Supervision, a random sample of 50 evaluations from 2007-2009, indicates overwhelming positive evaluations for university field experience supervisors. The Student Teacher Feedback on University Supervision, a random sample of 50 evaluations from 2007-2009, also indicated positive ratings for university supervisors. Candidate evaluations of COE courses from 2006-08 (on a 5.0 scale) include a rating of 4.17 for educational leadership, 4.11 for educational psychology, and 4.16 for education specialties, providing evidence of candidate satisfaction with instruction.

Part-time faculty are employed on a one-semester contract only, so evaluation is ongoing and constant. If changes need to be made, they can be done without waiting for a long-term contract to expire. Part-time faculty are evaluated by a department chair.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

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

Faculty (tenured and non-tenured faculty, as well as part-time faculty) regularly participate in professional development activities both on and off campus. As part of the faculty evaluation process, using the Statement of Expectations, goals are listed for professional development in specific areas and, if necessary, a plan of improvement is developed. The recommendations are made in accordance with the expectations set forth in the faculty handbook.

Examples of professional development opportunities completed by the faculty and verified in interview sessions and review of vitae included classes taken through the University of Arizona; INTEL Teach to the Future workshop on technology in the classroom; presentations at national conferences; drive-in conferences and seminars; video conferencing courses from the Flagstaff campus; sabbatical work presentations; “chats with the dean”; new faculty orientation; E-Learning Showcase; Provost’s Speak series; Teaching Indigenous Languages Conference; There’s a Reason I am a Teacher Conference; and a workshop on preparing annual review, retention, and promotion materials.

In addition, in an open session with unit staff, the team learned that there are numerous development activities for staff, including travel to conferences. Staff were uniformly complimentary of unit leadership in this regard and in creating a work environment that is supportive and collegial.

A review of vitae and annual reviews show that more than 95 percent of the full-time faculty members participated in some type of professional development activities during the past two years.

A review of participation in professional development activities for 2007-08 show that 89 unit faculty attended at least one NAU faculty development session, 111 unit faculty attended separate events through the Faculty Research Center, faculty logged 292 in-state trips and 149 out-of-state trips to conferences, and one faculty member was on sabbatical.

Eighty-nine workshops in support of the conceptual framework were offered in the past year. More than 50 percent of faculty in the unit attended the sessions.

Professional development opportunities are also offered for part-time faculty. Workshops are held in Phoenix and Tucson and conducted via video-conferencing for the combined rural sites. During the 2007-08 school year, 82 part-time faculty and 10 distance learning staff members attended one of the regional workshops.

Clinical faculty members participate in professional development activities sponsored by the Arizona K-12 Center.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit 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.

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
n/a	

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

New AFIs:

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
none	

Recommendation for Standard 5

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

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.]

Table 1 - inconsistent with information provided in other reports. As noted in Element 5.1, the most consistent faculty data provided came from the NCATE institutional report FY2008. Data reported in Table 1 of the IR was not consistent with that reported in Standards 4 and 5, nor with additional information provided during the on-site visit. For spring 2009, however, the following limited information seems to be accurate: 62 full-time tenured/tenure track in COE, 44 full-time non-tenure track in COE, 33 full-time tenured/tenure track in secondary education (part-time in the unit), and eight full-time non-tenure track in secondary education. There are 194 supervisors, all non-tenure track, in spring 2009 and three graduate assistants who teach or supervise. Because part-time in the unit/full-time in the university is characterized as secondary in the FY 2008 report, it is not possible to tell whether those numbers include faculty in clinical speech pathology, again indicating some inconsistencies in what exactly constitutes the unit.

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	Acceptable ▼
Unit Leadership and Authority – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

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

The unit has leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study within the unit. The unit manages or coordinates most programs, which prepare teachers or certified school personnel in the colleges of Education (COE); Arts and Letters; Health and Human Services; and Engineering, Forestry and Natural Sciences. The dean of the COE serves as the Professional Education unit head and has authority to make decisions within the unit. The unit head establishes and maintains open communication with the community, university, colleges, and COE departments. The COE also has directors and coordinators for accreditation/licensure, assessment, and field experiences. Organizational charts, interviews with unit and institution administration, and institutional governance policies (IR Exhibit 6.a.4) validated the unit leadership and authority over programs within the COE. Leadership over the education programs from the other colleges was informal through the University

Secondary Teacher Education Committee (USTEC) and other committee structures, and took place outside the primary curriculum processes. This is evidenced by the title of the document -- College of Education Decision-Making Structure (Exhibit 6.2).

The unit's recruiting and admission practices are described clearly and consistently in publications and catalogs. Academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current. This was confirmed through a review of both electronic and print versions. The electronic information consistently linked to the same calendar, program guide, catalog, or department website address to maintain consistency.

The COE ensures that candidates have access to student services by maintaining its own Office of Student Services (OSS). The other colleges provide comprehensive services to prospective and current students through similar offices. Graduate advising is primarily program-centered, and the graduate programs demonstrated this through faculty assignments and policies addressing advising. The institution provides additional student support services including the offices of Career Services, the Student Technology Center, and the Counseling Center. In addition, the unit operates a Counseling Practicum Lab, which operates as a full functioning counseling center for clients from NAU and the local community.

Faculty involved in the preparation of educators, and other members of the professional community, participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs. The unit provides a mechanism and facilitates collaboration between unit faculty and faculty in other units of the institution involved in the preparation of professional educators. The unit maintains collaboration between secondary programs through the USTEC. The team understood that membership of USTEC included COE faculty who teach secondary education coursework, but the set of factual corrections from the unit suggests that the USTEC "only involves secondary education faculty from across the university." The PEU Steering committee addresses programmatic developments within the unit. Committee structure exists within the COE (IR Exhibit 6.2.b). There are representatives from other campuses and colleges serving on various committees, including the University Curriculum Committee and the PEU Steering Committee. This presence of extended campus faculty helps maintain campus consistency and communication about all program changes. Evidence from policies, committee membership lists, interviews, and minutes demonstrated unit faculty involvement and collaboration with faculty in other colleges. There was inconsistent testimony regarding the involvement of P-12 practitioners, but there was some evidence of participation.

6b. Unit Budget

Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

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

The unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations proportional to other units on campus with clinical components. The budget adequately supports on-campus and clinical work essential for the preparation of professional educators. Of the three academic colleges listed (IR Exhibit 6.8), the unit received the highest budget for the past five years from state funds. The unit's 2007-08 budget from state funds amounted to \$8,778,632. With additional grants from various sources, the total budget amounted to \$16,131,403. In addition to these funds, the unit is the primary provider for off-campus and other

distance learning courses. The institution's Extended Campuses Division provided an additional \$3.1 million in financial support for 2007-08 budget. This total was significantly more than either of the other two colleges listed in the data. See IR Exhibits 6.7.d and 6.8 for overall budget comparisons across colleges, and the Distance Learning Data Report.

The State of Arizona is in the middle of steep statewide budget cuts. Because the institution receives more than 60 percent of its budget from state appropriations, these cuts affect a large portion of the institution's budget. In demonstrating the institution's commitment to the academic units, including the COE, the most recent cuts from the state legislature amounted to a 13.5 percent cut for the institution; however, the academic units, including the COE, were only required to take a 7.75 percent cut. This support of the academic units is based directly on the institution's Statement of Budget Principles. While allowing the academic units to take a lesser cut, the across-the-board cut for the colleges does not take into account enrollments, especially if a unit has an enrollment increase while the others do not. An across-the-board cut also does not consider the expense of running specific programs within the larger unit, such as partnership schools which provide extended field experiences and classes taught on-site.

6c. Personnel

Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Personnel – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

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

Workload policies, including policies addressing class size and online course delivery, allow faculty members to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, collaborative work in P-12 schools, and service. The Faculty Workload Policy for the NAU College of Education only (not the unit) (Exhibit 6.9) allocates a total of 15 credit units per semester, with three units for service and advising. The policy does not distinguish between undergraduate and graduate teaching load, other than for dissertation chairs.

Non-tenure track faculty are expected to dedicate the remaining 12 credits to teaching. Tenure-track teaching loads depend on level of research. Those who are "research active" have a teaching load of nine credit units per semester. Most teaching loads are well within these guidelines. The disaggregated data from the fall 2007 and spring 2008 semesters demonstrated that the vast majority of faculty do not have more than 21 credits for teaching during the entire academic year. Only 20 faculty taught more than 21 credits for the academic year, with only three of those teaching more than the standard 24 credits (Exhibits 6.10.a-d). Overloads were rare and are not encouraged by the unit administration.

Supervision of clinical practice does not generally exceed 18 candidates for each full-time equivalent faculty member per semester or the equivalent. Interviews and faculty load data indicate that most clinical supervising faculty are hired for this specific purpose, thus maintaining a supervision load of 12 candidates on average. There was one faculty member in educational leadership who was a full-time supervisor, who indicated he had 22 candidates to supervise, but this was the only such anomaly. The program utilizes a great number of part-time faculty each semester but maintains an established process for training, mentoring, and reviewing. During interviews, it was found that part-time faculty are included as colleagues with main campus faculty. They are involved in faculty meetings on the main campus or through video conferencing, and interact collaboratively with the main campus faculty throughout the academic year.

The unit support personnel appear comparable to other institutional units. The support staff for student services is well organized and managed. It was found through interviews that the unit supplements its permanent support personnel with work-study students, especially at department levels. The unit provides adequate resources for professional development of faculty, including training in the use of technology. Professional development determinations occur primarily at the department level. This is developed individually through the Statement of Expectations each faculty member completes at the beginning of each year. The institution provides consistent professional development opportunities through its Faculty Development Program. The director still holds a faculty line within the COE.

6d. Unit Facilities

Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

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

The unit has adequate campus and school facilities to support candidates in meeting standards. The unit occupies primarily one building-Eastburn Education Center. Eastburn includes office space for faculty members, three computer labs, a curriculum library, and 14 classrooms with seating capacities of up to 70 occupants (see Exhibit 6D.1). Most classrooms are equipped with ceiling-mounted projectors and computer stations (with video technology and pad camera capability). Numerous informal gathering spaces have been created in the building to encourage interaction among candidates and between candidates and faculty. For example, two lounge areas have been provided with mobile seating and computer technology, and each office area on the second floor includes a common area for meetings. Each faculty has adequate office space with updated technology including either a PC or Mac desktop computer.

For faculty on other campuses, the unit is able to either assign them office space in an NAU facility or provide funding for a home office. Classrooms are provided through three main mechanisms: 1) the unit leases facilities in Yuma, Phoenix (north and east regions), and Tucson that host both office and classroom space; 2) through partnerships with community colleges, a number of faculty members have office and classroom space within those institutions (Chandler-Gilbert, Mesa, Paradise Valley, Scottsdale, Glendale, and South Mountain Community Colleges, Pima College Community Campus, Yavapai College, and Central Arizona College); 3) the unit shares space with Arizona Western College in Yuma. The unit also leases classroom space for course delivery from schools, mostly high schools. Use of these facilities often includes instructional technology. In cases where such technology is unavailable, the unit provides additional technology resources for instructors (IR p. 136).

6e. Unit Resources including Technology

Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

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

The unit allocates resources across programs to prepare candidates to meet standards for their fields. It provides adequate resources to develop and implement the unit's assessment plan, aspects of which are still in progress. The unit has adequate information technology resources to support faculty and candidates. Faculty and candidates, documents, and web-based data verified adequate technology resources to support the assessment system, as well as faculty and candidates. The Institutional Accreditation System provides extensive support for the NCATE process.

Professional education faculty and candidates have access both to sufficient and current library and curricular resources, as well as electronic information. The main library is the Cline Library. The library offers services, instruction, and timely access to both print and electronic information and collections. The library has maintained a focus on providing service to distance learning students based on the institution's mission focus of access. This access has increased through electronic journals, E-books, and electronic document delivery. The library also staffs resource specialist teams, assigned by college, to assist faculty with all of their teaching needs, regardless of the delivery method.

The unit further supports its goals and mission through a Curriculum Lab and a Math and Science Classroom (MSC). In addition to over 40,000 holdings of curriculum, the Curriculum Lab also offers digital cameras, videotapes, cassette recorders, laminating services, and butcher paper for candidates to use in preparing for their courses and teaching assignments. The MSC was created to help prepare highly qualified teachers in math and the sciences. It is also used to help candidates teach math and science. The Unit maintains a Test Lab, which contains test materials in support of the school psychology program and other programs.

The primary support for technology is through the university's Information Technology Services (ITS). ITS operates and maintains information technology and telecommunications services in support of the Northern Arizona University mission and goals. Services include academic support, administrative systems support, student services, telecommunications, and faculty and staff support and training. The Unit also has its own Technology Assistance Group (TAG). TAG comprises of two candidate workers, two support systems analysts, the director of the Electronic Portfolio Project, and a staff member from E-Learning. Having this permanent E-Learning staff member helps support the unit's web courses (IR p. 138).

Resources for distance learning programs are sufficient to provide reliable and timely connection in the delivery system. This effort is institution wide and begins with the E-Learning Center. This Center provides technology training, support, assessment training, and assistance in evaluating courses to better prepare faculty for distance learning.

Overall Assessment of Standard

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. The informal and formal collaboration between the colleges is extensive, and the institutional commitment to education is quite evident. All of the supporting components of the institution--library, technology, outreach, distance learning--all have a clear commitment to the unit and its success. The unit's partnerships with the education community extend the use of its resources, from bringing students to the campus for teaching, to taking the curriculum to the schools across the state, and meeting candidates where they work. All of the components to support an effective professional education unit are present.

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
n/a	

AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
n/a	

New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. The unit lacks the authority and structure to approve and manage curriculum decisions for all of its programs.	Because each college utilizes its own curriculum approval committee, changes could be made to a program that involves both the COE and another college without the other's knowledge until it reaches the University Curriculum Committee. This does not appear to be occurring due to the informal communication of the USTEC and PEU Steering Committee.

Recommendation for Standard 6

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

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

--

Persons Interviewed

--

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

Exhibits
Interviews

See **Attachments** panel below.

(Optional) State Addendum: