NCATE

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★ *Report*

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:
Dr. Mark A. Hogan
Dr. Bonnie J. Banker
Mrs. Wanda G. Kindell
Dr. William E. Roweton

State Team:
Dr. Susan D. Henderson
Dr. Julie Smart

State Consultant:
Marcia Berry
Sherry Schneider

NEA or AFT Representative:
N/A

Continuous Improvement Visit to:

ANDERSON UNIVERSITY

College of Education
316 Boulevard
Anderson, SC 29621
October 19-21, 2014

Type of Visit:
Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
First visit - Advanced Preparation

BOE Report for Continuous Improvement Pathway (Updated May 2013)

Summary for Professional Education Unit

Institution Name:

Anderson University

Team Recommendations on Meeting Standards:

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

Not Applicable = Unit not reviewed for this standard and/or level

Team Recommendations on Movement Toward Target:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging)	Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging)
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 4: Diversity	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Not Applicable = Unit did not select this as a target standard

I. Introduction

I.1 Brief Overview of the institution and the unit.

Anderson University is a independent liberal arts, faith-based, university with a 102 year heritage in upstate South Carolina. The university is regionally accredited by The Commission of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to award baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral degrees. The institution serves 2,625 undergraduates and 297 graduates, of which 18 percent are minority students, and 32 percent are male. The College of Education (unit) oversees all undergraduate and graduate education degree programs. Within the unit the following programs oversee their individual licensure areas: early childhood, elementary, special education, secondary education, physical educaton, and graduate educational leadership and administration.

The 2014 EPP Annual Report indicated that in the 2012-2013 academic year the unit certified 95

candidates for teaching licensure and 29 candidates for administrative licensure for a total of 124 program completes. Course work is delivered predominantly on campus, with some online delivery, however, there are no distance campus sites.

I.2 Summary 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 a joint visit with the South Carolina team and the NCATE/CAEP review team. In addition to assessment of NCATE Standards, the South Carolina team reviewed the programs for compliance to the state standards. There was no deviation from the state protocol.

I.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.).

There are no branch campuses, off-campus sites, or distance learning offered at Anderson University. The unit does provide some online coursework and candidates and alumni within these courses were interviewed as part of the site review process.

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

There are no unusual circumstances that affected the site visit.

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.

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

"Builders of Knowledge, Values, and Community" is a coherent theme that threads through all programs of the unit. This conceptual framework springs from the university's mission statement and is evident throughout each program of the unit in the assessment of knowledge, skills, and dispositions of candidates. Evident in course syllabi, unit signage, and the unit's assessment system the conceptual framework is articulated through written and web communications, and evident in the training materials of P12 practitioners who supervise clinical experience.

The unit's conceptual framework divides knowledge, values, and community through looking at each with specificity relevant to the licensure area being prepared. Elementary curriculum stresses foundational knowledge and problem solving skills, whereas secondary curriculum stresses building knowledge from foundational knowledge toward problem solving and analytical knowledge. Throughout the initial licensure programs and the administrative licensure program the unit emphasizes social constructivist theory. Thus transformational learning is evident in course expectations, field experience assessments, and a gateway system that allows for developmental knowledge development.

Professional dispositions are assessed throughout the program as an extension of the conceptual framework dynamic of values. As a faith-based institution candidates are encourages to be reflective on

the integration of their values with the valuing of knowledge, children, and colleagues. The unit uses reflective practice a means to reinforce candidate exploration of values and as was evident in candidate interviews and course syllabi, as well as interviews with faculty, candidates are encourages, sometimes challenged, to explore how their values evolve and expand as they teach in a multicultural, diverse school setting.

The third arm of the conceptual framework, Community, is evident in the curriculum. program field placement designs and delivery, and opportunities provided candidates at both the initial and advanced levels. The use of informal assessment of the unit's assessment structures related to field experience is an example of living within community as the conceptual framework emphasizes.

The conceptual framework of "Builder of Knowledge, Values, and Community" is evident throughout both initial and advanced programs through setting direction for curriculum design, teaching, candidate performance. The service and scholarship of faculty is framed by the conceptual framework, however it was not as clear as how this is used to measure the unit's accountability. Though it was clear through interviews, review of syllabi and unit documents, as well as school site visits that the conceptual framework was being authentically applied in the unit's program and design.

III. Unit Standards

The following pages contain a summary of the findings for each of the six NCATE unit standards.

Standard 1

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.

1.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

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. Assessment indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Anderson University offers eight certification programs: undergraduate elementary (2-6), graduate (M.A.T), early childhood (K-3), physical education (K-12), special education multi-categorical (K-12), secondary English education (9-12), secondary mathematics (9-12), and secondary social studies (9-12). Evidence was provided that candidates at the initial level know the content that they plan to teach as measured by Praxis II. For 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2012-13, over 80 percent of the EPP's program completers passed Praxis II, the State's licensure test for content; this was true for each academic year and for each program.

Recent SPA evaluations found only two initial programs, secondary English education and secondary mathematics education, were recognize without conditions.

Other than clinical ratings by supervisors and self-assessments, the SSR presents no additional evidence that candidates in the advanced certification program (M.Ed.in Administration and Supervision) have in-depth knowledge of the content in their field of preparation, e.g., educational administration. However, advanced levels courses do contain content appropriate for this preparation.

In both college classrooms and in the field, narrative and assessment data indicated that the candidates are learning. (See Exhibit 1.4.g.)

Section IV of the Unit Work Sample developed during the candidates' clinical experience describes the evaluation of K-12 student learning. Aggregated data displayed pre-test, post-test, and gain scores for K-12 students from several school classes. Results of individual student performance show gain and learning achievement. (However, data was not aggregated and analyzed with typical descriptive and inferential statistical approaches (e.g., statistical significance, confidence intervals, effect size).

In the Clinical Benchmark III key assessment data, a clinical unit supervisor rates the candidate's long range planning, as it relates to content and pedagogy and technology; the quality of the unit work sample; and the lesson plan. The scoring rubric is aligned with state standards.

Here are some examples. (The SSR provided one year of data but did not always include all programs.)

Using a 3 point scale, Benchmark III assessed long range planning, content, and pedagogy by the EPP supervisor. Results indicated that ratings ranged from 2.69 to 2.93 for elementary education candidates (spring, 2013, fall, 2013), from 2 to 3 for physical education candidates (fall, 2013), from 2.33 to3.00 for secondary English education candidates (fall and spring, 2013), and from 1 to 3 for secondary social studies education candidates (fall, 2013). See Exhibit 1.4.d.1).

For one key skill measure, the EPP supervisor rated candidates on the use of technology. Ratings averaged at near 3 for secondary social studies education candidates for the fall and spring, 2013, semesters. Also, on technology, the EPP supervisor rated secondary math candidates (3.00, spring, 2013 semester)and MAT education candidates (2.98, fall, 2013 semester). (See Exhibit 1.4.d.3.)

For student learning and exceptionalities, the EPP supervisors rated elementary education and secondary English education candidates for two semesters, spring and fall, 2013, and the ratings averaged from 2.5 to 3. Physical education candidates, secondary social studies education candidates, as well as secondary math education candidates and MAT education candidate average ratings ranged from 2.00 to 3.00. (See Exhibit 1.4.d.2).

Evaluating reflective professional practice, average ratings for students in elementary education, physical education, secondary English education, secondary math education, and MAT education candidates averaged from 2 to 3. (See Exhibit 1.4d.1)

Anderson University's EPP employs observational ratings and self-ratings. As related to its Conceptual Framework--"Builders of Knowledge, Values, and Community," diverse dispositions are assessed and shows that professional dispositions are measured by unit and partner reviewers at Benchmarks I and III, during clinical experiences, and following graduation as in-service teachers. Numerical data were available for one or two semesters by program.

Self-assessment results, for example, for fall 2013 in Benchmark I (i.e., Exhibit 1.4.f.1) provided mean rating scores for dispositions related to knowledge, values, and community for five initial programs. Most mean ratings were above the mid-point of the three point rating scale. Similar self-assessment results from the spring 2013, semester appeared for elementary education, MAT elementary education, and secondary social studies education candidates. (See Exhibit 1.4.f.1.)

An assessment of the candidate's ability to accommodate diversity ethnic/racial diversity in classrooms was a capstone project in EDU 316/317. Several student project papers were provided. While the student project papers provided a limited set of data indicating that the candidates recognize diversity cognitively, there was no evidence presented in the SSR that the candidates clearly model these professional dispositions in their work with students, families, colleagues, and communities.

Given Anderson University's protocols, advanced candidates complete a self-assessment instrument related to dispositions at Benchmarks VI and VII. Sometimes, only one semester of self-assessment data are available and sometimes two semesters. Tables did not indicate the numbers in each cohort or if cut scores were utilized to distinguish levels of competency.

A follow-up survey by principals rated M.Ed. in Administration and Supervision graduates on their ability to foster student learning, in managing schools and resources, nurturing positive school climate, ability to interact with stakeholders, etc. All mean rating were above the scale's midpoint of 2. Mean ratings ranged from 2.11 (i.e., management of school organization for safe, efficient, and effective learning environment) to 3.00 (i.e., as leader, demonstrates integrity, fairness, and ethical behavior).

Advanced candidates also self-assessed themselves as builders of knowledge, values, and community. (See Exhibit 1.4.f.13). Results from the fall and/or spring 2013, semester, were above the scale's midpoint of 2. At the advanced and at the initial levels, the EPPs curricula and program assessments are guided by its conceptual framework; by South Carolina's system for assisting, developing, and evaluating professional teaching (ADEPT); by the Policy Guidelines for South Carolina Teachers; by InTASC standards; by the NCATE standards; and, for the advanced program, by the Preparation of Educational Leaders 2011 standards. Both assessments and curricula as well as clinical experiences align to relevant standards.

Considered collectively, these standards address a range of knowledge, skill, and dispositional attributes of effective educators. For example, protocols associated with the State of South Carolina guidelines demonstrate that 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 at the initial level.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable to this standard.

1.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The EPP reviews experiential data at annual retreats and institutes changes. Evidence provided in exhibits in Standards 1 and 2 indicate that the change is based upon a data decision-making change model, a strategy noted by EPP and Anderson University faculty as well as school partners.

First, for initial level programs, procedures associated with the benchmark assessments were streamlined. Second, the Candidate Assistance Plans (CAPs) were subdivided into short and long term. Students receiving long-term CAPs cannot continue beyond 16 hours and prior to entrance into the Teacher Education Program. Third, the Praxis I test must be completed prior to enrollment in the course when students apply for entrance into the Teacher Education Program. Fourth, for students enrolling in Anderson in the fall 2013, candidates must pass the Praxis II and the PLT prior to the clinical experience. Fifth, a review of portfolio data indicated that too many students at the Benchmarks I and II were not able to explain constructivism and its application to the classroom. Therefore, Brooks and Brooks' (1999) The Case for Constructivist Classrooms, is now required reading for faculty and students in Educational Psychology (EDUC 211) beginning in fall, 2014. Sixth, the unit adopted TaskStream software to collect and archive data, including student examples of related to Capstone Projects.

First, beginning fall 2013, the internship in the M.Ed. in Administration and Supervision increased from one to two semesters. Second, the College of Education Graduate Studies admission process added interviews with student applicants.

Additional initiatives are planned. First, lab classrooms will be established in two area elementary schools. Second, minimum GPAs and SAT scores as recommended by the State of South Carolina Department of Education will be adopted. Third, enrolling students are issued iPads to support the University's Mobile Learning Initiative. Fourth, starting June, 2014, a full-time data manager will be hired to insure consistent and high quality data entry.

1.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

There are several indicators suggesting that this EPP is functioning at the target level. First, nearly all initial program completers pass the PRAXIS II, South Carolina's content examination. Second, because of well-sequenced course content, initial program candidates master content and content-specific content, and advanced level candidates have the skills to model key educational functions for all 21st Century educators, like analyzing student learning data. Third, though course content, clinical practice, and self-assessment, candidates learn that educator-dispositions along with teacher and/or the administrator's knowledge and skills facilitate student learning.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are no plans and timelines for attaining	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *OR* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance

target level performance as described in the unit standard.	level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	level performance as described in the unit standard.	as described in the unit standard.

1.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

1.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

1.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

1.4 Recommendations

For Standard 1

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 2

Standard 2: Assessment System And Unit Evaluation

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

2.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The EPP's assessment system reflects the conceptual framework, assessing the three themes of Knowledge, Values, and Community. Review of assessment instruments, interviews with faculty,

candidates, and P-12 practitioners provided evidence that the EPP has set measures from the beginning to end of the program to measure the conceptual framework themes in addition to professional, state, and InTASC standards. As mentioned in the formative report, and verified in the onsite visit, the EPP uses a variety of evaluations measures, such as the Teacher Audition assessment, within-course-specific assignments, reflective practice responses, field placements evaluations, and candidate interviews to build on the EPP benchmark system which measures candidates' knowledge, pedagogical skills, and self-dispositions at the initial and the advanced levels.

The assessment system is informally reviewed on a regular basis with school practitioners and faculty from the arts and sciences who supervise field experiences. Interviews with unit faculty provided evidence that the assessment system is reviewed for fairness, accuracy of the instruments and the system itself, with formal assessment retreat held during the academic year. Further evidence gained from interviews indicated that change in the practice of the field assessment instruments have been made due to the feedback of practitioners, candidates, and analysis of data gleaned from the instruments. Beyond limited employer surveys there was not evidence that would support the EPP is measuring the relationship of the candidates' performance assessments with their actual performance later in classrooms and schools.

Through interviews with faculty and school practitioners, candidate and alumni, as well as assessment of data collected it was evident that candidate assessment of data collected are not only regularly and systematically collected, aggregated, summarized and analyzed to improve candidate performance and program quality. What was not present was evidence to show that the unit is collecting, or engaging the P-12 community to assess regularly and systematically its unit operations.

Requests to provide disaggregated data review the past three cycles of assessment were met after some research which reflects the unit's transition from one system of data collection to a new method in the past 12 months. Moving to this new system is evidence of the EPP developing and testing different information technologies to improve its assessment system. Review of the new system showed the EPP has a plan, a system, and can produce both aggregated and disaggregated data in order to report publically candidate performance, program quality. Again, there was no evidence within the new system that is presently measuring unit operations.

Review of candidate files and interviews with faculty and EPP, as well as university, administrators indicates that the EPP has system for maintaining records of formal candidate complaints. While there were none, a system also is in place that would provide for storage of the complaints and resolutions.

As stated in the Self-Study, the Formative Report, and the Addendum the unit regularly uses data (initial and advance) to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs and clinical experiences. Much of the data collect is focused on program and clinical experiences. The onsite review could not ascertain evidence that the same was being done regularly or systematically to assess unit operations, nor provide evidence from interviews that the P12 constituency was engage in the assessment of unit operations. Minutes from Data Retreats indicate discussion of data but retreats agendas indicate that the focus was more on candidate data and field experience data. Review of minutes of program advisory councils revealed similar results.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

The EPP chose Standard 2 as the Target Standard. The evidence gathered through the Addendum and the site visit, as well as requested evidence asked for in the Formative Report shows that the EPP is in the developing stage of it movement toward target status.

The EPP has developed a regular and systematic assessment system to measure candidate and program performance, there was no evidence to indicate the same is done regularly within the measuring of unit operations, particularly in the area of engaging the P-12 community in assessment unit operations. This lack of P-12 engagement and continuous assessment of unit operations has kept the EPP from the target level, however evidence at the site visit shows target-level status may be present in measuring candidate and program performance.

Evidence through interviews and review of documents indicate that the unit has moved in the last 12-24 months toward a more systematic assessment system with a more robust data management system in place, however, as the EPP moved toward program advisory councils there is some inconsistency in the degree to which all program data collection is being used to improve total unit improvement. Interviews of faculty, candidates, arts and science faculty supervising clinical experience, and P-12 partners indicate that not all programs have completed a full assessment loop and thus have not provided data to analyze, utilize, and design continuous improvement models. This inconsistency further shows that the unit is at the developing toward target stage and has not yet reached the target stage.

The EPP has begun the process for a regular and systematic assessment of candidate and program performance through a data management system that is able to collect, aggregate, provide analytical data which informs the unit in potential continuous improvement.

The EPP has initiated assessment cycle plans for individual programs through the use of data collected in its data management system, Data Retreats, a systematic benchmark model, candidate exit interviews, and planned employer surveys to move toward sustained continuous improvement.

The was no timeline provided that indicated the EPP's plan for sustainability of the assessment system.

2.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

2.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as

is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *OR* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	None

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	None

2.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
1. The unit's system does not engage P-12 collaboration to manage and improve the unit's operations.	While there was evidence of P-12 collaboration for program improvements, there was no evidence that the unit has engaged P-12 collaboration to manage and improve the unit's operations or in the design and delivery used to assess the unit's operations.

2.4 Recommendations

For Standard 2

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging)
Advanced Preparation	Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging)

Standard 3

Standard 3: Field Experiences And Clinical Practice

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

3.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

On-site data confirm that the EPP, its school partners, and other members of the professional community design, deliver, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice to help candidates develop their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

Interviews with EPP faculty and program coordinators indicated that initial and advanced programs meet twice a year with an Advisory Committee consisting of EPP faculty, P-12 school partners and teacher candidates. Elementary, Early Childhood, and Special Education program coordinators indicated that feedback from P-12 school partners was influential in initial program development. Interviews with cooperating teachers and school administrators affirm that P-12 faculty provide feedback about field and clinical experiences; this feedback in turn informs the EPP in making data-based decisions for the improvement of field and clinical experiences.

Data collected during the on-site visit indicated that the unit and its school partners jointly determine the specific placement of student teachers and interns for other professional roles to provide appropriate learning experiences.

Interviews with P-12 administrators indicated the hiring of a director of field experiences by the EPP has streamlined the placement process for initial and advanced candidates. The director maintains close contact with school administrators and has worked to build strong relationships with school partners. In addition, principals work with the director of field placements to ensure placements of high-quality and diversity for teacher candidates and graduate students.

Data indicate that the school and unit share expertise to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice. School administrators indicated that EPP faculty are involved in PD and teachers in the local school district also attend special training sessions, classes and programs hosted by the EPP. EPP faculty are involved in assessing curricular programs in local schools and implementing curricular interventions based on this data. In addition, EPP on-campus classroom space is shared with the local school districts as needed for teaching and meeting purposes. The EPP regularly reaches out to local school district faculty to invite them to special events on campus, such as guest speakers, and several school partners sit on the advisory council for Teaching Fellows.

At the school site visit and through interviews cooperating teachers gave evidence of P-12 collaboration on modeling instruction, observing the teacher candidate and providing detailed feedback, coaching the teacher candidates during small group instruction and communicating with university supervisors on a regular basis.

Data collected during the on-site visit indicate that field experiences facilitate candidates' development as professional educators. the school site visit provided evidence that candidates have the ability to work one-on-one with students, lead small group instruction, and can implement whole group instruction. Cooperating teachers and administrators indicated that candidates in initial and advanced programs are very engaged in the school and often attend after-school events and evening programs.

Data provided on site confirm that both field experiences and clinical practice reflect the unit's

conceptual framework and help candidates continue to develop the content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions delineated in standards.

Evidence gained at the school site visit indicated that candidates' field experiences provide opportunities for integration of math and science using inquiry-based instruction, have an opportunity to observe and implement a wide array of research-based instructional practices, Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS).

Data indicate that clinical practice allows candidates to use information technology to support teaching and learning. Field experiences provide candidate engagement in classrooms equipped with SMART boards, SMART tables, ipads and desktop computer stations.

On-site data confirm that clinical faculty, which includes both higher education and P–12 school faculty, use multiple measures and multiple assessments to evaluate initial and advanced candidate skills, knowledge, and professional dispositions in relation to professional, state, and institutional standards. EPP clinical supervisors indicated that they had received training on key clinical practice assessments and procedures through the following methods: group supervisor training, one-on-one training, shadowing an EPP in the local school district. New EPP clinical supervisors also reported being paired with a mentor to answer any questions regarding clinical practice assessments or procedures. In addition, EPP clinical supervisors reported meeting with the EPP director of field placements at the beginning of the clinical practice semester in order to go over all forms and any changes that had been made to clinical practice assessments. EPP clinical supervisors also indicated that they meet with the teacher candidate and cooperating teacher at for an exit conference to evaluate the candidate's performance in clinical practice and pedagogical skills.

P-12 administrators described EPP faculty as "part of their school culture." Administrators and cooperating teachers indicated that EPP supervisors regularly communicate with school partners about the progress of the initial and advanced candidates and visit the school regularly to observe and evaluate students in field experiences and clinical practice. In addition, during interview with EPP faculty, program coordinators indicated that teacher candidates are provided multiple opportunities to reflect on real-world applications of professional dispositions related to the conceptual framework (Builders of Knowledge, Values and Community).

Data collected during the on-site visit indicate that candidates in advanced programs for teachers participate in field experiences that require them to apply course work in classroom settings, analyze P–12 student learning, and reflect on their practice in the context of theories on teaching and learning. During interviews, MEd Administration/Supervision Alumni indicated that in their internships, candidates took leadership roles and were provided the opportunity to work with student data and communicate with families on a regular basis. EPP faculty played a supportive role and frequently visited the school to check in with interns and monitor their progress. The internships provided meaningful applications of concepts learned in coursework. Field experiences were also catered to specific needs of candidates, since most were working full-time school positions at the time of internship; internship projects were designed with the school context in mind.

On-site data confirm that candidates demonstrate mastery of content areas and pedagogical and professional knowledge before admission to and during clinical practice. ADEPT data, disaggregated by program and performance standard, indicated that teacher candidates demonstrate mastery of key content, pedagogical skills and professional knowledge during clinical practice. As measured by an ADEPT observation instrument with a 3-point scale (with 2 indicating Proficiency) all programs in the unit averaged at least 2.0 or higher on the following observable areas: Established and maintains high expectations for learners, instructional strategies, content knowledge, monitoring and assessing learning, maintaining an environment that promotes learning, and classroom management.

Data collected during the on-site visit indicated that field experiences and clinical practice provide opportunities for initial and advanced candidates to develop and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn. During interviews, administrators discussed school placements for field and clinical experiences. School placements represent a wide range of diversity, including ranges in SES, ethnic diversity, and linguistic diversity. Administrators indicated that there are a variety of poverty-related issues that students encounter while working in the local schools, including students with incarcerated parents, students transience, and students with affidavits. In addition, administrators described a rapidly shifting demographic in the area due to growth of industries which has introduced a growing population of students who are English Language Learners. This demographic shift provides teacher candidates in the schools an excellent opportunity to learn and practice ELL strategies. School administrators describe the local school districts as a "melting pot of diversity," thus providing teacher candidates a wide array of experiences with diverse students during field experience and clinical practice.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable to this standard.

3.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

In the past several years, the EPP has transitioned away from a unit-level committee to examine field and clinical issues at the initial and advanced level and has developed program-level advisory committees. These program-level advisory committees meet twice a year and include EPP faculty, P-12 school partners, and teacher candidates. The purpose of these advisory committees is to communicate program-level data to school partners and to solicit P-12 feedback on field experiences and clinical practice. The dean of the School of Education indicated that these smaller, program-specific advisory committees allowed for a more authentic, focused voice from P-12 school partners in relation to field and clinical experiences and programmatic topics.

During interviews with EPP faculty, program coordinators indicated recent revisions to the requirements of teacher candidate reflections completed in conjunction with their field and clinical practices. These revised assignments provide teacher candidates with multiple opportunities to reflect on real-world applications of professional dispositions in their instructional practice during field and clinical practice. EPP faculty reported that these focused, application-based reflections have helped teacher candidates to connect with the conceptual framework, "Building Knowledge, Values and Community."

The unit describes many revisions they have made to their field experiences and clinical practice since their last NCATE visit. Among these adjustments are the hiring of a full-time Coordinator of Education Field Partnerships, a restructuring of field experience hour requirements to make program requirements more consistent and revisions to assessments of field experiences to increase reliability and validity. In addition, the unit has made an effort to increase the diversity of field experiences for all candidates so that they will have increased opportunities to work with students from diverse ethnic, cultural, racial and

socioeconomic backgrounds.

The unit has also developed an assessment of candidate dispositions aligned with the conceptual framework, since data had not previously been collected in this area. In addition, candidates are now required to focus completely on their clinical practice by ceasing their involvement with extracurricular athletics, fine arts performing, and outside work hours. In special cases, students are permitted to work a maximum of 10 hours on the weekends during clinical practice. The Unit also indicates current conversations with partner school districts about the possibility of lab classrooms and consideration of a one-year clinical practice experience.

3.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *OR* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

3.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale

3.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

3.4 Recommendations

For Standard 3

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 4

Standard 4: Diversity

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

4.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

During the site visit, interviews with senior staff, initial and advanced candidates, adjunct professors, and cooperating teachers confirmed intentional design of the curriculum ensured candidates understood the value of diversity as it is linked into to conceptual framework as it relates the EPPs idea of constructivism as outlined in the concept of value.

Evidence shows the candidates at the initial and advanced levels have field experiences that allowed them multiple opportunities to interface with diverse populations within peers, P-12 practitioners, and P-12 students. The EPP provides opportunities for candidates to reflect on their observations and practices in schools and communities with students from diverse ethnic/racial, language, gender, and socioeconomic groups. Clinical faculty design learning experiences for candidates to help them process diversity concepts and provide feedback to them about their performance.

Evidence from the site visit revealed that candidates in the initial and advanced programs have field and clinical experiences with diverse populations. A visit to Nevitt Forest Elementary School, which serves as an AU Lab for candidates had a diverse student population revealed the totality of the diversity available to candidates for authentic experiences. Field experiences and clinical practice provided experiences with male and female P-12 students from different socioeconomic groups and several ethnic/racial groups.

Candidates also work with English Language Learners and students with disabilities during some of their field experiences as well as clinical practices which allows them to develop and practice their

knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for working.

The EPP's exhibits, interviews with candidates, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers provide evidence of the unit's ability to provide learning opportunities designed to help candidates understand the influence of culture on education and acquire the ability to develop meaningful learning experiences for all students.

As cited in the offsite report, the unit has made extensive revisions to the curriculum and field experiences to better prepare candidates to demonstrate appropriate knowledge, skills and dispositions while working with diverse professionals and P-12 students (4.4.2b). A review of minutes provided by the unit confirmed monthly meetings held to discuss activities for faculty as well as assignments, expectations, and courses for candidates. Graduate Program Alumni stated that through the multicultural online class, they felt very prepared to work with diversity in their present employment. They felt the online class provided an opportunity to look at diversity beyond race and ethnicity.

In addition, practitioners were available to give "First-hand accounts of the diversity they were encountering." Coursework in the graduate program also provided knowledge of diversity by integrating the concept across courses, including the School of Law and Public Relations courses. Interviewees from the Secondary Candidates Interview stated, diversity was emphasized as being beyond the culture and ethnicity and encompassed SES, exceptionalities, etc. These candidates further stated they were able to apply their knowledge of diversity during their field experiences.

Evidence provided during the site visit shows that data retreats are held at the end of every semester to review all data gathered from portfolios, auditions, benchmarks, and grades. Data are analyzed and recommendations made for individual candidates, courses, programs, and the unit as a whole. Candidates submit electronic portfolios as well as other information to TaskStream, a portal to manage data. A review of TaskStream, sample portfolios, rubrics, and interviews with candidates provided evidence of the EPPs efforts to utilize feedback to improve the education program. The need for more detailed data led to this change in the teacher education program. Capstone projects, many addressing diversity, were identified for undergraduate and advanced classes during these meetings. These projects are now correlated to dispositions, state standards, and specialty program areas. What is not clear in the SSR and exhibits presented regarding the capstone projects, or in evidence (i.e. assessment retreat discussion references) is whether there is any significant shift in great diversity awareness and ability to work with diverse populations brought about by the changes in the capstone criteria.

After reviewing a document entitled, "The College of Education Assessment System" presented by the COE, evidence to substantiate the effectiveness of assessments provided to ensure candidates are able to reflect on diversity and develop skills for having a positive effect on student learning. Although it is clear the EPP has strategically implemented programs and curriculum to address this standard, evidence provided doesn't assess the effectiveness of the programs.

The "Call Me Mister Program", is an excellent example of efforts by the Unit has to ensure candidates have opportunities to work with diverse candidates. This program is geared specifically towards African-American males, going into Education Profession. There was no evidence that long-term recruitment strategies are in place to sustain this program or if active recruitment is current taking place on the campus of AU.

The evidence shows candidates have limited opportunities to interact with professional education faculty from other units both male and female from at least two ethnic/ racial groups. Upon request, the unit provided evidence of employment of an African-American male who oversees the "Call Me Mister Program." This faculty member was hired for fall 2014. During the interviews with cooperating teachers, there was no male presence and no cooperating teachers of color. The administrators available during the

interview session was a mixture of male and females, but none of them were of color. The Unit Supervisor, which was part of principal/administrator group was an African-American male. After careful review of requested documents that provide ethnic/racial breakdown of the Professional Education Faculty, and interviews with senior administration, it is evident the EPP does not have faculty from diverse groups that informs the EPP's curriculum, pedagogy and field experiences in culturally meaningful ways. There are no faculty from diverse backgrounds who can assist candidates in addressing teaching and learning from multiple perspectives and different life experiences. The exhibits provided and notes taken during interviews with senior administration indicates there are not different voices in the professional development and work of the education profession.

There was also no evidence of the EPP's efforts to recruit, hire, or retain faculty from diverse populations. A plan that is monitored, and revised regularly to provide guidance in ensuring and maintaining diverse representation was not available during the Site visit. The Site Team was given a copy of a document entitled, "Forward 2021 Quality, Innovation, and Stewardship": The 6-Year Strategic Plan of Anderson University, which is in draft form, but review of the document shows no plan to recruit or hire faculty of color; nor does it mention how the EPP would recruit, admit, and retain candidates of color.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

4.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The EPP has intentionally addressed culturally responsive awareness within courses.

The unit has continued to monitor candidate field placements to ensure diversity.

4.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects

| described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.

AND

There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | of the target level rubric for this standard.

OR

There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

[BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.] | of the target level of the rubric for this standard.

AND

There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | of the target level rubric for this standard.

AND

There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. |

4.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Candidates have limited opportunities to interact with university, unit, and P-12 faculty members from diverse groups.	Candidates have opportunities to interact with P-12 faculty members from diverse groups. This rationale was removed because the P-12 faculty has been taken care of. The EPP still has not addressed opportunities to interact with university and unit faculty of diverse groups.

4.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None	

4.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
1. The unit has not demonstrated efforts to recruit and maintain male and female faculty from diverse ethnic/racial groups.	The unit has not created good-faith efforts to recruit and maintain male and female faculty from diverse ethnic/racial groups with a sustainable, comprehensive and systematic plan; however, the unit did hire one faculty of color in Fall 2014.
2. The unit has not demonstrated efforts to recruit and maintain male and female candidates, from diverse socioeconomic and ethnic/racial groups.	Despite the fact of a five-person Call Me Mister program, there was no evidence that the unit has created good-faith efforts to increase and maintain a pool of candidates from diverse socioeconomic and ethnic/racial groups with a sustainable, comprehensive and systematic plan.

4.4 Recommendations

For Standard 4

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable

Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 5

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance And Development

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

5.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Professional education faculty have earned doctorates or exceptional expertise that qualifies them for their assignments as shown in the course assignment chart from Table 1 of the Addendum for Standard 5. Further evidence is seen in curriculum vita for full-time and part-time faculty at the initial and advanced levels. The definitions of full-time faculty and part-time faculty are clearly defined in the Anderson University Personnel Handbook, Section 5.22, which the EPP follows.

The IDEA student evaluation reports show that the professional education faculty at the initial and advanced levels have a thorough understanding of the content they teach and that they integrate technology through their teaching at the initial and advanced level. Responses such as "Although you have to put a ton of time into this class, I have learned a lot to get me prepared for my upcoming years and becoming a teacher" and "It is very obvious that (professor) knows a lot about the content of child development" from IDEA comment sections point to such teaching effectiveness and knowledge of content. Interviews with initial and advanced program candidates show that faculty integrate technology and model its use in classes. Candidates commented that faculty use various types of technology in classes, allow candidates to use and add to knowledge base, and take critical look at the use of various types of technology. Interviews with Graduate Program Alumni confirmed the knowledge base of the faculty as they commented that the faculty have been great, that they are knowledgeable of their fields, and they present relevant information for schools today. One graduate alumni stated that "I have had several experiences already this year as an assistant principal in which I could handle the situation because I recalled what I learned in the Anderson University program." In addition, others commented that faculty are not only current but hold candidates to high rigor and high expectations.

The faculty professional development plans provided as evidence show that the faculty do assess their own effectiveness as teachers, scholars, and service contributors. In addition, the Adjunct Response Form for the IDEA Diagnostic Form Report shows reflection on learning objectives, progress the students report on learning objectives, response to students' rating to Excellent Teacher, response to students' views of course requirements and student effort, and changes for the future.

Professional education faculty demonstrate scholarly work in their fields of specialization and are engaged in different types of scholarly work based on the missions of their units and institution. The Addendum provided explains in detail the definition of scholarship based on Boyer (1990) and four areas of scholarship. Interviews with the Faculty Status Committee and the Provost confirmed this model as they explained differences that are recognized. The updated chart has current scholarly activity listed for 15 EPP faculty for 2012-13. Exhibit 1 for the Addendum further defines scholarship, research, and professional development. For comparison, the scholarly and professional activities for the School of Business are documented for 2012-13 which shows a similar comparison of types of activities.

Each faculty member has access to $500.00 for professional development/scholarly activity in the EPP budget which can be supplemented by requesting additional funding from the University's Faculty Development Committee. This source of funding was supported through the interview with the provost and with a faculty member currently on the Faculty Status Committee who had been chair of the Faculty Development Committee.

Professional education faculty provide service to the college or university, school, and broader community in ways that are consistent with the institution and unit's mission and provide education-related services at the local and state level. Details are given in the Addendum for Standard 5 regarding P-12 service of full-time EPP faculty which involve workshops for teachers, some that are specifically related to identified needs in a district such as an Assistive Technology workshop and Great Instructional Website workshop. In addition, "faculty also design and implement research projects based on needs of local schools such as one that looked into increasing the passing rates of secondary students who had failed Algebra I." This was supported though the poster session with faculty and students who discussed various action research projects that have been completed. Interviews with superintendents and cooperating teachers confirmed several had attended a summer technology workshop at the institution that had been offered to local school districts. In addition, the institution has invited the school districts to attend special events such as when key education speakers are brought to campus. Through interviews with local school district principals, information was shared that adjunct professors from the institution have provide professional development workshops in various schools.

The Addendum for Standard 5 describes the various service opportunities and projects that the EPP faculty along with candidates at the initial and advanced levels complete through EPP club meetings and other venues. When candidates were asked about such service activities in interviews, they mentioned tutoring math, working with children in Belize, helping with the Magi Project, and participating in the Buddy Walk, the Autism Walk, and Special Olympics. One MAT candidate stated that the School of Education truly promotes the aspect of the conceptual framework of being Builders of Community through community service.

Professional education faculty collaborate with faculty in other university units at the initial level. With the three secondary programs (English, Math, and Social Studies), there is collaboration with colleagues in the College of Arts and Sciences. An Internal Partnership Agreement between the dean of the college of Education and the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences documents the collaboration regarding curriculum development, advising, and SPA reports. In addition, secondary-area faculty participate in Secondary Programs Advisory Council meetings where the Addendum states that secondary-area faculty "are apprised of the EPP Benchmark data produced by secondary program candidates....and are part of the analysis that reviews program strengths and areas in need of improvement."

Professional education faculty also collaborate with the professional world of practice in P-12 schools. The Addendum for Standard 5 states that "two respective area public school teachers and respective area alumnus" serve on the five different Program Advisory Councils (Elementary, Early Childhood, Special Education, Physical Education, and Secondary Education) and meet "a minimum of once annually to analyze data generated by the candidates in the respective major programs and offer program suggestions based on that analysis." Two people in the superintendents interview group referenced they had served on the Teacher Education Advisory Board several years ago and had a general memory of looking at data. With the formation of lab schools, the EPP has further collaborated with P-12 colleagues as Table 3 in the Addendum for Standard 5 shows how five Education courses (335, 420, 440, 442, and 452) are taught at Nevitt Forest Community School of Innovation (K-5).

Interviews with EPP faculty confirmed that the unit conducts systematic and comprehensive evaluations for faculty teaching performance to enhance the competence and intellectual vitality of the professional

education faculty. Faculty receive teaching observation feedback by a peer in the fall semester and teaching observation feedback by the dean in the spring semester. This formal evaluation is added for the Professional Development Plans for the annual evaluation. The dean also evaluates the teaching performance of faculty members by data from the IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports through "Progress on Relevant Objectives" and "Overall Ratings." In addition to the quantitative data, the dean reviews all student comments. The Dean meets with individual faculty to discuss the evaluations and any possible areas for improvement. At subsequent meetings, progress toward identified areas is discussed.

In addition, the director of the Center for Learning and Teaching Excellence is always available to give feedback on teaching as well as mid-course reviews as discussed in the faculty interviews and the Sustainability Group interview. From the various forms of feedback received and comments made on the Professional Development Plans, faculty use the information received to improve their teaching, scholarship, and service.

The unit provides opportunities for faculty to develop new knowledge and skills through the Center for Learning and Teaching Excellence. As stated in the Addendum provided in Standard 5, this Center is responsible for assisting beginning teachers and developing experienced teachers through faculty development, instructional development, and curriculum development, and Exhibit 4 describes the many opportunities that were available in 2013-14.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

5.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable to this standard.

5.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

EPP faculty continue to equip themselves in new training, e.g. Common Core, technology skills, SPA standards, and ISTE-NETS standards.

Course syllabi show greater alignment with InTASC and state standards.

5.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED

Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. **_AND_** There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. **_OR_** There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. **_AND_** There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. **_AND_** There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale

5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale

5.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale

5.4 Recommendations

For Standard 5

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 6

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

6.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Visit interviews with administrators, faculty, and students, plus documents provided, confirm that the institution provides the unit leadership, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. The addendum and the interviews provided clarification of questions raised by the BOE as to adequacy and sufficiency of these allocations in some areas.

Colleagues in other units at the institution involved in the preparation of professional educators recognize the unit as a leader on the campus. An important area of collaboration between unit faculty and faculty in other units of the institution involved the preparation of the SPA reports. The information from the content area faculty made an important contribution to the development of these reports for professional evaluation.

Both the information in the addendum and interviews with content area faculty reveal that SOE faculty seek approval from the respective departments regarding any potential curriculum changes. One content area faculty member reported meeting with an education faculty member to determine the best approach to deliver a particular content course for education majors. Content area faculty, with background in the field of education, serve as the contact source for secondary candidates and often serve as a dual advisor with education to the secondary candidates. The SOE has designated a coordinator of secondary education programs who meets annually with content area faculty to discuss issues related to program improvement.

The unit has established content area advisory councils and minutes from some of these groups corroborated their convening. These minutes reflected the attendance of SOE faculty, student representatives and one P-12 educator. Evidence within the minutes of the Elementary Advisory Council indicated a couple of references to using assessment data to make curricular adjustments. Although the Secondary Advisory Council has not formally met due to a new hire in the secondary faculty coordinator position, in spring 2014 an online survey was conducted with the membership of this council, particularly the P-12 school partners. Although the names of the participants were not given, the nature of the responses demonstrated a broad sampling and included a strong number of responses to questions about the valuable aspects of the program and suggested areas for improvement.

University policy is for faculty to teach 12 hours per semester and if a faculty member teaches a graduate course, the load is limited to nine hours. For several faculty in the SOE, work loads for teaching on campus and online generally exceed 12 hours for undergraduate teaching and nine hours for graduate teaching per semester or the equivalent. Visit interviews and load analysis sheets across three years reveal that in addition to heavy over loads, little or no credit is given for leadership responsibilities, such as associate dean or coordinator functions. In terms of full-time faculty involvement in delivering the graduate curriculum, it requires these faculty to frequently teach their graduate courses as an overload. This has the potential to jeopardize the quality of instructional delivery. While the institution claims to be primarily a teaching university, the overloads challenge professional engagement and quality research desired by deeply committed professional educators. Several faculty have persevered in spite of the demands due to their commitment to research and preparing quality candidates, but find these loads placing stress on their instruction as well as personal and family

commitments.

A full-time staff member was hired this summer to take over the coordination of TaskStream and to assist with data collection and analysis for both initial and advanced programs, which may lighten the administrative burden to some degree. Nevertheless, the assessment system requires considerable administrative and faculty input to assure a fully developed system that yields usable candidate data for evaluation and program improvement.

Faculty workloads include maintaining required office hours, participating in faculty committees, and advising students. Although advising assignments are fairly evenly distributed, the number assigned can be as high as 53 advisees for a single faculty member. At a minimum, advisees must meet with their advisor prior to scheduling of courses each semester or as frequently as needed. For the most part, advisors monitor candidates' progress through their programs and communicate with candidates their status in the program in person or by email correspondence. Candidates in both the initial and advanced programs report a high regard for the availability and assistance of faculty.

Faculty, who observe clinical candidates, are awarded three hours of load credit "for every 16 visits to the cooperating classrooms." In other words, each supervisor of the culminating clinical experience receives .1875-hour load credit for each visit resulting in four visits for four candidates. Adjunct faculty, many of which have been administrators or classroom teachers, conduct the majority of the clinical supervision.

The coordinator of Graduate Studies, a staff member who has been a part of the program since its inception, manages the advanced program in collaboration with the dean of the College of Education. They handle all of the advising for the advanced candidates. Advanced candidates (teaching in the field) report they can use any of the campus services that they used as any initial candidate. One advanced candidate talked about assistance he received in writing papers and another reported the valuable resourceful help by librarians.

The unit has adequate information technology resources to support faculty and candidates. Under the leadership of the provost, technology has been a focal point for the campus. As of 2011, the Mobile Learning Initiative was implemented with one aspect being the provision of an iPad to all incoming freshmen. Decisions have not been made regarding providing these resources for advanced candidates. Technology support personnel report that the COE are some of the first faculty to sign up for the mobile lab. Currently, five education classes are undergoing redesign for incorporating technology resources. Several advanced classes have been put online. Education classrooms are very well equipped with technology and candidates report they are required to use technology when they model lessons, including interactive approaches.

Alumni report that the use of technology was modeled throughout their professional preparation and they were applying some of the actual technology techniques they learned in their classrooms today. Under the leadership of an SOE faculty member who obtained a grant, Anderson University put on a technology workshop for teachers in Anderson School District 5 this past summer. Teachers reported this was a highly valued experience by all participants. There are many technology initiatives and strong support for the use of technology across the campus.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable to this standard.

6.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Continuing Improvements:

The unit continues to seek ways to improve the quality of their program both at the initial and advanced levels. For example:
1. The creation of a staff position for a full-time Data Manager.
2. The successful completion of terminal degrees by two unit faculty, resulting in a full complement of well-trained faculty with terminal degrees.
3. A campus commitment to technology and the excellent use of these resources by the unit faculty, including quality instruction in this area for candidates.
4. The use of highly qualified and experienced P-12 school personnel to serve as adjuncts.
5. High use of the library by SOE faculty for both initial and advanced instruction.

6.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *OR* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NONE PRIOR	

6.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NONE	

6.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
1. Faculty loads for teaching on campus and online generally exceed 12 hours for undergraduate teaching and nine hours for graduate teaching per semester or the equivalent.	Data provided regarding workloads and interviews with faculty indicated many full time faculty are consistently asked to teach significant overloads to meet the needs of the unit's curriculum.

6.4 Recommendations

For Standard 6

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

IV. Sources of Evidence

Documents Reviewed

Persons Interviewed

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

Sources of Evidence
Sources Interviewed

See **Attachment** panel below.

V. State Addendum (if applicable)

Please upload the state addendum (if applicable).

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.