NCATE

The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation

Offsite BOE Report:
Spalding University
July 12, 2011 1:00 pm - 5:00 pm

Offsite BOE Team Members

Dr. Kim E. Boyd, Chair
Dr. Cindy A. Dell, Member
Dr. Russell B. Olwell, Member
Dr. Lemuel W. Watson, Member
Dr. Brenda A. Priddy, State Chair
Dr. Linda Olasov, State Member

Offsite BOE Team Observers

Miss Allison T. Bell, State Consultant
Dr. Kimberly Walters-Parker, State Consultant
Dr. Donna M. Gollnick, NCATE Staff

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

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 Statement about the evidence

1.1 Statement about evidence
Praxis exams must be taken and passed prior to program completion and alternative certification candidates must meet this requirement by the end of their first semester of enrollment (one exception: P-12 Learning and Behavior Disorders). Data were not provided on overall unit pass rates on Praxis licensure exams due to low numbers of candidates taking exams (less than 10). However, the IR states that pass rates exceed the 80% threshold annually and that, when combined, pass rates ranged from 96 to 100% over the past three years with the exception of 2008-09 when it was 83%. Data were provided (Assessment #2) indicating individual candidate (anonymous) scores. Pass rate for Other School Professionals (principal) ranges from 66.7% (2007-08, n = 3) to 100% (2008-09, n = 10). Content knowledge is assessed at two other points, called Gates, at admission and prior to student teaching. At admission, initial candidates must have a 21 on the ACT (or 1430 on SAT) or "acceptable score" on GRE or Millers Analogy Test for advanced candidates. No aggregated mean data were provided for admissions (Gate 2). Initial candidates must maintain of 2.5 in their major while advanced candidates must maintain a 3.0. GPA data indicated a range of 2.91 (reading/writing endorsement) to 4.00 (principalship).

Content knowledge of initial candidates is also assessed through clinical practice and portfolios. Evidence provided from the Student Teaching Evaluation Protocols (STEP) showed strong grasp of content knowledge with 85.7 percent (n = 12) having a 4.0 mean score (4-point Likert scale) on the criterion regarding content knowledge (Spring 2009 candidates). The same candidates' mean scores on electronic portfolios, regarding content knowledge, was 2.668 (3-point Likert scale). No data were provided for advanced candidates' portfolios.

Content knowledge is also assessed through surveys of program completers and follow-up surveys of graduates and their employers. The follow-up surveys of graduates included data from two sources – the KY Education Professional Standards Board (2003-04 to 2009-10) and the unit (Exit Survey, fall 2009 to spring 2011 and Periodic Review, Spring 2010). Sources reported data

indicating high levels of satisfaction with preparation in regards in content knowledge. For example, 90% of the 2008-09 traditional completers and 75 % of alternative certification completers reported they were "very well prepared." Return rate of surveys was not reported, however, there were 62 respondents to the Unit Periodic Review, 27 respondents to the First Year Teacher Survey, and 28 respondents to the 2009-10 EPSB Teacher Survey.

Pedagogical content knowledge is assessed in methods courses (e.g., the classroom management plan) work in field settings and portfolios. For example, the mean e-portfolio score on education philosophy on 30 sample students is 2.96 and 2.91 on the professional growth plan. Mean scores are reported on every KY Teacher Standard and supporting indicator. However, data are not disaggregated by specific programs. Candidates admitted after 2009-10 must pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching exam for their respective area of certification prior to student teaching. Data are presented anonymously by candidate due to low number of candidates (e.g., elementary education, scores ranged from 164 to 195 – 161 is the required passing score). Pedagogical content knowledge is assessed in field and clinical experiences using STEP. Initial candidates' proficiency in pedagogy, as evaluated by cooperating teachers, is indicated by mean scores ranging from 3.63 to 3.82 (on a 4-point Likert scale), from fall 2007 to fall 2009. Advanced candidates' proficiency of pedagogical content knowledge is demonstrated through the design, implementation and analysis of research and application of research to practice. No data were provided. Further, they must demonstrate in their own practice those concepts critical to their respective content areas through professional development plans, electronic portfolios, and course embedded assignments. No data was provided to substantiate this.

Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions are assessed through "gates," as a part of the unit continuous assessment plan. Candidates are expected to demonstrate proficiency in collaborating with a variety of stakeholders to design, implement and evaluate learning experiences that impact student learning. Data are collected through the STEP process to measure candidate proficiency in this collaborative endeavor. The mean score was at or above the *competent* level threshold on a 4-point and pedagogical knowledge and skills. The results ranged from a mean of 3.34 to 3.74 on a 4-point Likert scale. Data were not disaggregated by program due to low numbers. The survey also asked candidates to rate how the program supported their abilities to help all students learn. 100% of indicated the programs either "fairly" or "very well" prepared them.

Content knowledge for other professional roles (principalship) is measured by the Kentucky Principals Test. The pass rate has ranged from 90% (2009-10) to 100% (2008-09). Only grade point average data were provided for counselors since it was just added in 2009-10 (e.g., 4.00 in research methods, n = 24).

Dispositions assessed are: visionary, ethical, caring, reflective, creative, and knowing. Faculty identified these six behaviors to support the theme, *Educator as Leader.* Disposition are assessed three times while candidates are in the program: admissions, during coursework, and student teacher semester. Data indicate a mean range of 2.67 (visionary) to 2.93 (creativity) for 15 candidates in fall 2010. Twenty-eight candidates in spring 2011 reported a range of 3.03 (ethics) to 3.32 (reflective). Data are disaggregated by program for initial candidates. No dispositional data were provided on advanced candidates.

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

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

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

(1) Assessment data on advanced candidates is limited.

   Rationale: The Offsite BOE Team could not locate assessment data related to advanced candidates meeting standards.

(2) Limited evidence was provided to demonstrate that advanced candidates are able to support student learning in P-12 settings.

   Rationale: Information related to student learning in advanced programs was not available.

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

(1) Latest updates on the state review of programs. How have programs responded to the missing information cited by the state? What is the current status of the state program approval process?
(2) Perspectives on the quality of programs by candidates, completers, and employers. What are school partner perspectives on Spalding candidates meeting standards and being prepared for their jobs? While Praxis scores are high, is this content knowledge making its way into a rich, well-presented curriculum in K-12 schools? What are the response rates on the surveys of employers and completers?
(3) How is data on content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, student learning, and dispositions summarized and used to inform program and unit improvement.
(4) Provide evidence that candidate assessment data has been collected, aggregated, disaggregated, and analyzed for the **past three years**.
(5) Pass rates on content tests for candidates in programs with few candidates. How are these candidates performing on state licensure tests? Because some programs had fewer than 10 completers, these data were not available. These data may be presented over a three-year period.
(6) Assessment data on candidates for each advanced program. What assessments are used? What data are collected on professional knowledge and skills, student learning, and dispositions? What is the unit learning from these candidate assessment data?
(7) How are data reflecting candidate impact on student learning summarized and used for program and unit improvement.   What evidence demonstrates that candidates can assess student learning and use data related to student learning to develop meaningful instruction to improve learning? Are these data disaggregated by program?
(8) What data are available on advanced candidate disposition evaluations and how are disposition data used for all programs?

(9) Page 9 of IR makes reference to literacy education in a course in the counseling program (SBC 600 Counselor Preparation. The report states that the course addresses KERA (KY Education Reform Act) initiatives. This law was passed in 1990 and resulted in systemic reforms throughout the Commonwealth that have been in place for nearly 20 years now. There are more current initiatives (e.g. KY Core Academic Standards which includes literacy) that should be addressed. How has the unit incorporated the additional initiatives?

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2.1 Statement about the evidence

The unit has a comprehensive 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. The unit's assessment system is based on the conceptual framework and is aligned with state and national standards. The assessment system is organized around GATES: GATES 1 – 4 are developed around the initial program; GATES 5 – 8 are developed around the advanced programs; and GATES 9 – 11 are developed around the other school professional programs. Each GATE includes several key internal and external assessments for which candidates must demonstrate proficiency prior to moving to the next benchmark. Most key assessments have scoring guides, including rubrics, for determining levels of candidate accomplishment.

While it is unclear what role the professional community has played in the evaluation of the assessment system, data reports from key assessments at the initial, advanced, and other school professional programs suggest that data are collected, summarized, and analyzed on a continuous basis and embedded in the culture of the unit.

Since its last visit in 2003, the unit has adopted and fully implemented the use of several technologies to support its assessment system, including LiveText, Excel, and SPSS. Faculty members have access to technologies used to support the assessment system. The unit also has a secured network drive that all faculty members have access to for storing data reports.

The unit's Assessment Committee, headed by the Associate Dean, is primarily responsible for the oversight of the assessment system. The committee generates the reports, summarizes the data, and leads faculty discussions around data generated reports.

To ensure assessments are free from bias, the unit employs three distinct activities: (1) faculty and the Assessment Committee review data longitudinally to ensure consistency in scoring; (2) training is required for new raters of e-Portfolio using scoring rubrics; and (3) the unit continuously conducts studies of inter-rater reliability of instruments where rubrics are used for scoring.

Data are disaggregated for candidates in alternate routes, so program and unit changes can be made specific to these programs. However, according to the document, "Examples of Changes Made to Program as Informed by Data," examples of changes made by the unit as informed by assessment data are limited to initial programs. No changes are described that are distinctly related to alternate route programs or advanced and other professional programs.

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

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs corrected from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
The unit makes limited use of information technologies to maintain the assessment system.	ITP,ADV	The unit has adopted and fully implemented the use of several technologies to support its assessment system, including LiveText, Excel, and SPSS.

2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard. None

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

(1) The role of the professional community in the assessment system. What role do members of the professional community play in evaluating the assessment system? (Interview members of the professional community.)
(2) Samples of candidates' professional growth plans. How are these growth plans being used? How often are they used? How do candidates perceive the value of these growth plans?
(3) Feedback received by candidates on key assessments. What opportunities are provided candidates to receive feedback? What access do candidates have to their assessment data?
(4) Files with candidate complaints and the unit's response. How are records on complaints and their resolutions maintained?
(5) Policies and procedures for filing a complaint. What do candidates know about the complaint review process? Is the unit following its policies and procedures?
(6) Program and unit changes for alternate route programs, advanced teaching, and other school professional programs. What data led to these changes?
(7) Use of assessment data by faculty. When are candidate assessment data discussed by faculty? What is faculty learning from candidate assessment data? What changes based on these data have been recommended by faculty? (Interview faculty about annual retreats and review agenda and other documents from the retreat.)
(8) Unit's analysis of program evaluation and performance assessment data. How are the data being used to initiate changes in programs and unit operations? As the unit learns more about candidate performance, where are they applying this information? What changes are being made to correct weaknesses?

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

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

3.1 Statement about the evidence

The unit believes that high quality field and internship experiences are essential to program success. Field experiences and internships continue to provide our candidates with diverse, real world experiences in their major fields of study. Unit faculty members believe that graduates must depart from the unit with the knowledge and experience to be highly effective practitioners and leaders in the education profession. Under the Director of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice, the unit maintains both formal and informal partnerships that are long-standing with many area schools. These partnerships form a collaborative relationship between the university and school districts. The unit and their internal and external partners together have developed components of the preparation programs that anchor field based activities in real-world settings where candidates get first-hand experiences of problems that classroom teachers, school guidance counselors, and principals face. With regards to partnership relations, the unit develops Memoranda of Agreements (MOA). The unit maintains partnerships with local public and parochial school systems to provide undergraduate and graduate programs and courses that focus on the goals of the school systems and the professional development needs of pre- and in-service teachers. Specifically, unit faculty maintain the belief that a connection to P-12 schools will: enrich the educational experience and preparation of candidates; promote ongoing professional development learning of practicing teachers through increased engagement with the university; support P-12 School districts' recruitment, preparation, and retention of a new generation of highly qualified teachers; build school leadership capacity in an era of heightened accountability; give candidates a broader understanding of their future possibilities through real world experiences and opportunities. The unit has developed partnerships for initial and advanced programs with Jefferson County Public Schools District and for advanced programs in principal preparation program and teacher leader program or school guidance counselor program with Archdiocesan Schools of Louisville, Bullitt Country Public Schools, and Shelby County Public Schools. All of the MOAs clearly state collaborative efforts to work together to enhance the overall experiences of field and clinical based practices.

Candidates in the Alternative Certification program are currently placed in schools in the school systems in Hardin, Bullitt, Oldham, Frankfort, Gallatin, Spencer, Jefferson counties, and West Point Independent. The partner school districts continually offer support in various ways, including the supervision and assessment of candidates. The field experiences are organized into three distinct levels: Level I: Observation, Level II: Participation, and Level III: Leading. Each of these levels is associated to specific courses and assignments. Many course assignments require teachers to apply course theory to their daily classroom practice. As candidates progress through the professional coursework sequence, they move from being observers of practice to serving as support to the teacher of record, working with small groups, and then planning and teaching mini lessons to both small and whole groups of students. This progressive involvement design prepares teacher candidates for their student teaching semester as well as their first years in teaching.

Students' field and clinical based experiences appear to be diverse with the counties used. Evidence of the types of required assignments and experiences are documents on the website. There is a Director of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice who coordinates placement for all clinical experiences.

Unit and school-based faculty have developed a history of working as partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice. One example of collaboration is evident in the recent redesign efforts of principal preparation (2008 through 2010), and the teacher leader programs (2007 through 2010), and the school guidance counselor program (2008 – 2009). University faculty (including colleagues in the arts and sciences), principals, teachers, and school district administrators collaboratively designed programs that placed emphasis on school-based experiences that include the participation of P-12 faculty and retired practitioners with contemporary experience in delivery, supervision, and evaluation.

Entry and exit requirements for students who enter the programs and student teaching candidates are clearly stated in the Student Teaching Handbook on pages 10 through 17.

Candidates who completed the clinical practice semester were mentored by cooperating teachers who met the following Kentucky Status (16 KAR 5.040):
(a) A valid Kentucky teaching certificate for each grade and subject taught;
(b) Attained Rank II certification;
(c) At least three (3) years of teaching experience on a Professional Certificate; and
(d) Taught in the present school system at least one (1) year immediately prior to being assigned a student teacher. EPSB's mandates have caused the previously approved M.A.E.D programs (including the MA in Administration) to be deleted.

In addition, supervising faculty criteria include familiarity with Kentucky teachers' certificate regulations, previous mentoring or supervisory experiences, and contemporary experience in a school setting at the level they supervised. The unit continues to provide cooperating teachers and supervisors orientation session on a regular basis prior to the start of the field experience. Descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of candidates, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors are described in the Student Teaching Handbook. Data collected from candidates, university supervising faculty, and cooperating teachers were very positive regarding a high quality experience for all involved.

3.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard

Using baseline data collected from faculty, teacher candidates, and cooperating teachers, unit faculty collaboratively developed the Renaissance Plan for Continued Improvement as a planning document to drive efforts of moving the unit performance on Standard 3 from ACCEPTABLE to TARGET. Strategies outlined in the Renaissance Plan fall into three areas for improvement that are broad categories aligned with the elements of Standard 3. It includes indicators and strategies for all programs related to collaboration with P-12 partners. The first year of implementation of the Renaissance Plan was 2010,

During the current reporting period, unit faculty have made a number of remarkable improvements to the field-based component of the preparation of "Educators as Leaders" at both the initial and the advanced levels. At the initial level, improvements have included intentional school placements, alignment of field-based projects and assignments to the three distinct levels. In Level I: Observation (Field Experiences) – early in their programs, candidates engage in observing classroom activities and environments from the perspective of a teacher and may support the classroom teacher in working with students. Level II: Participation occurs prior to student teaching within the classroom and under the guidance of the course instructor and qualified classroom teacher. Level II field experiences are designed to give candidates an opportunity to assist teachers and observe them introducing new material and gradually building deep conceptual understanding while continually motivating, managing, and assessing student learning for rigorous learning outcomes, Level III: Leading is a 14-week full-time experience in which candidates are required to assume full responsibilities of the classroom teacher. The student teaching phase of the program provides the most intensive experience, supervision, and feedback. Each of these levels is associated to specific courses and assignments.

This intentional improvement to the field-based program component ensures that candidates progress through the professional coursework sequence by moving from being observers of practice to serving as support to the teacher of record, and then planning and teaching mini lessons to both small and whole groups of students. Unit faculty, with support from its school partners, hold the belief that this progressive involvement design better prepares teacher candidates for their student teaching semester as well as their first years in teaching.

In 2010, the unit had a total of 42 candidates who were eligible for the clinical practice semester (student teaching). All 42 candidates were subsequently admitted to clinical practice but only 35 completed. The four (4) of the seven (7) candidates who did not complete clinical practice dropped out for personal reasons. The remaining three (3) moved to the Alternative Certification Program before they began the traditional student teaching placement.

Over the last three years, the unit has collaboratively involved unit faculty and its school partners to redesign the program and implement the only (as of December 2010) redesigned Principal Preparation Program in the State of Kentucky. The redesigned program assures that the unit and JCPS collaboratively participate in the recruitment and selection of candidates; the design and creation of the curriculum, projects, learning experiences, and the facilitation of classes; the evaluation of candidates' coursework in relationship to the ISLLC, KYCLS, and the unit's Conceptual Framework. This has been an opportunity to provide a robust program that offers a "medical approach" in relating theory into practice.

In August 2010, the unit completed the redesign efforts of the M.Ed. Teacher Leader program and was given approval to implement it. The two redesigned programs are expected to adequately address the concerns arising from the 2003 BOE report. University-based faculty and school based mentors/faculty collaboratively assess candidates. There is evidence that the unit's has fully adapted criteria and evaluation procedures of school-based clinical faculty in all programs.

It appears the unit has included both internal groups and external groups to collaborate with them on enhancement, redesign, and bridging field based and classroom experiences, as evidence through the Redesign Team and the Renaissance Action Plan document.

3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs continued from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
School-based clinical faculty in the M.A. in Education Administration Program does not participate in the evaluation of candidates' field experiences.	ADV	The field experiences seem to be well planned, but evidence was not available to determine the involvement of school-based clinical faculty in the assessment of educational administration candidates.
The unit has not developed criteria for the selection and evaluation of school-based clinical faculty in the M.A. in Education Administration Program.	ADV	Criteria for clinical faculty in the Education Administration Program were not available at the time of the offsite review.

3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard. See the AFIs continued in 3.3 above.

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

(1) Evaluations of the effectiveness of partnerships. What evaluations are conducted? How effective are partnerships?
(2) Development of partnerships with professional development schools. How are faculty members involved in the school improvement activities of the PDS? How are candidates involved in the PDS?
(3) Data on performance of candidates in Alternative Certification Programs. What data are collected on these candidates? How are these candidates performing as compared to candidates in traditional programs?
(4) The Renaissance Action Plan rubric. What has been accomplished, especially for advanced programs?
(5) Field experiences and clinical practice for advanced candidates. What field experiences are required? What assessments are linked to field experiences and clinical practice? What data are generated from those assessments?
(6) Criteria for school-based and university-based clinical faculty members in the educational leadership program. Who are the school-based clinical supervisors for educational leadership candidates?
(7) Samples of e-portfolios. How are the e-portfolios used in field experiences and clinical practice? How are candidates performing on related assessments? How are e-portfolios used in advanced programs?
(8) Training materials for cooperating, supervising, and university faculty. What training materials are used? How do they learn to use the rubric for review and grading?

(9) Alignment of field-based experiences with expected outcomes. How do classes with field/clinical based experiences (Level 1, 2, and 3) support evidence-based outcomes of highly effective educators? How does the unit track this support?

(10) Criteria for a partnership site. What criteria are applied to the selection of a partnership site? What criteria determine when a partnership should be developed?

(11) Use of LiveText for field and clinical practice experiences. How is LiveText used to collect and analyze assessment data from these experiences?

Standard 4: Diversity

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

4.1 Statement about the evidence

In its conceptual framework, the unit clearly articulates proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to develop during their professional programs. The three competencies are **s**upport of equitable and inclusive learning environments; **a**wareness of individual and cultural differences that impact teaching and learning (important dimensions of diversity include ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area); and **r**ecognition that diversities affect the design of, outcomes of, interpretation of, and feedback stemming from, assessments. These competencies are taught and assessed through pre-determined learning outcomes in several required classes and field experiences in both initial and advanced programs.

Required coursework, field experiences, student teaching, and internships provide initial and advanced candidates a well-grounded framework for understanding diversity, including students with exceptionalities and limited English proficiency (LEP). Candidates are aware of different learning styles and are required to adapt instruction or services appropriately for all students, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities

Assessment rubrics are broad in initial and advanced programs and include all diversity and special needs except for the specific assessment of knowledge or skills related to English language learner. The student teaching evaluation instrument includes three specific learning outcomes related to the conceptual framework competencies, including: (1)Values and supports student diversity and addresses individual needs; (2) Fosters mutual respect between teacher and students and among students; and (3) Implements instruction based on diverse student needs and assessment data.

Initial candidates are expected to connect lessons, instruction, or services to students' experiences and cultures. A rubric related specifically to assessing the diversity competencies states that candidates value student diversity and support student learning needs. Initial course

requirements and field experiences require that candidates develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to sensitivity toward students and families with cultural differences, exceptional needs, and the belief that all students can learn. For example, the Lesson Plan requires candidates to incorporate multiple perspectives in the subject matter being taught or services being provided, assess student learning, and adapt instruction as necessary. In addition, various assessment instruments and rubrics require candidates to develop a classroom and school climate that value diversity.

Advanced candidates also have opportunities to develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions by meeting the unit's articulated diversity competencies. Although each advanced program has unique courses and clinical experiences, they all have learning outcomes aligned with the competency outcomes and those of the conceptual framework. Evidence such as the programmatic requirements for each advanced program reveals that each program has specific classes related to diversity. For example, the School Counseling program requires a course in counseling in multicultural settings, and by its nature, the curriculum requires candidates to develop proficiencies in identifying students with needs beyond the typical, which naturally includes those from various backgrounds and academic abilities.

Other examples include the Educational Technology Program, which requires a course in adaptive technology, and the Principal and Teacher Leader programs, which require coursework in inclusive education. Diversity competencies are also assessed during all programmatic clinical experiences.

Candidates interact with professional education faculty, faculty from other units, and/or school faculty, both male and female, from at least two ethnic/racial groups. The unit has made efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty members, and evidence indicates that the numbers of diverse faculty members has increased from two of 11 members in 2005 to 5 of 14 members in 2011. The IR indicates there are 14 faculty members, 8 of whom are white/Caucasian, 6 of whom are African American. Data from exhibits offsite indicate that in 2009-2010, there were 11 professional education faculty members, six of whom were white/Caucasian, five of whom were African American. In addition, faculty classified as "part time not employed by the Institution" included two of the seven who were African American. Of the professional education faculty, 57% are White, and 43% are African American. In addition, 79% of them are women.

Faculty members with whom candidates work in professional education classes and clinical practice have knowledge and experiences related to preparing candidates to work with diverse student populations. One faculty member holds a PhD in Special Education, and one has a Master's Degree in Mental Retardation and Psychology. Of the 14 current professional education faculty members, six have taught special education or reading in P-12 settings, and three have been superintendents, principals or school counselors. One member was educated in Kenya and does research on closing the achievement gap among African American students. Several of the faculty members serve on state or national boards related to various types of diversity.

Affirmation of the value of diversity is shown through good-faith efforts to increase or maintain faculty diversity. Policies in place guide the recruitment, hiring, and retention efforts made by the unit to increase and maintain diversity among the faculty. The unit participates in the

Minority Teacher Recruitment Project developed locally in Jefferson County Public Schools. In addition, the unit requires cooperating teachers to demonstrate, "an ability to create a learning community that values and builds upon students' diverse cultures" (IR p. 30).

Enrollment within the unit has increased over the past seven years, and the diversity among candidates has kept pace with enrollment trends. Evidence indicates that 25% of initial candidates and 24% of advanced candidates are African Americans, while one percent of initial candidates are American Indian/Alaskan Native, and one percent of initial candidates are Asian Americans. Fifty-six percent of the initial candidates and 67% of the advanced candidates are white.

In 1904, the "Day Law", formally named "An Act to Prohibit White and Colored Persons from Attending the Same School", was passed by the Kentucky legislature, prohibiting the teaching of black and white students in the same school. In addition, the law stated that the school could not run a branch which taught black students within twenty-five miles of the "whites only" school. In response to the case of Brown vs. the Board of Public Education, the state repealed the Day Law in 1948. Spalding was the first higher educational institution in the state to admit African Americans.

Continuing affirmation of the value of diversity is shown through several efforts the unit makes to increase and maintain diversity among the candidates. Policies which guide recruitment and retention of a diverse candidate population include a written commitment to value diversity among candidates, faculty, and administrators within the unit. The unit also participates in the Minority Teacher Recruitment Project and attends the "Aspiring Leaders recruitment fairs" at Newburg Middle School, both of which are organized locally in Jefferson County Public Schools. Another effort made to retain students is to Work with candidates struggling to pass the PRAXIS exams. Results of data analysis done by the unit prompted the dean to assign three credit hours release time to one faculty member to support candidates who struggle.

The unit utilizes a policy that guides placements in settings with students from diverse groups, requiring that initial candidates experience several settings, stipulating that at least 50% of all field placements be in settings with diverse students. To that end, the unit utilizes four main school districts for field experience placements, including Bullitt, Jefferson, Oldham, and Shelby County Schools. Of these, Jefferson and Shelby have the most diversity among their students. Evidence provided shows that Jefferson's student population consists of 35% African American and 5% Hispanic, while Shelby has a population consisting 10% African Americans and 10% Hispanic students. Each of the districts has a special education population of about 14%, and each also has about 5% of their students in Free and Reduced Lunch programs. All of the districts have students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP), ranging from 19% at Bullitt to 2% at Oldham. Shelby is the only district with children of migrant workers, with 2% of their students in that category.

Evidence provided by the unit shows that in AY 2009-2010, 36 of 44 of the initial clinical placements were made in Jefferson County Schools, which has the most diversity among the students. In AY 2010-2011, 47 out of 50 initial placements were made in Jefferson.

Advanced candidates often (but not always) work in their own classrooms for internships and clinical experiences. Other placements for advanced candidates are made in consultation with the individual candidate, a faculty member, and the school or agency. However, evidence of systematic placement in a diverse setting was not available during the offsite visit, and it is not clear if advanced candidates are provided experiences with P–12 students from different socioeconomic and/or ethnic/racial groups, English language learners, or students with disabilities.

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

4.2 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs). None

4.3 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

(1) The unit does not ensure that all advanced candidates have field experiences with students from diverse groups.

Rationale: Advanced candidates often work in their own classrooms for internships and clinical experiences. Other placements for advanced candidates are made in consultation with the individual candidate, a faculty member, and the school or agency. However, evidence of systematic placement in a diverse setting was not available during the offsite visit, and it is not clear if advanced candidates are provided experiences with P–12 students from different socioeconomic and/or ethnic/racial groups, English language learners, or students with disabilities.

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

(1) Rubrics for assessing the three competencies related to diversity. How effective are the rubrics in determining candidate proficiencies? How are these rubrics used in advanced programs? How are the rubrics linked to the expected competencies?
(2) Samples of candidate work related to diversity. What candidate work demonstrates that candidates are developing diversity proficiencies?
(3) Experiences of advanced candidates with students from diverse groups. How does the unit ensure that all advanced candidates have field experiences or clinical practice with students from different socioeconomic and/or ethnic/racial groups, English language learners, or students with disabilities?
(4) Diversity of counties and schools used for field experiences and clinical practice. How diverse are the settings outside of Jefferson and Shelby counties?
(5) Systematic tracking of candidate placement in schools with diverse student populations. How does the unit know that all candidates are placed in diverse settings? How is LiveText used for this purpose?

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate

performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Statement about the evidence

Based on the review of Exhibit 5.1, ten (10) of 14 full-time faculty have earned doctorates and exceptional expertise. Four (4) have masters' degrees, and the IR indicates they are on the tenure track. All university supervisors and clinical faculty have licensure; however, no further individual qualifications were provided (e.g. contemporary work experience). By state regulation, clinical faculty must have three years teaching experience, a relevant teaching license, and the master's degree.

The unit adopts the Boyer model of scholarship of the professoriate. Exhibit 5.1 indicates extensive faculty involvement in scholarship, leadership in professional associations, and service. The majority of faculty has made state and national presentations (7), many are published (5), and all are engaged in service, ranging from leadership roles in professional associations to consultative/technical assistance roles in public schools. Also, the majority have extensive involvement with the professional development school in JCPS, Maupin Elementary School. Though The "University Approved Curriculum Vitae Format" was provided in Exhibit 5.6, no faculty vitae were available to provide further evidence of scholarship.

A review of course syllabi from recently approved program submissions reveals a presence of the conceptual framework, *Educator as Leader,* throughout program courses. Faculty model best practices as indicated in course syllabi and the description in the IR, particularly in regards to fluency in the Internet, assessment practices, use of LiveText, engagement in reflection, critical thinking, and utilization of a variety of instructional techniques. Approved program submissions indicate that faculty helps candidates develop the proficiencies outlined in professional and state standards. Faculty evaluates candidate performances and utilizes the unit's assessment system at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

Exhibit 5.7 documents faculty participation in professional development activities from 2008 to 2011. The chart indicates that faculty members have consistently provided their own funds for participation in these activities although the unit/university funds activities (from 53% in 2008 to 86% in 2009). The chart further reveals active engagement of faculty in professional development particularly at the local and state levels. Since 2008, faculty has participated in 39 activities at the national/international levels.

The IR (p.31) states that faculty must be successful in three areas: effective teaching/fulfillment of professional responsibilities, continuing scholarly growth, and service to university/community. Evidence was found to support systematic and comprehensive evaluations of faculty in Exhibit 5.6, the "Narrative Outline of the Faculty Annual Evaluation." The evaluation cycle begins annually with faculty self-evaluation and includes development of a growth plan and revision of vita. Combined with the evaluation summary, which incorporates aggregated course evaluations every semester, faculty meets with the immediate supervisor before documentation goes to the dean for final review and approval. Reference is made in the

IR to a unit "Score Card" (p.31) that is developed by the dean and used in her own evaluation by the provost. No evidence of the card was provided (except a template in Standard 6).

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

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

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

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

(1) Number of professional education faculty. The IR states on p.32 that there is a "professional education faculty base of 13." Exhibit 5.1 identified 14. Review of education website shows 13. How many full-time, adjunct, and clinical faculty are employed? Are adjunct faculty included in the number of professional education faculty? Who are the adjunct faculty?
(2) Qualifications of clinical faculty (cooperating teachers and university supervisors). Exhibit 5.2 provides licensure only. What are the P-12 experiences and academic background of the university supervisors?
(3) Clarification of faculty on tenure track. What faculty members are on a tenure-track? Are the four full-time faculty members with masters' degrees on tenure track? Exhibit 5.1 identifies that three have assistant professor rank and one associate professor rank.
(4) Quality of faculty teaching. What specific technology hardware and software do faculty integrate into their teaching. How are faculty members integrating technology into their teaching?
(5) Sample unit Score Card, as referenced in IR, p. 31. How is this score card being used?
(6) Samples of completed faculty evaluations. How are the evaluations being used to improve faculty performance? How are adjunct faculty members being evaluated?

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

6.1 Statement about the evidence

The College of Education (COE) is the unit responsible for the preparation of teachers, principals, and school counselors. A dean heads the unit and is assisted by an associate dean, a director of initial certification programs, a director of the alternative certification program and certification officer, a director of field experiences and clinical practice, director of the school guidance counselor program, director of principal preparation program, and director of the leadership education program. Policies for recruiting diverse candidates and college notifications for counseling services and admission requirements are clearly and accurately described in online publications.

The budget for the COE's undergraduate and graduate programs has remained stable for the past five years. Over the last two years, the standard amount for professional development rose from $750 to $1000 for each unit full-time faculty member. According to the Scorecard, professional development continues to be valued by the unit and supported financially.

Faculty workload policies are defined in the university's *Faculty Handbook.* Full-time faculty who have no administrative reassignments are normally responsible for 12 semester hours of instruction or its equivalent. The unit's workload policy is 12 undergraduate hours or adjusted to nine graduate hours for each semester. Field supervision carries credit hours as does supervision of independent studies. There are three administrative assistants for office support.

The unit has adequate campus and school facilities to support candidates in meeting standards, including the use of technology enriched classrooms. **A** document identifies the university's technology facilities in a variety of places across campus: Spalding University Campus Informational Resources Library; Egan Learning Center; Mansion, East and West; Third Street Academic Center; University Center; College of Health and Natural Science Building; and Morrison Residence. The Mansion, primary housing for COE classes, contains six smart classrooms and an education lab with 20 student stations. All facilities are wireless. Full time faculty members have computers which are upgraded on a rotating basis. Site licenses are also provided for the most frequently used software programs.

The unit uses several technology resources for faculty and candidates. Among those resources is WebAdvisor for university functions like registering for classes and entering grades. Datatel is used by faculty and staff as integrated university-wide student management software that supports candidates' records, transcripts, advising information, course catalogs, and schedule of courses offered. Datatel is integrated with both WebAdvisor and LiveText, a data management system. LiveText is used by candidates to maintain an electronic portfolio. The unit uses LiveText as its platform for data collection **and analysis.**

Spalding Library has four full-time staff, each working 40 hours a week. There is a part-time reference librarian working 10 hours a week as well as an open position for a reference librarian working evenings 30 hours a week. The library is staffed 200 hours a week with at least one professional librarian on staff 85 hours per week. The hours of operation are clearly posted on the library's home page.

The Metroversity collaboration agreement provides the unit's candidates and faculty with access to library resources in neighboring universities and area public libraries. The Spalding University Library Home Page confirms access to the libraries at Bellarmine University, Indiana University SE, Jefferson Community and Technical College, Louisville Presbyterian, Southern Baptist, University of Louisville, the Kentucky Virtual Library, and public libraries of Louisville, Jeffersonville Township, and New Albany-Floyd County. These arrangements have greatly increased access to library resources available to faculty and candidates in addition to the traditional interlibrary loan option. As a member of the Association of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities (AIKCU), Spalding candidates and faculty have web access to additional scholarly journals**.** All resources are available on a 24/7 basis.

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

6.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs corrected from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
The library has insufficient professional staff to assist candidates in their research.	ITP,ADV	The library now appears to have sufficient staff.
Limited library resources are available to faculty and candidates.	ITP,ADV	Library resources now appear to be adequate.

6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard. None

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

(1) Mechanisms to ensure consistent and systematic inclusion of P-12 practitioners and faculty from other colleges in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit's programs. How are school faculty and other unit faculty involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit's programs?

Professional development for part-time faculty. What professional development on using technology resources is provided faculty?

(3) Adequacy of unit facilities. How adequate are the facilities used by the unit and its programs? What space and opportunities (scheduling) to use technologically enriched classrooms and labs are available?

(4) Adequacy of technology resources in P-12 schools. Do the P-12 schools used for clinical practice have adequate technology resources for candidates to use technology in their teaching? What are candidates' perceptions of the available technology in schools?

(5) Evidence of access to AIKCU resources and identification of electronic resources. How are these resources being used by faculty and candidates? How accessible are they?

(6) Results of Student Library Satisfaction Survey. Have these results been disaggregated for COE initial and advanced candidates? What has the library and unit learned from this survey?

Sources of Evidence

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