



IR ADDENDUM

September 15, 2011

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
Russell B. Olwell, Member
Lemuel W. Watson, Member
Brenda A. Priddy, State Chair
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

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

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).**

Unit's Response

The unit aggregates and reviews admission data collected in Gate 2. This data includes GPA and SAT or Praxis I for applicants seeking admission to initial programs at the bachelor's level. Unit data collected, analyzed, and aggregated over the last three years for applicants entering the undergraduate initial programs are contained in [Exhibit 1.1.1.1](#). Aggregated Praxis I (PPST) and SAT are also displayed in [Exhibit 1.1.1.1](#). Aggregated GPA data for applicants admitted to the MAT program are displayed in [Exhibit 1.1.1.3](#). Aggregated GRE and Miller Analogy Test data for candidates admitted to MAT programs over a three-year period are displayed in [Exhibit 1.1.1.4](#). Unit data for applicants seeking admission indicated a GPA mean range of 3.32 (n =12) to 3.38 (n =26) [See [Exhibit 1.1.1.5](#)] for admitted cohorts in a program that had more than 10 candidates. Three years of GRE and Millers Analogy Test data for advance candidates are displayed in [Exhibit 1.1.1.6](#).

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.**

Unit's Response

In 2003 (the occasion of the last NCATE review period), the unit offered a Master of Arts in Education (Administration) (MAED). This program has always had a limited enrollment. While the unit believes that it was well implemented, reviews of period data collected from the program

indicated that it, perhaps, did not meet curricula needs of the local school district and therefore it was not very popular. Beginning in May 2007, institutions across the State of Kentucky received a mandate from the Education Professional Standards Board to phase out and redesign previously approved MAED programs. With support from the school district, the Unit embarked on a redesign effort between May 2007 and June 2010. The product of the redesigned program yielded our current 30 credit hours Rank I: Instructional Leader (School Principal program); admitting the first cohort of candidates beginning in the fall 2010 semester. The ePortfolio is a major culminating component of the program. As of now, no candidates have completed the ePortfolio process. The unit anticipates completion of the first set of ePortfolio in spring 2012.

Another of our new programs is the Master of Arts in School Guidance Counseling. Candidates complete an ePortfolio as a culminating project of the program. While most of the artifacts are collected and organized as candidates matriculate through the program, various signature artifacts are collected as they complete SGC 680 Practicum I, SGC 681 Practicum II, and SGC 690 Program Development. Data generated from the ePortfolio project are displayed in [Exhibit 1.1.1.7](#).

The Teacher Leader M.Ed. program is still at its infancy. The unit had less than 10 candidates matriculating through the program by the end of the spring 2011. While content knowledge for candidates in the teacher leader and the three endorsement programs is still limited, the unit collects that data.

Master of Education Program: 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.**

Unit's Response

Dispositions of candidates in advanced programs are routinely assessed as they matriculate through their selected programs. All advanced program candidates' dispositions are first assessed at admission to the program. A review of the aggregated and analyzed completed between 2010 and 2011 for the [School Guidance and Counseling Program](#) indicates mean scores range from 2.51 (visionary) to 2.77 (ethical) for 35 candidates admitted to the program between spring 2010 and spring 2011. During the same period, candidates (n=3) in the [Teacher Leader Program](#) had a mean score range of 2.66 (visionary) to 4.00 (ethical); candidates in the [Principal Preparation Program](#) had mean scores ranging from 2.72 (visionary and reflective) to 3.00 in (ethical and creative) during the same period of time.

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.

Unit's response

A spring 2008 mandate from the State of Kentucky required the “sunsetting” of all Master of Arts in Education programs approved prior to May 2008. The mandate required the phasing out and discontinuation of all previously approved MAED programs by December 31, 2010. Further, the State’s mandate required institutions affected to implement redesigned programs focusing on teacher leadership. Spalding University at the time had only eight (six actively enrolled) candidates across its advanced programs. With the change in the unit’s administration following the hiring of a new dean (Dr. Beverly Keepers) and associate dean (Dr. James P. Takona), the unit began a teach-out process which included halting the admission of new candidates into the MAED program effective January 1, 2010.

During the summer of 2008 and continuing through the summer of 2010, the Unit engaged its faculty and school partners in the development of three separate programs – M.A. in School Guidance and Counseling, M.Ed. in Teacher Leader (Redesign) and a Rank I program in Instructional Leadership (School Principal). On August 3, 2009 the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board approved the program proposal for the implementation of the School Guidance Program. It should be noted that Spalding University was the first institution to have an approved Principal Preparation program. With this approval, the Unit hired Dr. Jacqueline Johnson to direct the implementation of the School Guidance Program. A cohort of candidates (11) was admitted into the program and matriculated into the program in November (Session 2) of 2009. Dr. Eric Barna was also hired to beginning spearhead development of the School Principal and the Teacher Leader programs. On May 17, 2010, the Education Professional Board voted to approve the School Principal Program. On August 2, EPSB also approved the Teacher Leader M.Ed. program. In August 2010, the Unit hired Dr. Jayne Morgenthal to direct the implementation of the Teacher Leader M.Ed. Program.

Through the development of the School Guidance and Counseling program and the redesign of the School Principal (formally MAED in Administration) and the Teacher Leader MAED program, the unit has identified and included Gate 5 through Grade 11 into the Unit Continuous Assessment System. A key assessment in Gate 5 is GPA. A cumulative GPA of 2.5 at admission is a university minimum requirement. The Unit collects and analyzes GPA data. For fall 2009, a total of 12 candidates were admitted into the School Guidance and Counseling program. Summary mean of GPA data for the fall cohort was [3.32](#) (n = 12). The spring School Guidance and Counseling cohorts’ GPA data was [3.38](#) (n = 26). For the fall 2010 semester, admission GPA data was [3.17](#) (n = 6) for School Guidance and Counseling, [3.42](#) (n = 7) for school principal, [2.70](#) (n = 1) for English as a Second Language; [3.17](#) (5) Instructional Computers Technology, and [3.5](#) (n = 1) for the Reading endorsement program.

In addition, retention in the advanced programs requires a cumulative GPA of 3.0. These two requirements reinforce to potential candidates the importance of maintaining a solid grade point average. Grade points in the course work are based on multiple assessments designed to evaluate both what the candidates know and how he or she can apply that knowledge to improve his or her efficacy as an educator or leader and extends to impacting student learning. Data tables with GPA distributions indicate candidates mean GPA in all advanced programs were above the GPA threshold of 3.0 [See [Exhibit 1.4.1.0](#)] except in the Rank I Planned

program which revealed a mean GPA of 2.0 in fall 2010. The program had two candidates. Of the two candidates one had a straight 4.0 GPA and the other failed and was subsequently removed from program.

Examples of the MAED Education Administration data collected, analyzed, aggregated and disaggregated by the Unit, include candidates' performance in courses, course embedded assignments and projects, and the practicum evaluations. As the number of enrolled candidates remained less than 10 each year, the Unit has combined collected candidates' scores collected during three or more combined years. Performance data completed by school based mentors from the using the Final Practicum Evaluation Form ranged between a mean score of 3.44 and 3.78 on a multiple years period [See [Exhibit 3.4.1.1](#)]. The Education Administration program also collected data from the School Vision Development and Implementation (a key assessment project of the program), performance data for the number of candidates reviewed during a three year period generated mean scores ranging between 3.50 (Implement Vision) and 4.00 (Articulate a School Vision). See [Exhibit 3.4.1.1](#)]

With the exception of the old MAED programs and stand-alone endorsement programs (Instructional Computer P-12, Teaching English as a Second Language -P-12; and Reading - P-12) Electronic portfolios (ePortfolios) are a requirement. The ePortfolio is a part of Spalding University Unit Continuous Assessment System (Key Assessment #4 for Initial Programs - See [Exhibit 1.4.1.1](#) and Key Assessment #10 for Advanced Level Programs –See [Exhibit 1.4.1.2](#)). All ePortfolios are development on the LiveText platform. The ePortfolio provides advanced program candidates a structure in which to file and organize examples of work completed throughout the program of study. The Unit has developed procedures and handbooks for the development of e-Portfolios to support candidates in identifying, reflecting, and documenting examples of critical artifacts that demonstrate growth and achievement, development of critical skills relevant to the Educator as Leader, as well as achievement of specific critical objectives embedded in standard course outlines.

In light of the most substantial revisions to the academic programs through the state mandated redesign process over the last three years, by the end of the spring 2011 semester, only candidates in the School Guidance and Counseling program have completed and submitted their ePortfolios. ePortfolios in the School Guidance and Counseling program are developed around the Kentucky School Guidance Counselor Standards. Although the rating of candidates based on most standards [See [Exhibit 1.4.1.3](#)] indicate a mean range scores of developed or highly developed the unit is poised to generated valuable data that would, on the overall, support curriculum planning and evaluation, as well as the budgetary process of the SGC program.

- (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.

Unit's Response

Throughout the program, candidates in advanced programs develop their knowledge in analyzing student learning. The following evidence is provided to demonstrate that the unit

requires advanced programs candidates to have a positive effect on P-12 student learning: (A) courses in which candidates are required to develop assessment tools and/or analyze P-12 learning. [See [Exhibit 1.4.2.1](#)]; (B) all advanced programs offer coursework in which candidate are offered opportunities to examine and reflect on impact on P-12 student learning. Examples of these course include [EDU 609](#) - *Research Procedures I*, [EDU 610](#) - *Research Procedure II* and [EDA 650](#) – *Leading Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment*, and [EDA 692](#) - *Using Data Analysis to Improve Schools* (old MAED Program); [ETL650](#) - *Assessment of Learning* and [ETL610](#) - *Philosophy, Interpretation, and Application of Research* (Teacher Leader M.Ed. Program); [SGC 630](#) - *Research Methods/Tests and Measurements* and [SGC690](#) - *Program Development* (School Guidance and Counseling Program); and, [EPP 610](#) - *Leading Teaching and Learning*; [EPP 611](#) – *Leading Teaching and Learning Lab*, [EPP620](#) - *Assessing the Instructional Program and Monitoring Student Performance*, and, *EPP 621- Assessing the Instructional Program and Monitoring Student Performance – Lab*. Candidates’ performance is included in Exhibit 1.4.2.2. The unit has begun collecting and analyzing data for each of the recently redesigned or added programs. (C) Candidates’ performance on the quality of reflections in the ePortfolios (Key Assessment #16) reviewed at Gate 8 for the School Guidance and Counseling Candidates and Teacher Leader program. (D) Candidates’ performance while completing EDU 685 – Practicum in School Leadership demonstrates their ability to impact student learning. Performance data from evaluation of candidates completed by mentors (school-based clinical faculty) indicate a cumulate three-year mean score of 3.78 [See [Exhibit 1.4.2.3](#)]

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?

Unit’s Response

The unit has fully responded to concerns cited by the State (EPSB) and resubmitted rejoinders. The State (EPSB) completed the review of resubmissions and indicated compliance of all unit programs. The unit has included the [State summary report](#) as a part of the accreditation Web site.

- (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?

Unit’s Response

The unit has engaged employers of former program completers to provide a perspective on program satisfaction. The unit has contacted follow-up studies with employers of program completers for 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009. Through the unit’s long standing relationship, as well as more contemporary relationships between the school district and many

of the current unit faculty, employer surveys administered to 53 principals who supervise or have supervised candidates in their schools. Principals were requested to complete a 16-item survey questionnaire via the online survey tool, Survey Monkey. Data gleaned from the survey indicated employer satisfaction of the skills and preparation of program candidates in both the traditional and alternative initial programs. As some principals had more than one Spalding University graduate on their faculty [See [Exhibit 1.5.2.1](#)], each graduate was separately assessed. For that reason, the Unit does not have accurate data on the return rate from principals due to head count duplication. The Unit may consider using the build in IP address register to capture respondents on future surveys administered to principals.

In addition, perspective on program satisfaction is evident in program completers' survey data where 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 candidates were surveyed. From a return rate of 52 percent (n= 62 from a possible population of 119) the response to survey Question 1c: *"I was prepared to effectively use instructional strategies that are appropriate for content and contribute to student learning,"* indicate that over 98 percent of the respondents considered to have been "fairly prepared" or "well prepared." [See [Exhibit 1.5.2.2](#) , page 6].

Another perspective of program satisfaction comes not from students but from clinical- and school- based faculty who mentor our candidates in the P-12 schools. We ask our school-based clinical faculty to evaluate our university supervisors [see [Exhibit 1.5.2.3](#)] on key indicators. Resulting data in the 2009-2010 administration reported a mean range of between 3.57 and 3.78 on a -point scale on the degree of agreement to with the mentoring work that supervisors complete when overseeing candidates.

- (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?

Unit's Response

For several years, the Unit has used multiple evaluations for assessing the performance of candidates. The unit has identified a set of seven key assessments [see [Exhibit 1.5.3.1](#)] for initial programs and 12 for the advanced programs (see [Exhibit 1.5.3.2](#)). Each of the seven key assessments in the initial programs has been fully implement. The Office of the Associate Dean oversees the collection, analysis, and distribution of data. Analyzed and summarized data generated from the Key Assessment are provided.

Over the last several years, the unit has had advanced programs over the last several years. Candidate enrollment in all of the unit's advanced programs has been very low and often sporadic. Many courses offered at the advanced level between AY 2004-2005 and spring 2011 were predominantly serviced as independent courses. The MAED program in administration began a phase-out process in 2008 following a state mandate to phase out programs approved prior to May 2008. Other programs including endorsements in Reading and Writing and Instruction Computer Technology averaged one to two candidates per course, per semester and serviced as independent courses. The ESL program did not have candidates (three candidates

matriculated in the ESL program and enrolled in independent courses during the fall 2010 semester with grades assigned in during the spring 2011 semester).

Examples of Recent Use of Data to Improve Programs: During the academic year 2008-2009 the University hired a new dean and associate dean with the expectation of reviewing and resuscitating advanced level programs offered at the time and ensures their viability. Following a review of enrollment data over a five-year period, the new dean opened conversations with partner school districts and systematically began a review of Web sites of advanced level programs offered by other universities in our service area. This activity identified a need to develop and implement a new school guidance and counseling program.

The unit consistently and routinely analyzes Unit programs, and faculty (collectively) reviews candidate Praxis II data on content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical and profession knowledge and skills. Changes have been made based on the analysis of data, and candidates and faculty have used the analysis to make changes that improve candidate success. In during the AY 2009-2010 unit faculty reviewed analyzed data of Praxis II scores for all initial programs. While candidates performed well in most content areas, faculty considered candidate performance in Elementary Content (0014) as unacceptable. The review indicated that only 82 percent (n=12) of program completers were successful. A detailed examination of each of the four Praxis II components (mathematics, English/English language arts, and social science) revealed that candidates struggled most in mathematics, especially candidates in the Master of Arts programs. For that reason, Unit faculty supported the need to add MATH 522 or an equivalent as a pre-requisite for EDU 532. In addition, unit faculty made a recommendation for the implementation of a tutorial program to support candidates in their preparation for Praxis II. In 2010, the Dean of the College assigned Dr. Larry Lewis a three (3) hour release time on his workload to provide a tutorial support program [See [Exhibit 1.5.3](#)] that includes test taking skills and strategies.

- (4) Provide evidence that candidate assessment data has been collected, aggregated, disaggregated, and analyzed for the **past three years**.

Unit's Response

The unit collect, aggregates, disaggregates, and analyzes data on candidate assessment data. Guidelines and activities to ensure that data is consistently collected, aggregated, and disaggregated and analyzed are published in the unit's operations guidelines manual [[Exhibit 6.1](#)] This data is shared with faculty and other stakeholders for program improvement (see Addendum [Exhibit 1.5.4.1](#); [Exhibit 1.5.4.2](#); [Exhibit 1.5.4.3](#); [Exhibit 1.5.4.4](#); [Exhibit 1.5.4.5](#); [Exhibit 1.4.6](#)).

- (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.

Unit response

The state of Kentucky requires that all applicants for initial certification [Art Education (P-12); Business and Marketing Education (5-12); Chemistry Education (8-12); Elementary Education (p-5); Art Education (P-12); Learning and Behavior Disorders (P-12) Biological Science Education (7-12), Earth Science Education (8-12); English Education (8-12), Mathematics (8-12), Middle Grades Education (5-9); and Social Science Education (7-12); Spanish Education (P-12)] submit passing scores on the Praxis II exam their content areas as well as passing scores on pedagogical content knowledge. Summary of unit performance scores on Praxis II examinations for both traditional and alternative certification routes are provided as exhibits [See [Exhibit 1.5.5](#)] on the unit's accreditation website. Also included is data for programs with less than 10 completers.

- (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?

Unit response:

During the AY2008-2009 began a focused effort in the development of the Unit Continuous Assessment System and the identification of Key Assessments. Because the majority of the assessments used in the “sunseted” MAED Education Administration program were not utilized throughout the Unit, it should not be concluded that there is not a strong relationship existing within the assessment process. The Program assessment includes comparable assessments, such as licensure tests, GPA, employer surveys, and completer surveys, which have counterparts elsewhere within the unit. The unit had not included in the IR data from these assessments due to the limited size of candidates in the advance programs. [Exhibit 1.4.1.1](#) provides sample assessment data collected across advanced programs including the MAED Education Administration program.

Assessments used in other advanced programs include both course and field-based assessments. Examples of data generated for advanced programs which include the School Guidance and Counselor, Teacher Leader, and the redesigned principal preparation program are also presented in [Exhibit 1.4.1.1](#).

Advance candidates' assessment data provides evidence of the unit's success in preparing candidates to promote a positive school culture, provide effective instructional programs, apply best practices to student learning, and design comprehensive professional growth plans.

- (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?

Unit's Response

The action research project which served as the expected product for EDU 610 Research Procedure II for all advanced programs offered prior to fall 2009 provided a rich source of evidence of candidates' ability to reflect on their practice and identify their strengths and areas needing improvement. Candidates gather both formative and summative evidence of student learning during instruction and use that evidence to monitor and adjust instructional content, strategies, and resources as needed for individuals and groups of students.

- (8) What data are available on advanced candidate disposition evaluations and how are disposition data used for all programs?

Unit's Response

Assessment of disposition for candidate in advanced programs begins at admission. Faculty from the Graduate Admission and Retention Committee form teams of up to three members to assess applicants during the formal person interview process [See [Exhibit 1.5.8.1](#) as an example] using a unit developed rubric [See [Exhibit 1.5.8.2](#) and [Exhibit 1.5.8.3](#)]. The collected data is reviewed, analyzed, and aggregated. [See [Exhibit 1.5.8.4](#) and [Exhibit 1.5.8.5](#)]

- (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?

The Unit acknowledges the findings of the off-site reviewers where KERA initiative statements were found in SGC 600 Counselor Preparation, which is an introductory course in the history, philosophy, techniques, standards, and models of school counseling. The unit recognizes that state of Kentucky has recently signed a resolution directing their respective agencies to implement the Common Core State Standards in English/language arts and mathematics, formalizing Kentucky's agreement to integrate the standards into the State's public education system.

The unit prepared and submitted the required Program Review Documents on September 15, 2010 based on the guidelines [see KY Program Guidelines under [Document 3: Program Experiences](#)] for preparing the syllabi and other program documents. The Unit has, however, begun a systematic and intentional effort [See [Exhibit 1.5.9.1](#)] to identify specific courses in programs and experiences to meet Senate Bill I initiatives (Common Core Standards).

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.**

Unit's Response

The Unit has provided an additional list of changes in [Exhibit 2.1.1](#) that are specific to the alternative

certification route programs as well as advanced 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.)

Unit's Response

Spalding University's Continuous Unit Assessment Systems have been developed over a long period of time with revisions put into place based on evolving needs for information. Unit faculty developed the unit assessment system with involvement from school-based and university partners. Initially (prior to 2003) [See [Exhibit 2.5.1.0](#), I.R. 2003, p.32), the partners including teachers, principals, and the professional community faculty were involved in ongoing workshops to discuss the conceptual framework and the assessment system. The protocols are updated and improved as programs change and new ideas are put into operation. Most recent involvements of the school partners in the development and refinement of the assessment system and its components occurred during the development of the School Guidance and Counseling Program as well as during the redesign process of the Teacher Leader M.Ed., and the Instructional Leader (Principal) Rank I programs (See [Exhibit 2.5.1.1](#)). For example, the Unit utilized the expertise of Lynne Wheat (2010) in the development of the Principal Preparation program capstone and anchor assessments associated with the one credit hour lab courses. Dr. Verna Lowe from Asbury University provided guidance in the development of the Unit's gated assessment system in 2009.

- (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?

Unit's Response

Growth plans are used as a tool to assist teacher candidates identify their strengths and areas for growth related to the institutional, state, and professional standards. The growth plans,

offer candidates a tool to identify two to three priority areas and develop a plan in order to make improvements over the course of his or her student teaching semester. It also asks the teacher candidate to identify areas in which they may need support or assistance from their cooperating teacher and/or university supervisors. These plans are reviewed the first week of student teaching with the University supervisor and cooperating teacher and a plan of action is documented. The university supervisor and cooperating teacher revisits the candidate's plan at every formal observation and discusses the progress made towards meeting the goals and possibly revise and change the areas of need. These growth plans also are required submissions as artifacts included in the ePortfolio as a demonstration of proficiency in Standard 9, "Evaluates Teaching and Implements Professional Development."

Professor Jennifer Mangeot, Director of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice reflects: "Students seem to find these plans very useful tools as it 'forces' them to reflect on their areas of need and make a concrete plan on how to make improvements in these areas. It is also quite encouraging for teacher candidates to track and see their overall progress towards achieving these goals, along with the assistance from their supervisors and cooperating teacher. They do not feel isolated in this professional growth and it encourages honest reflection and collaboration."

In a recent conversation relative to professional growth plans a faculty member made the following observation: "Growth Plans are used and revised annually. Candidates are required to reflect thoughtfully on their experiences, assess their own learning, and set goals for professional growth. Field experiences and clinical practice support the development of the delineated functional dimensions of the conceptual framework and provide multiple opportunities for candidates to integrate theory into practice. Candidates have shared this with me." [Dr. Jayne Morgenthal, Director of the Principal Preparation Program].

(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?

Unit's Response

Candidates are able to review their performance in relation to the scoring guides and rubric to see how their performance can be improved. Candidates have individual, unrestricted access to their academic files housed on DataTel through their WebAdvisor accounts. In addition, the Unit utilizes LiveText in the administration of course level assessments. Since the implementation of LiveText in 2009, the University has generously purchased accounts for all candidates in both initial and advanced programs. Also, both faculty and candidates use Blackboard for instructional and assessment purposes. Through the use of Blackboard, candidates added opportunities to access their assessment data.

With support from the Office of the Associate Dean, the program directors review a candidate's course performance and provide information to program directors in case the student's performance was to fall below expectations. At the end of each semester, courses and grade point averages are completed for every professional education course. Candidates who do not meet program requirements at the course level are notified and

where necessary action regarding counseling them out of the programs begins. The unit maintains copies of correspondence on action taken on candidates [See [Exhibit 2.4.3](#)]

- (4) Files with candidate complaints and the unit’s response. How are records on complaints and their resolutions maintained?

Unit’s Response

The Office of the Dean maintains files of candidate complaints. These files will be made available for review by the NCATE/State Joint Team during the on-site visit.

- (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?

Unit’s Response

The unit has adapted the University-wide appeals process to ensure fairness and unbiased treatment of teacher candidates and advanced students as well as provide an opportunity for candidates to voice their concerns and complaints about a course or program. It also allows for the unit to strengthen the communication between the candidates and the Unit. Candidates are made aware of the policies through various published documents, including the catalog and student handbook.

Spalding University provides students with information about services, resources, and responsibilities within the campus community through the *Spalding University Policy Manual Volume VII, 2006-2007 Student Handbook: A Guide to Civil and Honorable Conduct* [See [Exhibit 2.5.5.1](#)], which states:

The purpose of this Handbook is to assist you in understanding your rights, freedoms, and responsibilities as a student. This Handbook is an official publication of the University. As such, it is a legal and contractual document between the University and its student body. As a student, you will be held accountable for its contents. This means that while officially enrolled at the University you are responsible for abiding by its rules which are intended to facilitate and sustain, in an orderly fashion, the ongoing business of the University. For its part, the University has committed itself to your holistic development and to the support of those regulations designed to enhance and protect your individual rights.

In addition, the Unit requires faculty to use a uniform and standard template [[Exhibit 2.4.5.1](#)], which includes a link to the description of the policy. It is a unit expectation that faculty spend a portion of the first class at the beginning of the semester to review the syllabus with candidates. The Unit adheres to the complaint policies and procedures. When a candidate seeks a “shortcut” the responsible administrator points the student to the process [See example in [Exhibit 2.4.5.2](#)].

- (6) Program and unit changes for alternate route programs, advanced teaching, and other school professional programs. What data led to these changes?

Unit’s Response

Additional examples of changes for alternative-route programs, advanced teaching, and other

school professional programs are presented in [Exhibit 2.5.6.1](#).

(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.)

Unit's Response

The Unit's assessment system [See [Exhibit 2.5.7](#)] assures accountability of candidate, program and unit operations. This is made possible through a collaborate effort that is based on a clear feedback process that ties assessment to ongoing revision of the curriculum, to instruction, and to unit operation. The role of the Assessment Committees is to sustain the assessment system through systematic meetings to assure efficacy of assessment instruments used at the program and unit level, the participation and collaboration of all members of the professional community, integration of technology (LiveText) in assessment and data collection activities, among others. These processes contribute to the development of the assessment instruments and rubrics consistent with the conceptual framework of *Educator as Leader*, and to facilitate the evaluation of the assessment system through the discussion of findings among unit faculty on a periodic basis. Through the office of the Associate Dean, the unit ensures that data is systematically collected, analyzed, aggregated, and disaggregated and shared with faculty and other stakeholders. The results inform and advise them about forthcoming next steps for courses, field experiences, and related matters. During annual faculty and staff retreat, and other faculty meetings, the unit's associate dean coordinates the review [see [Exhibit 2.5.1.1](#)] of candidate and unit data and supports discussion leading to collaborative program designs initiatives for the overall program improvement and success of candidates.

Listed below are examples of changes recommended by faculty:

1. Reviewing and appropriately increase field based hours;
2. Extending the knowledge of faculty in formal discussions and conversation about field experiences;
3. Collaboratively developing a uniform course syllabi template to ensure consistency in program requirements and expectations;
4. Collaboratively developing the Renaissance Plan for Improvement; and
5. The SGC program review the "first crop" of ePortfolio submitted on LiveText during the spring 2011 semester. Following a review by members of the Assessment Committee, a number of lessons were learned:
 - (a) Both faculty and candidates were experiencing challenges using LiveText in portfolio development. Some candidates submitted multiple ePortfolios. The unit has assigned a three credit hours release time to Teri Schoone to support faculty in professional development sessions and activities focused on LiveText. A published calendar that includes various scheduled sessions and activities is displayed in [Exhibit 2.5.1.2](#).
 - (b) Need to calibrate the scoring scale from 3 points to 4 point scale and provide precision in rating candidate performance. A 4 point scaled rubric will be used in assessing ePortfolios submitted in the fall 2011 semester.

(10) 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?

Unit's Response

The Unit engages in routine data collection, analysis and review of data to provide a sense of the effectiveness of programs and unit operations. application of findings Due to the heightened need for data collection and analyses, in 2008 the Unit requested the creation of an Associate Dean's position to spearhead the coordination in the implementation of the Unit's Continuous Assessment System (UCAS) and support for programs. With the selection of Standard 3 as area for continuous improvement, Unit faculty have come to learn that an intentional systematic process do data collection for field experiences in important. As a response to this finding, unit faculty made a recommendation to seek an automated system that will support field experiences. Unit faculty exploration for automated technology yielded a recommendation for the purchase of newly LiveText developed Field Experiences Management System.

Assessment data has also revealed a need to provide support to candidates who require additional test taking skills to pass Praxis examination. To remedy this shortcoming, the unit has implemented a Praxis preparation program serviced by a faculty member. A dedicated space on the garden floor of Mansion West was allocated to the program.

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.

(1) School-based clinical faculty in the M.A. in Education Administration Program does not participate in the evaluation of candidates' field experiences.

***Rationale:* 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.**

Unit's Response:

As a result of our last accreditation in 2003, the Unit received two areas for improvement for Standard 3. The 2011 off-site review process continued to have concern over both areas indicate a lack of availability of evidence. Over the course of the years since the last visit, the unit developed and implemented criteria for the selection of school based clinical faculty, developed assessment forms, and provided training identified school based faculty in the use of forms and the associated rubric.

The MAED program in Administration continued to be small over the years and only a small number of candidates matriculated through the program. However, the school-based clinical faculty who mentored candidates assessed candidates in their charge. While MA Education Administration candidates are engaged in their practicum assignments, formal observations and evaluations are completed by mentors in the school settings in collaboration with university clinical/course faculty.

Assessment data collected by school-based clinical faculty was analyzed and aggregated. This data and assessment instrument is presented in [Exhibit 3.4.1.1](#).

The MAED program in Education Administration has been phased out.

(2) Criteria for Selecting School-Based Personnel – Advanced. The unit has not developed

criteria for the selection and evaluation of school- based clinical faculty in the M.A. in Education Administration Program.

***Rationale:* Criteria for clinical faculty in the Education Administration Program were not available at the time of the offsite review.**

Unit Response:

During the 2003 NCATE visit, the Unit did not have established and published criteria for the selection of school-based personnel for the advanced program. The unit has since established and implemented a set of criteria for selecting school based personnel for all advanced programs. Below is an excerpt of the selection criteria as described in advanced programs handbooks. This criteria is also published the Unit's Operations Guide [see [Exhibit3.4.2.1](#) p. 39].

In collaboration with school partners will select supervising teachers, school guidance counselors, and principals who will provide a high-quality educational experience for advance programs' candidates, and who will have an interest in participating in educator preparation programs.

The criterion for selecting school-based personnel for the advanced programs is as follows:

School-based supervisors must have

- i. Favorable recommendation for the principal or school district's central office;
- ii. evidence of student, class, or school-based effectiveness;
- iii. a willingness to mentor candidates;
- iv. at least three years of experience (one of which is at the grade level or position to which the candidate will be assigned);
- v. full state certification based upon at least a bachelor's degree, for the subject(s)/position to which the candidate will be assigned;
- vi. State of Kentucky Rank I classification status; and
- vii. a willingness to participate in orientation and relevant professional development sessions

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?

Unit Response:

Unit faculty will share insight with the NCATE/State partnership teams on various discussion and meeting agenda from the December and January 2011 meetings on field experiences.

- (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?

Unit Response:

Spalding University has a long history of preparing high quality teachers and administrators for the state of Kentucky and beyond. In recent years, the unit has been influenced by the national emphasis on systematic collaboration between institutions of higher education and P-12 schools. With support and leadership from the newly (2008) hired dean of the college, unit faculty's interest in research on developing PDS was heightened. That interest among faculty was further extended when the College of Education was selected, through the JCPS partnership relationship, to become an equal partner in "adopting" Maupin Elementary School to become a *Gheens Institute for Creativity and Innovation*. The Dean sought to coordinate faculty interest and energy to focus our relationships with Maupin in order to enhance student learning, the school culture, teacher preparation, and student teaching. Following multiple meetings that included unit faculty and Maupin's representatives, a partnership was formed. The two partners began working on goals and activities.

Initial shared activities included a book talks. The first book shared was Zander R., and Zander, B. (2002). *The art of possibilities: Transforming professional and personal life*. New York: Penguin Books. As an outgrowth of the bonding between faculty in both institutions, the idea of adding after- school programs emerged and several ad hoc committees were formed; each with a defined mission and goals. Other activities included joint faculty meetings [See [Exhibit 3.4.2.1](#)]; joint professional development programs (including a professional meeting at the Zoo in 2009; another in the History Museum down town in 2010); Day on campus activity on campus in 2010 and 2011 for fifth graders; joint faculty meetings; joint scholarly presentations at both local, state, regional and national level and others.

Dr. Karen Dunnagan who teaches some of her reading courses at Maupin has involved her students in tutoring and reading. Dr. Barbara Foster's methods courses have also been relocated to Maupin Elementary School. Maupin has also become a valuable placement site for candidates in the P-5 Elementary and P-12 LBD programs.

- (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?

Unit Response:

The unit utilizes multiple assessments for all initial certification programs. However, there are several program-wide assessment used for both traditional and alternative route candidates. While the program structure in course servicing is different, Alternative certification candidates' performance is comparable to the traditional route. However it is notable to not that the unit employer surveys offer a more favorable perception relative to the preparation of candidates in the alternative certification programs. In addition, observation data and various evaluation assessments indicate that performance in general

for alternative certification route candidates' performance is generally higher.

- (4) The Renaissance Action Plan rubric. What has been accomplished, especially for advanced programs?

Unit Response:

The unit considers the development of the Renaissance Action Plan (for 2010-2012) to have been instrumental in providing a systematic process in guiding Standard 3 to target. Over a period of time that lasted several months, unit faculty participated in small group to develop the Plan and to align goals and objectives to the Target level column of the NCATE rubrics for Standard 3. The plan has remained a unifying conversation instrument for reflection and planning. Unit faculty has made steady progress accomplishing set benchmarks. Program directors and found the usefulness of the plan as they developed specific goals of their annual Balanced ScoreCards. [Exhibit 3.5.4.1](#) highlights components of the Renaissance Action Plan relative to the advanced programs. The status column (last column of the Plan) indicates accomplishments/progress the unit has made in reaching its goals.

- (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?

Unit Response:

Field experiences are a part of each program offered at both the initial and advanced levels. While field experiences in the advanced programs are not leveled they are, nevertheless, required and considered as critical opportunities to blend theory and practice as well as demonstrate performance based on standards and professional dispositions reflected in the Unit's conceptual framework. All professional education courses include program identified requisite hours of field experiences. Through their field experiences, candidates see the merging of theory and practice and further develop their teaching knowledge and skills. The unit ensures that field experiences for advance candidates are well sequenced, supervised by trained personnel and monitored by unit faculty, and integrated into the program

All field experiences are developed and assessed with unit developed instruments that are aligned to the appropriate standards. For the School Guidance and Counseling program, field experiences are aligned to the Kentucky Standards for School Counselor and reflected published standards by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP); the Teacher Leader Program uses the Advance Performance indicators of the Kentucky Teacher Standards as well as the appropriate professional standards depending on the endorsement area. The Principal Preparation program aligns it field experiences and assessments on the six dimensions of the Kentucky Cohesive Leadership System which are aligned to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards.

These field experiences are carefully planned and follow a clinical approach to formative assessment (pre-observation conference, observation and post-observation conference), by field based supervisors who provide support to candidates within their own schools. Assignments and assessments completed in field experiences are course embedded. In the endorsement programs (which are also a part of the Teacher Leader Program) the Practicum involves observations and completing cases that emphasize isolated skills. Programs that do not have a practicum, candidate assignments and assessments involve skill integration and progressive movement toward independence in the school building.

- (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?

Unit's Response

Lists of school-based and university clinical faculty members are provided in [Exhibit 3.4.6.1](#) and [Exhibit 3.4.6.2](#).

- (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?

Unit's Response

Like initial level programs, candidates in the advanced programs are expected to include samples of work from their placements in the ePortfolio. A particular emphasis on the school guidance and counseling program ePortfolio is engagement in reflective practice where candidates are required to reflect on their artifacts and action. In ESL program, all lesson plans require a reflection which the candidate writes after s/he has taught the lesson—either about current knowledge or effectiveness. These reflections are included as a component of the portfolio. The “first crop” of evaluated ePortfolios was obtained from the School Guidance Counseling program. All other advanced programs are new or recently redesigned.

- (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?

Unit's Response

University clinical faculty/supervisors and cooperating/mentor teachers are trained by the Field Experiences and Clinical Practice and the Director of the Alternative Certification Program in collaboration with program directors. The purpose of the training is to provide them with the requisite skills needed to work with both candidates and program faculty. The unit has

developed training materials [available for review by the NCATE/State joint teams during the on-site review] that includes the use of rubrics, evaluation forms, use of LiveText and other technologies in addition to the shared vision of the unit's Conceptual Framework. Other areas of training include policies and procedures related to field and clinical experiences. Clinical faculty members provide the final summative evaluation as to whether candidates meet unit, state and professional standards during student teaching and practicums to meet program requirements for their licenses and endorsements. Their opinions and perceptions are valued concerning changes that need to be made in programs or regarding confusion by candidates in relation to program requirements.

- (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?

Unit's Response

The unit recognizes that the conceptual framework is the underlying structure of the unit that sets forth a vision of the unit and provides a theoretical and empirical foundation for the direction of programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, faculty scholarship and service, and unit accountability. Faculty routinely reviews and updates the conceptual framework and ensures that it is remains responsive to best practices and current research. A review of unit documents and exhibits would review evidence of threads of the conceptual framework. Over the last three years, the unit has given intentional focus to NCATE Standard 3 as evident in the development and redesign of advanced programs. The unit has, however, not implemented a tracking system to support. The unit may consider the inclusion of a tracking mechanism in the next revision of the Renaissance Action Plan for Continuous Improvement and research the capabilities of the newly acquired FEMS component of LiveText.

- (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?

Unit's Response

Collectively as a unit, we seek to prepare teachers and other school personnel who are able to impact student learning through the creation classrooms and school cultures that value **all** students and honor diversity. In extending our theme of Educator as Leader, the unit faculty recognize that the Educator as Leader must have a preparation varied and meaningful school sites that understand student experiences and issues of diversity are related to school achievement; school sites that have an d an understanding of the tools necessary to promote an equitable and inclusive school environment to help **all** students learn. Embedded in the unit's conceptual framework and supported by the overarching mission of the university, is a commitment to diversity. As the Unit considers partnership sites that exemplify best practices in teaching and have an interest in the preparation of educational practitioners.

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

Unit's Response

Unit faculty entered into a discussion during a faculty meeting in December 2010 regarding the use of LiveText's recently developed Field Experiences Management System. During the May faculty and staff retreat, the Teri Schoone, Coordinator of Technology and LiveText provided a detailed presentation of the use FEMS to enhance the field experiences program. In July 2011, the unit send three faculty members (Carletta Bell –Director of the Alternative Certification Program; Jennifer Mangeot, Director of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice; and Teri Schoone, Coordinator of Technology and LiveText) to the summer LiveText conference to explore the capabilities of the Field Experiences Management System (FEMS) The unit has recently acquired (see [Exhibit 4.4.4](#)) the FEMS component to the LiveText platform that would support the field experiences program from observation (Level I in initial programs) to clinical practice/practicums in advance programs. Beginning in the fall of 2011, the unit expects to utilize the full range of the FEMS modules to support placements, cooperating teacher/mentor teacher assessments, and collecting evidence of student impact on K-12 learners.

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 support of equitable and inclusive learning environments; awareness 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 recognition 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.**

Unit response:

The Unit has provided a placement list [see [Exhibit 4.1.1](#)] of current candidates in the advance programs. Unit faculty will share specific thoughts, with the NCATE/State review teams during the on-site visit, on the on-going faculty effort and discussions regarding the development of a diversity index that will identify and assign index value for each school in our partner school districts.

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.

Unit's Response

The Unit is dedicated to uphold and to carry out the university's mission and commitment to diversity. A particular focus of the unit's conceptual framework is the preparation of an Educator as Leader who has a commitment in support of equitable and inclusive learning environments KTS 2.4; KTS 3.3; KyCLSC #6.1 (Initial and Advanced) [aligned to KyCLS 4.3b; KSGC 1g; 2a-f]; has an awareness of individual and cultural differences that impact the teaching and learning (important dimensions of diversity include ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area). [aligned to KTS 3.4; KyCLS 3.2c; 4.1g; 4.3; 6.1h; KSGC 2a-f]; and demonstrates a recognition that diversities affect the design of, outcomes of, interpretation of, and feedback stemming from, assessments. [aligned to KTS 2.2; KTS 5.4; KyCLSC 1.1c; 1.2a; KSGC 2a-f; 3d].

Partner schools provide a variety of settings for placements for candidates. These placements provide opportunities to candidate to interface with P–12 students from different socioeconomic and/or ethnic/racial groups, English language learners, or students with disabilities. Some of the placement schools have inclusion programs for their students with disabilities which further ensure candidates' experiences with diversity. Through course and field experiences, candidates are encouraged to explore, reflect on and plan for diverse students. These opportunities encourage and enrich discussion in courses about the diversity and specific communities developed within various schools

To give an idea of the demographic of the State's schools as a whole and the Unit's primary field experience placement schools most used for the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 school years see [Exhibit 4.3.1](#). [Exhibit 4.3.2](#) provides current individual placement site of advance program candidates as well as individual school data. All of these schools have diverse student populations. Program faculty work closely with school-based faculty and university supervisors in the evaluation of candidates' knowledge, skills and professional dispositions related to diversity.

The Unit offers a Teaching English as a Second Language (ESL), which has a strong focus on diversity, as one of the three endorsement programs in the advanced program. The program includes four courses which place emphasis on culture, language structure and acquisition,

methodology, linguistics, and assessment. One the four courses [EDU 587] is a fifty-hour practicum specifically designed to meet the needs of the ESL. Placement data for the practicum course are presented in [Exhibit 4.3.3](#). It is important to note that the ESL program has not had program completers since 2004.

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?

Unit's Response

The indicators are integrated throughout the curriculum to ensure that all candidates develop an understanding and appreciation of diversity and are continually assessed to determine the effectiveness of the Unit's efforts to help candidates effectively teach all learners in all settings. Unit faculty, with support from school partners has developed a Conceptual Framework is organized around our long held overarching theme of *Educator as Leader* model. Our present Framework describes the Unit's commitment to diversity and identifies three core proficiencies that are aligned to state and professional standards. Teacher candidates in initial and advanced (Teacher Leader) level programs are assessment using rubrics linked to Standard 4, indicator 4.2, standard 5, indicator 5.4 and standard 8, indicator 8.1 and 8.3. Each of the indicators is assessed throughout the program from the initial field experiences to the end of the professional semester and documented in the ePortfolio. In the School Guidance and Counselor program, candidate proficiencies are aligned to the Kentucky Standards for Guidance Counselor Programs (C.2 – Social and Diversity), are derived from the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Candidate complete anchor assessments and their ePortfolios which are based on the Kentucky Cohesive Leadership System Continuum for Principals Preparation and Development [KyCLSC](#)). Aspects of the evaluation rubrics for diversity are aligned to Function 3.1c under Dimension 3: Securing and Developing Staff; Function 4.1g and 4.3b under Dimension 4: Building Culture and Community; Function 6.1d and 6.1h under Dimension 6: Leveraging Community Systems and Resources.

- (2) Samples of candidate work related to diversity. What candidate work demonstrates that candidates are developing diversity proficiencies?

Unit's Response

Candidate completed anchor assessments and ePortfolio are, perhaps, good examples demonstrating that candidates are developing diversity proficiencies. The NCATE/State Board of Examiners team will gain insights from candidate works and interviews during the onsite visit.

- (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?

Unit's Response

The Unit, in particular, ensures that candidates make the connections between coursework and practical experience. Programs ensure that the candidates satisfy the candidate proficiencies, meeting diversity competencies specified in the Conceptual Framework for all programs. The Unit compiled information on the P-12 student diversity of the partner schools where initial and advanced candidates completed their student teaching. Diversity information was obtained from the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) Spalding University advanced program candidates (Principal Preparation, School Guidance and Counseling, Teacher Leader, and endorsement areas programs) completed their field experiences during the last three years. A review of P-12 student demographic data suggests in the advanced programs at Spalding University graduate with experience working with diverse populations. Overall, advance level candidates complete their field experiences in predominantly Title I school with higher percentages of minority students, students receiving free or reduced lunch, English Language Learners, and students with disabilities/exceptionalities than state-wide averages.

- (4) Diversity of counties and schools used for field experiences and clinical practice. How diverse are the settings outside of Jefferson and Shelby counties?

Unit's Response

Spalding University has established partnership relationships with four surrounding school districts: Bullitt County Public Schools, Jefferson County Public Schools; Shelby County Public Schools, and Oldham County Public Schools. Candidates in the initial and advanced programs are systematically placed in school settings in the four school districts.

Oldham County Public Schools: The 2010 data from the United States Census Bureau indicate that Oldham County has slightly more than [10 percent](#) minority/other groups. While the percentages of minority groups are lower than the national averages, the impact of the non-English speakers is reflected in the number and size of programs instituted at Oldham County School district. Enrollment of ELL students is evident in every school throughout the district. Upon entry into Oldham County Schools, students who have indicated a language other than English on the enrollment form are tested for English proficiency. Oldham County began [English as a Second Language](#) (ESL) instruction in the fall of 1996. The program is now known as English Language Learners (ELL) and has grown to include more than 300 students speaking more than 35 different languages.

Bullitt County Public Schools: The Unit has established a partnership with Bullitt County Public Schools located just 12 miles south of Spalding University and easily accessed by Interstate 65. Like many Kentucky counties in non-urban centers, Bullitt County has a White Non-Hispanic population of 96.4 percent; Hispanic or Latino (1.1percent; two or more races (1.0 percent; Black Non-Hispanic is estimated at (0.8 percent [Exhibit 5.5.4.1](#); [Exhibit 5.5.4.2](#) and [Exhibit 5.5.4.3](#) provides school/classroom diversity data.

- (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?

Unit's Response

The student population in the counties served by the Unit has shown a gradual increase in diversity over time. Candidates for all programs (initial and advanced licensure) complete field and/or clinical placements in diverse settings. Candidates' field experiences are deliberately made to ensure interaction with a wide array of students. Candidates in initial programs, especially, must complete a minimum of 50 percent of their field experiences in schools designated as serving higher than average numbers of minority students and students with exceptionalities. Candidates are also encouraged to complete placements in schools with populations of English language learners and students from low socioeconomic status homes. Unit faculty is currently working on large data-base to develop a diversity designation index of the partner public schools and places candidates where candidates have completed field placements. In addition the unit has recently acquired [See [Exhibit 4.4.5.1](#)] the Field Experiences Management System (FEMS) component to the LiveText platform that would support the field experiences program from observation (Level I in initial programs) to clinical practice/practicums in advanced programs. Beginning in the fall of 2011, the unit expects to utilize the full range of the FEMS modules to support placements, cooperating teacher/mentor teacher assessments, and collecting evidence of student impact on K-12 learners.

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.

Unit response:

The unit recruits and hires university clinical faculty for the purpose of providing regular and continuing support for student teachers and interns through a process that includes observing, conferencing, group discussions, email and the use of other technologies. In addition to state licensures and other academic and professional credentials, the unit recruits and hires university clinical faculty/supervisors who have a minimum of three years of teaching experience. [Exhibit 5.1.1](#) provides a summary of clinical faculty qualifications.

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.**

Unit's Response

The unit has included Faculty curriculum vitae under [Exhibit 5.1.2](#).

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).**

Unit response:

Samples of completed scorecards for the previous three years are provided in [\[Exhibit 5.1.1\]](#). Beginning in academic year 2011-2012, the unit implemented a process where each program area completed its own ScoreCards. Samples of current years ScoreCards are also provided.

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?

Unit's Response

While faculty numbers have somewhat fluctuated in the last two years due to retirements, faculty loss through death, and faculty transition to other opportunities, the total number of faculty has remained steady at between 13 and 14. [Exhibit 5.1](#) indicated a total of 14 faculty members while the count is 13 on the Website following the unexpected departure of Dr. Eric Barna in January 2011, who transitioned back to his home state of Virginia to assume a position at a local institution. The number of adjunct faculty was not included in the list available on the Website. The Unit has added [Exhibit 5.5.1.1](#) which includes the list of

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?

Unit's Response

[Exhibit 5.5.2.1](#) would reveal that 100 percent of the part-time clinical faculty have post-graduate preparation, have P-12 experiences, and they hold licenses in their disciplines including Rank 1 designations.

- (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.

Unit's Response

At the time of the July 12, 2011 off-site visit, the unit had three (3) full-time faculty members with master's degree at the assistant professor rank and one (1) at the associate professor rank. All four (4) faculty members are not on tenure-track. [Exhibit 5.5.3.1](#) provides a list of all Unit faculty, their academic credentials, and rank or tenure status. Individuals who are on the faculty on non-tenure track without terminal degrees were, at the time of their hiring, outstanding educators with exceptional expertise from the public school sector.

At the beginning of the academic year 2011-2012 (August) the unit hired two additional faculty members – Dr. Elisabeth Rogers and Professor Patricia Todd. Mrs. Todd does not have a terminal degree. However, she possesses extensive experience and was thus hired at the associate 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?

Unit's Response

The University Office of Information Technology (IT) manages the University's computer infrastructure, providing customer-focused delivery of our services in the use of information technology. Faculty and candidates heavily use the network. Standard equipment for many classrooms includes: a networked desktop computer, laptop cable hookups, a ceiling-mounted LCD video/data projector, a VCR/DVD combo unit, sound reinforcement, and a projection screen. All sources can be controlled with a projector remote control. A major enhancement to the technology infrastructure in classrooms is the addition of several SmartBoards. Mansion West 307, which is a dedicated classroom /instructional laboratory of the Unit, has a state of the art SmartBoard with an integrated high fidelity ceiling-mounted sound system. Faculty has opportunities to model as integrated technology into teaching.

(6) Sample unit Score Card, as referenced in IR, p. 31. How is this score card being used?

Unit's Response

The University has instituted detailed Balanced ScoreCards as an annual planning process based on the work of Robert Kaplan and David Norton. Because it is a university-wide process, the ScoreCard planning process is tied to the University's strategic plan. The Unit is using James Nichols' 5-Column Model for assessing and reporting the vitality of academic programs and institutional services; including as a major component, the assessment of student learning outcomes. This five-column model provides the framework that all programs and units must use in designing their assessment reports. The first three columns consist of the Strategic Plan Goal (Column 1), Intended Student Learning Outcomes (Column 2), and Means of Assessment & Assessment Criteria (Column 3). The assessment plan is laid out in these 3 columns.

The last two columns, Summary of Results (Column 4) and Use of Assessment Results (Column 5), primarily complete the assessment report. For the academic year 2011-2012 the Unit head encouraged each program area to complete its own ScoreCards [See current Balanced ScoreCard: [Exhibit 5.1.1](#)]. A sample of completed ScoreCards for each unit are also available as [Exhibit 5.1.1](#). Not only does the Balanced Program review is a continuous university-wide process involving faculty, dean, chairs and the University Provost. Program review provides the means for monitoring and strengthening program coherence. For yearly internal review, each academic school across the University develops goals for the programs as documented in the Balanced ScoreCard. Changes in program content and unit operations are consistent with the "Use of Results" column of the ScoreCard.

The results of the ScoreCard process drive new action steps in the coming year, but also it allows all faculty and staff to have a sense of satisfaction about their specific role in the achievement of the University's objectives and improvements. Additional samples of completed ScoreCards for previous years are also available as exhibits.

(6) Samples of completed faculty evaluations. How are the evaluations being used to improve faculty performance? How are adjunct faculty members being evaluated?

Unit's Response

Spalding University regularly evaluates the teaching effectiveness of each faculty member (regardless of contractual or tenure status) through multiple mechanisms that include the following: annual evaluations, applications for promotion and/or tenure, third year review (for tenure track faculty), and seventh-year review (for tenure track faculty who have not been awarded tenure). The *Faculty Governance Document* Article XII outlines the evaluation process for all full- and proportionate-time faculty members (both undergraduate and graduate faculty members, regardless of tenure status). This provision mandates an annual review by the faculty member's immediate supervisor and Dean that begins with a self-evaluation. The evaluation addresses three major areas: teaching effectiveness,

professional development (including research and artistic production), and service. The evaluation process begins in January for the previous calendar year and concludes by [July](#). The Instructions for Preparation of Annual Faculty Evaluation for Calendar Years are published by the Office for Academic Affairs outlines the processes and procedures to be followed and includes a time line.

Academic policies also require administrators (chair or program director) in each unit or their designee to evaluate all adjunct faculty who teach at Spalding University. Careful consideration is given to student comments, complaints, and student grade-appeals when considering whether to re-hire adjunct faculty. The Dean and or Associate Dean have counseled adjunct faculty regarding student feedback and, at times, decided not to re-hire certain adjunct faculty. The procedure for adjunct evaluation includes forms that are Unit developed. These evaluation forms [See [Exhibit 5.5.6.1](#)] are filled out and signed by the Unit head (or their designee) and the adjunct instructor. In addition, adjunct faculty performance is reviewed with the respective program director at the conclusion of the semester. Evaluations of adjunct instructors are kept on file in the designated College or School office. In addition to the administrative process for faculty evaluation, all courses serviced by the unit are formally evaluated to provide evidence of faculty teaching performance. The results of these evaluations are required on individual faculty annual review documents.

The primary goal of faculty evaluation is to improve teaching, scholarship, and professional service. These evaluations lead to course and program evaluation and revision, and serve as key benchmark in faculty growth and program consistency. Overall, faculty performs well on their annual evaluations and every effort is made to ensure faculty success. Those who are not successful in advancing toward tenure, typically transition after the third-year review. Consequently, most faculty who make a bid for tenure are awarded tenure. Cooperating teacher effectiveness is assessed through the office of the Director of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice where candidates and university clinical faculty provide feedback/perception of the teacher.

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?

Unit’s Response

The design, implementation and evaluation of field experiences require ongoing collaborative practices between the University and the school districts. The program directors and Director of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice work with district level personnel and school principals in the selection of schools in which candidates are placed and select the individuals who will best serve as cooperating teachers and supervisors. The unit engages school faculty and Unit faculty in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the Unit’s programs including 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. Cooperating teachers

evaluate field experiences including the role and support of the University clinical faculty (See [Exhibit 6.5.1.1](#)). University clinical supervisors also evaluate the role and support of cooperating teachers. Another example of faculty (Unit faculty and clinical faculty) involvement in the review of field experience is evident in [Exhibit 6.5.1.2](#) and [Exhibit 6.5.1.3](#). The NCATE/State jointed team will gain insight in faculty involvement in the design, implementation, and evaluation of programs.

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

Unit's Response

The unit has designated a faculty member, Teri Schoone, who serves as the Unit's technology and LiveText coordinator. Prof. Schoone has a strong background and training in computer science and information systems. With support from the Office of the Dean, Prof. Schoone provides ongoing training to faculty (full-time, part-time and adjuncts), staff, and candidates in accessing and using the technology including the LiveText system. A schedule the fall 2011 series of professional development sessions are included in [Exhibit 6.5.2.1](#).

- (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?

Unit's Response

The Unit facilities are quite adequate to support teaching and learning. While there are no designated classroom for any program on campus the University's Registrar assigns classroom space to courses. However, faculty across campus have opportunities, prior to course scheduling, to place a formal request for a technologically enhanced classroom. The College of Education which is housed in the Mansion Building, offers many of its courses on the second and third floors of Mansion West. Several classrooms in Mansion West are technologically enriched and offer overhead projectors, a desktop computer unit running on the Windows 7 platform. A state of the art computer laboratory/classroom is located in Mansion Room 307. While it is not owned by the College of Education, the unit has exclusive use of the space. The laboratory offers candidates opportunities to observe faculty modeling the use of the state of art SmartBoard with overhead High Fidelity sound system. Other courses are offered in other buildings across campus which are equally spacious, well lighted and are adequate to support the preparation of the *Educator as Leader* model. Faculty offices are modern and equipped with computers, shared high speed printers and Internet access photocopiers are available within the Unit. In addition, the University offers duplication service to faculty at the center located on the garden floor of the Mansion West building.

- (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?

Unit's Response

Data from Student Teaching Evaluations aggregated over the last three years indicate candidates have a strong understanding in the use of technology and information technology while completing the student teaching semester. Candidates are required to integrate the use of technology in their lesson planning and the ePortfolio, which is completed during the clinical semester for both initial and advanced programs. Data generated from the perception survey administered by the Unit is located under [Exhibit 6.5.4.1](#).

- (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?

Unit's Response

The Spalding University Library is the heart of the campus community and displays its [89 hours per week](#) of operation online on its Webpage. Centrally located, this resource center merges information and technology resources with a focus on educational outcomes to provide an adequate library collection, access to collections, and sufficient resources to support educational research and public service. Spalding University provides and supports student and faculty access and user privileges to adequate library collections through both ownership and formal agreements with The Kentuckiana Metroversity, Inc., which includes the University of Louisville ([ranked among the top 100](#) in the nation of university research libraries), and the [Association of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities](#). Spalding University is a member of the Southern Library Network (SoliNET), the largest regional library network in the United State. In addition, the nationwide standard Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) cataloging utility is the library's backbone for the creation of the online catalog, interlibrary loan activities, technical services support, and staff training opportunities as well as additional discounted electronic resource licenses.

Data gleaned from the 2011 faculty survey, indicates that approximately [63 percent](#) of the faculty who responded indicated that they never use monograph holdings in the University Library for their personal research use. The survey did not include other resources that faculty might use from the Spalding Library. It is not clear if the 63% meant to indicate that they use monographs from other Metroversity locations offered through Spalding University's Library. However, only [13.04 percent](#) of students/candidates who responded to library survey indicated that they "never" access Spalding University research databases. However, [60.87 percent](#) of the student/candidate respondents indicated that they access Spalding University electronic research databases more than six (6) times per Session (6 weeks).

Library services and resources available to College of Education faculty, candidates, and alumni are exemplary in a number of ways:

1. With special attention to Spalding’s educational programs, the library offers many Electronic resources with password access. Faculty and candidates have access to 180,000+ items, 50 electronic data-bases through the Spalding University Library, Metroversity and AIKU.
2. As member the Metroversity and AIKCU, candidates and faculty have web access to additional scholarly journal articles. All resources are available remotely on a 24-hour basis, including on-line catalog databases.
3. All electronic resources, books, journals, and databases are available to candidates from any location on or off-campus. Off-campus access to electronic resources is authenticated through a valid login with Spalding University user name and password.

The University librarians speak at various University meetings (including the bi-weekly Academic Affairs Committee – an academic affairs decision-making body) to ensure that faculty members have access to media, electronic journals and anything else they may need to enhance instruction.

- (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?

Unit’s Response

The University Library routinely administered periodic surveys to both university students (including teacher candidates) and faculty. Since the last NCATE visit, the University made significant budgetary allocations expended to in enhancing Library physical and electronic resources needed to support the curriculum. This expansion includes collections that is of value to candidates in both initial and advanced programs. In a [2011 student survey](#) administered electronically using QuestionPro and realized a 48 (91.3 percent being full-time students) indicates that indicate [60.82 percent](#) access research databases more than six times per session (6 weeks).

From qualitative data generated from the Student Library Survey data, the unit has learned that:

1. There is a need to consider computer units designated for group projects – Quote: “My program of study includes a lot of group projects that require using computers while on campus; however the groups always end up getting too loud. It would be helpful to have a designated computer area to work on group projects.” The unit also learned that some computers in the Library are slow.”
2. The computer startup process is lengthy. It would be helpful to cut out some of the steps. It seems this process can take anywhere from 3-5 minutes which in the scheme of things is not that long but would be helpful. Also, on the 2nd and 3rd floors, I have not been able to access the internet on the side of the building that faces the church. I have mentioned this to IT in the past and they checked on it but the problem was not resolved the last time I had checked. This problem has since been resolved.
3. There was a need to add more printers. “Printer use has been troublesome at times particularly when there are many students in the computing area. Is there some way to

provide an additional computer? This is especially important because there have been times when the printer was not working and no backup printing is available.” In response to this need, the Library has provided a high speed printing kiosk in the Library in the summer 2011.

4. Feedback from the survey indicates a need for expanding the electronic databases. “It is not a shock for me to say that the collection of journal articles held at the school is lacking considerably. While the Metroversity system is beneficial, it would be 100 times better if articles that are available through Metroversity but are not held at our school had information about what Metroversity location we could get them at. This would save us a ton of time going from library to library checking their holdings (if we don't have the time to wait for an interlibrary loan) because the database would already tell us which schools have the article.” The Library has a catalog access to resource for Metroversity locations. This catalog is accessible to all students from Spalding University Library website (See [website’s menu on the left](#)). A lesson gleaned from this information indicates there are some students who lack adequate familiarity with the university Library website. The Library and the unit may need to provide more library orientation sessions with a specific component that includes navigating the Library website. A [survey administered to faculty](#) in 2011. [66.67%](#) of the faculty responded indicated satisfaction on “the quality of research materials that students are using for your courses?”

Sources of Evidence

Spalding University’s Institutional Report

Annual Reports and Program Reports in NCATE’s Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS)

Web site and Exhibits of Spalding University