

Part C: Annual Report

Section A. Conceptual Framework

During the NCATE accreditation visit in 1997, the Department of Education presented its Conceptual Framework. This Conceptual Framework incorporated a shared vision consistent with the institution's mission as well as with NCATE, Interstate New Teacher Assessment Support Consortium (INTASC) Standards, Indiana Professional Standards Board Standards, and National Board Standards for Professional Teachers (NBSPT). The framework has been and continues to be the foundation for all programs and curriculum from the first classes taken in the freshman year through the student teaching experience in the senior year. The Conceptual Framework is evidenced in the "Critical Decision Points" a reference table delineating the transition points for the Unit Assessment System (UAS), portfolio process, and course syllabi.

As part of the transition to the NCATE 2000 performance-based standards, the Department members (including adjunct and Arts & Science faculty) revised the existing framework to better articulate a the shared vision consistent with the unit's efforts in preparing effective teacher's for the 21st century. The revised Conceptual Framework is key in providing direction for programs as illustrated through the "Critical Decision Points in Teacher Education" (CDP). The CDP were developed in 1999-2000 and were revised in 2001-2002 in an effort to provide structure and guidelines, and ultimately quantifiable evidence that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards. The CDP clearly demarks the timeframe, decision point, performance indicator, source of evidence, and evaluators. Each decision point and the related sources of evidence are connected to the University of Saint Francis (USF) Conceptual Framework and INTASC Standards at the undergraduate level and include the National Board Standards at the graduate level. In addition, the Conceptual Framework establishes the connection between what teachers should know and be able to do with the process and procedures to become a teacher, which is articulated in the Portfolio Manual and the Teacher Education Handbooks.

The portfolio plays a strategic role in the CDP. The three portfolio levels for undergraduate teacher education candidates include the Initial Portfolio Check 1, Developing Portfolio Check 2, and Proficient Portfolio Check 3. Graduate candidates must successfully complete two portfolio reviews referred to as the Skilled Practitioner and Distinguished. These levels are clearly described in the new Portfolio Manual, as are the accompanying rubrics. The portfolio evaluation rubric for both the initial and advanced programs was revised in Spring 2002. The revision combines what were three separate rubrics into one. In addition, there is a Proficient Portfolio Interview rubric completed at the end of student teaching.

Instruction is based on the philosophical belief that the Conceptual Framework provides a core of competencies from which effective teaching is modeled and practiced. A master table, revised to include the NBSPT Standards (Summer 2002), illustrates the alignment of the Conceptual Framework and standards are included in the USF Portfolio Manual. Education candidates demonstrate teacher competencies through the two (advanced) or three (initial) levels (stated above) as described in the manual. The "Teacher Education Handbook" has been updated to include the specific processes and procedures for all teacher education candidates (initial and advanced) as well as an IPSB Standards guide for the selected program of study.

The Conceptual Framework's influence and the direction it provides are evident in each course taught in the Department. The syllabus format was designed based on NCATE expectations and was implemented beginning the 2001-2002 academic year. The purpose of this format is to adequately inform the candidate of the relevant standards and expected skills to be acquired in each class. In addition to the basic syllabus information (e.g., textbook, objectives, references/resources), each course author articulates the Conceptual Framework competencies and also the IPSB content and program related developmental level(s) with the corresponding performances and knowledge addressed in their course. Each IPSB performance and/or knowledge is aligned with the product/evidence that will demonstrate the skill acquisition through the "Course Linkage Chart". A menu or listing of a variety of assessment methods was created for faculty consideration and potential selection. Finally, beginning in Summer 2002 all course charts are entered in the "Program Alignment Matrix" which connects each content area IPSB Standard with matching INTASC Standards for the initial level and the National Board Standards for the advanced level.

Conceptual framework weakness cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

No weaknesses cited in the previous report.

Section B. Candidate Performance

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Content Knowledge

The 2000 report indicated that the Department was in the process of defining a common core of professional education courses that would be used to introduce students as teacher education candidates to content knowledge in order to prepare for their professional roles. The common core also includes the field experiences for all teacher education programs. In addition to the common core, a program specific core was defined and finalized in Spring 2002 for each program (Elementary/Mild Intervention, All-Grade Exceptional Needs/Mild Intervention, and Secondary/Mild Intervention). The Department is committed to providing a rigorous professional education core curriculum (defined as "what *all* teachers should know and be able to do") that addresses diversity issues such as race, ethnicity, language, and exceptionality. Beginning in 2001 and finalized in 2002, each teacher education program aligned courses within the program specific core [the content area specific course work] with the IPSB content standards to ensure teacher education candidates completing their program of study will have demonstrated the acquisition of expected knowledge.

Pedagogical Knowledge

Pedagogical knowledge begins in the common core field experiences. The field experiences are built to reflect the developing skills of the candidate beginning with Introduction to Teacher Education Experience (TEE 1) proceeding to Practicum in Teacher Education Experience (TEE 2) and finally, Advanced Practicum in Teacher Education Experience (TEE 3, approved Spring 2002). These field experiences are dispersed appropriately with the introductory content courses

advancing to methods specific course work as revised by professional education faculty in Summer 2002. At the advanced preparation level pedagogical knowledge is infused throughout the curriculum but is most evident in the methods and practicum/internship experiences. Systematically candidates are provided content knowledge and then given the opportunity through the field experiences to observe and/or practice their ability to apply that knowledge.

In addition to the instructional design of content and field experiences the Department incorporates the portfolio system, which continued to be refined and aligned with the new curriculum to allow teacher education candidates a means to demonstrate the knowledge and pedagogical skills obtained throughout their program. The introductory core culminates with the completion of the first stage of a three-part portfolio assessment system referred to as the “Initial Portfolio” and first stage of a two-part system referred to as the “Skilled Practitioner” at the graduate level. The portfolio for each stage is assessed through the use of a rubric. The newly constructed rubric (based on the Conceptual Framework) is part of a system that is consistent and monitors both the candidate’s performances and the teacher education programs’ effectiveness in developing knowledge-based skills to support all students. Next, the Department focused their review on the effectiveness of the pedagogical curricula. Once beyond the introductory core, students accepted into the Teacher Education Program enter the pedagogical courses to continue their professional development. The pedagogical level of course work is assessed through the second stage for the undergraduate candidate entitled the “Developing Portfolio”. The final level of study is student teaching, which integrates content knowledge, dispositions, and performances required to teach all students and is assessed by a new tool approved Spring 2002. The “Proficient Portfolio” was designed to demonstrate candidate competencies that meet professional, state, and institutional standards. The second and final portfolio review at the graduate level is the “Distinguished Portfolio” check. The “Critical Decision Points in Teacher Education” illustrates the connection between the decision point, Conceptual Framework, and standards.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge

In addition to curriculum content and pedagogical changes the Department has investigated ways to increase candidate involvement in content/pedagogical experiences such as participation and attendance in conferences and workshops. Faculty members in the Department serve as mentors and attend conferences and/or workshops in conjunction with students. A journal/log (includes reflections) completed by each candidate illustrates their efforts to be involved in extended learning opportunities. The above-mentioned log is required and reviewed during “Initial” and “Developing Portfolio” (undergraduate candidates) and “Skilled Practitioner” and “Distinguished Portfolio” (graduate candidates) reviews. A scheduled list of activities is made available to students. Examples of specific conferences and workshops attended by candidates and their mentors last year include Indiana Council of Teachers of Mathematics Conference (ICTM), Indiana Council for the Social Studies (ICSS), Science Central Workshop funded by an Eisenhower Grant, and Marcy Cook Math Workshop. Finally, sixteen students attended and presented at the Campus Compact Student Conference on Service Learning hosted at Ball State University.

The graduate programs in education engage in professional development through their teaching placements and course work and demonstrate their experiences in the portfolio. This year master candidates were encouraged to attend the National Professional Development Conference held in Indianapolis. In addition, graduate candidates are expected to be involved in discipline related organizations.

Weaknesses related to Standard 1 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

No weaknesses cited in the previous report.

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The 2000 report defined and described multiple formative and summative assessments that would provide a collective presentation of the quality of the program and each student's progress. To address the progress made in the 2001-02 year each of Indiana's seven criteria for the Unit Assessment System development and review will be used to organize and present the information.

Assessment System

Stakeholder involvement

The Department of Education determined that two existing committees, the Teacher Education Committee and the Teacher Education Advisory Council would be effective formal structures to provide stakeholder input. The Teacher Education Committee consists of Department faculty, content faculty, and candidates representing each teacher education program. In the past two representatives were elected by Faculty Forum to serve as members of the Teacher Education Committee. Last year, the Department requested that Forum change the membership to include a member from each content department that provided a teacher education program. The membership change was approved and the new members attended their first meeting in January 2002. The Teacher Education Advisory Council includes professional education and content faculty, P-12 school faculty and administrators, related education stakeholders (i.e., teacher union director, Local Education Fund Director), and program alumni. Since these are established structures whose primary purpose is to provide input relative to the teacher education program, these stakeholders were logical groups to involve in the steps to establish the UAS. Both the Committee and Council are included in the procedures for the UAS to assure their continued input. The focus of work and resulting recommendations in the 2001-02 academic years for these USF stakeholders has revolved around the decisions points as related to their effectiveness in predicting successful outcomes for candidates and the implementation of the UAS. The Department of Education presented its continued work and use of the "History of Change within the Department of Education" as an early UAS effort to provide direction for accuracy, fairness, and consistency through which decisions regarding changes in practice and performance are made in the Department.

Conceptual Framework incorporates the standards.

The USF Conceptual Framework was revised in Summer 2002 as was the Department theme “Educators facilitating and advancing learning in a diverse, ever-changing society” and is aligned with the INTASC principles (initial level) and National Board Standards (advanced level) as is evidenced in the “Teacher Education Handbook”, course syllabi, and the requirements and format prescribed for the portfolio. Since the framework is aligned with INTASC principles, which are embedded in the IPSP standards the Department is confident that it comprehensively addresses all standards. Professional education and Arts & Science faculty members finalized course syllabi templates that include content and/or developmental standards addressed in each course. Finally, faculty members mapped courses in each program (elementary/mild intervention, secondary/mild intervention, all-grade exceptional needs/mild intervention, and secondary and all-grade visual arts) to provide a systematic mechanism that assures USF programs address standards that ensure teacher competency at the initial and advanced levels.

In late spring 2002, the Department began a collaborative venture with the Indiana Department of Education, Division of Special Education Project entitled “Individual Curriculum and Assessment Notebook” (ICAN). The purpose of this effort was to use the ICAN system to assist colleges/universities in a process through which the alignment of the IPSB Developmental and Content Standards can be achieved. Once the process of breaking down standards into measurable elements is complete, the ICAN program will conduct a search for matching elements resulting in an inter-standard alignment. Currently, it appears each institution is completing an autonomous alignment between standards to demonstrate candidate competency. The ICAN collaborative effort will provide a proven and consistent method (based on the ICAN Indiana Academic Standards alignment in existence and implemented in many Indiana P-12 schools) accessible throughout the State to support IPSB Content and Developmental Standards alignment. The University of Saint Francis will use the ICAN alignment to support program alignment with standards.

The UAS provides a coherent, sequential, assessment system for individual candidates.

Candidates are informed of the standards in the professional education courses, syllabi, discussion in professional education courses, advising sessions, the “Teacher Education Handbook”, “Critical Decision Points in Teacher Education”, the “Portfolio Manual”, and the “Field Experiences Manual” which were all revised during the 2001- 02 academic year to reflect changes and better clarify the assessment system. To facilitate the assessment process, the CDP includes portfolio checkpoints which are evaluated through the use of rubrics. Since the piloting year for the portfolio rubrics, the Department of Education faculty members made revisions to the portfolio rubrics. The 2001 revisions reflect recommendations from the trained pool of portfolio raters. These training sessions for portfolio evaluation occur each semester with the intent to broaden the pool of raters and collect recommendations for more effective evaluation and meaningful feedback for candidates. Currently students receive individual feedback from their advisors and instructors as they complete each portfolio check/review and decision point. Once the UAS is fully implemented in a secured online database, it will serve two purposes. First as a monitoring system for students and faculty who will be able to gain access and view program progression. Second as an analysis system since faculty in the Department will be able to analyze collected data for their advisees’ that relate to program progression through decision

points, which includes the competencies obtained through individual courses and clustered through specific decision points, and finally the competencies gained at program completion through the use of aggregated data reported for individual students. Finally, the Department determined that some program decisions about candidates and detailed information supporting the UAS will continue to be recorded and stored in individual student hard files. An example of such information is the record of a formal candidate appeal. The documentation of the nature and resolution of the appeal is contained in the student's confidential hard file. Other data that is regularly collected and analyzed are the Title II Report Praxis scores for program completers, the USF program evaluation survey, the Indiana Induction Survey, and graduate follow-up studies completed three and five years after program completion.

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

UAS used collective presentation of candidate assessments & related data to document that standards are met.

Over past five years, the Department developed several specific databases in either Excel or Access to store and organize individual candidate assessment information used to document that candidates meet standards. Examples of data stored in this mechanism are candidates with the criteria for acceptance into Teacher Education checked/dated if met, practicum and student teacher evaluations, and Praxis I and II results, which are also part of the USF "Critical Decision Points for Teacher Education". The software applications used could produce aggregated data across students or individual student performance reports that could be used to monitor if standards are being met according to the specific data analyzed (i.e., Praxis scores over a period of years). These databases represent the initial stages of a comprehensive UAS and their analysis is apparent in the "History of Change Document". However, the University recently purchased a more comprehensive registration system (Jenzabar which, replaced Teams Elite) that the newly designed Education electronic UAS can interact with this and other existing internal databases to pull UAS required information and run individual or group aggregated reports. This system and the reports that can be produced will allow faculty advisors to monitor and analyze student performance. It will avoid the necessity to re-enter or update information existing in the University database. The 2001-02 academic years began the implementation of the student-monitoring phase of the UAS. This phase included the entry of the decision points and the designated area(s) to post data for each criterion within each of the decision points for undergraduate and graduate candidates. Next, a cluster system for student access entitled "student designations which allows the advisor to select the appropriate options from the following clusters: freshman, sophomore, junior, senior; advisees, licensure, graduate; current and/or former candidates was developed. Finally, in the 2001-02 academic year all courses within the curriculum with their respective "Course Linkage Charts" were entered in the UAS. The purpose of the course charts is to demonstrate the standards-based skills addressed in each course. Once a course is successfully completed, the skills attained by the candidate can be documented through a report generated by the UAS.

The Course Linkage Chart provides one type of assessment collection in the new electronic system to document individual performance and aggregate data among and across students, at each decision point and program completion to view the acquisition of expected skill. The

sequential system of Critical Decision Points allows the Department to identify weaknesses in candidates and offer remediation. The second stage referred to as analysis is in progress and data continues to be entered hence the aggregation of student data documenting that standards are met is not complete at the time of this report. The Department expects to begin aggregated reports for analysis of student progress and program effectiveness by the end of Fall 2002. The Department has collected assessment data related to performance indicators within the Critical Decision Points (CDP), which represents multiple assessments from internal and external sources for current candidates. The CDP is key in defining the data that regularly and systematically needs to be compiled and entered in the UAS mechanism to document and ensure standards have been assessed and students are acquiring the expected competencies throughout their program. The following are examples of data collected to demonstrate candidate performance and analyze if they have met the criteria (connected to standards) for entrance into Teacher Education: Initial Portfolio evaluation and interview rubrics (internal & external evaluators), Assessment of Professional Potential (internal & external evaluators), Praxis I results (external source), Limited Criminal History & Sex Offender Checks (external sources). The other decision points have a similar variety of sources of internal and external evidence to assess the performance indicators. In addition to the above noted examples for applicants and current candidates, the Department disseminates surveys to a variety of sources regularly such as program completers-each semester (TEC: Candidate Exit Survey), cooperating teachers and school administrators- each semester, and graduate follow-up – every 3rd and 5th year to analyze the effectiveness of the teacher education program

The unit ensures that its assessment system is continuously managed.

The Department of Education continues the process of shifting its original Access/Excel-based UAS to a new database system specifically designed to be a more effective and comprehensive mechanism for storing, documenting, monitoring, and analyzing program and student data. The electronic UAS will extract information stored in the University registration system, which was recently upgraded by replacing the existing “Teams Elite” module with a new system entitled, “Jenzabar”. During the 2001-02 academic year, the University of Saint Francis hired consultants from a local database development company to expand the capabilities the Department’s UAS. The Department worked in collaboration with USF academic computing/technology staff and the database developers to revise collection system to reflect changes in the decision points and extent the amount and type of data collected. An example of extension and type of data change is a new area on the UAS that is secured to store samples of candidate and P-12 student work. These moves demonstrate the University’s and the Department’s effort to test different information technologies and improve its assessment system. In addition, the UAS Coordinator (new position beginning September 2002) is working with the USF program developer to refine the database to more effectively demonstrate assessment data and reflect changes made in the CDP.

In summer of 2001 the Unit was successful in redefining and upgrading the secretarial role to administrative assistant. This effort was spurred in part by the need for a UAS data manager and as such those skills were included in the search for an assistant. A new administrative assistant was hired in August 2001. The Academic Computer Center worked with the Department to create the UAS system but the administrative assistant will be responsible for entering the data.

The Chair of the Department will be responsible for overseeing the UAS. Validation and documentation processes are the responsibility of all Department faculty members as advisors. In the academic year 2001-02 the University continued to support the Department with an additional office assistant, which the Department will request to continue for the next academic year. At the end of the 2001-02 academic year, an analysis of the type of work and time required to collect, organize, and aggregate the data for meaningful analysis warrants consideration of a new ½ - time position. The Department submitted a request to recruit a new full-time position entitled UAS Coordinator and Licensing Officer.

The UAS provides for review and revision of the assessment system.

The first phase of the electronic UAS development is referred to as the monitoring phase is nearing completion. In this phase, the UAS Coordinator collects and enters data related to the Critical Decision Points, which allows faculty/advisors to monitor students' progression in their program. The next phase is the analysis development phase, which is currently at a rudimentary level. The analysis phase requires the construction of questions, which will be used to develop a reporting system programmed in the UAS. The Department is developing questions to be analyzed through the UAS system. The questions posed will be used to program the UAS to run reports, which will utilize the data collected, entered, and aggregated to answer the question. The resulting reports are intended to assist the Department in making student and program decisions. The third phase is the follow-up analysis, which will use external assessments (e.g., graduate follow-up survey) aggregated data to analyze program effectiveness and beginning teacher performance. Existing surveys are under reviewed and revision is anticipated. The revised follow-up survey will be disseminated in Fall 2002 and the data being added to the UAS in Spring 2003.

Even though the Department is in the early stages of making the UAS operational, there is a "debugging" level of UAS review and revision occurring between the Department and Academic Technology Office. This group designed a table to capture the UAS problems, problem priority, potential solutions, and date of resolution. The timeline will be maintained as documentation that the UAS is in a continuous state of review and revision at this early phase of implementation. Once the three phases are completed (maintenance is on-going) for students beginning with the 2001 academic year, the formal review and revision for the UAS begins. The process for review and revision is based on input from the Teacher Education Committee, which includes members from content areas with education majors, student representatives from all programs and the Teacher Advisory Council, which includes faculty and administrators from K-12 schools, alumni, related education stakeholders, and Department faculty. The Department established timelines for data entry so information is available to advisors and students for feedback, reflection, and decision-making relevant to the teacher education program and progression.

The Department continued to refine the decision points this past year, which resulted in revising the UAS. An example of such revision is the development of an alternative source for the portfolio rubric, which is in its 4th revision. The UAS collects scores for the current portfolio rubrics. For those candidates who were scored using an earlier rubric format the UAS was only able to waive the requirement. This was inaccurate since the candidate did complete the requirement but the rubric scoring systems were incompatible. The revised system reflects a

portfolio requirement with a “met” status and a notation to see the student’s file for the rubric. Another refinement of the UAS is the link to an Internet site that once the name of a school and its district has been entered, the system will search the state database for diversity demographics thus offering the ability to produce a report rendering aggregated data on diversity of placements for the individual candidate, program, and Department.

As data is entered, the Department monitors the effectiveness of the system. It is the intent of the Department to share the timeline with both UAS stakeholder Committee/Council to collect their insights and recommendations. In addition to collecting, entering, and managing the data, the Department is refining the analysis/questions to be answered by the data.

Use of Data for Program Improvement

UAS uses aggregated assessments from individual candidates and other sources to refine & revise the framework, courses, & curriculum.

The Department UAS uses multi-level, internal and external assessment tools to gather data and maintains a systematic and comprehensive to provide information on the qualifications and competence of candidates and program effectiveness. Examples of these tools are: Initial, Developing, and Proficient Portfolio checks (undergraduate candidates) Skilled Practitioner and Distinguished Portfolio reviews (graduate candidates), Praxis I and II results, course evaluations, practicum, student teaching evaluations, Teacher Education Program: Candidate Exit Survey, Senior Exit Interview, Cooperating Teacher/Administrator Evaluation Survey, Graduate Follow-up Survey, Beginning Teacher Induction Survey and Teacher Performance Evaluations for graduate candidates working in the teaching field. Aggregated data across students and programs are compiled from these assessment tools. This data is used to make revisions in relevant aspects of the Teacher Education Program, which are then recorded in the “History of Change within the Department of Education” document. The changes stated in the document occur as a result of many of the sources including assessments mentioned earlier (e.g., course evaluations, practicum & student teaching evaluations, surveys). The source, rationale, and date for each change are noted. Curriculum revisions made during the 2001-2002 years reflect the Departments response to standards’ expectancies and students’ evaluation of their program. The following are examples of the Department’s use of data to improve its programs. The Candidate Exit Survey 2001 responses indicated that all candidates desired more behavior and classroom management instructional time (response to quantity of instructional time 2.0/5.0 = deficient). As a result SPED 430: Classroom/Behavior Management was added to the elementary & secondary programs of study. In the same survey, working with students with exceptionalities was rated low in terms of quantity of instructional time by elementary and secondary majors (2.9 and 2.8 respectively). The new curriculum (Fall 2002) responds to this deficiency with the dual licensure for elementary/exceptional needs: mild intervention and secondary/exceptional needs: mild intervention programs which will significantly increase candidate work with students with exceptionalities. Another curriculum change was to make all student teaching clinical experiences fifteen weeks, which is an increase of five weeks for secondary majors. Cooperating teachers surveyed by faculty and Teacher Advisory Council gave input to support the fifteen-week placement. It was also noted in the Program Completer Survey that candidates did not fully understand the activities/opportunities for professional development. The Department is

reviewing the courses (methods and advanced practicum) in which professional development is a significant component to better articulate professional development plans and review of performance. In addition, two assessments were recently implemented to evaluate candidate dispositions entitled the “Assessment of Professional Potential”.

Candidates are provided individual feedback based on the assessments used to make decisions respective to their performance and related to their progression through the program. Feedback is given during each course, at each decision point, and during advising sessions. In addition candidates will be able to access their individual file to view their performance in relation to the Critical Decision Points (CDP) with a password through a secured UAS web-based system. The newly implemented “Assessment of Professional Potential” evaluations must be reviewed with the candidate and recommendation/remediation offered at the time of feedback meeting.

Faculty receive feedback and are able to reflect on their performance at the course level through course evaluations conducted each semester (revised in 2000) that are aggregated and include student comments. The Department Chair completes an annual evaluation of each member and gives feedback during an individual meeting. At the program level, a compilation of information gleaned through the Program Completer and Cooperating Teacher/Administrator Surveys are shared with the Department members on an annual basis. Finally, the University conducted in 2001 a campus-wide survey entitled, “Student Satisfaction Inventory (Noel Levitz)” of students’ attitudes regarding for example academics, advising, and instructional effectiveness. This campus-wide survey and its results were disseminated to all Departments.

The systematic feedback provided through assessments such as those noted above allow improvements to occur at the course level through student course evaluation and at the program level through program evaluation. In addition, the Department continues to review the effectiveness of its data system as it implements the UAS in the following phases: development, monitoring, and analysis. As stated earlier, changes have already occurred in the data system.

Section C. Unit capacity

Standard 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice.

The Department continuously evaluates the effectiveness of the field experiences and clinical practice it provides for candidates in teacher education. Feedback supplied by pre-service candidates during the Program Completer Survey indicated that these field experiences were among the most useful ways to develop professional skills. A field experience tracking system has been designed to evaluate type, level, and the numbers of hours of each placement initial candidates have been exposed. The Unit is committed to offering experiences that are diverse, high quality, and adequately supervised. Finally, as of January 2002, the Department now meets with representatives from each content area providing a teacher education program through the membership of the Teacher Education Committee. The Committee membership change has resulted in the Departments ability to increase collaboration with the content faculty especially in relation to assessment efforts that occur during the portfolio checks, which are linked to practicum and student teaching field experiences. At the advanced level candidates apply skills as related to teacher inquiry research in their area of concentration through the practicum and/or

internship experience. Teachers who are licensed but are continuing their education are allowed to use their own classrooms for their field experience.

Collaboration between unit and school partners

The University of Saint Francis continues to develop partnership sites with of P-12 schools that share a common goal of improving teacher training and education for students. Collaborative projects are designed between the school and the Department to provide authentic experiences for teacher education candidates. There are two distinctive types of collaboration with schools – through content/field courses and methods/field courses. An example of a collaborative content/field experience is the Irwin/USF project. Irwin Elementary hosts a school-based course (Sped 237) that is taught cooperatively by school-based and USF professional education faculty members. The class meets twice a week at Irwin Elementary School where the candidates receive content instruction followed by working with 1-5 grade students in inclusive general education classrooms. Field experiences are also established in methods classes to apply the instructional strategies taught. Methods courses in each program provide a block of hours in settings that match the developmental level(s) students are being trained. Examples of methods/field-based projects are found in Whispering Meadows and Lindley Elementary Schools. Lindley Elementary and University of Saint Francis host a “Math Night”, which requires many hours of preparation to provide Lindley teachers and parents with games and materials to develop mathematic skills in elementary students. The 2001-02 academic year partnership focus was to construct a proposal for a professional development school with the Fort Wayne/South Bend Catholic Schools system. A committee was formed and a draft paper was written.

At the advanced preparation level, candidates must relate learning theory and application of assessment administration and interpretation to teaching in their own classroom or the USF on-site Oaks & Willows Center for students with learning difficulties and/or disabilities through focused assignments such as a case study, pre and post assessment, and the design of an instructional planning tool. In addition, advanced teacher candidates must complete a practicum/internship and/or student teaching. Those candidates possessing a teaching license but currently teaching on an “Emergency License” and the University collaborate with the school that the candidate is teaching.

During the 2001- 2002 academic school year, the Department involved stakeholders in a variety of newly designed field related documents to give input prior to implementation. First, the Department piloted a new evaluation tool for student teaching Spring 2002 at which time the cooperating teachers involved gave input to the assessment’s effectiveness. The areas the Department focused feedback for the student teaching evaluation tool were related to the accuracy of the connection between the Conceptual Framework and standards, appropriateness of the skills being assessed, consistency & comprehensiveness of the assessment, usability, and any issues of fairness or bias. Another document was the new “Affiliation Agreement” used for student teacher placements to be implemented Fall 2002 with the eighteen school districts in which the University places its candidates. The agreement was revised to include additional candidate information such Sex Offender Registry checks. In addition, the University of Saint Francis requested an equal role in the selection and placements of its candidates. The Director of

Student Teaching will use the newly design “Field Experience Tracking Form” to recommend the best match for the final placement.

Design, implementation, and evaluation of field experience and clinical practice

The teacher education field experiences and clinical practice (initial and advanced) were redesigned to more effectively ensure diversity, reduce redundancy, and provide systematic opportunities to observe, practice, and apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions required of teachers. Each practicum at the initial level targets a different type and level of teaching experience. The newly implemented IPSB and INTASC Standards, Course Linkage Charts, and program alignment matrix gave direction to the competencies each experience would focus therefore, eliminating unnecessary redundancy. All field experiences including methods use various instruments and products to provide evidence of attained competencies as depicted in the course linkage chart. Finally, the redesigned field experiences offers the teacher education candidate a continuum of instructional events related to the science of teaching such as focused observations, direct instruction, and service learning opportunities linked to the community.

Changes and improvements occurring in the final field experience, student teaching include the combination of two former courses, the Student Teaching Seminar and the Foundation in Education course. This combination allows students to focus on specific educational issues such as culture, ethics, and gender in a meaningful context since they are teaching. In addition, the new seminar class includes as part of the student teaching requirement a discussion area online. All student teachers are required two substantive postings per week. The University supervisors enter the discussion area each week and respond to student questions and/or comments. The purpose of the discussion area is to encourage collaboration/sharing of ideas among students with guidance from the supervisors. At the advanced level, the practicum/internship now includes a disposition assessment and portfolio review. The disposition assessment is completed by outside stakeholders and University faculty who can attest to the candidate’s professional potential. The evaluation tool for the advanced level practicum and internship are under revision.

Last year the evaluation instrument for student teaching was redesigned. The Department based the new tool on the INTASC Standards, which are aligned with the USF Conceptual Framework. It collects rated performances for all standards. If a candidate receives an unsatisfactory score on any standard, the evaluator completes a rating of knowledge and/or dispositions that are not satisfactory for that standard. This information is used to plan remediation strategies for the candidate. In addition the candidate must successfully complete a variety of requirements, which include demonstration of the P-12 students under his/her charge during the student teaching experience. Finally, all student teachers must complete their Proficient Portfolio and Interview with evaluations being completed by multiple raters such as professional and content faculty, field supervisors, cooperating teachers, and Advisory Board members.

Development and demonstration of knowledge, skills and dispositions

The Department added a service-learning component to the curriculum for all teacher education candidates. Several courses require service-learning experiences. These experiences provide opportunities for students to demonstrate dispositions and develop professional skills. One such

service-learning project was the Vincent House (a shelter for homeless people), which was an interdisciplinary, campus-wide event. Students volunteered to organized activities to support and assist individuals and families in need and reflect on the process and their personal and professional growth.

At the end of the 2001- 2002 academic year, the Department developed an “Assessment of Professional Potential for Teacher Education”, which was approved for implementation beginning Fall 2002 to evaluate dispositions first, at the time of Admission to Teacher Education, a critical decision point and a second, separate form to be completed by any faculty or field supervisor at any point during the program.

Weaknesses related to Standard 3 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:
No weaknesses cited in the previous report.

Standard 4. Diversity.

Weaknesses related to Standard 4 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

The unit does not have a plan to recruit a diverse faculty.

The unit faculty is not diverse.

The unit does not have a comprehensive, systematic plan for recruitment, admission and retention of a diverse teacher candidate population.

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Recruitment Plan for Faculty

On an annual basis, each department within the University of Saint Francis is required to submit a *Business/Marketing Plan* (BMP) to the administration. The 2001 BMP for the Department of Education and the University reinforced the need for a plan to recruit and retain ethnic minority students and faculty. The Department and the University are working in tandem to create such a plan. The University Strategic Plan states the following diversity plan goals: expansion of diversity awareness in USF curricular and co-curricular programs; cultural diversity training for faculty and staff; recruiting, hiring and retaining more faculty and staff with divergent cultural backgrounds; recruiting, enrolling and retaining more student with divergent cultural backgrounds; ongoing assessment of progress in achieving these goals (p. 14). To ensure the plan’s effectiveness, a subcommittee was formed that in addition to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Human Resource/Affirmative Action Officer, and a member of the Department of Education also includes a University Advisory Board member with expertise in facilitating diversity. Finally, consultation with a member from a local state university with a more diverse population who is familiar with diversity recruitment and retention issues was established to begin in the Fall 2002.

In the spring of 2001 and 2002, the University, which is an Equal Opportunity Employer, placed advertisements in local, regional, and national media to search for diverse, qualified faculty. The

current efforts to recruit faculty from underrepresented groups include advertising in “The Chronicle of Higher Education”, “Black Issues, contact with the Holmes Partnership Scholars Program and the use of the Minority and Women Doctorate Directory. Unfortunately, neither search resulted in filling open positions with qualified candidates with diverse backgrounds. The unit will continue its search efforts for candidates representing diverse racial and cultural heritage but extend the existing recruitment activities. Extended activities being considered are the use of online professional search sources, postings in ethnically targeted professional journals, direct mailings to higher education institutions with advance degree/doctoral programs and diverse populations, and a visiting scholar position.

Diverse Faculty

The University of Saint Francis provides opportunities for candidates to understand the impact diversity has in the teaching and learning experience. USF students interact with faculty from diverse ethnic, religious, and gender groups. Professional education members, while not of ethnically diverse backgrounds, have educational experiences with diverse populations. For example, two faculty members spent extensive time teaching in Columbia, South America. One member continues her involvement serving on accreditation teams for South American P-12 school systems. Another Department faculty member is of Albanian decent and has engaged in collaborative scholarly projects with that country’s education system as related to professional development of Albanian P-12 teachers and administrators. Finally, a faculty member recently taught elementary & middle school aged children in Cameroon, Africa for 2 years. In addition, the Department has the authority to define budget items and allocate monies such as a resource faculty line item, which was established during the 2001 academic year for the budget beginning 2002 academic year. The purpose of the resource faculty budget is to recruit a resource person to serve as a topical lecturer on diversity issues. The diversity topicals are planned to occur in the three teacher education experience courses (EDUC 100, 201, & 301) and the Introduction to Exceptionality courses (initial and advanced) plus the graduate level Advanced Seminar. This lecture position will begin during the 2002-03 academic year.

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Recruitment/Retention of Students

Current enrollment indicates that students from the following undergraduate populations have remained the same or slightly increased. Demographic breakdown supporting the total enrollment (1986 students) for the 2001-02 academic year are as follows: African or African American – 89 students = 5% of total population, Hispanic or Hispanic American – 30 students = 2%, Ethnically Unknown – 378 students = 22%, and White – 1179 students = 69%.

The University consistently seeks to recruit minority students recent efforts include the 21st Century Scholars Program, which targets minority students in the State of Indiana. Approximately 22% of the 21st Century Scholars students at the University of Saint Francis are ethnically diverse students. Another effort to recruit students was the intense collaboration between the Department of Education and the Admissions Department in hosting campus visitation days. The Admissions Department routinely visits a number of schools with a

significant number of prospective first generation college students and ethnically diverse student bodies. For the first time the University is tracking these students for follow-up.

The retention of students has been a focus of the University and the unit as demonstrated in the USF mission statement. “The University of Saint Francis exists to challenge and engage a diverse student body by facilitating learning, personal growth and professional development....” The USF Institutional Strategic Plan includes a strategic direction statement and objectives to develop appropriate recruitment and retention strategies to ensure a diverse student body. An in-depth analysis of student responses to the Noel-Levitz, “Student Satisfaction Inventory” administered February 2002 was undertaken to discover the factors related to either withdrawal from the program or from the University. It was found that decisive factors related to retention were quality advising and academic support. The Department continues to increase faculty resources permitting each faculty member to give quality time and guidance to each teacher education candidate. Three initiatives supported by the University to increase retention through academic support are as follows. First, the Student Learning Center, which serves students with disabilities on campus, provides academic support and assistive technology. The concept for and the development of the Center began in the Department of Education. A full-time staff member and peer tutors support 45 students with documented exceptionalities (e.g. visually impaired, hearing impaired, learning disabled, etc.). Second, the Student Academic Support Services program provides tutoring for students requesting assistance and also administers the Praxis I tutorial “Learning Plus Program”.

Lastly, the Department of Education developed a committee entitled, “United” which consists of internal and external stakeholders to address the issues of retention of minority students in teacher education programs. This committee began meeting Spring 2002 with an initial focus of identifying difficulties/barriers for minority candidates. These issues will be taken to the broader University/Department subcommittee working on the University recruitment and retention plan. In addition to the University plan, the Department BMP is undergoing revision to further articulate its plan for recruitment and retention of diverse candidates and will also use the information developed by the United Committee. Additionally the BMP states the Department developed strategies to increase candidate opportunities to interact with candidates from diverse ethnic, racial, and social groups. Examples of these strategies are 1) a series of diversity related topics presented by a local expert & guest lecturer in each of the three Teacher Education Experience classes and the Introduction to Exceptionality course; 2) collaborating with another local state university with a more diverse population to allow candidates from both institutions to interact through planned seminars, lectures, and institutional social events; and 3) the implemented service-learning activities that are a requirement in several courses and part of the performance-based outcomes connected to the USF mission and the Department Conceptual Framework. Students are expected to participate in and document time devoted to service learning activities. These activities have the potential to further develop in the student a sense of civic responsibility for populations in need. Examples of such outreach activities are found in projects like the Jesters (performance/drama group with special needs) and the Vincent House Project (a transitional homeless shelter). Service-learning opportunities are posted on public bulletin boards and announced in classes.

Field Experiences

The professional component in the Department of Education has, in numerous courses, combined content and field experiences. These courses offer candidates opportunities to know and develop an understanding of the needs of diverse learners in P-12 urban, suburban, rural, parochial, and private schools. The two Teacher Education Experience courses (TEE 1 & 2) were redesigned and another TEE (3) was added to the teacher education professional common core to provide more opportunities for candidates to work with diverse student. Each TEE targets a different type of school (i.e., urban, parochial) and school setting (developmental levels).

Partnerships sites continue to be developed and sustained with Fort Wayne area schools. As of 2001-02, the Department works with most Catholic Schools (K-8 and 9-12), two urban elementary schools (both with large minority populations), one rural school, and an elementary school in a suburban setting. Through these experiences candidates are exposed to diversity of race, culture, settings, and a wide variety of teaching and learning styles.

Fort Wayne Community School District provides the University of Saint Francis candidates the opportunity to receive training and subsequently substitute teach as interns within their program entitled “Little Red School House” and a similar experience is offered through the Catholic Schools known as “Sub-Mission”. Substitute teaching experiences have been diverse in grade level and in profile of the student body.

Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development.

Weaknesses related to Standard 5 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Consistently assigned and accepted faculty overloads & assignments interfere with the faculty’s ability to be effective in teaching, scholarship and service.

Qualified Faculty

The University and the Department of Education seek to hire qualified faculty. The summer of 2001 resulted several successful searches for the Department. Qualified faculty were hired in special education (1 full-time 1- half-time), elementary (1 full-time), and reading (1 position vacated as of January 2002). Two additional positions (special education and secondary education) for January 2002 were approved, advertised. Statistics illustrating the qualifications of the teacher education faculty are as follows: 81% (9/11) of Full and Part-Time Professional Education Faculty have a doctorate or administrative degree and 27% (3/11) have a masters degree, 57% (4/7) of the Arts & Science Faculty have a doctorate and 42% (3/7) have a masters degree, 22% (2/9) of School Faculty have a doctorate or administrative degree, 66% (6/9) have a masters degree, and 11% (1/9) have a bachelor degree, finally, 50% (7/14) of Clinical Faculty have a doctorate or administrative degree and 50% (7/14) have a masters degree.

In 2000, the Department had five full-time faculty members. As of fall 2001, there were 7 faculty members, of which two were ½-time, resulting in 6 full-time equivalent members. The Department received approval to hire 2 additional full-time members in special education and secondary education as of January 2002. One search was successful in recruiting a full-time secondary education faculty member to join the Department while one full-time faculty member (elementary/reading) resigned in January 2002. At the end of the 2001 academic year, the Department of Education hired a full-time Unit Assessment Coordinator/ Licensing Officer and an additional 1/2-time elementary/mild disabilities faculty member. The UAS Coordinator/ Licensing Officer position allowed the faculty member (elementary/learning disabilities) who received a 6-hour load reduction for Licensing Officer responsibilities to return to full-time teaching (12-hours). An adequate number of qualified adjunct faculty were hired over the past year to deter faculty overloads. As a result, there were no faculty overloads for the 2000-01 or 2001-02 academic years in education. All program directors have an earned doctorate and beginning 2001 academic year, program directors have a 10-month contract and a one-course reduction implemented in Spring 2002. The Department chair was given a 12-month contract, which is a change from a 10-month contract in 2000-01. In addition, the chair responsibilities were changed to ¾-time administrative duties and ¼-time teaching (one course) from ½ time administrative duties and ½ time teaching. Professional education, Arts & Science, clinical, and school faculty members are licensed in the fields that they teach or supervise. In addition to faculty with degree qualifications, the Department hires faculty that includes contemporary professionals with experiences in school settings who model “best practice”.

Professional Practices in Scholarship and Service

The University of Saint Francis is implementing Boyer’s model of scholarship. Boyer states, “Faculty should establish their credentials as researchers...all members of the faculty should, throughout their professional careers, stay in touch with development in their fields and remain professionally alive (p. 27).” Boyer’s model is not restricted to research, but calls for a variety of professional activities. Boyer defines scholarship within four areas: discovery (research), integration (synthesis) – interdisciplinary research across disciplines interpreting research findings and bringing new insight, application (practice) – service applied to the faculty member’s field of knowledge, and teaching. Professional education faculty are engaged in scholarly application and teaching in their field of expertise through grant writing, authoring web-based/supported courses, conference attendance, professional presentations, and inservice. They are involved with the community as demonstrated by the many service learning projects previously discussed in this report as well as inservice with P-12 schools.

Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources.

Weaknesses related to Standard 6 cited as a result of the last NCATE review:

Budgets for materials in the Instructional Media Center and the Education Technology Learning Center are limited.

Unit Leadership and Authority

The Department of Education functions under a University system of shared governance. It continues to make the decisions that effect teacher education programs and candidates. An example of the authority of the Department was the “on hold” status of the advanced Reading Specialization program in 2000 and the recommendation from the Department supported by the Teacher Education Committee and the Teacher Advisory Council to discontinue this program as of Spring 2002. Faculty Forum approved this recommendation. The Department of Education recommended to Faculty Forum that the Teacher Education Committee membership be changed to include a member from each program offering a teacher education program. The Forum approved the Department’s recommendation and five Arts & Science faculty members were added to the Teacher Education Committee membership beginning January 2002. The past membership only included two members elected to represent Arts & Science faculty. This change in membership has significantly improved communication and collaboration between professional and (secondary) content faculty.

Unit Budget

Unit budget has steadily increased over recent years. Those increases are demonstrated in faculty salary, personnel support, and instructional resources. The Leadership Team approved two additional faculty members in addition to those in the 2001 budget, one position to begin in January 2002 and the second position to start in August 2002. The chair position has been upgraded to a 12-month contract and directors of programs are now on a 10-month contract. The new demands for personnel with the expertise to support and manage the UAS were addressed by redefining the role and responsibilities of the secretarial position to include database knowledge. As of August 2001, the Department is staffed with an administrative assistant who has the expertise to manage databases important to the UAS. In Spring 2002, the Department requested a new position be added to support the UAS and the responsibilities of licensure. The position was defined and approved by the Administration to begin in Fall 2002. Finally, the 2001 budget specific to instructional resources experienced an overall increase of 40%. Target items warranting an increase were those related to instructional equipment (increased 56%) and instructional support (increased 79%).

Unit Facilities & Resources Including Technology

Unit facilities changed since the last report. A second office area providing three additional offices with upgraded desktop computers for professional faculty was redesigned for the Department. Unit resources including technology continue to increase. In 2001, the Department of Education partnered with the former Education Technology Learning Center (ETLC) (now Oaks & Willows Center), and the Academic Computer Center on campus to purchase a mobile computer lab. The lab contains 16 computers, a cart with a printer, hub, zip drive, and Internet capability. This portable set-up will service education courses and the ETLC. In addition another laptop was purchased for a total of 4 laptop computers available to Department members and the Oaks & Willows Center teachers and staff.