BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

Auburn University Montgomery

July 11, 2013 1:00-5:00 p.m.

Offsite BOE Team Members

Dr. Suzanne M. George, Chair
Mr. Thomas H. Bell III, Member
Dr. Jeanelle B. Day, Member
Dr. Terrie T. Poehl, Member
Dr. Mona L. Eason Jenkins, State Member
Dr. Kathy S. Wetzel, State Member

Offsite BOE Team Observers

Dr. Anna T. Kozlowski, State Consultant
Dr. Linda M. Bradley, NCATE Staff

BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

The Purpose the of BOE Offsite Report

One of the key features of the Continuous Improvement (CI) Pathway is the combination of formative and summative processes. *The BOE Offsite Report provides formative feedback from the offsite review meeting. The BOE Onsite Report provides a summative evaluation of the findings from the onsite visit.*

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

The BOE Offsite Team has conducted a thorough review of the Institutional Report and exhibits to produce this report; however, the BOE Onsite Team is not limited to these findings. If the team is unable to validate information, or if further or contradictory information is found, the Onsite BOE Team may request additional evidence and/or cite new concerns as areas for improvement.

BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

I. Movement Toward Target

Please indicate the standard(s) on which the unit selected to demonstrate movement toward target:

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

II. Unit Standards

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 Preliminary Findings

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

The unit is accredited by the Alabama State Department of Education, most recently in February 2013. According to Alabama's partnership agreement with NCATE, programs are not required to complete Specialized Professional Association (SPA) reports prior to an NCATE visit. However, Alabama does have a state review process using state standards that are based on SPA standards. The unit has decided to use the Basic Skills Test, Praxis II Tests, GPA, the School of Education (SOE) Comprehensive Examination, university graduate data, stakeholder data, and the EDUCATEAlabama Statewide Data Report for assessment measures across programs.

Programs offered within the four departments making up the SOE include those at the Class B, Class A Alternative, Class A, and Class AA levels. Class B programs are initial certifications at the bachelor's degree level. Class A Alternate programs are initial certifications at the master's degree level. Class A programs are advanced certification programs in areas for which Class B certification is available. Class AA programs are advanced programs on the sixth-year level.

The SOE offers Class B initial certification programs in art, biology, childhood education, collaborative special education (K-6), collaborative special education (6-12), collaborative education/K-6, elementary, early childhood education, early childhood special education,

elementary education, English language arts, general science, general social science, history, mathematics, physical education and physical/general science. Class A Alternative initial certifications are offered in art, biology, childhood education, collaborative special education (K-6), collaborative special education (6-12), collaborative education/K-6 elementary, early childhood special education, English language arts, general science, general social science, history, mathematics, and physical education. Master's level advanced Class A certifications are offered in art, biology, collaborative special education (K-6), collaborative special education (6-12), early childhood education, early childhood special education, elementary education, English language arts, general science, general social science, history, instructional leadership, mathematics, physical education, reading specialist, school counseling, and sport management. Class AA certifications are available in collaborative special education (K-6), collaborative special education (6-12), early childhood education, elementary education, instructional leadership, physical education, and school counseling.

All candidates are subject to the same assessments. All initial candidates must pass the Basic Skills Test, an external test measuring basic content in reading, writing, and mathematics, before entering the program, and graduate initial candidates must pass the basic skills test before graduation. Another external measure, the Praxis II is used in all initial programs and two advanced programs (reading specialist and instructional leadership) as a content knowledge measure. It will secondarily measure pedagogical knowledge more extensively beginning in fall 2013. Undergraduate candidates are required to pass the Praxis II test in their area prior to their professional internship, and advanced candidates must pass Praxis II prior to completion of their clinical work. Because of this requirement, candidates in initial and advanced programs have a pass rate of 100 percent for program completers.

GPA is an internal measure used throughout all programs to validate content and pedagogical knowledge. Undergraduates must have a GPA of 2.5 in the teaching field and in the core to graduate. This is consistent with Alabama requirements in the Alabama Administrative Code for Class B certificates. All candidates in the M.Ed. programs must have a 3.0 GPA (3.25 GPA for instructional leadership), and all Ed.S. candidates must have a GPA of 3.25 to graduate. GPA averages in 2011were 3.12 in undergraduate programs, 3.56 in M.Ed. programs, and 3.76 for Ed.S. programs.

All candidates must pass the SOE Comprehensive Examination to graduate. Candidates in the undergraduate programs are given exams in their major programs of study in academic departments. Candidates are scored as Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory. Candidates in initial and advanced programs at the graduate level are given the Comprehensive Examination scored by two faculty in the SOE.

Programs use data from four sources for feedback on their programs. The first source is university graduate data, an internal assessment point that measures candidate perceptions of pedagogical knowledge after their professional internship each semester. In the Teacher Development areas, candidates felt most prepared in Presentation of Organized Instruction and Establishing a Positive Learning Climate. Classroom management was one of the areas in which candidates felt less prepared. All averages were above 3.0 on a 4.0 scale. On the SOE Learning Outcomes, candidates felt most competent in Professionalism and least competent in Diversity

and Assessment. All averages were above 3.4. A content analysis of the comment section of the survey from fall 2006-spring 2011 revealed Classroom Management as the greatest concern, followed by the need for more field-based experiences before internship. The majority of the comments focused on candidate confidence and recognition of demanding and high expectations from instructors. Candidates also desired more field experience hours in professional courses and fewer hours in pre-professional courses, a better screening process for mentor teachers, and a longer time period with one teacher rather than split placements.

The second source of data is stakeholder data, which measures employer perceptions of content and pedagogical knowledge. Principals in a hundred-mile radius of AUM (n=149) were surveyed in 2012 to determine the proficiency of graduates hired over the last three years. Of the respondents who had hired AUM graduates (13.6%), all confirmed the proficiency of the graduates in regard to knowledge, understanding, skills, and professionalism. Superintendents (n=20; 25% return rate) of AUM graduates in the instructional leadership advanced programs were also surveyed in 2012. Superintendents who had hired AUM graduates in leadership roles were satisfied with performance of graduates; no concerns were noted. Other data in this area are generated from stakeholder meetings with the professional community. At the stakeholder meeting in 2012, twenty principals and teachers felt that the strengths of AUM SOE graduates were in Professionalism, Establishing Rapport, Use of Technology, and Use of Hands On Activities. Stakeholders identified the primary weaknesses of AUM SOE graduates in Classroom Management and Written Communication.

The third source of data is the EDUCATEAlabama Statewide Data Report, which measures teachers' perceptions of their own effectiveness. In this report, candidates reported strength in content knowledge, communication, teaching and learning - providing a positive climate, professionalism - ethics and compliance with regulations and policies. The greatest weaknesses were in the areas of diversity - primarily working with ELL students and professionalism - collaboration with other professionals in effective professional development.

The fourth source of data is the SOE Outcome Scores, which measure content and pedagogical knowledge tied to the ten learning outcomes related to the conceptual framework and to professional, state, and institutional standards. Instructors teaching clinical courses generate scores on these outcomes. For initial candidates, the clinical course is the professional internship, and various practicum courses are used for advanced candidates. All use the same outcomes. The instructional leadership programs use seven of the ten learning outcomes and have different indicators due to specific state requirements for those programs. Outcome scores are averaged across each of the ten Learning Outcomes in each program area. All candidates must score at least 2 or basic on each indicator to graduate. The areas most relevant for Standard 1 for teacher candidates and other school professionals are: content knowledge (not used for instructional leadership), diversity, instructional strategies, technology, planning, assessment, and professionalism.

Ten indicators in initial and advanced programs, including reading specialist, relate directly to professional dispositions. The complete list of Outcome Indicators listed within the Conceptual Framework include subject matter knowledge, human development, diversity, planning, learning environment, instructional strategies, communication, assessment, technology, and

professionalism. The lowest average on these factors was 2.75, and the highest average on these factors was 4.00 (on a 4-point scale). Thirteen indicators from instructional leadership relate directly to professional dispositions, but it is unclear about what the new three indicators are for the advanced programs. For the 2011 academic year, the Ed.S. was not included in the averages due to program redesign. For candidates in the M.Ed. program, the lowest average on the thirteen measures was 3.00, and the highest was 3.08 (on a 4-point scale).

There do not appear to be program-specific assessments with scoring guides and/or rubrics linking data to program objectives (SPA or state content standards).

Impact on student learning is measured in programs. The capstone course in each program focuses on student learning outcomes in the teacher work sample. The advanced special education and reading specialist programs do not use the teacher work sample, but evaluate their candidates' ability to assess and analyze student learning in the classroom and make data-driven and appropriate adjustments to instruction and monitor student progress. On all these measures, candidates in 2011 ranged from 2.05 to 4.00 (on a 4-point scale) for all programs.

1.1.b How were unit programs reviewed by the BOE? What trends emerged? What do these trends reveal about the unit's programs?

Alabama is an NCATE partnership state, but the programs are not required to be evaluated by SPAs. The Alabama Department of Education reviews the programs and did so most recently in February 2013. The names of the programs on the State Department Findings (February 2013) do not match the programs listed on the All Programs list on the NCATE AIMS website. A lack of complete data sets makes it difficult to ascertain if trends in data exist. It appears that all measures except for the SOE Outcome Scores and Feedback Surveys of Graduates and Students are external in nature.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

1.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has substantially changed the mode of instruction for four advanced programs to an online format for over 50 percent of the courses. These programs are the Ed.S. programs in early childhood education, elementary education, and physical education and the M.Ed. program in physical education. A majority of SOE faculty members are certified to teach online courses. However, disaggregated data of candidate performance on online course assessment measures are not provided.

The SOE assessment system was revised to meet the new Alabama standards, but the conceptual framework and ten learning outcomes were not changed. Indicators related to the outcomes had to be revised to better align with the standards. Therefore, a change in rubrics occurred.

All departments established candidate monitoring plans to better support struggling candidates. The focus was on the mid-checkpoint data, where candidates are identified and specific remediation plans are created.

1.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No Areas for Improvement were cited during the last review.

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1) Assessments and data directly aligned to program standards are not available.

   Rationale: There is a list of key unit-wide assessments with unit-wide data, but there are no data specific to program objectives and outcomes. The state requires assessment at indicator level for each of its standards, plus information on how it will be assessed. Program level data are needed.

2) Assessment data are not provided for online programs.

   Rationale: There is a list of key assessments for onsite programs, but not the online programs related to outcomes and objectives. The state requires assessments at indicator level for each of its standards, plus information on how it will be assessed. Program assessment data are not provided.

3) Assessment of all state standards and of all the points on the conceptual framework is not clearly occurring.

   Rationale: A review of the exhibits does not clearly demonstrate that all the state standards and the conceptual framework are being met or being assessed in all programs. Clarification of the state review process is needed.

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

1) What does the certification to teach online courses entail? Is this an internal certification at AUM?
2) Are all faculty across the four departments trained on using the measures for evaluating candidates on the learning outcomes (reliability)?
3) When, where are the data related to assessments shared?
4) Listing of unit candidate dispositions, not just selected dispositions. Candidate performance data for all dispositions.
5) Clarification of unit program listings. The State of Alabama program approval document does not match the program listing on NCATE Aims All Programs pages.
6) Disaggregated data for online programs.
7) What data points exist outside of Basic Skills scores, Praxis II, GPA, Comprehensive Exam scores, and Outcome Scores? Are there any candidate scores based on internal assessments, such as those that might be related to student achievement, lesson planning, student teaching?

8) When are Outcome Scores assessed? Are candidates assessed at the same points in every program?
9) More detailed information on impact on student learning is needed. The capstone course includes the teacher work sample but this is not listed as an assessment in the key assessment document. Also, this measure had a mean of a little over 50% (2.05/4.00). What remediation is available for candidates not passing this assessment point?
10) Confirm state GPA requirements with unit requirements.
11) Program assessments with scoring guides/rubrics and data.

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

The IR states the most comprehensive assessment tool used by the unit is the SOE outcomes and indicators. There is not a specific document listed as such in the exhibits, but there is an SOE indicators assessment rubric which includes the ten learning outcomes and indicators. There are two versions of this rubric, one for initial programs and one for advanced programs in leadership, both dated 2009. This rubric includes a scoring guide of 1-4 (Unsatisfactory-Exceptional). The IR reports candidates are evaluated by course requirements aligned to these indicators, and they also complete a portfolio at the end of each course. The course portfolio is evaluated by SOE indicators in LiveText, and candidates are scored with the 1-4 scoring guide. The portfolio content and outline are not provided. It is unclear if the SOE assessment rubric is used just for evaluating portfolios or if the rubric is used for evaluating other assignments. The unit has provided data on inter-rater summary of the assessment reviewed using this rubric. There is a list of selected dispositions in an exhibit in Standard 1 and dispositions are noted in the SOE assessment rubric, but there is no description of how they are evaluated. The entire list of dispositions was not located.

Each program has an assessment matrix and an alignment table. The assessment matrix aligns the SOE outcomes to courses and indicators found on the assessment rubric. The alignment tables align the SOE outcomes and indicators to state (Alabama Continuum for Teacher Development and the Alabama Quality Teaching Standards) and national standards for initial programs. There is a comparable table for the instructional leadership program.

Review of syllabi show inconsistency in terms of the presence of learning outcomes and indicators. Many just list all ten learning outcomes and/or indicators and do not specifically align them to particular outcomes of the course. Some syllabi refer to the Alabama Quality Teaching Standards (AQTS) and some provide an alignment to indicators found on AUM assessment rubric. There is not consistent alignment to the learning outcomes, indicators, program objectives, or the AQTS.

The SOE outcome data provide a rubric that includes ten learning outcome and indicators. Data are recorded for 2010, 2011, and 2012, but it is unclear if the data represent all candidates and if the evaluative measure is a portfolio and/or other assessments.

Candidates are required to purchase LiveText at the beginning of their professional course sequence, and they are trained to use it by an instructional support specialist/LiveText coordinator. The IR reports data from internal and external sources are collected, analyzed and evaluated, but limited specifics of this process were noted. An assessment coordinator is mentioned in an exhibit titled "School of Education Program Data Analysis Procedures," which states this person will compile, organize, and place data on LiveText. It also states the assessment coordinator will design individualized data analysis templates and summarize aggregated data for program analysis and goal development into a report that will be disseminated annually to faculty. However, there is no information on who else might be involved in this work, how it is used after the report is completed, and how stakeholders will be involved in review of assessment information. There is also no information on any university or school committee that might use the assessment results in a more comprehensive fashion other than reading the annual report.

There are data analysis reports provided for childhood education, instructional leadership, physical education, secondary education, and special education. These reports provide information on instructional changes, Praxis II scores, admission numbers, summary of assessment data on indicators, follow-up survey data, and data on impact of student learning. The most current data are from 2011.

Key assessments for initial and advanced programs are listed. A description of passing scores or minimum grades is provided. These assessments are not specific to programs, but are unit-wide assessment points.

The IR reports entry points candidates must meet to be admitted to the program. For initial candidates, these include a minimum overall GPA of 2.5, physical exam, speech and hearing test, self-assessment in FNDS 2010, adequate communication skills, passing scores on all Alabama Basic Skills assessments, and a physical fitness test for all physical education majors. For initial Master of Education programs, requirements include an earned bachelor's or higher degree with a minimum 2.5 GPA, MAT or GRE scores, passing score on the appropriate Praxis II test or prerequisite coursework at the undergraduate level for the degree being sought, and an ABI/FBI background clearance.

For advanced programs (Master of Education and Education Specialist), the entry requirements consist of a bachelor's level Alabama Teacher's Certificate in the same field in which the degree is sought except for a few areas such as special education, reading, or educational leadership; a minimum GPA of 2.5; MAT/GRE score of 400 or higher for Master of Education and 475 or higher for specialist; and a background clearance. Certain areas may require additional requirements.

The IR also provided information on transition points for both initial and advanced programs. Initial programs have specific requirements, such as passing courses with a C or better, GPA

requirements, and a passing score on Praxis II. Advanced programs have a midpoint assessment, including GPA requirement, required Praxis II tests, and required AECPT/APTT test and background clearance.

Exit criteria are presented for both initial and advanced programs, including the passing of certain field and professional education courses, GPA requirement, at least a score of 2 on SOE indicators, and a passing score on comprehensive exam and Praxis II exam if not already required.

The unit provides information in the IR on how it handles fairness, consistency, and the avoidance of bias in assessments. The program matrices provide a guide to showing where content is provided in programs. Candidates are made aware of assessment expectations through the use of outcome indicators found in course syllabi. The alignment tables align the SOE outcomes/indicators to state and national standards. The use of multiple raters and a review of the assessment rubric by the Diversity Committee help ensure consistency, and there are a variety of assessments throughout a candidate's program to provide a review free of bias.

It is not clear if the unit has an assessment system. Unit operations are not clearly measured, and the system as presented does not appear to be regularly evaluated by the professional community. Some assessment documents date back to 2009, and it is not clear if any review or update has occurred. It is reported that an assessment coordinator is involved in data collection and organization, but there is no mention of other persons or committees involved in the assessment system or how the unit decides how to use the data provided.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

2.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The SOE outcome data provide a rubric that includes ten learning outcome and indicators. Data are recorded for 2010, 2011, and 2012.

The unit has made some changes based on review of practices. These changes (most recently dated 2011) include changes in the professional internship evaluation to allow candidates to receive the highest score (4-Excellent) so that it better reflects the candidates' overall evaluation as beginning educators. SOE assessment indicators were revised to reflect changes in state department requirements. Changes in use of mid-checkpoint scores were made to allow candidates to become more aware of their weaknesses. In addition, data analysis templates were designed to capture annual data. Data are now provided on candidate progress in courses to develop monitoring plans for candidates who are having difficulty in their courses. Because the state of Alabama discontinued collecting follow-up data from employers, AUM developed and distributed a follow-up survey to area superintendents and principals. Master and cooperating teachers were surveyed to obtain diversity information to better inform the SOE.

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

2.3.a What AFIs are recommended for removal?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
Not all stakeholders are involved in the development of the unit assessment system.	ITP,ADV	Stakeholders were involved in the development of a review of data.
The unit does not systematically ensure the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of all assessments or whether they are predictors of candidates' success.	ITP,ADV	The unit has put a variety of practices and strategies in place to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of all assessments.

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
Rubrics used to assess some indicators of candidate performances are not written in such a way as to provide consistent developmental assessment as candidates progress through the program.	ITP,ADV	The assessment rubric does provide criteria for a developmental assessment of candidates; however, the data are from 2009, so a current rubric is not available for review.

2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1) Assessment information and data are not regularly reviewed by stakeholders.

   Rationale: There is no evidence to show that assessment information and data are regularly reviewed by the unit's stakeholders nor do they have the opportunity to provide input.

2) The unit does not maintain an assessment system that provides regular and comprehensive information on candidates, programs, and unit operations.

   Rationale: Some of the assessment documents are dated 2009, so current review of some assessments is not available. There is not a clear description of the manner in which data are collected, analyzed, and reviewed.

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

1) Where are portfolios required in candidate's program? Are they evaluated in every course?
2) Requirements of portfolios, including format and expectations.
3) Full list of dispositions. How are dispositions evaluated?
4) Each program has an assessment matrix and an alignment table—does every program use LiveText and use the 1-4 scoring criteria for portfolios, as well as other assessments?
5) Expectations and directions for alignment of syllabi to the learning outcomes, indicators, program objectives or the AQTS.
6) Clarification of the SOE outcome data for 2010, 2011, 2012 - do data represent all candidates? What is the assessment used in this exhibit?

7) Who works with the assessment coordinator? What it is the process used once data are collected—who reviews, how used, by whom?
8) Assessments evaluated by the SOE assessment rubric.
9) Data being reported on the SOE outcome data report. Do the data include all candidates? From which course(s)?
10) Data analysis reports for childhood education, instructional leadership, physical education, secondary education, and special education. Where are the data from the data analysis report for these and all other programs for 2012?
11) Are there more updated assessment documents, including the SOE assessment rubric and assessment matrices?
12) Information on assessment of unit operations. Are there any data in process?

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

Goals stated in the 2007 Strategic Plan (IR, p. 1) include items related to this standard. These goals are: enhance student programs; increase student success and retention; enhance AUM's engagement with Auburn University; increase AUM's partnership with business, government, and the community external to AUM.

Stakeholder meetings were most recently held in 2012. The Community Partnership Meeting minutes (Exhibit 3.3.a) include the December 2012 Instructional Leadership Advisory Board Annual Meeting along with two AUM Mentor Teacher Professional Development meetings from summer 2012 and 2010, and Mentor Teacher Advisory Board Meeting agendas/minutes from February 2012, May 2011, November 2010, and April 2010. In the Timelines for Target Implementation document, the SOE states that interaction with families and school community will increase with spring 2014 completion data.

The goals of the unit for 2012-2013 (IR, p.2) include developing a plan for service learning for all candidates, and for internationalizing the curriculum and providing international opportunities for faculty and candidates. These goals will help to provide candidates with classroom and community experiences beyond typical field experiences of observation, small group instruction, and whole class instruction. Service learning will also help candidates develop according to the purpose of the unit's Professional Education Model.

The Standard 3 exhibits include copies of course syllabi grouped in an area titled High Quality Field Experiences. A viewing of the syllabi results in limited understanding of the requirements for candidates. For example, ELEM 4100, Methods of Teaching Elementary Mathematics, states that candidates will work with groups of four to five students, for a total of ten hours for the course requirement. However, it is not clear if candidates complete more than the peer

evaluations and self-reflection. Although university faculty observe the lessons, there is no sample of the observation form. Another example, ELEM 4200, Curriculum and Teaching Elementary Science, indicates that candidates complete ten hours of field experience with five at the Alabama Nature Center and five in a school setting. There is no description of the Nature Center activities and the criteria for the lessons taught in the school setting. Finally, PHED 4030, Methods of Teaching Physical Education, has a required field experience of participating in a field day at a local elementary school and in an intramural sports event at AUM. Candidates are to assist with the planning, officiating, and implementation of the events. There are no guidelines explaining how the candidate will participate in the intramural sport and complete the other activities mentioned. In addition, there is no information regarding the evaluation of these activities. The SOE Field Experience Manual (p. 7) states, "The means for evaluating the field experiences are prescribed by the individual AUM instructor." The explanation continues with, "In many cases the course grade will be withheld or reported as an "F" if the field experiences are not successfully completed." (p. 7) There is very limited information on evaluation tools used in field experiences.

The SOE Field Experience Manual delineates specific activities and number of hours for the field experiences associated with courses for childhood education, secondary education, health education and physical education, and special education for undergraduate candidates (pp. 17-20) and candidates in advanced programs (pp. 21-25). However, a description of the diverse nature of these experiences is not complete, and specific requirements for all programs are not included.

Since candidates in initial programs for secondary education must complete a content major in the School of Liberal Arts or School of Sciences (IR, p. 2), it is important to know the course work that they complete to develop pedagogical skills. The number of field experience hours for candidates in initial programs varies by program. Regardless of the program, the design, implementation, and evaluation of the field experience do not have associated assessments and rubric for evaluation. Field experiences for candidates in advanced programs (Field/Clinical Experiences by program, p. 1) only exist for the Instructional Leadership programs for M.Ed. (30 hours) and Ed.S. candidates (40 hours).

The SOE has a section in the IR titled, "Examples across programs of collaborative activities between unit and P-12 schools to support the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, including memoranda of understanding." This section contains 11 course syllabi for physical education, elementary education, and reading courses. All do not describe field experiences explicitly, and most do not list the number of field experience hours. For example, the syllabus for PHED includes information that candidates complete nine lesson plans, but there is no mention of teaching these lessons to K-12 students. On the other hand, ELEM 6523, Curriculum and Teaching Elementary Mathematics (listed as READ 6523 in the IR) provides a detailed description completing a modified teacher work sample and the teaching of those lessons. A description of the evaluation of these items is not available.

The SOE Field Experience Manual lists courses for secondary education majors (pp 22-23). However, a total of 140 hours is stated for these programs on the Exhibit 3.3.b item titled Field/Clinical Experiences by Program. Viewing the undergraduate Programs of Study in

Standard 1, Exhibit 1.5.b provides a total of 135 hours for these programs exclusive of the 70-hour practicum course. The number of field experience hours for specific courses is listed in the Field Experience Handbook (pp. 17-25). In verifying these hours with plans of study (Exhibit 1.5.a), the numbers for several courses do not agree. For example, PHED 2130 states 30 hours in the Field Experience Handbook, but has 20 hours stated in the Plan of Study for Childhood Education. Another inconsistency for this program occurs where the Plan of Study lists 10 field experience ELEM 4100. This course is not listed in the Field Experience Handbook.

Advanced program plans of study have similar discrepancies regarding field experiences. The document providing a total of field experience hours states that none of the advanced candidate programs have field experiences other than practicum requirements with the exception of the Instructional Leadership programs for M.Ed. and Ed.S. candidates. The differences between practicum and field experiences are unclear.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

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

The SOE provided an explanation of five goals in the IR (pp. 17-18) and a document titled Timelines for Target Implementation found in the IR for Standard 3. The numbering for the goals is from the Timelines document.

Goal 1: Interaction with families and school community will increase for all candidates in the SOE through community and service learning projects that are collaboratively planned and implemented by peers. (IR, p. 18)

Since the timeline begins in summer 2013, a plan was not submitted with the IR. Without the plan, it is difficult if this goal helps to move toward target.

Goal 2: Design an accurate, simple, and easy-to-use system to track field experiences and clinical practice of all candidates. This system should track racial/ethnic/socio-economic diversity and the types of experiences for different programs across the SOE, as well as allow effective data analysis of individuals and groups. (IR, p. 17)

Data from the fall 2012 candidate survey are not provided.

Goal 3: Field experiences in all programs will be designed to provide more modeling by clinical faculty members and more opportunities for candidates to learn through doing. (IR, p. 17)

A written description of the duties of the working committee and how they plan to record the ideas generated is not available.

Goal 4: Candidates will work collaboratively with other candidates and clinical faculty to critique and reflect on their own and each other's practice and their effects on student learning with the goal of improving practice. (IR, p. 18)

This goal does not provide data that describe and verify structure for candidate collaboration.

Goal 5: The SOE will develop stronger collaborative relationships with P-12 schools by participating in professional development and instructional programs with each other. Furthermore, the unit and school partners will integrate more resources to increase learning of candidates and P-12 students. (IR, p. 16)

There are no artifacts for this goal that provide a description of the structure for the working committee that will be formed at the end of summer 2013.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

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

3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No Areas for Improvement were cited during the last review.

3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1) "In many cases the course grade will be withheld or reported as an "F" if the field experiences are not successfully completed." (SOE Field Experience Manual, p. 7)

   Rationale: Although individual course instructors evaluate accompanying field experiences, no sample was provided either from the Field Experience Manual or a course syllabus. There was no definition of a successful field experience.

2) Evaluative tools for field experiences in general for candidates in initial programs were not provided, and it is not clear how candidates' field experiences are evaluated throughout their

programs. All documents focus on observing, and it is not explained how candidates complete other activities. In addition, none of the syllabi for courses in advanced programs includes information for required field experiences. All do refer to the teacher work sample, but specific requirements for field experience are lacking.

Rationale: Scoring guides and/or rubrics used to evaluate this aspect of the courses requiring field experience are not provided. Clarification of field experiences in advanced programs is needed.

3) The five goals stated in the IR and the Timelines for Target Implementation document all begin at different times (Goal 1, summer 2013; Goal 2, end of spring 2013; Goal 3, end of summer 2013, Goal 4, end of summer 2013; and Goal 5, end of summer 2013.

Rationale: The unit hasn't provided evidence or data for activities already in progress. The process for implementing the goals is not clear.

4) The number of required field experiences found in the Field Experience Handbook and the Plans of Study are not consistent, and it is unclear how diversity experiences are provided.

Rationale: All documents need to be consistent. Field experience requirements need to describe experiences candidates will have in diverse settings.

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

1) Evidence of continuing community partnership involvement in development and review of field experiences.
2) The documents for collaboration between the SOE and school/community partners to provide a description of working committees formed to meet the stated target goals.
3) Evidence of the implementation and data collection of the five target goals.
4) Evidence on the unit's movement toward target for advanced programs.
5) Evidence on impact on student learning based on field experiences.
6) Evidence of diversity opportunities in field experiences.
7) Clarification of the number of field experience hours for each program.
8) Evaluation tools used in field experiences in initial and advanced programs.

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

The unit provided a clear connection of proficiencies related to diversity with the conceptual framework's learning outcomes. The IR indicates that eight of the ten Learning Outcomes are taught and evaluated in all programs except for instructional leadership, which teaches and evaluates diversity through one of the ten outcomes. The IR is contradicted for all programs, aside from instructional leadership, by the Diversity Indicator document, which indicates nine of the ten outcomes have diversity elements that are taught and evaluated. In addition, the unit provides information in exhibits showing connection of diversity outcomes in each course of each program. Both the instructional leadership evaluation and the evaluation for all other programs indicate candidates must receive a minimum of a score of two, which indicates the performance is Acceptable but needs additional work and attention, prior to completion of the program.

The unit provided data in the exhibits indicating candidates at the initial and advanced levels had a mean score of well above two for all areas. In addition, the data provided by the unit in the exhibits demonstrate the candidates identified in the available assessments received no lower than a two in any of the assessments. The unit provides information in the IR regarding English learners (EL) and students with exceptionalities as well. The IR indicates candidates in all programs are evaluated on their ability to understand how to, and their ability to, work with students with exceptionalities. The unit evaluates candidates in the initial programs and secondary advanced programs regarding abilities to work with EL students, but does not currently evaluate candidates in other advanced programs.

The unit provided narrative in the IR indicating candidates in all programs are required to utilize multiple perspectives and work with individual student needs. Further, the unit provided assessment data demonstrating candidates must be able to develop a classroom and climate that value diversity. The unit did not discuss the process by which their own candidates are prepared to do this, only that they are able to value diversity and create environments that value and support diverse learning needs of all students.

In the IR, the unit asserts that education faculty represent at least two different racial groups and are both male and female. The unit provided further data in the IR and in exhibits detailing faculty demographics. According to the IR and exhibits, in 2012 there was a five percent increase, from 25 percent to 31 percent, in faculty who identified as either African-American or Hispanic. The advanced program faculty stayed the same at 33 percent identifying as either African-American or Hispanic. The IR indicated the provost has been supportive of any unit that works toward increasing diversity in faculty, thus 50 percent of the newly hired faculty since 2011 are from an underrepresented group. According to the IR, the education faculty have a higher percentage of individuals from an underrepresented group compared to other units at the institution. The unit did not provide data on those who teach distance and online programs. Additionally, the IR does not discuss how candidates interact with diverse faculty.

The IR identified coursework that indicates candidates are prepared to work with diverse students, including students with exceptionalities and English learners. However, the unit did

not provide examples or information in the IR or the exhibits indicating how clinical faculty or education faculty have knowledge of how to prepare candidates to work with diverse learners.

The unit provided data in the IR and exhibits indicating candidates enrolled in the programs represent at least two racial or ethnic groups and are both male and female. Specifically, the unit stated most candidates in their programs are female; however, they do have male candidates in most programs. The unit makes the assertion that because 60 percent of the individuals at the institution are first-generation college students and 37 percent receive Pell Grants to attend college, candidates are from different socioeconomic groups. However, the unit did not provide the data to conclude that their candidates reflect the overall institution's data.

The unit stated in the IR that approximately 33 percent of the candidates enrolled in their programs identify as African-American, which is slightly higher than the average for the geographical area served by the institution. The unit did report that over the past three years there has been an increase in candidates who report their race identification as two or more /or unknown. Over the past three years, the unit reports a slight decrease in candidates identifying as African-American. According to the IR, because the unit and the institution have a high number of diverse candidates, special recruitment efforts are not made to recruit a more diverse student population. The unit did not report any information in the IR or exhibits as to how candidates work with each other.

The unit asserts in the IR that candidates demonstrate the belief all students can learn. The unit collects data and provides feedback to candidates regarding their work with diverse learners. Candidates are expected to reflect on their practice and modify when appropriate. The unit states in the IR all candidates have experiences with both male and female students and different socio-economic groups. Additionally, the unit provided a narrative suggesting candidates are placed in districts where candidates work with at least two racial/ethnic groups. Finally, there is limited access to EL students, but some candidates have placements that include working with these students. According to a survey of candidates in the exhibits, candidates indicated that their placements had some EL students, students with special needs, and racial/ethnic students at their field placement sites. The unit did not discuss in the IR a systematic placement process for candidates to ensure they are getting opportunities to work with diverse learners; however, the data provided in the IR and exhibits would indicate a high probability that candidates throughout their multiple field placements and student teaching would be placed in a setting in which they worked with diverse learners.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

4.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit identified in the IR and exhibits that diversity of SOE faculty has increased since the last NCATE visit. Specifically, in 2005, 86 percent of the faculty identified as White, while 14

percent identified as either African-American or Hispanic. In 2012, the 80 percent of the faculty identified as White, while there was a six percent increase of African-American or Hispanic faculty (20%).

Additionally, the unit has developed candidate monitoring plans for all students. These plans identify any issues the candidates may have and then provide support mechanisms for these candidates.

In addition to an increase in diverse faculty, the P-12 partnerships have seen an increase in diverse students since 2005. Thus, the unit asserts the candidates are getting more exposure to diverse P-12 learning environments. Specifically, the IR and exhibits show an increase of Hispanic and Asian students within the partner schools. This has led to an increased awareness around EL students and has given the unit's candidates a greater opportunity to work with EL students.

Finally, the unit's secondary education faculty have formed intentional partnerships with certain P-12 schools, developing opportunities to work with special needs students in middle and high school. Much of this work has been through the efforts of the unit's faculty in securing grants to support the work and development of relationships.

4.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No Areas for Improvement were cited during the last review.

4.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1) Verify how the unit is tracking placement of candidates in diverse settings. It is not clear how they know candidates have exposure to working with diverse students in the P-12 setting.

   Rationale: The unit provided data of surrounding districts, but did not provide evidence of candidate exposure to, or placement in, settings with diverse students.

2) It is unclear as to how candidates connect lessons, instructions, or services to P-12 students' experiences and cultures. Additionally, the unit did not provide information as to how candidates communicate with students and families in ways that demonstrate sensitivity to cultural and gender differences.

   Rationale: The unit provided information loosely connected to this in their exhibits, but this needs to be clarified as to how this is done and more information as to how the unit knows its candidates are able to do this.

3) Lack of information about advanced programs – curriculum, field experiences (ensuring opportunities for candidates to work with diversity).

Rationale: The information in the IR and or exhibits was not clear or not available to provide a clear understanding about how the unit ensured all candidates had diverse placements and were exposed to diverse experiences, including working with diverse faculty and other candidates throughout the program. The IR did not include information as to how candidates learned from one another, nor did it indicate there was a specific tracking mechanism to ensure all candidates had diverse experiences with faculty or diverse placements in field/student teaching.

4.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1) Interview candidates regarding work with EL and students with varying abilities.
2) Verify unit claims in IR vs. claims in data regarding evaluation of candidates on areas of diversity.
3) Verify mechanism for collecting information regarding diverse candidate experiences and impact of those experiences on candidate learning (exposure to diverse faculty, working and collaborating with candidates from differing backgrounds from themselves, placements in diverse settings).
4) Verify candidates are able to connect lessons, instruction, or services to students' experiences and cultures**.** How do they communicate with students and families in ways that demonstrate sensitivity to cultural and gender differences**?**
5) How are candidates prepared with an intercultural lens, what does that mean to the program, and how do faculty model this process?
6) The unit needs to provide data regarding specific breakdown of diverse candidates in all programs.
7) Verify how the unit ensures candidates work with each other and candidates learn from one another's diverse experiences and backgrounds.
8) During interviews with candidates, verify they have exposure and work with faculty from diverse backgrounds within the unit and throughout the institution.
9) Provide information on faculty who teach distance and online courses.
10) What data or evidence are available that faculty have the ability and knowledge to prepare candidates to work with diverse learners?
11) During interviews with candidates and the field placement coordinator/faculty, verify the process for placing candidates in diverse settings.
12) Do candidates have experiences working with diverse peers? How do they work with each other?
13) Data on diversity of faculty and candidates (unit, not just university).

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

Documentation provided by the unit reveals that professional education faculty are qualified for their teaching assignments and additional responsibilities. Most unit faculty hold earned doctorates, while a small number hold master's degrees, coupled with exceptional expertise in their fields. A majority of the P-12 clinical faculty hold a minimum of a master's degree and Alabama Class A certification, in addition to professional experiences in the teaching field, which qualifies them for the position. Documentation indicates that approximately 14 percent of the clinical faculty in "high need positions" possess certification at the bachelor's degree level; however, all clinical faculty are teaching in the field in which they are certified, have a minimum of three years of experience, and model sound professional practice. A review of vitae (exhibit 5.3.a) and additional documentation provides evidence that faculty have a thorough understanding of the content they teach. The teaching of candidates by clinical education faculty contributes to the development of the proficiencies outlined in state and professional standards.

A review of syllabi also provided evidence that faculty are using best practices in teaching, including awareness of diversity and use of technology in instruction. Documentation within the syllabi further indicates that faculty in the unit embrace a variety of technologies for teaching and learning. An analysis of instruction in the unit revealed that 85 percent of all instructors use Blackboard, 65 percent utilize the interactive whiteboard, and 62 percent administer online quizzes/tests. To ensure best practice in this area, instructors must hold graduate teaching status and be appropriately certificated through the college in Online Instruction and Writing Across the Curriculum prior to teaching related courses.

Most professional education faculty members demonstrate scholarly work in their fields of specialization. According to the IR, publications, grants, professional conference presentations, and editorial board memberships are all considered scholarship activities. Online links to such activities by departments within the unit provide evidence that faculty members are actively engaged in ongoing scholarship. With two years of evidence provided in the IR, the unit's faculty were rated 2.86/4.0 (Good) in the latest report provided from 2011, supported by evidence of 34 articles published in national and international refereed journals, 12 grants funded, 49 national/international conferences, and 48 state conferences.

Faculty provide extensive service to the unit, the community, and to professional organizations in ways consistent with the unit's mission, as this major component accounts for 10 to 35 percent of the performance evaluation. Collaborative and service activities include such actions as working with P-12 partnership schools, tutoring services for P-12 students, providing professional learning for P-12 teachers, unpaid service to schools and community, and grants funded for the community. Documentation is provided for review and compilation by the individual department and ranked collectively by the unit. The overall ranking for modeling best professional practices in service was "Good" for the 2011 academic year.

Procedures for faculty evaluation and guidelines for tenure and promotion are in place. Candidates evaluate non-tenured faculty members at the end of each semester, and tenured faculty every two years. The results serve as vehicles for self-reflection and professional learning. Unit faculty submit a self-evaluation to the department chair annually, who then completes an evaluation for submission to the dean. Evaluations are used for merit pay, promotion, and tenure. Adjunct faculty are evaluated on a yearly basis using the unit's adjunct evaluation form.

Numerous opportunities throughout the year support faculty's development of new knowledge and skills. Evidence provided in the IR shows the unit provided over $135,000 in professional development from 2010-2012, the majority being for professional conference expenses. In addition, many opportunities for professional development are provided on campus year-round, some of which include writing institutes, promotion and tenure workshops, grant writing, and diversity training. All faculty receive training on the unit's assessment system and LiveText.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

5.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

During an extensive revision of performance evaluations, the IHE administration allowed faculty to provide input and create additional information to the faculty evaluation system. This resulted in a separate evaluation for clinical faculty and tenure-track faculty, based upon unit goals. This newly developed evaluation form, in turn, necessitated a change in the annual reporting system and the recent development of a self-assessment form which is directly related to candidate performance.

The "recent P-12 teaching experience" requirement for anyone teaching methods or supervising interns has prompted the onset of classroom teaching observations by department heads. This continues to be an evolving plan to ensure state requirements are met and clinical faculty are evaluated for continued quality assurance.

Several new regulations have been in place university-wide which contributed to the unit being actively engaged in ongoing improvement. All faculty members must earn a certificate in Online Instruction and/or Writing Across the Curriculum Instruction, prior to teaching a related course. Additionally, a post-tenure review and third-year review were added as part of the institution's tenure and review process. This allows the unit to provide additional support to faculty prior to the beginning the formal process of tenure.

5.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No Areas for Improvement were cited during the last review.

5.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None, based on the IR and exhibits presented thus far.

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

1) Documentation, including definition and identification, of "high need" areas for the eligibility of one with a bachelor's degree to serve as a member of the P-12 clinical faculty. How is this determined? Criteria used, etc.?
2) Documentation on recent P-12 teaching experience (10 hrs. per semester) for unit clinical faculty members --how is this information approved, tracked, and monitored? Do all department chairs meet the "recency requirement" for the state department?
3) Completed classroom teaching observations of higher education clinical faculty members by department heads. (from #2 above)
4) Individual evaluations of modeling best professional practices.
5) The unit's evaluation of faculty performance and its facilitation of professional development. Data from faculty evaluation used to improve teaching and learning. How are the results used for improvement?

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

The School of Education (COE) is one of five schools in Auburn University at Montgomery and serves as the unit for the preparation of teachers and other school personnel. The organizational chart (exhibit 6.3.b) indicates that the dean reports to the provost and serves as the designated executive officer of the unit with the authority to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study. Reporting directly to the dean are two associate deans, four department heads, and a technology specialist. The unit reports that since the last review, five provosts, three deans, five associate deans, and seven department heads have filled these positions. The IR indicates that the existing dean will leave his present position this year.

Unit management takes place through the dean's weekly meetings with department heads who are responsible for disseminating information, discussing issues, and analyzing data with program faculty. The SOE Faculty Council and the SOE Faculty Executive Council also provide leadership to the unit. Another source of leadership has been the NCATE Steering Committee established in 2007. Meeting minutes and agendas were found in the exhibits, but no

information was provided about the membership of this committee. Three faculty members serve on the AUM Faculty Senate.

As indicated, the unit is organized into four departments: Counselor, Leadership, and Special Education; Early Childhood, Elementary, and Reading Education; Foundations, Technology, and Secondary Education; and Physical Education and Exercise Science. These departments house unit faculty and programs and are responsible for any changes/additions/deletions of programs and courses. No information was found concerning how curriculum changes are handled by the unit once approved in the department. To promote additional input to the programs, the associate dean and unit faculty meet with faculties in the Schools of Sciences and Liberal Arts on a regular basis to discuss program changes, and course offerings. The unit solicits involvement of P-12 practitioners and the professional community in the teacher preparation programs through stakeholder meetings and surveys. Limited evidence of stakeholder meetings was found in the exhibits, but the role of P-12 partners should be validated on site.

According to the IR, the unit offers 13 undergraduate certification programs, 27 Master of Education programs (11 alternate route programs), and seven Educational Specialist programs. The unit does not utilize off-campus sites at this time. Since the last review, the unit has developed 50 online courses and four online advanced programs (two at the MAE level and two at the EDS level).

Unit admission and degree requirements are clearly and consistently described in university's undergraduate and graduate catalogs, departmental materials, and online resources. Additionally, information regarding the application process and key transition points within programs are clearly articulated in the unit's printed and online materials. The unit reports that it is in the process of updating catalogs and all recruitment brochures. The IR states that a staff member is responsible for meeting with departmental faculty to update all materials, including the SOE website.

A major change made by the unit since the last review has been the move to a centralized advising system. Two part-time undergraduate advisors and two new full-time graduate advisors now advise all candidates. This provides more accurate and current advising for all candidates and ensures that no problems occur during the graduation/certification process. Another resource available to candidates is the Office of Student Services and Certification.

Additional resources include two computer labs in the SOE building, additional computer labs located throughout the campus, the AUM Counseling Center, Nursing Care Center, Wellness Center, and Learning Center. The unit supports two additional centers for its candidates—the Reading Center and the Early Childhood Center.

The library provides adequate library resources for both traditional and online candidates through extensive print and online resources including books, databases, journals, eBooks, and other electronic offerings. Library administrators collaborate with unit faculty on an annual basis before purchasing additional educational materials. The IR indicates that the unit includes library staff in new course development to ensure that the appropriate resources are available. The library's allocation to the unit for the past three years increased from $17,119 (2009) to

$38,567 (2011). Information was not found concerning the library's collection of children's and juvenile literature available to candidates. Interviews with SOE faculty and library staff will be needed to provide this information.

According to the IR, the unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations that are proportional to other units on campus with clinical components. The School of Nursing was the example cited. However, an examination of the budget documents for the schools did not result in a clear picture of the two budgets. Interviews with administrators, faculty, and staff will be needed to determine if allocations received are equitable. Based on the review of the evidence, it appears that funding is adequate to support curricular programs and the preparation of candidates to meet standards. The unit's budget also appears to be adequate to support teaching, scholarship, and service that extend beyond the unit to the P-12 community. Evidence found in the IR shows that, in addition to unit professional development funds, faculty received over $60,000 from external grants to help candidates with research and other professional activities. In 2012, the unit funded over $24,000 in scholarships for candidates from its endowed funds and funds received for the unit's fund-raising activity (SOE Luau).

The unit follows the campus-wide policies concerning faculty workload, tenure and promotion, and other faculty-related matters, as described in the Faculty Handbook. Faculty teaching loads typically consist of 21 hours per year for undergraduate teaching and 18 hours per year for graduate teaching. Faculty members supervising interns are limited to 18 interns per semester. Online courses are taught by faculty members as part of their teaching load. Faculty can earn additional compensation by teaching one overload course per semester and teaching in the summer. The centralized advising system provides faculty more time for research, teaching, and service. Since the last review, the institution approved four clinical faculty positions. These are non-tenured track positions with three-year contracts. The unit states that part-time adjuncts comprise 16 percent of the teaching faculty members. The provost allotted a new faculty position to increase faculty diversity. This position has resulted in a decrease in the use of adjuncts for the last two years.

A review of the evidence reveals that the unit supports professional development and travel of faculty members through funds from the dean's office and departments. The budget presented in the exhibits shows an increase in funds spent for professional development that ranged from $34,050 in 2010 to $65,336 in 2012. Faculty members who graduate from the Faculty Development Institute (Technology) and the Writing Faculty Development Institute receive $400-$800 to buy instructional technology.

The unit is housed in two buildings—the SOE building and the AUM Wellness Center. Selected classrooms and administrative areas in the SOE were recently renovated with funds from the institution and the unit. Many of the classrooms have interactive whiteboards, LCD projectors, computers, speakers, and document cameras. All classrooms in the building are scheduled to be updated with appropriate instructional technology by the end of 2013. The Physical Education and Exercise Science Department is now housed in the AUM Wellness Center, which includes a new human performance lab, faculty offices, and classrooms for instruction. Classrooms in the center have the appropriate instructional technology to support faculty and candidates. All full-

time faculty members have their own offices equipped with technology needed to support teaching, research, and service.

In summary, evidence presented in the IR and the Exhibit Center seems to indicate that the unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations to support on-campus and clinical work essential for the preparation of professional educators. Classrooms, faculty offices, library resources, technology resources, and other university facilities also appear to adequately support the various research, teaching, and learning activities of the candidates and faculty members.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

6.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit moved to a centralized advising system. Clinical faculty members were added to SOE faculty. The unit identified the development of online/hybrid courses and programs as the leading improvement since the last review.

In 2009, the unit added a SOE instructional support specialist with federal stimulus funds. Later, unit funds were used to support the position. Most faculty members have been trained to teach Writing Across the Curriculum courses. These courses are part of the Quality Enhancement Plan adopted by the institution for SACS. Beginning in 2009, funds were offered to faculty for professional support, travel, and research. These funds have continued.

Selected classrooms and administrative areas in the SOE building were remodeled. The Department of Physical Education and Exercise Science was moved to the state-of-the-art AUM Wellness Center. The institution has improved instructional support labs, writing center and assistive technology.

The unit reports three extensive revisions to policies related to governance since the last review. These revisions include: the Department Head Continuance Policy, which limits department heads to a three-year renewable contract; the AUM Grade Forgiveness Policy, which allows candidates to be forgiven for nine hours of low grades; and the SOE Repeating Course Limit Policy, which limits candidates to only taking professional courses twice.

6.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No Areas for Improvement were cited during the last review.

6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None, based on the IR and the exhibits presented thus far.

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

1) Clarify the SOE and School of Nursing budgets. Who determines the amount of the allocation? What criteria are used (number of faculty, number of candidates, etc.) to determine the total budget allocation for each school? Is the allocation for candidate preparation equal?
2) Information about the library's collection of children's and juvenile literature available to faculty and candidates. How many volumes? How are they selected?
3) Information about how curricular changes are handled after departmental level approval. Who reviews and approves for the unit? Is the process for curricular changes at the initial and advance levels different?
4) Validate the role of P-l2 partners.

Sources of Evidence

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