

The NCATE logo consists of the word "NCATE" in a bold, red, sans-serif font. The letters are slightly shadowed, giving it a three-dimensional appearance. The background of the entire page features a large, light gray, stylized star shape that is partially obscured by the text and other elements.

The Standard of Excellence  
in Teacher Preparation

# INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

P.O.Box 2119

Huntsville, TX 77341-2119

10/10/2009-10/14/2009

**Type of Visit:**

Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation

Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

# Institutional Report

## OVERVIEW

This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel.

### A. Institution

#### A.1. What is the institution's historical context?

When asked what office--U. S. representative from Tennessee, governor of Tennessee, general of the Texas Army, president of the Republic of Texas, governor of Texas, or U. S. senator from the state of Texas--had given him the most pride, Sam Houston replied, "When a young man in Tennessee I kept a country school. . . . I experienced a higher feeling of dignity and self-satisfaction (from that) than from any office or honor which I have since held."

Sam Houston State University (<http://www.shsu.edu>) is located in Huntsville, Texas, a small city of 35,078 residents, the home and burial place of General Sam Houston, "Texas' Greatest Hero". Although only 70 miles northeast of downtown Houston, Huntsville is surrounded by forests, lakes, and ranch land. Created by the Texas legislature in 1879 as Sam Houston Normal Institute, its purpose was to train teachers for the public schools of Texas. In 1918, the curriculum was expanded to four years and the baccalaureate degree was first awarded in 1919. As programs and enrollment increased, several name changes ensued, with the final change to Sam Houston State University occurring in 1969. The college was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) in 1925 as an institution of higher learning, and in 1954 the educator preparation programs were among the first accredited by NCATE. In the decades of the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, the university continued to expand its offerings to keep pace with its dynamic environment by adding degree programs at all levels. These additions were accompanied by significant improvement in faculty credentials and growth in faculty research activities. In recent years, SHSU has been the fastest growing University in the state with 22% growth from 2003 until 2007. The University is a member of the Texas State University System.

#### A.2. What is the institution's mission?

Sam Houston State University is a multicultural institution whose mission is to provide excellence by continually improving quality education, scholarship, and service to its students and to appropriate regional, state, national, and international constituencies.

#### GOALS

- Promote students' intellectual, social, ethical, and leadership growth.
- Recruit and retain qualified, dedicated faculty and support staff.
- Recruit and retain qualified, motivated students.
- Provide the necessary library and other facilities to support quality instruction, research, and public service.
- Provide an educational environment that encourages systematic inquiry and research.
- Promote and support diversity and provide for equitable opportunities for minorities.

- Offer a wide range of academic studies in pre-professional, baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral programs.
- Collaborate with other universities, institutions, and constituencies.
- Provide instructional research and public service through distance learning and technology.

**A.3. What are the institution's characteristics [e.g., control (e.g., public or private) and type of institution such as private, land grant, or HBI; location (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban area)]?**

Sam Houston State University is a regional, public, doctoral institution located 70 miles north of Houston, Texas. SHSU serves students from rural, suburban and urban areas, offering 79 undergraduate degree programs, 54 masters' programs, and 5 doctoral programs in Criminal Justice, Educational Leadership, Counselor Education, Clinical Psychology, and Reading. SHSU is a member of the Texas State University System. There are five colleges: Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Criminal Justice, Education, and Humanities and Social Sciences. Of the students enrolled in the university, approximately 64% receive some type of financial aid. The student body is among the most diverse in the state, with 69.6% white, 14.3% African-American, 1.4% Asian-Pacific Islander, 12.7% Hispanic, and 2.1 % Other. Improving the retention and recruitment of minority students is a stated goal of the SHSU Strategic Plan for 2008-2009. The University takes pride in an average class size of 31 students and a faculty:student ratio of 1:20.

Although SHSU does not have a branch campus, a partnership agreement with six area universities and the Lone Star Community College system, provides the opportunity to offer courses leading to bachelor, master's and doctoral degrees at the University Center, located in The Woodlands, Texas, approximately 40 miles south of Huntsville. While many educator preparation programs offer courses there, it is not possible for candidates to complete their program.

**A.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the institutional context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

**B. The unit**

**B.1. What is the professional education unit at your institution and what is its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators?**

The professional education unit at SHSU includes Educator Preparation Programs housed in the College of Education (COE) and in the academic departments offering majors in a teaching field. Undergraduate candidates for certification in Grades EC-6 and 4-8 receive a degree in Interdisciplinary Studies conferred by the COE. In the State of Texas, professional education coursework for initial certification is limited to 18 semester credit hours, or 24 hours, if field based. Degrees in the major/teaching field are conferred by the Colleges of Arts and Sciences or Humanities and Social Sciences. Representatives from each of the departments that prepare candidates for teaching work collaboratively through the Educator Preparation Advisory Council and the Sam Houston Innovative Partnership with Schools (SHIPS) to plan, evaluate and refine the Educator Preparation programs.

Post-baccalaureate candidates for teaching participate in either a certification-only program or a Master's degree program in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction in the COE. Graduate degrees and certificates for other professional personnel are offered by the COE in Administration, School Counseling, School Librarians, Educational Diagnosticians, and Reading Specialists. Master's degrees in Special Education, Reading, Curriculum and Instruction and Instructional Leadership are also conferred by the COE. A master's degree in School Psychology is offered by the College of Humanities

and Social Sciences.

**B.2. How many professional education faculty members support the professional education unit? Please complete Table 1 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.**

**Table 1  
Professional Education Faculty**

Professional Education Faculty	Full-time in the Unit	Full-time in the Institution, but Part-time in the Unit	Part-time at the Institution & the Unit (e.g., adjunct faculty)	Graduate Teaching Assistants Teaching or Supervising Clinical Practice	Total # of Professional Education Faculty
Number of faculty	73	16	93	7	189

**B.3. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare candidates for their first license to teach? Please complete Table 2 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.**

**Table 2  
Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status**

Program	Award Level (e.g., Bachelor's or Master's)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)	Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)	State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)	Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE

**B.4. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals? Please complete Table 3 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.**

**Table 3  
Advanced Preparation Programs and Their Review Status**

Program	Award Level (e.g., Master's or Doctorate)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)	Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)	State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)	Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE

**B.5. Which of the above initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are offered? [In addition to this response, please review the "Institutional Information" in AIMS and, if updating is needed, contact NCATE with details about these programs.]**

SHSU is currently approved to offer any secondary education, 4-8, and EC-12 program through our post-baccalaureate program. This option is available to candidates who have received degrees, have a specified number of hours in the specific content area, meet the entry requirements, and are interested in becoming educators. This program is almost entirely administered on-line, with limited face-to-face

orientation sessions. Field experience is required of the candidates prior to student teaching/internship.

Several of the advanced programs are offered exclusively on-line or as hybrids: M. Ed. in Instructional Technology Leadership, M. Ed. in Administration, M. Ed. in Instructional Leadership, and M. Ed. in Reading.

**B.6. (Continuing Visit Only) What substantive changes have taken place in the unit since the last visit (e.g., added/dropped programs/degrees; significant increase/decrease in enrollment; major reorganization of the unit, etc.)? [These changes could be compiled from those reported in Part C of the AACTE/NCATE annual reports since the last visit.]**

In 2004-2005 the University reorganized to add a fifth college, the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. In this reorganization, two departments, the Department of Psychology and the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences were reassigned and the College of Education and Applied Sciences was renamed the College of Education. Enrollment growth across the University has been rapid over the period. Graduate programs in the College of Education continue to generate most of the graduate semester credit hours in the University.

To manage the assessment system of the Unit, a data management system was adopted in Fall 2006. After multiple attempts to develop a tracking system within the Unit, a selection committee comprised of faculty, assessment committee members, and administrators selected the TK20 system. Each semester since the initial implementation in Fall 2006, unit and program assessments have been added, aligned, and refined. Currently, student applications that trigger automated review of data at transition points in the program are being shifted from the SIS system to TK20 as new candidates enter the program.

Beginning in Fall 2008, SHSU shifted from a preparing candidates to teach Grades EC-4 to a new program for teaching in Grades EC-6, mandated by the Texas State Board for Educator Certification. At the same time, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board required a reduction in credit hours for all degrees. To meet these mandates, a new program design committee was formed to address 1) changing state standards, 2) requests from school partners to address a shortage of middle grades teachers, and 3) Texas' growing population of English Language Learners. Since certification structure had changed only four years before, the committee was designated as the Déjà vu Committee. The charge to the committee was to develop three new EC-6 certification programs-Generalist, Generalist with Bilingual Supplement and Generalist with EC-12 Special Education. Also, there was a need for two new programs for Grades 4-8, composite Mathematics/ Science and composite English Language Arts and Reading/Social Studies. Preparation for ESL supplemental certificate was also included in each program, at the request of our school partners. The new programs incorporated new state standards, new licensure exams, and alignment with different SPA standards (e.g. moving from NAEYC to ACEI and adding NMSA).

For a candidate to receive certification in the EC-6 program, the state requires two licensure exams-the TExES Generalist EC-6 and the TExES Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities EC-6. SHSU candidates will first take the new exams in Fall 2009. The NCATE AIMS system reflects new programs; data from previous programs is available on the website or in the exhibit room.

**B.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

SHSU IR Table 3

SHSU IR Table 2

See **Attachments** panel below.

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This section provides an overview of the unit's conceptual framework(s). The overview should include a brief description of the framework(s) and its development.

**C.1. How does the unit's conceptual framework address the following structural elements?**  
**[Please provide a summary here. A more complete description of the conceptual framework should be available as an electronic exhibit.]**

- **the vision and mission of the unit**
- **philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit**
- **knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit**
- **candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards**
- **summarized description of the unit's assessment system**

The Educator Preparation Unit within the College of Education is dedicated to instructional excellence, modeling life-long learning, and sharing a vision and expertise with the surrounding community and has adopted a logo that makes the mission explicit to all stakeholders: “Enhancing the Future through Educator Preparation”.

Stakeholders associated with the Educator Preparation Programs believe that learning is a science and a developmental process that through reflective experience can become an art. Through the mission of the Educator Preparation Programs, educators grow as learners and develop the craft of teaching, administrating, or school counseling in public P-12 settings. Striving to fulfill the need in our society for quality educators, who will advance and positively influence the goals of society, faculty in the Educator Preparation Programs work collaboratively with faculty in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Humanities and Social Sciences, with school district personnel, the general public, and with candidates. The Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Humanities and Social Sciences faculty provide the foundation with content area knowledge and serve as committee members on various committees within the College of Education such as our NCATE committees and the Professional Concerns Committee (the professional concerns committee addresses concerns about the dispositions of our candidates from any of our stakeholders). Additionally, district personnel provide proactive insight in field experience (professional experiences in real world settings are described in depth in other parts of the report) and reflective feedback on the work of our pre-service teachers, counselors, administrators, and other school professionals. Our candidates plan, implement, assess, and modify their methods and strategies to benefit the children in public P-12 schools who are the ultimate benefactors of all efforts (Weimer, 2002). This instructional decision- making is reflected throughout course work and capstone experiences like the Teacher Work Sample. The general public supports our institution with tax dollars and expects accountability, which is documented in the State Board of Educator Certification’s Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) (information about specific institutions is available on the SBEC website [www.sbec.state.tx.us](http://www.sbec.state.tx.us)). The Conceptual Framework (CF) numbered indicators serve to identify concepts within course work, assessments and our data management system.

### Knowledge Base (CF1)

The purpose, as evidenced by our mission statement and college goals (appearing earlier in this document), of the Sam Houston State University Educator Preparation Programs is to develop a knowledge base that is comprehensive and directed to the candidates' individual needs ; dispositions that enable them to be understanding, respectful, and inclusive in their creation of nurturing learning environments for diverse learners ; and skills which enable them to plan, implement, and assess appropriate instruction (Gagne, Briggs & Wagner, 1988) .This knowledge base, comprehensive in content, and reinforced with pedagogical and learning theory, prepares candidates to be effective instructional leaders responsive to the diverse needs of their students, campuses and learning communities (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Freiberg, 2002) . They will gain this knowledge through course content, faculty modeling, and field experiences. Coaching and modeling by the educator preparation faculty, by content area faculty, and by teachers, administrators, counselors and other school professionals in the public school settings reinforce this learning. The educator preparation faculty also integrates opportunities for candidates to collaboratively build an understanding of their vocation (Dewey, 1943, 1975; Schön, 1991; Vygotsky, 1978). Candidates graduate from our programs with the experience of and the theory for effective planning, implementation, assessment, and modification of lessons to insure optimal learning. Additionally, they understand the importance of reflection and inquiry for their continued professional growth (Dembo, 2001; Hackney & Henderson, 1999; Teitel, 2001).

### Technological Learning Environment (CF2)

Candidates immerse themselves in a learning culture framed by information technology. This culture focuses on technological mastery and the more complicated processes, problem-solving, and decision-making necessary in a world with complex standards that are at times abstract and perhaps seemingly contradictory. (Friedman, 2005; Popkin & Iyengar, 2007; Turkle 2004). The candidates learn to create an authentic environment that encompasses the use of simulation games, research, data assessment, interactive multimedia production, video and audio editing, and the Internet to engage students in the P-16 learning culture (Turkle, 1995).

Candidates use diverse technologies, group activities, and teaching strategies to focus, engage, and lead P-16 students to high level thinking skills in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains (Bloom, 1980; Harrow, 1972; Krathwoh, Bloom & Masia, 1964).

### Communication (CF3)

The graduates of the Educator Preparation Programs are effective communicators. Using a variety of media, candidates communicate through their words and thoughts by oral and written methods in ways that further our mission. They are active listeners who are thoughtful before responding. They communicate effectively with a diverse group of stakeholders and strive for the highest levels of professionalism in all their interactions. Several assignments from program course work specifically address communication and are indicated by a CF3 designation in course syllabi.

### Assessment (CF4)

Learning to plan and implement learning processes is critical for educators in P-16 settings. However, learning to assess and modify those processes is just as important. Candidates learn how to assess performance and to provide feedback that will lead to growth in their students academically and developmentally and, in the case of administration candidates, to growth in the teachers they will supervise (Chase, 1999; Merhens, 1992). Candidates also learn several formal and informal tools for assessing the development, needs, and strengths of children critical to the professional educator and counselor (Popham, 2000; Stroh & Sink, 2002). Mastering the analysis and uses of learner profiles, our candidates will be able to create tools for measuring and evaluating performance and educational

progress to facilitate the success of all students (Glasser, 1969, 1987; Stiggins, 2002). Our faculty is dedicated to helping all candidates gain the skills necessary to be effective evaluators of children, programs, and themselves, and leads candidates to make data informed decisions. This includes the components of modeling life-long learning, inquiring into areas where further study is needed, and reflecting on the accountability of the professional educator in the successes and failures of children (Schön, 1991; Schulman, 1992). Knowledge of and about assessment is measured in program coursework and these assignments are indicated by CF4 designation in course syllabi.

#### Effective Field Experience with Diverse Learners (CF5)

The Educator Preparation Programs immerse candidates in field experiences that help them develop the dispositions of leadership, patience, flexibility, and respect for and acceptance of individual differences. To prepare candidates for diverse cultures found in the schools, the Educator Preparation Programs emphasize an understanding of the issues involved with implementing an anti-bias curriculum (Derman-Sparks, 1989), as well as an awareness of the importance of inclusive education permeating the school experience (Banks & Banks, 1993; Garcia & Pugh, 1992; Hale, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Paley, 1995). The importance of these field experiences cannot be overstated. It is through these experiences that our candidates develop and test what has been learned in the university setting in a realistic environment. Building a strong, collaborative, respectful relationship with stakeholders enables the Educator Preparation Programs at Sam Houston State University to gather qualitative and quantitative data (TEXES data, portfolios and The Teacher Work Sample are described in other sections of the document) that support our belief that graduates are effective in their chosen fields (teaching, administrating, counseling or coaching). This belief is supported with the quantitative data provided from the state accrediting agencies and the testimonials of area administrators who hire our candidates. This conceptual framework guides the way in which we structure our courses and certification programs. It is also a central theme that is reinforced individually in our classes. In the adoption of this framework, the educator preparation faculty insures that the programmatic direction is in alignment with standards established by the State of Texas for the preparation of professional educators and the standards of relevant professional organizations. This coherent program, course objectives, field experience evaluation, and state assessment insure the preparation of outstanding graduates in the fields of elementary and secondary education, counseling, school psychology, and educational leadership.

### **C.2. (Continuing Visits Only) What changes have been made to the conceptual framework since the last visit?**

Our current Conceptual Framework draws heavily from the framework developed in 2002/2003. In 2005, the Conceptual Framework was reviewed and approved by the faculty as relevant. Additional meetings were held by the Conceptual Framework committee during the fall and spring of 2006 and 2007 to review and update the document. Stakeholders from outside the university were given the opportunity to comment on the framework through their participation in the Sam Houston Innovative Partnership with Schools (SHIPS). During Fall 2007, minor changes were made to the Conceptual Framework narrative based on the work of the Committee from the previous year. Updates to the Conceptual Framework document, related references and the Institutional Standards were adopted by consensus of the Committee, after review and feedback from the faculty. Once again, school district partners reviewed the framework to ensure it reflected the most current understanding of program goals and objectives by stakeholders.

These updates did not require substantive change to the key components or spirit of the Conceptual Framework. Similarly, the logo, developed in 2002, and used across the Unit to represent the key elements of the Conceptual Framework was reviewed in 2008. A change was requested by the faculty to convey several key components of the Framework more explicitly. Previously, ideas related to diversity and the integration of technology were symbolized by a cartoon-like image that inadequately conveyed



the importance of the concepts in our expectations for candidates. Several models of a new logo were reviewed by the faculty and partnership schools, and a more current and accurate depiction was selected for use. These changes did not represent substantive alteration of the meaning or emphasis of the elements of the framework.

**C.3. (First Visits Only) How was the conceptual framework developed and who was involved in its development?**

Not applicable

**C.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the conceptual framework may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

## STANDARDS

This section is the focus of the institutional report. A description of how the unit meets each standard element must be presented. Significant differences among programs should be described as the response is written for each element under subheadings of initial teacher preparation, advanced teacher preparation, and other school professionals. Significant differences among programs on the main campus, in off-campus programs, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs should be identified. Links to key exhibits to support the descriptions may be attached to the last prompt of each element.

### 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.

#### Directions When Programs Have Been Reviewed Nationally or by a Similar State Review

To reduce burden and duplication, units have fewer reporting requirements for Standard 1 when programs have been submitted for national review or similar state review. These review processes cover many of the elements in Standard 1. For programs that have been submitted for national review or similar state review, units are asked to report in the IR only the following information:

- State licensing test data for Element 1a (content knowledge for teacher candidates) and Element 1e (knowledge and skills for other school professionals)
- Assessment Data for Element 1c (professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills)
- Assessment data for Element 1g (dispositions)
- Results of follow-up studies of graduates and employers (all standards elements)

Because program standards do not generally cover general professional knowledge and skills

nor professional dispositions, the unit must respond to all of the prompts in Elements 1c (Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates) and 1g (Professional Dispositions for All Candidates) regardless of whether programs have been submitted for national or state review.

The prompts for each element in the IR include reminders of when data for these programs need not be included. The term "similar state review" refers to state review processes that require institutions to submit assessments and assessment data for evaluation and/or approval. For more information on "similar state review," click on the HELP button at the top right corner of your screen.

**1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]**

**1a.1. What are the pass rates of teacher candidates in initial teacher preparation programs on state tests of content knowledge for each program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 4 or upload your own table at Prompt 1a.5 below. [This information could be compiled from Title II data submitted to the state or from program reports prepared for national review.]**

Table 4  
Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation

For Period:

2006, 2007, and 2008

Program	Name of Content Licensure Test	# of Test Takers	% Passing State Licensure Test
Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all initial teacher preparation programs)			

**1a.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]**

The programs are nationally reviewed.

**1a.3. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]**

The programs are nationally reviewed.

**1a.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in the content area? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to content knowledge could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]**

Recent graduates and their school principals were surveyed in 2000 and in 2003, prior to 2003 NCATE review, and subsequently in 2006 and 2009. In 2006, the response rate for principals was 58%; for graduates 20%. Responses indicated that candidates do possess knowledge in the content areas of their certification. In both surveys, confidence in their ability to teach the state's curriculum received the highest ratings by both the principals and new graduates (R=.77). There were no areas related to content knowledge that were rated below 4.25 on a 6 point scale in 2006.

In 2009, online survey methods were used, and a new questionnaire was developed to assess the SHSU Institutional Standards and NCATE Standard 1. The response rate for principals was 36% and for graduates 30%. Administrators reported that understanding the alignment of state, national and local standards was a content-related concern. Since content knowledge is acquired prior to entry to the program, based on this information, emphasis on alignment for various content areas was added to the introductory class, EED 232, to ensure understanding of the relationships among varied instructional frameworks. Standards are cited in each syllabus and are frequently discussed in each class. Graduate survey data indicated confidence with regard to content preparation. Data from these surveys is attached in 1a. 5.

**1a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

SHSU Followup Survey Data
SHSU IR Table 4

See **Attachments** panel below.

**1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]**

**1b.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]**

The programs are nationally reviewed.

**1b.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates know and apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, are able to**

**use a range of instructional strategies and technologies, and can explain the choices they make in their practice. [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]**

The programs are nationally reviewed.

**1b.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]**

The 2006 and 2009 Surveys of recent SHSU Graduates and their Principals also allow for pedagogical content information to be reviewed. Survey forms and response data are included in Prompt 1a.5.

The response rate for the 2006 Principal Survey was 58%, the survey of recent graduates yielded a 20% response rate. Data indicate that our students are prepared for employment with pedagogical knowledge in their certification areas. Principals' and graduates again agreed- they were well prepared to implement teaching methods that meet academic objectives and to integrate technology into their teaching. While no areas of concern were raised, curriculum changes to further improve candidate proficiency in technology integration were implemented in 2008.

In 2009, online survey media was employed and a new questionnaire was developed to assess the SHSU Institutional Standards and NCATE Standard 1. The response rate for principals was 36% and for graduates 30%. In May 2009, administrators and recent graduates again agreed that they were well prepared to integrate technology into their teaching. On a four-point scale the mean rating for principals on that indicator was 3.17, for graduates, it was 3.24. Data from these surveys is attached in 1a. 5.

**1b.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the pedagogical content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. (Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.)**

**1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]**

**1c.1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced teacher preparation programs demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]**

To earn Teaching Certification in Texas, the teacher candidate must pass two or more statewide exams. One of the exams is the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Exam, designed to address various levels of practice: EC-4, EC-6, 4-8, 8-12, or EC-12. Teacher candidates must take the exam that includes the grade levels of their certification (i.e. candidate seeking a 6-12 certification or an EC-8 certification would take the EC-12 exam). A second exam is a content exam in the area of certification. In addition to these two exams a 3rd or 4th exam may be required for some certification areas. Coursework activities and assessments are aligned with the Texas Knowledge and Skills Standards for

appropriate levels of certification and also with the TExES Certification Examination Frameworks to assure a focus on both content and pedagogical knowledge for each graduate. Table 4 in 1a.1 lists each certification area, the content and PPR TExES state exams, and the passing rates for each completer cohort over the past three years.

In addition to the statewide TExES Exams, each initial certification candidate must complete a 4 year baccalaureate or a 24 hour post-baccalaureate program with a 2.5 or above GPA in the content area and meet an overall GPA requirement. All initial certification candidates are evaluated using four common assessments: the TExES PPR examination, an instructional planning assessment; an observation rating scale, the Professional Development Appraisal System (PDAS), which parallels the instrument used in many Texas schools to evaluate in-service teachers; and the capstone Teacher Work Sample. Each student teacher or post- baccalaureate intern is observed and provided with feedback and mentoring by both a classroom teacher and a SHSU University Supervisor on the PDAS and the Teacher Work Sample. The University Supervisor completes multiple formative and one summative observation using the Professional Development Appraisal System form (Form D- PDAS) to highlight the candidate's strengths and areas for growth. Data from these assessments are analyzed and monitored for the entire unit and within individual programs. Additional coursework assessments, portfolios, thesis, and exams are required by specific certification programs. Attached in 1c.5 is a list of the specific assessment instruments, by program. Performance data for each of the four common assessments is also attached in 1c.5.

**1c.2. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs consider the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings? If a licensure test is required in this area, how are candidates performing on it? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]**

One of the requirements of the initial certification programs is the completion of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) modeled on the Renaissance Partnership version. The TWS is typically completed in the first 6 weeks of the student teaching placement or in the second semester of the post-baccalaureate program internship. The first of the seven TWS teaching processes is Contextual Factors, in which the candidate examines multiple facets of the classroom and the students he/she is teaching. The teacher candidate uses information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals and plan for instruction and assessment within the classroom of their student teaching experience. Included in this section is a discussion of the community, district, and school factors, classroom factors, and individual student characteristics which will provide the context for the learning-teaching situation. The candidate describes these factors in detail and relates the identified factors to the needs of the students as he/she plans for instruction. A minimum of two characteristics of the students are highlighted as the teacher candidate plans for implementation of the unit. Throughout the TWS process, the teacher candidate applies knowledge of teaching philosophies and researched practices to provide quality instruction to each of the students in the classroom. The teacher candidate assesses, devises goals, implements instruction, reflects on the instruction and analyzes student performance, plans for additional learning, assesses and finally reflects on the entirety of the learning. It is in this final reflection that the teacher candidate includes self-evaluation and plans for additional professional development. Each initial teacher candidate must submit a Teacher Work Sample and score at the acceptable or target level to receive credit for student teaching. A copy of the scoring rubrics for the TWS and performance data for the past three years is included in 1c.5.

**1c.3. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates reflect on their practice; engage in professional activities; have a thorough understanding of the school, family, and**

**community contexts in which they work; collaborate with the professional community; are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices; and can analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their own practice and the profession? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]**

Graduate programs have portfolios or projects that incorporate the context of the school, family, and students into their specific area of certification. Samples of these projects and portfolios are the Family Support Plan Project in the Special Education/Diagnostician program, the School Improvement Project in the Educational Leadership/Principal program, the Coordination Plan in the Education Leadership/Superintendent program, the Literacy Coaching Project in the Reading program, the Collaboration for Instruction and Design and Implementation Project in the Technology Facilitator program, and the Program Administration and Library Internship Projects in the School Librarian Program. The rubrics for these portfolios and projects and performance data are included in 1c.5.

**1c.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]**

Surveys of recent graduates and their supervising principals were conducted in 2006 and 2009. The survey documents and data reports are attached in Prompt 1a5. Information regarding professional and pedagogical knowledge in 2009 indicate confidence on the part of graduates in the areas of continuous professional growth and valuing critical and creative thinking, reflection and inquiry. Principals responded that they were most prepared to collaborate with parents, professional and learners and to model life-long learning and literacy. Each group expressed concern about using a variety of classroom management techniques to optimize the learning environment and maximize student engagement. Faculty will be informed of these results in Fall 2009 so that adjustments may be made in the curriculum.

In 2006, the correlation coefficient for graduate and principal responses was .81, with areas showing the most preparedness 1) keeping the classroom on a timely schedule and 2) maintaining order in the classroom. The areas of concern related to practice and preparedness in implementation of new methods of teaching. In response to these needs, changes were made in the methods coursework and additional field settings were obtained.

**1c.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

**1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]**

**1d.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not**

**have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]**

The programs are nationally reviewed.

**1d.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning; regularly apply them in their practice; analyze student, classroom, and school performance data; make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning; and are aware of and utilize school and community resources that support student learning? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]**

The programs are nationally reviewed.

**1d.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to help all students learn? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to help all students learn could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]**

Response rates for SHSU Graduate Teacher Preparedness and the Graduate Teacher Surveys administered in 2006 and 2009 are reported in 1a.4. Included in Prompt 1a.5 are copies of the Principal Survey of SHSU Graduate Teacher Preparedness and Graduate Survey and the response data. Responses received in 2006 indicated that principals believe that our graduates are prepared to plan for teaching and learning of all students within the classroom. The areas that showed the most preparedness were the use of student performance assessment techniques with a mean rating of 5.33 on a 6 point scale. In 2009, principals again cited skill in assessment. The areas identified for improvement related to using learner profiles to plan, implement and assess instruction, which we interpret as lack of preparation in considering individual differences and differentiating instruction. The summary of graduates' responses identified the same strengths and needs, once again highly correlated to the responses of the principals ( $R=97$  in 2006, .90 in 2009). Please note that the survey methodology used in 2009 provided anonymity for respondents, so it was not possible to match supervisor responses with individual graduates.

In response to these needs, ESL coursework to accompany field experiences were added to the new programs to prepare all EC-6 and 4-8 candidates to work with English Language Learners. Since this new program was designed in 2007-2008 and implemented in Fall 2008, follow-up surveys will not yield information to validate this change until 2010-2011 or later.

**1d.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

## **1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals**

**1e.1. What are the pass rates of other school professionals on licensure tests by program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 5 or upload your own table at Prompt 1e.4 below.**

Pass Rates on Licensure Tests for Other School Professionals

For Period: \_\_\_\_\_

Program	Name of Licensure Test	# of Test Takers	% Passing State Licensure Test
Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all programs for the preparation of other school professionals)			

**1e.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that other school professionals demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for programs for other school professionals that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below.]**

The programs are nationally reviewed.

**1e.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about the knowledge and skills of other school professionals? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]**

Changing leadership in the departments delayed administration of follow-up surveys in Library Science, Instructional Technology, and in Reading. Follow-up surveys conducted in these programs in Fall 2009 will inform program planning for 2010-2011. Copies of those survey instruments are available on the website.

A table detailing data from the follow-up surveys of graduates and employers administered by the graduate programs for principals and special education diagnosticians is available on the website.

Analysis of the SPED Diagnostician survey data indicated that graduates of the program and their employers perceived that they exceeded the expected levels of proficiency for the standards. The means reported range from 3.38 to 3.85 on the employer survey and 3.17 to 3.57 on the graduate surveys. Graduates expressed concern as to their ability to conduct clinical observations of students in various settings and to integrate and apply data to the needs of the whole child. Employers expressed concern regarding skills in interpreting assessment results to reach valid and reliable conclusions. This data confirmed faculty expectations that interpretation and integration of assessment findings has shifted dramatically since graduates took their core coursework, largely due to changes in IDEA 2004 and state regulations. Professional development is offered yearly to address this gap.

The Educational Leadership Principal program 360° survey indicated that 57% of graduates felt only somewhat prepared to use formative evaluation processes to develop campus staff, 25% of that same group felt very prepared. Strongest preparation was cited in selection and induction of personnel. Revised program sequence and courses reflect these findings.

**1e.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the**



knowledge and skills of other school professionals may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

SHSU IR Table 5
Diagnostician Follow Up Survey Information
Principal 360 Evaluation

See **Attachments** panel below.

## 1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

**1f.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates can create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work? [Data for programs for other school professionals that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]**

The programs are nationally reviewed.

**1f.2. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to create positive environments for student learning? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to create positive environments for student leaning could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]**

Changing leadership in the departments delayed administration of follow-up surveys in Library Science, Instructional Technology, and in Reading. Follow-up surveys conducted in these programs in Fall 2009 will inform program planning for 2010-2011. Copies of those survey instruments are available on the website.

A table detailing data from the follow-up surveys of graduates and employers administered by the graduate programs for principals and special education diagnosticians is available on the website.

**1f.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to other school professionals' creation of positive environments for student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

## 1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates. [Indicate when the responses refer to the preparation of initial teacher candidates, advanced teacher candidates, and other school professionals, noting differences when they occur.]

**1g.1. What professional dispositions are candidates expected to demonstrate by completion of programs?**

Initial Programs: SHSU teacher candidates are expected to demonstrate 4 dispositional standards throughout the program.

Standard 1 – Values – candidate seeks to create supportive environments sensitive to learning and cultural differences

Standard 2 – Commitment – candidate fosters respect for teaching profession, positive human interactions, and collaboration

Standard 3 – Professional Ethics – candidate exhibits professional development through intellectual curiosity, reflection, self-assessment, ethical practice, and communication skills

Standard 4 – Organization/Flexibility – candidate exhibits, structure, flexibility and patience

At three or more points in the program, candidate dispositions are evaluated. In EED 233, and EED 374 (entry to Educator Preparation Program) candidates are rated at the novice level for their dispositions. In Literacy Methods and Content Methods (Transition Point 1a, b), candidates are rated at the emerging level and during student teaching (Transition Point 2) at the competent level, by two external evaluators. Each teacher candidate completes the Dispositions rating sheet and adds documentation for the selected self-rating. The professor of the course reviews the rating and documentation and assigns a score indicating degree of agreement with the student rating. Feedback and individual conferences are conducted with the candidates if there is a discrepancy in the professor's rating and candidate's rating. During these feedback or conference sessions, specific areas are addressed. The final ratings are transcribed into a score from 1 (unsatisfactory) – 5 (distinguished). The Disposition rating scale, data from instructor ratings, and data from external evaluations (Form D) are included in 1g.5.

Performance data for candidates for the Dispositions assessments over three years is attached at 1g.5.

Advanced Programs for Other School Professionals-The process, assessment instruments, and candidate data tables are displayed on the SHSU NCATE website for the advanced programs.

**1g.2. How do candidates demonstrate that they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]**

Initial Programs: Standard 1 of the SHSU Dispositions states that the candidate seeks to create supportive environments sensitive to learning and cultural differences. The single indicators under this standard include: creates responsive and supportive learning environments that nourish and promote individual student development; respect cultural and linguistic differences; celebrates individual differences; demonstrated equity in daily interactions; uses multiple forms of on-going assessment to guide instruction; considers family, community, and cultural information regarding beliefs, values, traditions of self and others; and develops intrinsic motivation of the student for lifelong learning. These 7 indicators are self-rated by the teacher candidate a minimum of three times during their program. Initial ratings are at a novice level, second ratings are at an emerging level and the final rating is at the competent level. Each indicator is rated on a 5 point scale from 1 (Unsatisfactory) to 5 (distinguished). A score of 3 indicates competence. Therefore, mean scores on each indicator that merit a 3 or higher indicate success. Performance data for candidates for the Dispositions assessments over three years is attached at 1g.5.

Advanced Programs for Other School Professionals-The process, disposition assessment instruments, and candidate data tables are displayed on the SHSU NCATE website for the advanced programs.

**1g.3. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions listed in 1.g.1 as they work with students, families, colleagues, and communities? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]**

Within the aforementioned dispositions ratings are indicators that document an establishment and fostering of respectful, productive, and consulting relationships with professions, agencies, community members and care givers. Performance data for candidates for the Dispositions assessments over three

years is attached at 1g.5.

Also during the student teaching semester, the candidates are evaluated using an instrument, entitled Form D, developed to address Dispositions, Texas Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility standards and Texas Technology Standards. Form D is completed during the student teaching semester by University Supervisors and each classroom mentor teacher. Performance data for the past three years on Form D is attached at 1g.5.

Advanced Programs for Other School Professionals-The process, assessment instruments, and candidate data tables are displayed on the SHSU NCATE website for the advanced programs.

**1g.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' demonstration of professional dispositions? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional dispositions could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]**

Changing leadership in the departments delayed administration of follow-up surveys in Library Science, Instructional Technology, and Reading. Follow-up surveys conducted in Fall 2009 will inform program planning for 2010-2011. Copies of those instruments are available on the website.

A table detailing data from the follow-up surveys of graduates and employers for principals and special education diagnosticians is available on the website.

Response rates for the 2006 and 2009 Principal Survey of SHSU Graduate Teacher Preparedness and the Graduate Teacher Survey information are described in 1a.4. These two surveys provide information regarding graduate's dispositions as displayed during the first years of teaching. In 2009, responses indicate that graduates demonstrate positive dispositions in the teaching environment with the lowest rating by principals at 3.28 on a four-point scale, lowest rating of graduates was 3.265. The areas rated most positively by both groups were ethical behavior and intellectual honesty (3.58), demonstrating respect and awareness of the needs of students (3.42) and ability to be understanding, respectful and inclusive of diverse learners (3.385). Areas each group identified for improvement include commitment to life-long, learning, literacy, inquiry and reflection (3.27) and belief in advancing and positively influencing the goals of society (3.27). These data will be reviewed by the faculty in fall 2009. In 2006, preparation to meet needs of students with diverse cultural backgrounds was a concern of graduate respondents and principals. These data and the Standard 4 self-study prompted the development of diversity proficiencies, currently being implemented and assessed in the programs. In addition, preparation to meet the needs of English Language Learners and qualify for a supplemental ESL certificate was added to each EC-6 and 4-8 program. Response data and examples of the survey instruments are attached at Prompt 1a.5.

**1g.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to professional dispositions may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

Teacher Disposition Summary Alignment Chart
Teacher Disposition Instrument
Teacher Disposition Data
Form D Data
Undergraduate Dispositions Data

See **Attachments** panel below.

## Optional

### 1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 1?

SHSU provides quality learning experiences to the teacher candidates and other school personnel. It is evident in the high pass rates on the statewide TExES Exam scores that the SHSU experiences have assisted the graduates to master the content, skills and develop the necessary dispositions to become quality teachers and professional staff. These experiences include in-class learning and field experience opportunities in a variety of settings. The satisfaction ratings on the employer surveys and graduate surveys documents the quality of our SHSU graduates as they continue to effectively provide experiences to the children in Texas public schools. Implementation and subsequent refinement of common assessments that are conducted across undergraduate programs, including the capstone assessment for initial certification candidates, the Teacher Work Sample, represent a growing focus on assessment of learning outcomes for candidates, specifically evaluating their content knowledge and ability to assess and modify their effect on student learning.

### 2. What research related to Standard 1 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

Over the past five years, through participation in the non-profit Center for Research, Evaluation and Advocacy of Teacher Education (CREATE), SHSU joined Texas educator preparation institutions to develop a Scorecard for Teacher Education. Faculty and administrators within the unit continue to participate in the CREATE research consortium and to benefit from the CREATE partnership. Participation in the Performance Assessment for Colleges of Education (PACE) provides data regarding student achievement in our zone of proximal impact, comparisons of candidate retention in the field and other information of value to the faculty and to our programs. Reports of SHSU performance are available on the SHSU NCATE website and in the on-site exhibit room.

Several grant funded research efforts focus on NCATE Standard 1f for other school professionals and their ability to create positive learning environments to promote EC-12 student learning:

Project ELLA-an on-going longitudinal randomized trial project targeting at Hispanic English learners' English language and literacy acquisition (project ELLA), from kindergarten through 3rd grade. The seven elementary schools involved in the project have 89-98% low socio-economic students and are 65% Hispanic. P.I is Dr. Beverly Irby.

A National Science Foundation grant, an ongoing longitudinal randomized trial examining the language and literacy learning of ELL students in grades 3-5. PI is Dr. Beverly Irby.

Project PULSE-a grant funded teacher leadership project. PI is Dr. Stacey Edmonson.

Project TRIAD-a grant funded project focused on reading instruction of ELL students through teacher leadership development. Co-PIs are Dr. Genevieve Brown and Dr. Beverly Irby.

Project CONNECT-investigates learning and retention of 1st generation college students. Co-PIs are Dr. Alice Fisher and Dr. Beverly Irby.

## STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

## 2a. Assessment System

### 2a.1. How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards?

To ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, in state standards and professional standards systematic review of data and of each element of the assessment system occurs. Performance data is collected and reviewed by the faculty, the Administrative team, school partners and candidates, using unit-, program-, and individual-levels of analysis to monitor candidate performance against NCATE standards, specialty program area (SPA) standards, State of Texas content and pedagogy standards, and SHSU institutional standards. A summary table outlining this process is attached at Prompt 2.a.6-Key Assessment Data and Management Schedule.

In both initial and advanced programs, candidate qualifications and proficiencies are assessed, using multiple measures, at several transition points as they matriculate through their program of study. By using the University SAMWEB system, and the COE data management system, TK20, monitoring of candidate progress has become an institutionalized routine over the past six years, using automated candidate applications at each step, with improved analysis and reporting each year. Transfer of the candidates' transition-point applications from SAMWEB into TK20 in 2009 will facilitate reporting and provide clarity by displaying their transition point status each time they log onto the system. Transition point criteria and unit level data for initial programs are attached in Prompt 2a.6. Transition point criteria for advanced programs are available on the website.

Annual goal-setting and ongoing program improvement planning is informed by data relating to candidate qualifications and performance, faculty productivity and operations data. Within the unit, program area faculty develop, align and review the rubrics that are used for key assessments. These rubrics, as well as course activities, are aligned to the conceptual framework, and to state and professional standards. Common syllabi denote this alignment and common rubrics are used in multiple sections of each course. In addition, the standards are cross-referenced to assessments and rubrics that are managed using TK20, so that analysis of performance by standard is possible.

For initial certification candidates, four common assessments are used; licensure exams (TExES), a Content Methods Lesson Plan, an observation instrument (Texas Professional Development Appraisal System), and the capstone Teacher Work Sample. Additional program-specific content assessments vary by area and are further described in the Standard I section above and in the Assessment Inventory, also attached. All candidates complete a Dispositions Self-Assessment at various stages within the program. This self-assessment is accompanied by evidence supplied by the candidate, and reviewed by the faculty for feedback.

The wide variety in the graduate programs requires program-specific assessments which are similarly

developed and managed. Both initial and advanced candidates are required to take practice licensure exams, using a representative test, prior to gaining approval to take the Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES) certification exams in content and pedagogy. Feedback on practice exam performance is provided to each candidate at the domain and proficiency level. A chart outlining each element of the assessment system is attached in Prompt 2a.6.

**2a.2. What are the key assessments used by the unit and its programs to monitor and make decisions about candidate performance at transition points such as those listed in Table 6? Please complete Table 6 or upload your own table at Prompt 2a.6 below.**

**Table 6**  
**Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments**

Program	Admission	Entry to clinical practice	Exit from clinical practice	Program completion	After program completion

**2a.3. How is the unit assessment system evaluated? Who is involved and how?**

The COE Productivity and Performance Report is presented and reviewed by the entire COE faculty as each academic year begins. The Sam Houston Innovative Partnership with Schools also reviews and reacts to this data at their fall meeting. After initial implementation of the assessment system in 2003-2004, faculty in the unit developed and/or adopted authentic performance measures and use those data to address annual goal-setting and program planning. A glimpse of this planning is offered in the Online Assessment Tracking System, used to gather evidence of program outcomes across the University. Within the unit, adoption of the TK20 system made possible systematic data collection, analysis and reporting. Each semester, undergraduate faculty now participate in “Data Day” activities at which the NCATE Coordinator, Associate Dean, and Assessment Coordinator distribute reports and facilitate discussion of unit and program-level data, followed by group activities to analyze and strategize for program improvement. That discussion includes evaluation of assessment instruments and their continuing effectiveness. Similar data review and planning sessions are conducted in each department by graduate program faculty, also informed by reports generated by the Assessment Coordinator using TK20.

In addition, the Assessment Committee is responsible for annual review of the assessment system. The Assessment Committee is comprised of the Standard 1 and Standard 2 Work Groups. The Standard 1 Work Group focuses on program specific assessments, the Standard 2 Work Group on unit-level data. In 2008-2009, several assessments were identified for evaluation and immediate improvement during the self-study process, others assigned for 2009-2010 or later. The Key Assessments and Data Management Schedule is posted at Prompt 2a.6. This committee also requested an added series of training sessions related to faculty use of TK20 to ensure consistency in application across faculty members and courses. Through the self-study process, faculty reported that they were satisfied with the current practice of including multiple assessments from internal and external sources. The need to use information gathered from Advisory Panels and from follow-up evaluations was stressed by the leadership teams of various program areas.

Since its inception in 2003, the assessment system has improved each year as we expanded our expertise. The college administration, the Educator Preparation Advisory Council, program faculty, the Educator Preparation Leadership Team and the Assessment Committee have revisited and reviewed transition point criteria and assessments of candidate proficiency. As data-management improved, the

process became more systematic, with web-based applications at each transition point and consistency across courses. Our proficiency in assessment was enhanced by a variety of professional development activities, especially by participation in a multi-institutional research grant focused on development of a Scorecard for Educator Preparation Programs. This three-year project provided experience and external review of selected performance-based assessment results, culminating in presentations at AACTE in 2007. Training of multiple SPA Program Review “writers” also prompted improved understanding of national accreditation standards. While we have made great strides, understanding of assessment varies and we continue to discover how much there is to learn.

**2a.4. How does the unit ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?**

The unit ensures that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias by several means: 1) assuring that program faculty develop and approve rubrics used for key assessments, 2) using common rubrics and common syllabi across all sections of each course in the programs, 3) providing training for scorers of high-stakes assessments, and 4) examining validity and reliability of assessments, to the extent possible. The following provide example:

- Candidate data reviewed at transition points is transcript, degree plan or other official University data.
- Candidate dispositions are self-assessed, at multiple points, using rubrics that were developed and refined by the COE Dispositions Committee to align with COE Institutional Standards, and approved by the faculty. Candidates provide evidence of their development for review and feedback is provided at each stage.
- Benchmark assessments share common rubrics that are standards-based and regularly reviewed by faculty groups, the Assessment Committee and the Educator Preparation Leadership Team.
- Multiple standards bodies are cross-referenced in the common syllabi used across all courses, to ensure consistency in the evaluation system.
- Use of the Teacher Work Sample is guided by the Renaissance Group protocol. Faculty, mentor teachers, and student teacher University Supervisors attend a calibration session and anti-bias training before each scoring session. Scoring of the Teacher Work Samples involves a blind scoring protocol. Each scorer evaluates and assigns a score of three (target), two (acceptable), or one (unacceptable) for each indicator, assigns an holistic score to each of the seven processes, and then an holistic summary score for the entire Teacher Work Sample. If consensus in scores is not achieved, a third and even a fourth scoring are done.
- Candidates are required to submit their Teacher Work Samples using Turnitin.com to assure that their work is original.
- Training is provided for University Supervisors of student teachers in the use of the Professional Development Appraisal System (PDAS), a state-adopted teacher observation instrument, used in districts across Texas as the official teacher evaluation tool. The scoring rubrics are applied to candidate teaching exactly as they are used in Texas schools.
- In follow-up studies of teacher preparedness, correlation studies are performed to examine the strength of the relationship between graduates and supervisor’s responses.

**2a.5. What assessments and evaluation measures are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?**

The Continuous Assessment and Feedback Loop document, which may be viewed on the NCATE website, summarizes the process used in the unit.

The following assessments and evaluation measures provide example of instruments used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit.

Program Evaluation Survey: As teacher candidates complete their student teaching semester, they

complete a unit operations assessment, either the elementary or secondary Program Evaluation. This instrument is under revision for 2009, however, the instrument previously requested that candidates rate the extent to which they were prepared by the program in terms of content area knowledge, the ability to create positive learning environments, the ability to respond appropriately to diverse groups of students, the development of skills to become an advocate for all students, the development of skills to become a reflective practitioner, the development of skills in using a variety of instructional methods, materials, and strategies, and development of skills in fostering positive relationships with parents. In addition, candidates rate their general satisfaction with several areas of service: advising within the program, coursework, their satisfaction with the TExES/Certification Office, the Office of Field Experience and their satisfaction with their overall experience in the College of Education.

Graduate Follow-Up Survey: two versions of a graduate survey, one in 2006 and another in 2009, were used to gather information from graduates of the program to determine the extent to which the program prepared them for their current job. The 2009 instrument was revised to reflect the COE Institutional Standards, on the recommendation of the Assessment Committee.

Principal Follow-Up Survey: this survey instrument, also administered in 2006 and in 2009, provides information about the principal's assessment of an SHSU graduate in the first year of employment as to teacher preparedness, duplicating the questions on the Graduate Follow-Up Survey.

Several program areas also have an advisory council that meets to discuss the program and improvements that could possibly be made. Graduate and Employer Surveys are also used to determine satisfaction with the candidates' preparation for their current position. Both performance and productivity measures are included in the annual Productivity and Performance Report.

**2a.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's assessment system may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

Transition Points EC-6
Transition Points 4-8
Transition Points 8-12 and EC-12
Key Assessments and Data Management Schedule
Assessment Inventory by Program

See **Attachments** panel below.

## 2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

**2b.1. What are the processes and timelines used by the unit to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, unit operations, and program quality?**

- **How are the data collected?**
- **From whom (e.g., applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty) are data collected?**
- **How often are the data summarized and analyzed?**
- **Whose responsibility is it to summarize and analyze the data? (dean, assistant dean, data coordinator, etc.)**
- **In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? (reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)**
- **What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?**



The unit's goal is to maintain an excellent system of data collection that enables the participants to evaluate the candidate, program area, and unit performance. The unit uses a systematic timeline to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, operations, and program quality. This timeline, the Key Assessment Data Management Schedule is attached at Prompt 2.a.6. Most performance data is collected within the TK20 system, which is managed by the Assessment Coordinator located in the Center for Assessment and Accreditation, TEC 274. The Assessment Coordinator works with the Dean, the Educator Preparation Leadership Team and the faculty to design reports that meet the needs of the various stakeholders.

The assessments for undergraduate programs follow:

- The Dispositions Self-Report at the Novice level is completed just after entry to the Educator Preparation; the Dispositions Self-Report at the Emerging level is completed during Literacy Methods and during Content Methods. These are self-assessments that are reported in TK20 in the form of a rubric. Faculty evaluate candidate evidence using the rubrics and provide feedback .
- The Writing Process Lesson Plan is assessed during Literacy Methods. The plan is posted to TK20, and faculty members evaluate the plan with a rubric on TK20.
- The Guided Reading Lesson Plan is assessed during Literacy Methods. The plan is posted to TK20, and faculty members evaluate the plan with a rubric on TK20.
- The Case Study is assessed during Literacy Methods. The Case Study is posted to TK20, and faculty members evaluate the Case Study with a rubric on TK20.
- The My Life Project is completed during one of the earliest theory courses. The project is posted on TK20 and assessed by faculty.
- The Instructional Planning Assessment is completed during Content Methods and is evaluated by faculty using TK20.
- Form D, an external evaluation of competent level performance of SHSU Dispositions Standards, Texas Skills Standards for Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility, and Texas Standards for Technology is completed by the classroom mentor teacher and the University Supervisor, during Student Teaching.
- The TExES Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility Examination is taken upon completion of Content Methods. The data are downloaded from ETS and stored on TK20.
- The EC-6 or 4-8 TExES Content Examinations are taken upon completion of Literacy Methods. For secondary candidates, the content examinations are taken upon approval by the major department. The data are downloaded from ETS and stored on TK20.
- The Teacher Work Sample is the capstone assessment, designed to measure candidate affect on K-12 student learning, completed during the first placement in Student Teaching. This assessment is scored by faculty, Student Teacher Supervisors, and mentor teachers and imported into TK20.
- Form A – Professional Development Appraisal System is a performance-based assessment completed by the mentor teacher and the University Supervisor twice each placement. The form is scored as three formative and one summative assessment and corresponds with the PDAS used in most Texas public schools.
- The Evaluation of the Educator Preparation Program is completed by candidates at the conclusion of the Student Teaching semester.
- The Graduate /Employer Survey is a follow-up survey mailed to initial Education Preparation graduates and employers every three years, last administered in 2006. The unit now is able to administer the survey annually and will begin to do so in the 2009–2010 academic year. The instrument was revised and the new version implemented in 2009.

A sample of assessments for the graduate programs follows, most are administered using TK20 and may

be viewed in the AIMS system or on the website:

The Transition Points Summary provides information regarding decision points in each of the advanced programs.

Special Education Diagnostician Candidates complete the Behavior Change Intervention Project in SPD 637, a comprehensive examination, an Evaluation of Candidate Performance in SPD 538, an Internship Evaluation, a Family Support Plan Project in SPD 635, an Educational Diagnostician Portfolio in SPD 537, an Evaluation of Assessment of Knowledge and Skills in SPD 537, and take the TExES Examination for Educational Diagnosticians.

Educational Leadership candidates in the Principal program complete an Internship Performance Survey in and a comprehensive examination in ASE 662, a Curriculum Alignment Project in ASE 578 and ASE 694, a 360° Alum Employer Survey in ASE 662, an Academic Internship Portfolio in ASE 668 and ASE 662, a School Improvement Project in ASE 662 and take the TExES Examination for Principals.

Educational Leadership candidates in the Superintendent program complete a Coordinating Plan for the Strategic Planning Process in ASE 680, a 3-year ISD Revenue Analysis in ASE 681, an Internship Progress Assessment in ASE 683 and ASE 684, a K-12 Student Performance and Resource Allocations project in ASE 682, an Estimating and Allocating Resources project in ASE 681, an Equity and Equality in Funding project in ASE 681, and take the TExES Examination for Superintendents.

Candidates in the Reading Masters program and the Reading Specialist program complete a Class Discussion Reflection in RDG 598, a Literacy Coaching project in RDG 690, a Reading Masters in Education Portfolio, a Lesson Plan project in RDG 589 and RDG 561, a School Literacy Case Study in RDG 675, a Student Case Study in RDG 532, a Lamplighter Paper in RDG 638, and take the TExES Exam for Reading Specialists.

Candidates in the Technology Facilitator program complete a Comprehensive Technology Planning project, an Analysis of ISD Results and Campus Plan, a Copyright and Fair Use Portfolio, a Pedagogy K, S & D Effect on K-12 Learning Project, a Practicum Project Portfolio, a Collaborating for Instructional Design and Implementation project, take a comprehensive examination and must maintain a GPA of 2.5.

Candidates in the School Librarian program complete a Program Administration project in LS 537, an Interactive Multi-Media project in LS 591, a Book talk project in LS 585, a Lesson Plan project in LS 566, a Collection Mapping project in LS 530, an Electronic Portfolio and take the TExES Examination for School Librarians.

The data are collected from various sources, including candidates, faculty, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, graduates, employers, and statewide testing services. Reports are available to faculty through TK20 or from the Assessment Coordinator upon request.

**2b.2. How does the unit disaggregate candidate assessment data for candidates on the main campus, at off-campus sites, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs?**

While off campus courses are offered at the University Center and at various school district campus sites, those settings are not considered multiple sites by the state. The unit disaggregates candidate assessment data by using designated section numbers for each course. Main campus sections of courses and off-campus site courses receive different section numbers. The data are pulled for the two groups and then compared to make certain consistency exists in the program.

All post-baccalaureate alternate route certification classes and those in the advanced Instructional Technology Leadership program are offered online, therefore differentiation utilizing section numbers is not needed.

### **2b.3. How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?**

The unit maintains records of formal candidate complaints and their resolution in multiple offices, depending on the nature of the grievance. The Director of Educator Preparation Services generally addresses issues related to field experience, student teaching, and the TExES / Certification Office. The Associate Deans address issues relating to those areas, as well as advising or professional concerns. Each office maintains an electronic file of emailed complaints and a folder of general actions related to student concerns.

Ongoing dispositions concerns are referred to the Professional Concerns Committee by the faculty, the administration or a school district employee according to procedures developed in collaboration with the Dean of Students. The Educator Preparation Leadership Team provides an opportunity to appeal decisions relating to admission or transition points, unless they involve violations of the Student Code of Conduct. Appeals regarding grades are addressed according to University policy. The University Grievance Policy can be found at the following link:

[http://www.shsu.edu/~vaf\\_www/FacultyHandbook/grievanceprocedure](http://www.shsu.edu/~vaf_www/FacultyHandbook/grievanceprocedure)

**2b.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's data collection, analysis, and evaluation may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

## **2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement**

**2c.1. In what ways does the unit regularly and systematically use data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences?**

A Continuous Assessment Feedback Loop is used to improve programs, courses, field experiences and operations, as follows:

Step 1: Each fall, at the COE Faculty Meeting, performance and productivity data for the previous year is reviewed. Detailed unit and program data is electronically disseminated to faculty in each department, for use in planning for the next academic year. Data may include unit or faculty production and performance, TExES scores, key assessment data, semester credit hour production, graduate follow-up surveys, graduate retention data, field experience locations and demographics, unit demographics, student teaching evaluations and other qualitative and quantitative data.

Step 2: Using relevant performance or operations data, program coordinators, program faculty, program advisory committees, COE committees, school district partners, the Educator Preparation Advisory Council, and the Administrative Team discuss and analyze data to determine areas of strength and opportunities for improvement in light of the Conceptual Framework, the core values statement, and institutional, state or professional standards.

Step 3: Each semester, data review events provide opportunity for the faculty, the Sam Houston Partnership with Schools advisory group, and the Educator Preparation Advisory Council to develop recommendations for program changes. The COE Assessment Committee and the Dispositions Committee review data and assessments to develop or recommend revisions that may be needed. The Dean's Cabinet or the Educator Preparation Leadership Team designate program faculty, administrative staff or an appropriate committee to carry out these revisions. Depending on the nature of the change,

department, college, University, system or state approval may be necessary.

Step 4: Finally, requests for additional human, financial or facility resources are incorporated into the University strategic planning and budgeting process. Selected department and program goals, objectives, criteria for assessment, findings and actions are recorded in the SHSU Online Assessment Tracking system. Achievement relevant to program and department goals is reviewed by the Dean, in consultation with the Associate Deans and Department Chairpersons, and is included in the performance evaluation process. Individual faculty goals are reviewed by the Department Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee and the Chair.

Step 5: Repeat each year.

The unit, organized in teams, committees and program areas, regularly and systematically uses data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences in regularly scheduled meetings, department meetings or on "Data Day". The Assessment Coordinator provides each program area with tables, graphs and charts to support analysis, often collected on disc or electronically posted. In some areas, faculty have access to dynamic reporting of their assessment data within TK20, thus the professors may generate reports within the system as needed. The program area faculty, in both graduate and undergraduate programs routinely meet within departments or in program area committees to discuss program issues.

In addition, the Déjà vu II Committee, a team of faculty drafted to design new EC-6 and 4-8 programs in 2007, evaluates data and addresses scheduling and management issues relating to the new programs implemented under state mandate in Fall 2008.

A Teacher Work Sample team, originally formed to manage the implementation of the Teacher Work Sample, now addresses curriculum issues that surfaced through analysis of Teacher Work Sample data. That team of faculty also work together to pursue a research agenda centered on the Teacher Work Sample performance of our candidates.

The Assessment Committee systematically reviews unit level assessment instruments and processes, making recommendations to the Administrative Team, the Educator Preparation Leadership Team, and/or an appropriate committee.

The Dispositions Committee oversees the development and administration of dispositions measurement within the unit. Representatives of advanced and initial programs, with one member from outside the college, work together to assure that dispositions measures and data provide information that is valuable to candidates and faculty.

### **2c.2. What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years?**

See chart at Prompt 2c.5.

### **2c.3. What access do faculty members have to candidate assessment data and/or data systems?**

Faculty members receive the Annual Productivity and Performance report and also receive candidate assessment data related to their program, distributed on disc according to the Key Assessment and Data Management Schedule. In addition, some faculty groups have requested and gained TK20 access to independently run dynamic reports of their own assessment data when they choose. The Assessment Coordinator provides additional data analysis and reporting at their request. Additionally, TExES score data is communicated to members of the Educator Preparation Advisory Council after each paper-based test administration is scored and monthly to transmit results of Computer-Assisted Tests to the major departments across the University.

Information posted on the NCATE website will also be available for faculty view when the accreditation team review is complete.

**2c.4. How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders to help them reflect on and improve their performance and programs?**

Assessment data are shared with faculty, the SHIPS partners, the Educator Preparation Advisory Council, and other stakeholders by presenting them in PowerPoint form, through a CD in tables and graphs, in dynamic TK20 reports and during “Data Day”. Both initial and advanced program faculty members meet in program groups within departments, to review data and make suggestions for changes to the program or to their specific program area. As changes are suggested, they are reviewed by all faculty involved in the program area, as well as the Administrative team, the Educator Preparation Leadership Team or relevant committees. Depending on the nature of the change, other approval may also be needed.

Candidates receive feedback on course-based or key assessments through TK20, Blackboard, paper-based or electronic scoring guides, grades, instructor ratings, conferences or other methods. Dispositions self assessments are rated at three points in the initial program, with feedback provided by faculty. Advanced program dispositions assessments differ across programs, with varying feedback methods in place.

Practice TExES exams are required of each candidate, with electronic feedback by Domain, regarding areas of strength or concern, to assure that adequate steps in preparation may be fostered in each candidate. Practice software is available in each department and in the Reading Center to further support their success.

Teacher Work Sample (TWS) scores are posted online, as soon as the scoring process is completed, with specific scores and scorer comments transmitted to candidates soon afterward by mail. Those candidates who do not perform at target or in the high-acceptable range on the TWS are required to revise or re-do their work sample during their second student teaching placement, with coaching from faculty and the University Supervisor.

**2c.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the use of data for program improvement may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

2c.2 Chart

See **Attachments** panel below.

**Optional**

**1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 2?**

A major strength in the College of Education is the utilization of TK20 to manage assessment data. TK20 has a wide range of capabilities. As the faculty and staff grow increasingly more proficient with TK20, the data collected can be used for program improvement and improved preparation of teacher candidates. The College of Education now has an experienced Assessment Committee to oversee the assessment system and its various components. The Assessment Committee is comprised of the Standard 1 and 2 work groups. The Standard 1 work group oversees the program-level assessments

while the Standard 2 work group focuses on the effectiveness of unit-level assessments. The Assessment Committee has become more focused on the reliability and validity of the various assessments as performance data have accumulated. Now that trend data are available, unit assessments will be investigated by graduate student groups using a rotation schedule that begins 2009-2010.

Submission of 19 SPA program reports in this accreditation cycle has prompted thorough examination of program standards and development of standards-based assessments in reviewed programs. While these assessments demonstrate variation in assessment capacity, the process of tracking candidate performance across programs and examining the results in program-specific groups has been invaluable. Due in part to the depth of our assessment system, the College of Education had a leadership role in the recent SACS Reaffirmation.

The College of Education is dedicated to using assessment to fuel program improvement as evidenced by the employment of an Assessment Coordinator, an NCATE Coordinator, an Associate Dean, and faculty who are committed to the assessment system and continuing accreditation. Additionally, all syllabi and rubrics are aligned to the state, national, and professional standards as further evidence of our dedication to meeting the high standards necessary to produce quality educators for P-12 schools.

## **2. What research related to Standard 2 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?**

The Teacher Work Sample Committee has met to discuss possible research studies to be conducted using the data from the Teacher Work Samples and anecdotes from the Teacher Work Samples that are kept on file.

In addition, the Teacher Work Sample Committee has presented at three different national conferences information about our University's Implementation of the Teacher Work Sample from the beginning to the present time. The committee plans to write an article based upon the presentations.

The College has sent several faculty members to the CREATE Conference to gather information and ideas about research that can be conducted using our data.

## **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.**

**[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]**

### **3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners**

**3a.1. Who are the unit's partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?**

Field experiences place SHSU candidates on accredited public school campuses in school districts that are members of the Sam Houston Innovative Partnerships with Schools (SHIPS). Targeted, sequential,

diverse field experiences provide candidates the unique opportunity to observe and work with children at the Elementary, Middle School, and Secondary levels in Texas public schools. The Education Service Center, Region VI, based in Huntsville is also a member of the partnership. Representatives participate in each meeting and provide information and added support. Several alternative programs offered by the service center include SHSU coursework, so collaboration is ongoing.

Under the facilitation of the Director of Education Preparation Services, the SHIPS partnership is currently comprised of 40 school districts. While the role of this partnership has evolved over time, in response to changes in state law, it has continually provided critical guidance and support. The SHIPS members serve as a guiding body and foundational structure, coordinating the field/clinical opportunities for SHSU candidates. They integrate procedures and expectations within their districts and provide rural, urban, and suburban school settings with widely diverse K-12 learners.

Another collaborative component of the unit's field and clinical experiences is the group of University Supervisors, who are, for the most part, retired teachers and administrators from partnership districts. They are advocates for the candidates and liaisons for the unit, supporting candidates, mentor teachers, and administrators in the various site locations. With a wealth of experience, the University Supervisors play a critical role in enhancing our relationship with the SHIPS districts.

The Educator Preparation Advisory Council is comprised of faculty liaisons representing the various teaching field programs housed in the College of Arts and Sciences or the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. This group meets annually to discuss curriculum, field experiences and assessment data. Some members serve student teachers as Focused Content Observers to provide support and feedback specific to the content area. The Focused Content Evaluation is a key assessment in several Secondary certification programs.

In the advanced programs, a variety of partnership arrangements exist beyond the SHIPS partnership. Each graduate program has an advisory council to provide input and expertise. In addition, agreements are often negotiated with school districts to deliver specific graduate programs on-site to a cohort of candidates. In Library Science, for example, the program has been offered for many years in the Rio Grande Valley, approximately 300 miles from the campus. The post-baccalaureate alternative route program and programs for other school personnel are integral to the SHIPS partnerships, however, internship/practicum sites may be outside the immediate service area, especially in online programs.

### **3a.2. In what ways have the unit's partners contributed to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?**

The Educator Preparation Programs immerse candidates in field experiences that help them develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. It is through the planned sequence of diverse field placements that students put into practice the knowledge, skills, and dispositions described in the various institutional (SHSU institutional, SHSU Standards of Professional Conduct, Dispositions), state (Content, PPR, Technology), and national (SPA and NCATE ) standards.

Through the SHIPS partnership, school district liaisons and site administrators work with the unit to design policies and expectations for the field experience/clinical settings and a quality teacher preparation program. This working relationship produces an environment that welcomes candidates into their schools for all levels of field experience. Orientation meetings are scheduled with administrators when new school districts are added as partners, and regularly scheduled semi-annual SHIPS meetings facilitate communication for an effective design for field/clinical experiences. Input of the SHIPS partners guides and informs the structures, assessments and requirements for all field experiences.

Through this collaboration the Literacy Methods block and the Content Methods block classes are held at carefully selected sites that offer opportunity for every initial certification candidate to work with diverse EC-12 students and faculty.

In recent years, the partners have reviewed and practiced scoring Teacher Work Samples, guided our design of new EC-6 and composite middle-level programs, requested ESL competence and helped us to design a single student teaching placement option. With an established relationship through the SHIPS partnership and knowledge of the sequence of field experiences, the site administrators recognize the importance of thoughtful pairing of candidates with classroom mentors. Additionally, site administrators understand the critical need for support and guidance of both the mentor teachers and the candidates during the candidates' instructional process.

The mentor teachers serve as content and pedagogical experts, providing daily assistance and support that are crucial components for an optimum learning environment for teacher candidates. Mentor teachers are the day-to-day models, continually coaching, guiding and inspiring candidates as they learn, practice and improve their skills in the instructional process.

Evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences is accomplished on an on-going basis. Student teachers evaluate university supervisors, classroom mentor teachers, and their programs each semester. Field experience assessment data and reports are included in the discussion with SHIPS partners each semester. In addition, the Director of Educator Preparation Services solicits any concerns or needs of the districts during day-to-day contact with the districts, its administrators, and its mentors.

### **3a.3. What are the roles of the unit and its school partners in determining how and where candidates are placed for field experiences, student teaching, and internships?**

#### **UNDERGRADUATE**

Level I Field Experience (Introductory) -Candidates select from partnership campuses that have agreed to host early field experiences. Each campus has flexibility in scheduling these experiences, to match the candidate's content area.

Level II Field Experience (Pre-methods and SPD courses, Literacy Methods Block and Content Methods Block) -Field experiences for non-blocked courses are completed at many campuses, usually arranged by the instructor. The candidate's goals and activities and role in the classroom are determined jointly by the unit instructor and P-12 faculty. Partnership schools are enthusiastic hosts of field experiences because they are directly involved with the planning, and the cooperating teachers and P-12 students benefit from candidate assistance.

Collaboration deepens in the literacy methods and content methods blocked courses. University classes are often held on the P-12 campus, candidates spend a significant amount of time assisting and teaching in P-12 classrooms. Principals and the university instructor collaboratively determine each candidate's assigned class. Schools selected for these intensive settings serve a diverse student population, so that candidates gain experience with students and mentors of multiple racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds.

Level III Field Experience (Student Teaching)-Qualified candidates submit an application for placement, indicating four prioritized district preferences. Requests initiated by a partnership district for a specific student teacher are indicated in the application, and are typically honored. Provided the candidate's request complements the overall diversity of Level I and Level II field experiences, student teacher applications are sent to the partnership districts. District personnel arrange appropriate placements, based on the candidate's certification program, with mentors who meet SHSU's criteria. The relationship between SHSU and the district personnel facilitates collaborative resolution of challenges that may arise during the student teaching semester, including assigning a student teacher to another



classroom, campus, or district. Students with extenuating circumstances (spouse moving to another region in TX or extreme medical situations) may request an outgoing courtesy placement.

#### POST-BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM

Student Teaching–Procedure follows that found in the undergraduate Level III Student Teaching.

Internship -Candidates complete the internship in schools where they are employed as the teacher of record. While many of these placements occur in the partnership schools, placements at greater distance require approval of the program director.

#### GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Internships/Practicum-Candidates have base experience at the site where they are currently employed. In order to obtain varied experiences, they interact with district personnel in various locations, providing more opportunities to learn about their content in mixed and diverse environments.

### **3a.4. How do the unit and its school partners share expertise and resources to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice?**

In blocked courses and student teaching, sharing of expertise and resources is proportionate to the increased level of collaboration. The extensive unit faculty presence at the schools results in sharing and application of new research-based pedagogical techniques by cooperating teachers and candidates. P-12 administrators and faculty in turn provide the practical “real-life” environment, and spend substantial time working with, observing, and providing feedback to candidates. The P-12 campus often absorbs some or all incidental expense when providing professional development, facilities, adult-size desks, paper, etc.

Student teaching represents the highest level of sharing of expertise and resources by both the unit and school partners. Student teachers bring a wealth of the most recent best practices and high commitment to student success. Classroom mentor teachers are encouraged to attend Teacher Work Sample training and scoring, and SHSU student teachers are available to substitute teach, without compensation, to facilitate mentors attending TWS scoring or other professional development workshops, such as the Mentor Orientation Workshop.

#### Hosting student teachers

Sam Houston State University works in conjunction with its partners to share expertise and resources to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice. This is evidenced by the following:

**Mentor Training Program** –Developed collaboratively with partner school administrators and faculty, SHSU offers a Mentor Orientation Workshop to share mentoring techniques and expectations. The districts support this training by providing sites and allowing upcoming mentor teachers to attend while student teachers remain in class.

**Methods Mentor Orientation** –At the beginning of each semester, the SHSU Methods faculty provide an orientation presentation and materials to the mentor teachers. Mentors learn about the expectations of their assignments, and gain strategies for providing feedback to make the field experiences more meaningful..

**University Supervisor Orientation** –Each semester, the Office of Field Experience conducts a training session for the University Supervisors. This provides an opportunity to learn and improve the processes and procedures for the semester (observations of the assigned candidates in the field, completion of assessments, and technology integration).When needed, multiple follow-up meetings are conducted to support their work.

**3a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to collaboration between unit and school partners may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

Cooperative School Partnership Agreement Letter

See **Attachments** panel below.

### **3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

#### **3b.1. What are the entry and exit requirements for clinical practice?**

Undergraduate Initial Certification:

**ENTRY:** The candidate must be in good standing in the educator preparation program and complete all content and certification coursework before student teaching. This requires a 2.5 overall GPA and a 2.5, with no grade below “C”, in the content area coursework. In addition, the candidate must clear a second criminal history background check. The application for Student Teaching is submitted one full semester in advance completion of all "methods" courses is required. Student teaching courses comprise final semester coursework in certification programs.

**EXIT:** The candidate must successfully complete the requirements for student teaching, which include an acceptable (high 2) or target level (3) score on the Teacher Work Sample. In addition, successful completion of each key assessment is required.

Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification:

**ENTRY:** The candidate must be in good standing in the educator preparation program and complete all content coursework before student teaching or internship. To be in good standing, the candidate must have earned a 2.5 overall GPA, and a 2.5 in the content area in the Bachelor Degree. In addition, the candidate must have successfully cleared a criminal background check. The application for Student Teaching is submitted with approval of the program director, the bachelor’s degree must include 24 hours of appropriate teaching field coursework, 12 at 300-400 level, and no grades below “C” in any coursework required for certification (content and education courses).

**EXIT:** The candidate must have successfully completed the requirements for student teaching or the internship and the program. This includes successful completion of the Teacher Work Sample and other key assessments.

Internships for other school personnel:

Entry requirements for internships/practicum for advanced programs include successful completion of certification coursework in the program and a comprehensive exam. Often, logging of clock hours in the field along with reflective reporting of activities is needed for successful completion. A variety of summative assessments appropriate to the program content are administered. A table outlining transition point criteria for clinical experiences in each advanced program is available on the website.

**3b.2. What field experiences are required for each program or categories of programs (e.g., secondary) at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels, including graduate programs for licensed teachers and other school professionals? What clinical practice is required for each program or categories of programs in initial teacher preparation programs and programs for the preparation of other school professionals? Please complete Table 7 or upload your own table at Prompt 3b.9 below.**

**Table 7**  
**Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program**

Program	Field Experiences	Clinical Practice (Student Teaching or Internship)	Total Number of Hours

**3b.3. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards through field and clinical experiences in initial and advanced preparation programs?**

**Undergraduate Initial Certification:**

In all certification coursework, assignments, key assessments and associated rubrics are aligned to state standards, the conceptual framework. For each candidate, assessment of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, student learning and dispositions are evaluated. A series of transition points provide opportunity to evaluate candidates as they progress toward completion. Throughout the sequence of courses, candidates complete several self-evaluations of dispositions and provide supportive evidence of their development. Their ratings and the evidence are reviewed by instructors and a score is assessed at three points in the sequence. In the Methods Block, faculty and school-based mentors complete Observations Forms during the presentation of instruction by candidates and assess dispositions. During Student Teaching, university supervisors and school-based mentors complete several assessments of candidate proficiency in teaching and dispositions.

**Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification:**

In all certification coursework, assignments, key assessments and associated rubrics are aligned to state standards and the conceptual framework. For each candidate, assessment of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, student learning and dispositions are evaluated. A series of transition points provide opportunity to evaluate candidates as they progress toward completion. Throughout the sequence of certification courses, candidates complete several self-evaluations of dispositions and provide supportive evidence of their development. These ratings and the evidence are reviewed by instructors and a score is assessed at each point. During Student Teaching or Internship, university supervisors and school-based mentors complete several assessments of candidate proficiency in teaching and dispositions.

**Advanced Programs:**

During the coursework in the programs, the syllabi, assignments, key assessments and associated rubrics are aligned to state, national or professional standards and the conceptual framework. A series of transition points provide opportunity to evaluate candidates as they progress toward completion. Throughout the sequence of courses, candidates complete several self-evaluations of dispositions and provide supportive evidence of their development, which is evaluated by faculty as appropriate to the program. Dispositions assessments and data tables may be viewed on the NCATE website, while key assessment instruments, related prompts, scoring guides and data tables may be examined in the AIMS system.

**3b.4. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences and clinical practice?**

Syllabi and assessments for each initial certification program are aligned to the Texas Technology Standards and to the Conceptual Framework indicator (CF2) relating to technology proficiency. Every

candidate's performance is tracked through the capstone Teacher Work Sample, in the Instructional Planning assessment and rated by the University Supervisor and classroom mentor teacher in Form D. Follow-up surveys track this proficiency as well.

Each initial program also requires coursework in instructional technology that provides for application during clinical experiences in EC-12 classrooms. In the secondary content teaching fields, degree requirements may add additional content specific technology preparation. Examples of coursework assignments that facilitate candidate proficiency in using technology as an instructional tool are listed below for the initial certification programs. A table outlining assignments for other school professionals may be viewed as an attachment on the website.

Undergraduate Initial Certification:

Methods Block: Candidates' knowledge and skills to integrate technology into instruction are demonstrated by the following assignments:

Website Reviews - designed to allow the candidate to research website activities that are appropriate to what is being taught in the classroom.

Technology Mini-Lesson - candidates demonstrate to their classmates a meaningful way to integrate technology into instruction in a way that will lead to more effective and more efficient learning by students.

Copyright and Fair Use - Working in groups, teacher candidates create a collaborative assignment addressing Copyright and Fair Use.

Analysis of Student Learning - The teacher candidate uses various forms of data such as pre-assessments, formative assessments, post-assessments, and graphic representations in an analysis of student performance related to learning objectives.

Student Teaching: Candidates' knowledge and skills to integrate technology into instruction is evaluated during Student Teaching through two observation-based evaluations, the PDAS or Form A, and external evaluation of the Texas Technology Standards in the student teaching classroom. In addition, candidates evaluate their experience with and preparedness to use technology on the Evaluation of the Program.

Post-Baccalaureate Initial Certification:

The majority of the Post-Baccalaureate courses are online. With the use of this tool, the candidates are not only the learners with this technology, but they are also the teachers via online teaching assignments. In addition, these candidates, complete assignments that require presentation of evidence of technology integrated into every aspect of instruction.

**3b.5. What criteria are used in the selection of school-based clinical faculty? How are the criteria implemented? What evidence suggests that school-based clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals?**

In the undergraduate program, the following requirements, approved by the SHIPS partnership, are communicated to the site administrators and district liaisons:

**CLASSROOM MENTOR TEACHER REQUIREMENTS**

Classroom Mentor Teachers must:

- Be certified in student teacher's grade level and certification area
- Have a minimum of three years teaching experience-preferably in the student teacher's specialization area
- Be willing to guide, coach, support, work with, and teach student teachers

Additionally, the Sam Houston Innovative Partnerships with Schools prefers that the Classroom Mentor

Teacher has three years teaching experience in the placement classroom.

Implementation of the criteria is monitored by administrators at the individual sites and verified by University Supervisors to ensure that these school-based clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals. If it is determined that a proposed mentor does not meet the qualifications, the unit will request the school district secure a different mentor who meets the qualifications. In addition, evaluation data for every classroom mentor teacher is collected each semester and communicated to the district SHIPS liaison so that feedback from University Supervisors and student teachers may be used to make future placement decisions.

In the post-baccalaureate initial certification program, the University Supervisor meets with the principal to assure that a school-based mentor teacher is assigned in accordance with the requirements of the state and SHSU.

In advanced programs for other school personnel, assignment of mentors is often made at the district or school in which the graduate candidate is employed, usually by the principal of the school. Internship and practicum activities are designed to encourage interaction with a variety of district personnel, in different settings, to maximize experiences with multiple qualified professionals in roles appropriate to the area of certification.

### **3b.6. What preparation do school-based faculty members receive for their roles as clinical supervisors?**

A Collaborative School Partnership (CSP) agreement was developed in preparation for candidate placements for Literacy Methods at one site. Data collected will provide new knowledge regarding professional practice, organizational change and school-University collaboration. This arrangement provides a prototype for use at other campuses using less formal agreements.

Methods Block–Mentor Orientation Sessions are held on the campus of the school-based partners at the beginning of each semester. An agenda for one such meeting is attached.

Student Teaching–Developed collaboratively with partner school administrators and faculty in 2008, SHSU offers a Mentor Orientation Workshop to share mentoring concepts, strategies and expectations with mentor teachers in Conroe ISD. This model for mentor training will be implemented across multiple districts in coming years as funding permits.

The Guidelines for Student Teaching provide suggestions and information pertinent to mentor responsibilities. Student teachers and university supervisors are directed to share the “Expectations of the Mentor Teacher” section with the mentor. University Supervisors schedule a visit with each mentor teacher to provide guidance at the beginning of each placement. Following training done in Literacy Block and Methods Block, mentors already have had an opportunity to practice the knowledge and skills required in the SHSU clinical program. In addition, they may attend Teacher Work Sample training, a professional development offering CPE credit for mentor teacher participants in the Teacher Work Sample Scoring day.

Advanced programs:

To assist school-based faculty who mentor candidates in the Master of Instructional Technology, SHSU offers a Technology Conference, beginning in Fall 2009. In Educational Leadership, internships require interaction with a variety of mentoring professionals. University Supervisors typically confer with supervising administrators to assure a quality clinical experience.

### **3b.7. What evidence demonstrates that clinical faculty members provide regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing graduate programs, and other school**

**professionals?**

Student Teachers: University Supervisors provide orientation for school-based classroom mentor teachers, beginning with a review of Student Teaching guidelines. The University Supervisor observes the student teacher and consults with the classroom mentor at least four times during the student teaching experience. Evaluations of the classroom mentor teachers are completed by candidates and University Supervisors. These data are shared with school-district partners each semester. Examples and data are attached.

University Supervisors indicate mentor teachers' strengths at demonstrating realistic and fair expectations of the student teacher and assuming a collaborative role in assisting the student teacher in developing professional skills. The University Supervisors were less satisfied with classroom mentor teachers' communications and skills at analyzing candidate performance.

Student teachers' evaluations of the mentors indicate that the mentor teachers encourage student teachers to ask questions, take time to plan lessons with the candidates, observe the candidates teach, and provide feedback regarding their performance. Candidates indicate that roughly 25 % of the mentors did not appear to have had mentor training or previous experience supervising a student teacher. Candidates also reported that the same percentage of teachers did not make arrangements for the candidates to observe in other classrooms.

Other School Professionals: University supervisors for advanced clinical experiences also observe the candidate during clinical practice and provide guidance for school-based mentors. Principal candidates and other school professionals in graduate programs that include clinical practice are required to fulfill various requirements outside their own school. While assignments include observation in classrooms outside their own, clinical practice coursework is not required for licensed teachers pursuing a master's degree in Curriculum and Instruction.

**3b.8. What structured activities involving the analysis of data and current research are required in programs for other school professionals?****IST – Assessment Assignment:**

The candidate performs research to determine what analysis at the district or site level, if any, is done with the results of student assessments such as benchmarking or TAKS. Summarize what is included in the district's or site level's procedures for analyzing results of student assessments (particularly as it relates to technology), discuss how this plan affects you and your responsibilities as a technology facilitator at the site location, and delineate a plan to implement the district's procedures for analyzing results of student assessments at the site location.

**Educational Leadership:**

The Curriculum Alignment Project (in ASE 578) and the School Improvement Project (in ASE 579) are program projects/assessments that require analyses of data. The School Improvement Project requires a review of existing research literature. The School Improvement Project is included in the portfolio and scored in TK20.

**Counseling:**

Candidates listen to taped counseling sessions and "analyze" the content of the student's problem or issue and then discuss the best strategy for dealing with that particular student. Also, counselor interns are required to read articles for various issues that students being counseled are dealing with; for example, suicidal ideation, cutting themselves, eating disorders, family violence and problem relationships, etc.

**Reading:**

In every course, the candidates are required to use current research found in professional journals to

support course content and/or their own research projects. The expectation is that current research is cited within discussion board entries and formal papers.

**3b.9. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

SHSU IR Table 7

See **Attachments** panel below.

### **3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn**

**3c.1. On average, how many candidates are eligible for clinical practice each semester or year? What percent, on average, complete clinical practice successfully?**

See attached table for detailed information at 3c.7.

**3c.2. What are the roles of candidates, university supervisors, and school-based faculty in assessing candidate performance and reviewing the results during clinical practice?**

Student Teaching-

Candidates engage in multiple reflective activities during the student teaching semester, both in the student teaching seminars and accompanying coursework. The Teacher Work Sample also includes reflection and self-evaluation regarding professional development needs that emerge from the unit taught and analyzed. Candidates receive feedback from the University Supervisors related to scheduled observations and from mentor teachers on their day-to-day teaching proficiencies.

Form A-PDAS is completed at least twice in each placement by the University Supervisor, with conferencing with candidates after each observation. The final summative scoring provides critical data regarding candidate proficiencies.

Form B-Student Teacher Reflection/Mentor Teacher Formative Observation- completed by both the Student Teacher and the Mentor Teacher and discussed with the student teacher –paper/pencil

Form C-Final Student Teacher Evaluation by the Classroom Mentor Teacher- completed by the Mentor Teacher-paper/pencil

Form D-evaluating SHSU Dispositions, Texas Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility Standards, and Texas Technology Standards- completed by both the Mentor Teacher and the University Supervisor in TK20.

Teacher Work Sample-completed by the candidate during student teaching, scored using a blind scoring protocol, scores and feedback are returned to the candidate. Candidates scoring below acceptable levels are coached by faculty and required to revise or repeat the TWS assessment during the second placement.

Post-Bacc Internships-

Form A-PDAS is completed twice by the University Supervisor, with feedback after each observation, Teacher Work Sample-completed by the candidate during second semester, scored by faculty, university supervisors and some mentor teachers using a blind scoring protocol, scores and feedback are returned

to the candidate,

School –based mentor teachers are required to observe each intern and provide feedback and guidance during the first year of the probationary contract. This is supervised by the school administration. The University Supervisor consults with the school based mentor during four observation visits.

#### Advanced Programs:

A variety of reflection activities are required of candidates preparing for certification as other school professionals. Discussion board topics require reflection regarding performance as related to common assignments in each program. In each advanced program, evaluation of candidate performance during internship or practicum involves collaboration between the University Supervisor and the school –based mentoring professional. A requirement for conferencing with candidates regarding performance and strategizing for improvement is consistent across programs. While the number and sequence of assessments of clinical practice differ according to program requirements, the assessments are aligned to state and national standards and administered by both university and school-based faculty. Varying observation instruments are used and available for review in the program reviews in AIMS. As in the initial programs, a sequence of dispositions self-assessments are reviewed and feedback provided by faculty.

### **3c.3. How is time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty incorporated into field experiences and clinical practice?**

Level 1-Candidate assignments and reflections are evaluated by instructors for each field experience. The Field Experience Profile allows candidates to verify all Level 1 and Level 2 field experience sites and to submit an assignment or reflection related to the experience.

Level 2 field experiences provide "hands-on" opportunities for teacher candidates to connect and apply their university coursework to public school classroom environments. Level 2 field experiences emphasize lesson planning, and the application of acquired pedagogical knowledge and skills in classrooms. Classroom discussions with peers and mentor feedback provide opportunities for candidates to reflect on their clinical experiences. Practice with a mini-Teacher Work Sample provides faculty feedback.

Level 3 is the final step of the teacher preparation program for SHSU pre-service teachers. During student teaching, teacher candidates experience two 7-week placements in a SHIPS school district. Some EC-6 student teachers may have one 14-week placement. Candidates gradually increase their teaching during each placement to full responsibility, literally making a transition from student to teacher. Classroom mentor teachers and university supervisors share the responsibility of assessing and evaluating the candidate’s instructional and classroom management skills. Reflection and Self-Evaluation is evaluated in the Teacher Work Sample.

#### Advanced Programs:

Clinical practice involves school based mentoring with a practicing professional and multiple opportunities for reflection and feedback on performance. Seminars throughout the term promote peer sharing and observations by a University Supervisor includes feedback and discussion about candidate progress. All programs use Blackboard Discussion Boards where students are required to interact with peers and reflect on their learning in internships. Students are also required to submit reflections about their progress and areas for future growth.

### **3c.4. What data from multiple assessments provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field experiences**



## and clinical practice?

### Initial Certification:

Candidates demonstrate their knowledge, skills and dispositions for helping all students learn on multiple key assessments relating to field experiences and clinical practice, classified by level of interaction with EC-12 students, as follows:

Level 1: Field experience profiles, Disposition Self-assessment at the Novice Level, course activities with field experience in ECE, EED and SPD coursework.

Level 2: Benchmark assessments in Literacy Methods-the Guided Reading Lesson Plan, the Case Study, the Guided Writing Lesson Plan and Disposition Self Assessment at the Emerging Level; Benchmark assessments in Content Methods include the Lesson Plan, mini-Teacher Work Sample, Dispositions Self-Assessment at the Emerging Level.

### Level 3: Student Teaching

Form A, Form B, Form C, Form D, Teacher Work Sample (examples and data attached)

### Advanced Programs:

Instructional Technology Leadership: Within the practicum courses, candidates are evaluated using detailed rubrics aligned to program standards. In addition, mentors provide feedback on candidates' dispositions during the Practicum experience.

Educational Leadership: the collection of assessments in the Principal Portfolio, located in TK20, evaluate knowledge and skills in the field and dispositions related to student learning as shown in the program review section of AIMS. In addition to the program assessments, candidates are evaluated by faculty using Disposition Self-assessments and a Curriculum Alignment Project.

Counseling: During the practicum, a mid-semester evaluation is reviewed with the student and a plan developed to increase skills. A final evaluation is also completed to highlight areas that improved.

Reading: Candidates must show EC-12 student work as evidence of improved teaching. Within the clinical courses, candidates are evaluated by detailed rubric, as evidenced in the AIMS system.

Library Science: Supervising Librarians complete Assessment of Intern Performance, Assessment of Dispositions, and Collaborative Lesson Evaluation. Candidates complete a Self-Assessment of Dispositions.

### **3c.5. What process is used to ensure that candidates collect and analyze data on student learning, reflect on those data, and improve student learning during clinical practice?**

In the initial certification programs, the Teacher Work Sample, modeled on the Renaissance Partnership's five-year federally funded project to improve teacher quality, has been incorporated into the Sam Houston State University's Initial Teacher Certification Program as a capstone assessment. Teacher Work Sample methodology requires that candidates implement seven processes of good instruction into their clinical experience in teaching a unit and reporting on their work. This provides opportunity for the candidates to analyze EC-12 student learning resulting from their instruction and to reflect on the outcomes, followed by a self-assessment to determine areas requiring improvement.

Advanced programs also assess the impact of other school professionals on EC-12 student learning.

These assessments and candidate performance data may be reviewed in the program review section of AIMS or on the SHSU NCATE website, for ELCC building and district programs, school librarians, educational diagnosticians, reading specialists and school librarians.

**3c.6. How does the unit ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice that includes students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups?**

Experience in diverse settings is stressed to candidates upon their application to the program, and the unit ensures candidates have experiences that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups. This is accomplished by arranging the bulk of field experiences at school campuses that are racially/ethnically/linguistically diverse and have a significant number of economically disadvantaged students. The level of diversity is particularly high and consistent at the school campuses where the blocked literacy and content methods courses are held, and it is in these blocked courses that every initial candidate logs a significant amount of field experience.

The Field Experience Profile permits candidates to verify the location of their field experience. The Field Experience Profile program accesses detailed demographic information for every campus provided by Texas Education Agency's state EC-12 database. This connection facilitates the tracking and assessment of the level of diversity candidates have in their field experiences.

Field experience supervisors meet regularly with candidates both on and off-site to provide guidance in adapting lessons and strategies to accommodate the needs of diverse learners. Students are asked to reflect on their performance and demonstrate their ability to differentiate instruction. Knowledge and skills are assessed through regular on-site observations by university supervisors and campus mentors. Candidates are also required to develop or design: adaptive physical education plans, units adapted to English language learners and students with exceptionalities, multicultural counseling strategies, multicultural literature units, cultural proficiency improvement plans, comprehensive guidance plans, demographic studies of school communities, and Teacher Work Samples. Within each program, dispositions are assessed using a disposition scale that is completed by the candidates themselves, as well as supervising professors in each course taken. SHSU Diversity Proficiencies, developed by the 08-09 Standard 4 Committee are currently being integrated into course competencies in each program.

In the Post-baccalaureate program and in programs for other school professionals, field experiences most often occur at the campus where the candidate is employed. Requirements for clinical experiences outside that campus are common to all programs, but district and campus demographics vary across the partnership schools. The greater Houston area and rural areas in the area provide experience with diverse students, students with exceptionalities and various language groups as shown in the attachment documenting school district demographics for all field experience sites as Table 10 at 4d.2.

**3c.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

Table 3c.1

See **Attachments** panel below.

## Optional

### 1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 3?

A significant amount of carefully sequenced field experience hours provide opportunities in diverse settings for candidates to observe and assist in public school classrooms, apply their knowledge, and gradually develop their instructional skills.

Form A-PDAS and the Teacher Work Sample are assessments completed during student teaching that are closely aligned to expectations candidates will encounter as teachers of record. Form A-PDAS duplicates the Professional Development and Appraisal System, the instrument by which the majority of teachers in Texas are assessed. The Teacher Work Sample is a capstone assessment designed to provide evidence and information related to the candidate's effect on student learning.

### 2. What research related to Standard 3 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

The unit systematically collects, reports and analyzes candidate performance during field experiences using the Teacher Work Sample, PDAS, Field Experience Profiles, evaluations of candidates by mentor teachers and University Supervisors and evaluations of school-based faculty. Participation in the CREATE Performance Assessment for Schools of Education studies provides the unit with current information about K-12 student achievement in the schools at which candidates are placed. Faculty research also includes examination of retention in the field of the Post-baccalaureate Alternative Route candidates, led by Dr. Sam Sullivan, the senior tenured member of the College of Education faculty.

## 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.**

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

### 4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

#### 4a.1. What proficiencies related to diversity are candidates expected to develop and demonstrate?

The College of Education's commitment to diversity is reflected in its conceptual framework and applied through cognizant teaching, curriculum design, field supervision, assessment, and faculty research and professional development efforts. While diversity proficiencies have always been embedded in the unit's disposition measures, specific diversity proficiencies were identified in the Fall of 2008 as part of the unit self-study process. Integration of these proficiencies into each program is in progress.

Prior to 2009-2010, the dispositions items relating to diversity were:

**NOVICE LEVEL**

Awareness that learning styles are unique to individuals and that all children can learn something

Recognizing linguistic, cultural and individual differences

**EMERGING COMPETENCY LEVEL**

Planning for active engagement of all students and for the independent thinking of all students

Accepts responsibility to help all students succeed

Values diversity

Develops the role of students in promoting each other's learning

**COMPETENT LEVEL**

Creates responsive/supportive learning environments that nourish/promote individual student development

Respects cultural and linguistic differences

Celebrates individual differences

Demonstrates equity in daily interactions

Uses multiple forms of on-going assessment to guide instruction

Considers family, community, and cultural information regarding beliefs, values, traditions of self and others

Develops intrinsic motivation of the student for lifelong learning

The Diversity Proficiencies were developed by a committee of faculty members and were grounded in academic literature and framed by several diversity-related theories and models. As part of continuous improvement efforts, each unit program will integrate the newly developed diversity proficiencies into their program curricula and assessment procedures.

- a) Candidates demonstrate an understanding of how gender, socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographic area influence the teaching and learning of children/youth, and communication with other educators, families and communities.
- b) Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the second language acquisition process and skills that support the learning of learners whose first language is not English.
- c) Candidates will demonstrate an ability to adapt teaching approaches and create instructional strategies for learners with exceptionalities and learners from diverse cultural backgrounds.
- d) Candidates design and implement instruction that effectively includes a variety of methods, multicultural resources, and technology to positively impact the learning of all students and prepare them to interact in a diverse and global world.
- e) Candidates utilize a variety of assessments to evaluate student learning and use these data to accommodate all students and continually improve instruction.
- f) Candidates build collaborative and respectful relationships with diverse colleagues, supervisors, students, parents, and other community members.

**4a.2. What required coursework and experiences enable teacher candidates and candidates for other school professional roles to develop:**

- awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning; and
- the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to adapt instruction and/or services for diverse populations, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and

## students with exceptionalities?

Teacher Education: Diversity proficiencies, awareness, and dispositions have been integrated into all aspects of the teacher education program. Additionally, all teacher candidates now graduate from the program with a state of Texas ESL Certification. Second language teaching strategies are integrated into all coursework. Also, as part of a required sequence, teacher candidates must take SED 374 (focusing on special needs in human development), SPD 231 (introduces special education strategies), EED 232-Becoming a Teacher (candidate dispositions are examined). In the sequence of courses, student teaching is preceded by two semesters of intensive field experiences in diverse schools: the Literacy Methods Block and Content Methods Block. Within each of these semesters, students develop units that focus specifically on working with culturally and linguistically diverse students. Units address issues and strategies in bilingual education, English as a Second Language, culture, socioeconomic class, exceptionalities, and parent involvement and community. Throughout the program, candidates must demonstrate the ability to adapt units to the special needs of students. A group of candidates have recently been involved a U.S. Department of Education cultural exchange grant with K-12 teachers in Mali, Africa.

Advanced Candidates and Other School Professionals: As required by CACREP standards, professional school counseling candidates demonstrate multicultural competencies in order to graduate and pass licensing requirements. These diversity competencies or proficiencies are assessed in numerous ways including the ability to demonstrate effective counseling abilities with multicultural individuals and groups. Masters students in counselor education are required to take CNE 592-Cross Cultural Issues in Counseling. The course includes experiential learning components in which students are required to immerse themselves in an unfamiliar cultural or racial group and reflect upon and discuss these experiences in class assignments. Candidates' dispositions toward working with diverse groups are assessed using the Counselor Potential Scale (IPS) and the Holcomb-McCoy Individual Cultural Competence Inventory. School counseling candidates then use feedback from these self-assessments to reflect upon their own biases and perspectives in working with diverse student groups, parents, teachers, and others to explore potential needs for further growth and development as school counseling professionals. If assessment on the IPS is low, a counseling student cannot move on to candidacy. In the CNE-533-School Counseling course, candidates also conduct Culture Audits using the School-wide Cultural Competence Observation Checklist (SCCOC) (Bustamante & Nelson, 2007) to collect data on how responsive their schools are to diverse groups in the school and school community. Comprehensive school guidance programs are then developed based on strengths and needs identified through the school culture data collection process.

Advanced Candidates in Educational Leadership, Instructional Leadership, and Principal Preparation complete electronic professional portfolios which must demonstrate diversity proficiencies. Advanced candidates must also pass the State of Texas licensure exams which assess embedded competencies addressing the needs of special populations. Core requirements for all Masters, Doctoral, and Credential programs include courses that specifically focus on addressing the academic and social needs and experiences of diverse groups. Specifically, required core courses include: ASE 685-Cultural Proficiency for School Leaders; ASE 586-Special Populations and Special Programs; EDL 773-Societal Factors in Education; EDL 734-Issues in Contemporary Education. In all core courses, graduate faculty are expected to integrate relevant theories, research, pedagogy, and strategies related to working with and leading schools with diverse populations, as well as preparing K-12 students to function in a global society. Every year, candidates are offered summer internships in Mexico.

### Comparison with Off-Campus Programs

Currently there are no significant differences in the integration of diversity proficiencies in off-campus

and distance education courses or programs. Every attempt is made to keep programs parallel in terms of diversity-related knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Distance education students must reflect on multicultural case studies, readings, and content, as well as demonstrate development in diversity proficiency competence through a variety of course-related activities and field experiences.

#### **4a.3. What key assessments provide evidence about candidates' proficiencies related to diversity? How are candidates performing on these assessments?**

Key assessments that provide evidence about candidates' proficiencies related to diversity vary by department and program. Each program is in the process of developing specific means for assessing the unit's newly identified diversity proficiencies as part of the continuous improvement process. Currently, in the teacher education programs, the Teacher Work Sample is a holistic assessment in which candidate growth related to the development of diversity proficiencies can be identified. Additionally, diversity proficiencies are assessed by performance in PDAS observations, lesson plans prepared in each methods course, and teacher and candidate self-report disposition scales in which candidates are determined to be at novice or emerging level. Student Teachers are evaluated by their mentor teacher and University Supervisors for the competent level of dispositions for teaching. Teacher candidates in Health and Kinesiology develop an adaptive PE plan, for special needs students, which serves as a key candidate assessment.

For the advanced programs in Educational Leadership, Instructional Leadership, and Principal/Superintendent Certification, candidates are required to prepare electronic portfolios of their work. Some of the requirements of the portfolio include: (a) culture audits and school improvement action plans; (b) demographic studies of candidates' schools and local school communities; (c) curriculum plans designed to improve the academic performance and advanced program accessibility of traditionally marginalized groups; and (d) action research designed to address real problems in diverse local districts. Additionally, advanced candidates must take the TExES licensure exams and written comprehensive exams on all content presented throughout each program. Professional school counselors are assessed through state licensure exams, clinical observations, and comprehensive exams. Candidates in Library Science also complete numerous activities and assessments to demonstrate diversity-related proficiencies. Library Science activities involve the development of multicultural reading lists and websites, integration of multicultural literature into curriculum, internships in diverse schools (particularly on the Mexico-Texas border), class reflections and discussions about race and ethnicity, exceptionalities, different family structures, and the needs of English language learners.

Candidate performance data associated with the assessments cited above may be viewed on the website or in the AIMS system.

#### **4a.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to diversity proficiencies and assessments may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]**

Diversity Proficiencies

See **Attachments** panel below.

## **4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty**

### **4b.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in**

**distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with higher education and/or school-based faculty from diverse groups?**

Sam Houston State University recognizes the need to increase faculty diversity and has formed a Faculty Diversity Committee with the aim of identifying creative ways to attract and retain more diverse faculty members. College of Education unit members serve on this committee. Candidates in both on-campus, off-campus programs, and on-campus programs have increasing opportunities to interact with diverse higher education faculty members as the unit makes a concerted effort to recruit a diverse pool of full-time and adjunct instructors. While Caucasian-American Faculty members represent the majority of both higher education and school-based faculty, the unit is committed to recruiting and retaining diverse faculty members and field mentors. This has been best accomplished by hiring recently graduated doctoral students from the SHSU Ed. D. program to become faculty lecturers, as well as expanding the nature of our partnerships with large diverse school districts (i.e., Aldine ISD, Conroe ISD, Coldspring CISD) that have a large pool of potential mentors who represent diverse races, ethnicities, socioeconomic class, religion, languages, exceptionalities, and other characteristics. As our distance education programs increase, candidates have even greater opportunities to interact with a wide array of faculty members.

**4b.2. What knowledge and experiences do faculty have related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups?**

All full-time faculty members have been school practitioners in diverse school districts before coming to the academy and the unit racial/ethnic makeup of the unit’s full-time faculty is becoming increasingly diverse as efforts are made to recruit diverse faculty. The unit also contracts numerous adjunct professors who are practicing school professionals and represent diverse groups themselves. The majority of unit faculty members bring a wealth of knowledge and expertise in teaching and counseling students from diverse groups. Specifically, many faculty members have specialized training in working with students with special needs, bilingual children, and teaching English language learners. Throughout the unit, faculty have degrees and certificates in these specialized areas. Some graduate program faculty are leading national scholars in the areas of ESL/Bilingual Education, School-wide Cultural Proficiency, Cultural Competence, reading disabilities, African-American male achievement, and International Education as evidenced by publications and professional service in these knowledge areas. As a continuous improvement goal, faculty professional development opportunities will be provided to guide faculty in teaching about topics that they have reported to be “particularly sensitive” and “difficult to address” in the classroom, namely race, religion, immigration, and sexual orientation.

**4b.3. How diverse are the faculty members who work with education candidates? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 8 can also be presented and/or discussed, if data are available, in response to other prompts for this element.] Please complete Table 8 or upload your own table at Prompt 4b.5 below.**

**Table 8  
Faculty Demographics**

	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Advanced Programs n (%)	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach in Both Initial Teacher Preparation & Advanced Programs n (%)	All Faculty in the Institution n (%)	School-based faculty n (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (1%)	2 (0.5%)
Asian	4 (3.5%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	30 (3.6%)	2 (0.5%)

Black or African American, non-Hispanic	4 (3.5%)	7 (8.8%)	0 (0%)	28 (3.4%)	15 (3.8%)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A	N/A
Hispanic or Latino	1 (0.9%)	7 (8.8%)	0 (0%)	37 (4.4%)	26 (6.5%)
White, non-Hispanic	106 (92.2%)	65 (81.2%)	6 (100%)	689 (83%)	355 (88.8%)
Two or more races	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A	N/A
Other	0 (0.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	34 (4.1%)	0 (0%)
Race/ethnicity Unknown	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (1.1%)	0 (0%)
<b>Total</b>	115 (100%)	80 (100%)	6 (100%)	832 (100%)	400 (100%)
Female	81 (70.4%)	47 (58.8%)	3 (50.0%)	389 (46.7%)	361 (90.3%)
Male	34 (29.6%)	33 (41.3%)	3 (50.0%)	443 (53.2%)	39 (9.8%)
<b>Total</b>	115 (100%)	80 (100%)	6 (100%)	832 (100%)	400 (100%)

#### 4b.4. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain a diverse faculty?

**RECRUITMENT:** The University and the unit are committed to recruiting faculty members who represent diverse groups and bring an array of perspectives, knowledge, skills, and experiences. In recent years, the COE has consciously increased its representation of faculty from various racial and ethnic groups. Many adjunct professors or lecturers are practicing school personnel and former graduate students who are recruited from our diverse candidate pool upon completion of their doctoral degrees. Search committees contact historically Black colleges and universities and Hispanic serving institutions to make graduates aware of openings. Positions are also posted on academic job search sites (e.g., Chronicle for Higher Education), as well as the career websites of associations such as AERA, NCPEA, UCEA, IRA, ACTE, TESOL, and NABE. Search committees contact other special interest groups comprised of diverse faculty members or groups that focus on bilingual learners, Latino education, African American education, Asian education, Native American education, special education, GLBTQ issues, etc. Faculty members consistently convey a value for diversity as they interact with potential faculty members and are encouraged to actively recruit potential faculty while attending conferences.

**RETENTION:** Formal mentoring programs are in place to orient and support all new faculty. Collaborative research and scholarship is encouraged so that diverse faculty members can successfully begin and/or continue to pursue active research agendas in support of tenure and promotion and avoid feelings of marginalization. The unit offers salaries that are comparable to the market, provides faculty enrichment grants, allows for flexible scheduling and office hours, offers professional development in the areas of teaching, research, and service, and provides an extensive budget to support travel to conferences.

A table detailing retention, promotion and tenure of diverse faculty is on the website.

**4b.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty diversity may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

Faculty Research in Diversity

See **Attachments** panel below.

## 4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

**4c.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with candidates from diverse groups?**



On campus, undergraduate teacher education candidates have many opportunities to interact with diverse groups of undergraduates through encouraged participation in campus groups and community activities. SHSU is a diverse institution that primarily serves first-generation college students. The departments of Health and Kinesiology and Library Science have candidate populations that are generally more diverse in terms of gender, race, and ethnicity than candidates in Curriculum and Instruction. To maximize interactions, teacher candidates in these areas are frequently partnered with the more racially and ethnically homogeneous classes in completing required projects.

Unit graduate programs for other school professionals (i.e., principals, professional school counselors, reading specialists, etc.) tend to be relatively diverse. Candidates typically are practicing school professionals who represent a wide range of diverse urban, suburban, and rural school districts throughout the Greater Houston and surrounding rural areas.

Overall, in the classroom setting, faculty are encouraged to apply different grouping strategies to ensure that candidates interact and partner with diverse candidates in completing class projects, units, and assignments. Distance learning classes tend to be comprised of a more diverse array of candidates as on-line enrollment tends to draw on potential candidates from a larger geographic area.

**4c.2. How diverse are the candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 9 can also be presented and discussed, if data are available, in other prompts of this element.] Please complete Table 9 or upload your own table at Prompt 4c.4 below.**

**Table 9  
Candidate Demographics**

	Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)	Candidates in Advanced Preparation Programs n (%)	All Students in the Institution n (%)	Diversity of Geographical Area Served by Institution (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native	10 (0.7%)	2 (0.4%)	95 (0.6%)	2,743 (0.2%)
Asian	15 (1.1%)	8 (1.4%)	222 (1.4%)	64,542 (5.4%)
Black or African American, non-Hispanic	118 (8.8%)	32 (5.8%)	2,129 (13.6%)	241,673 (20.4%)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Not Reported	Not Reported	Not Reported	Not Reported
Hispanic or Latino	138 (10.3%)	121 (21.8%)	1,967 (12.6%)	495,618 (41.7%)
White, non-Hispanic	1,050 (78.7%)	386 (69.4%)	11,017 (70.4%)	382,647 (32.2%)
Two or more races	Not Reported	Not Reported	Not Reported	Not Reported
Other	3 (0.2%)	7 (1.3%)	209 (1.3%)	Not Reported
Race/ethnicity unknown	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Total</b>	1,334 (100%)	556 (100%)	15,639 (100%)	1,187,223 (100%)
Female	1,106 (82.9%)	502 (90.3%)	9,209 (58.8%)	Not Reported
Male	228 (17.1%)	54 (9.7%)	6,430 (41.2%)	Not Reported
<b>Total</b>	1,334 (100%)	556 (100%)	15,639 (100%)	1,187,223 (100%)

**4c.3. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups?**

A permanent graduate recruitment committee is comprised of faculty members from various departments and programs. Their primary goal is to increase the diversity of graduate candidates in all unit programs. Potential advanced degree students for all programs are frequently recruited through urban, suburban, and rural districts in the Education Service Centers, in Regions IV and VI. Enhanced partnerships are made with area school districts that include courses held within district facilities, on-line and hybrid course options, and partnerships that include grant-sponsored accelerated leadership and



Name of school	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American, non-Hispanic	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Hispanic or Latino	White, non-Hispanic	Two or more races	Other	Race / ethnicity unknown	receiving free / reduced price lunch	English language learners	Students with disabilities

**4d.3. How does the unit ensure that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups?**

Candidates are observed throughout their methods courses and student teaching experiences using a formal validated classroom observation instrument the Professional Development Appraisal System (PDAS). PDAS contains indicators specifically targeting skills in working with and adapting to the instruction needs of diverse groups of students. In these courses, teacher candidates participate in reflection activities with peers and supervisors based on feedback received from PDAS observations. During Level II and II field experiences courses, formative feedback is given from both university supervisors and campus-based mentors with a particular focus on adapting instruction to meet the academic and socio-emotional needs of diverse learners. Additionally, in preparing the Teacher Work Sample portfolio assessment, candidates are provided with feedback and consistently asked to reflect on how well they are modifying instruction, utilizing a variety of teaching strategies and assessment methods, managing their classrooms, and engaging students from diverse groups in learning. Peer feedback also is integrated into the reflection processes.

Other school professionals (school superintendents, principals, counselors, and specialists) also receive consistent feedback and opportunities for reflection throughout their coursework and field experiences. Internships involve “shadowing” mentors and leading actual projects with increasing responsibilities. Both university-based supervisors and on-site mentors provide feedback on performance and guide candidates in examining their own beliefs and biases toward different groups, collecting school-wide data in the form of demographic studies and school culture and equity audits, and developing equity action plans and school improvement strategies around leading schools and counseling students from diverse groups.

**4d.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the diversity of P-12 students in schools in which education candidates do their field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

SHSU IR Table 10

See **Attachments** panel below.

**Optional**

**1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 4?**

The Huntsville and North Houston areas include rural, suburban, and urban districts that have PK-12 students representing all social classes and racial/ethnic groups, as well as students who are English language learners and have exceptionalities. Candidates are proactively placed in a variety of field experiences based on their prior experience working with diverse groups.

Numerous faculty have grants, research, and publications which focus on the academic and social success of diverse learners. Many are nationally and internationally recognized for their work.

Scholarship in relevant research areas is evident and includes: English language learners, students with exceptionalities, cultural competence and proficiency, counseling multiple heritage individuals, college readiness for traditionally marginalized groups, gender and leadership, leadership for social justice, etc.

Curriculum improvements have been made to integrate strategies for teaching English language learners into methods and student teaching. Multicultural courses are part of the school counseling program and courses on Cultural Proficiency for School Leaders are required for all administration candidates. In these courses, students reflect on their own beliefs and biases as well as collect data on their community, school, and classroom environments to determine strengths and needs in providing culturally responsive instruction to diverse groups of students.

External grants have been obtained from the U.S. Department of Education to provide Masters degrees in Instructional Leadership and Educational Administration to educators of students with special needs, bilingual and English as a second language teachers, and bilingual counselors. Candidate selection, field experiences, and professional development were done in conjunction with district partners. Additionally, Masters candidates in C&I participate in a two-way exchange programs with teachers from Mali, West Africa.

## **2. What research related to Standard 4 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?**

Faculty members in the SHSU College of Education are involved in extensive research that supports Standard 4. Several faculty members are leading national scholars in conducting research on English language learners and bilingual students. Others have conducted research on students with special needs and race, ethnicity, and culture in schools. The Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling (EDLC) has received large research grants from the U.S. Dept. of Education's Institute for Educational Sciences and the National Science Foundation for work on dual language instruction and English instruction with young bilingual students. The EDLC has also received large professional development grants to prepare Bilingual Instruction Leaders, Bilingual Counselors, and Instructional Leaders in Special Education who receive Masters Degrees at the completion of their training. Unit faculty research also centers on counseling multiple heritage individuals, strategies to enhance the achievement of African-American males, and examining school-wide cultural competence and proficiency to support the learning and engagement of all students in a school setting. A list of diversity-related research and publications by unit faculty provides evidence of active scholarship in and commitment to diversity, equity, and social justice.

## **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.**

**[In this section the unit must include the professional education faculty in (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]**

### **5a. Qualified Faculty**

**5a.1. What are the qualifications of the full- and part-time professional education faculty (e.g.,**

earned degrees, experience, and expertise)? Please complete Table 11 or upload your own table at Prompt 5a.5 below. [Professional Education Faculty information compiled by AIMS from earlier reports submitted for the national review of programs and updated by your institution (see Manage Faculty Information page in your AIMS workspace) can be imported into Table 11. For further guidance on completing this table, see the directions provided below (select link "click here") as well as in the Help document (click on "Help" in the upper right corner of your screen.)]

**Table 11**  
**Faculty Qualification Summary**

**5a.2. What expertise qualifies professional education faculty members who do not hold terminal degrees for their assignments?**

The institution and unit consider faculty competence, teaching effectiveness, appropriate undergraduate/graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements.

Non-tenure-track faculty consist of interim faculty who are hired as full-time for nine-months or temporary faculty, hired on a semester-by-semester basis, who may be assigned a full-time or part-time instructional load. Upon review of the 2006, 2007, and 2008 calendar years, the professional education faculty within the unit (n=205) and the affiliate faculty in the College of Arts and Science [COAS (n=41)] and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences [CHSS (n=49)] were highly qualified in regard to degree earned and professional expertise. Within the unit, 74% (n=151); in the COAS, 100% (n=41); and in the CHSS, 67% (n=33) hold terminal degrees in the relevant content area they instruct. Two doctoral graduate assistants have served as the instructor of record for educator preparation courses during these years.

Examples of the professional expertise the education faculty in the unit and affiliate colleges who do not hold terminal degrees include: teaching or serving in administrative capacity in P-12 schools, coordinating grants/programs, being employed in governmental educational agencies, holding bachelors and advanced degree in relevant content area, or have conducted research in the P-12 sector.

**5a.3. How many of the school-based faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or are supervising? How does the unit ensure that school-based faculty members are adequately licensed?**

School-based faculty are certified by the State Board for Educator Certification in the areas they teach or supervise. All classroom Mentor Teachers and the University Supervisors of student teachers and graduate field experiences are professionally licensed. University supervisors are typically retired teachers, principals, and administrators and faculty members who use their experience base to assist candidates in the classroom. The professional certifications held by these faculty members demonstrate the competencies and achievements that contribute to successful candidate outcomes.

School-based faculty are experienced teachers in accredited public school campuses in school districts that are members of the Sam Houston Innovative Partnerships with Schools (SHIPS). A custom match of candidate to mentor teacher is arranged by the school district liaisons, guided by specific guidance provided to the district by the unit. Their expertise and fitness for mentoring are reviewed each year by the school district liaisons within the districts. To further ensure a check of content expertise, the unit provides for Focused Content Observation in fields where SPA standards require specialized expert evaluation of clinical experience.

#### **5a.4. What contemporary professional experiences do higher education clinical faculty members have in school settings?**

Clinical faculty possess graduate degrees and have relevant professional experience in the school setting. University Policy for the Appointment of Clinical Faculty Members provides institutional guidelines to assure that they are carefully-selected, uniquely-qualified individuals. When the need arises, SHIPS partners or University faculty are consulted to recruit experienced individuals with proven expertise. Recent experience and unique knowledge with regard to Closing the Gaps for P-16 students is highly valued by our faculty.

Upon review of the 2006, 2007, and 2008 calendar years, the clinical faculty within the unit (n=10) were highly qualified. Of these clinical faculty, 70% (n=7) earned a terminal degree in a relevant content area, 100% (n=10) were active in service and demonstrated various forms of scholarship, and 100% (n=10) had been employed or had P-12 experience in the public schools during their professional careers. There were no clinical faculty who served as educator preparation program faculty in the COAS and CHSS during these calendar years.

Clinical faculty within the unit, are experts in the field of educator preparation as detailed in Table 11: Faculty Qualification Summary. A sample of the contemporary professional experiences reported on the curriculum vita of the unit clinical faculty revealed the following experiences in the P-12 school setting: teachers in various levels of public schools, principals and school administrators, school superintendents, chief administrators within state and private education agencies, educational consultants at the state and national level, coordinators of academic programs within school districts, and held multiple certifications in the area of teacher preparation and administration. Clinical faculty members typically serve as university supervisors in the field experience program and provide instruction in the undergraduate and graduate educator preparation program courses offered within the unit.

**5a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty qualifications may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

### **5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching**

**5b.1. How does instruction by professional education faculty reflect the conceptual framework as well as current research and developments in the fields?**

The content of each course is structured to align with the criteria established by the specialized state and national program standards. These specific standards, as well as relative components of the unit conceptual framework, are identified in the course syllabus, and all key assessments are aligned to the Conceptual Framework indicators.

The conceptual framework serves as the foundation of the Educator Preparation Program which guides the faculty to provide candidates with opportunities to develop the dispositions, skills, and knowledge that will enable them to be effective teachers. The concentric rings in the conceptual framework logo reflect the important relationship that collaborative instruction, research, and field experience has on the development of professional dispositions, knowledge, and skills that require effective candidates to plan, implement, assess, and modify their levels of instruction. The qualified faculty within the unit model collaborative research and participate in professional development activities that enhance the effectiveness of their instruction. Through these experiences, the faculty are well equipped to prepare the candidates for the realities of the teaching profession. The Conceptual Framework document was

updated in 2007-2008 to assure that recent developments and research were reflected.

A review of the syllabi of the courses facilitated in the Educator Preparation Program revealed the following sample of instructional strategies that reflect the conceptual framework, research, and developments in the field: professional portfolios, cooperative learning models, literature reviews, case studies, mentoring field work, action research projects, peer education and evaluation, academic fairs, after school activities, mapping, collaborative learning, constructivist models, and service learning projects. The Teacher Work Sample, required of every candidate, integrates the components of the conceptual framework, research, and current developments in the field. This culminating project demonstrates the skills, knowledge, and dispositions the candidate developed during their academic preparation and their ability to plan, implement, assess, and modify their instructional strategies to positively affect P-12 student learning.

**5b.2. How do unit faculty members encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions?**

Unit faculty members actively promoting the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions in all levels of course assignments. Instructional methods used by the faculty actively encourage the development of these critical components into the professional foundation of the candidates.

Reflections are designed to reinforce what the candidate has learned through lectures, discussions, and activities presented in class, coursework, and P-12 school experiences. These experiences are combined with personal reactions, fundamental beliefs and value systems, and serve to integrate dispositions into the professional development of the candidate. Candidates develop reflective pieces through the experiences gained through observation, reading, personal teaching experiences, case studies, portfolio development, internet searches, and through reviewing evaluations from supervisory teachers and students.

Candidates are engaged in skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a means to improve their reasoning capacity. The multi-dimensional components of critical thinking are integrated into many course assignments.

Educator preparation faculty strive to activate the problem solving process in course activities that integrate critical thinking skills into the problem solving, problem finding, and problem shaping process.

The promotion of professional dispositions is embedded throughout the educator preparation programs through a variety of instructional methods, and the modeling of dispositions by the faculty. Dispositions are an integral part of the Unit Conceptual Framework which strives to promote values, commitments and professional ethics that influence behaviors toward candidates, colleagues, and communities which affect learning.

**5b.3. What types of instructional strategies and assessments do unit faculty members model?**

Unit faculty use innovative instructional strategies that are developmentally structured for the content and level of the educational preparation courses they instruct and incorporate a variety of assessments for evaluating candidate performance and academic attainment. Formative, summative, and ipsative assessments are used by the Educator Preparation Program faculty to determine candidate mastery of

course content. The broad categories of assessments include demonstrations of skill proficiencies, written and oral examinations, course projects, and evaluations from supervisory faculty. A review of assignments posted on Tk20 generated the following sample of the diverse instructional strategies and assessments modeled by the faculty:

Anecdotal Reports, Book-talks, Brainstorming, Clicking and Clunking, Collaborative Strategic Reading Instruction, Conference Logs, Connecting with Children's or Young Adult Literature, Cooperative Learning, Creating Flip Charts, Graphic Organizers, Guided Note-Taking, Guided Reading, Identifying Text Structure Patterns, Jigsaw Research Report, K (know)-W (want to know)-L (learn) Charts, Learning Logs, Kid-watching, Listing Key Ideas, Literacy Folders, Mapping, Oral Questions, Peer Conferences, Peer-Tutoring, Performance Assessments, Phonics and Phonological Awareness Activity Portfolios, Presentations, Questioning, Reading and Spelling Key Vocabulary, Research Reporting, Role Plays, Running Records, Scatter Plots, Sharing, Simulations, Skimming and Scanning, Skits, Small Group Discussion, Study Questions, Summarizing, Think-Aloud, Reinforcement Programs, Prompting Strategies, Verbal Debates, Webbing, Writer's Workshop, Writing Opinion Papers, and Written Testing.

The following assignments posted on TK20 describe the methodology used by the faculty to integrate several of these assessments and instructional strategies into their courses: SPD 378 Interventions Paper, SPD 637 Case Study, LS 566 Information Literacy Lesson Plan--Assessment #5, and RDG 589 Lesson Plan (Fall 2008), RDG 530 Professional Change, and SPD 637 Case Study (Summer 2008). These Instructional strategies and assessments help the faculty create positive learning environments that engage the candidate in the learning objectives outlined in the course.

#### **5b.4. How do unit faculty members incorporate the use of technology into instruction?**

Technology is highly valued within the institution and unit and enhances candidate learning and faculty development in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The Department of Computer Services, the Newton Gresham Library, and the Distance Education and Learning Technologies for Academics (DELTA) Center support and provide technology that improves candidate success and faculty qualifications. The institution received a "compliant" rating for technology capabilities during the SACS Spring 2009 review cycle.

All academic classrooms and many public access spaces have high-speed wireless connections to the University's computer network and the Internet. All candidates are allocated 70 Megabytes of personal storage space on a networked drive and are provided with 20 Megabytes for creating a personal web page. Smart classrooms in the Teacher Education Center, Health and Kinesiology Center, and the University Center, are equipped with appropriate technology to enhance candidate learning. The Blackboard Learning System, a course management tool is used to create content, post course materials, communicate, facilitate group projects, and evaluate candidate progress. Tutorials for the use of Blackboard, Scholar, Tegrity and TK20 are available for faculty and candidates.

All candidates use Blackboard and become proficient in various forms of electronic communication including email, Wiki tools, discussion boards and forums, Turnitin.com, and real-time chat environments. The Distance Education and Learning Technologies for Academics (DELTA) Center provides technical support for the design, purchase, and utilization of classroom-based technologies; and offers training and consultation for faculty offering distance learning courses. On-line and distance learning course formats are widely used by the professional faculty in the unit.

Technology is one of the three foundations of the unit Conceptual Framework and is a viable component of the Teacher Work Sample conducted by candidates during student teaching. Integration of the Tk20 data management system into the Educator Preparation Program systematically improved the knowledge



and application of computer-based programs for both faculty and candidates. To encourage faculty proficiency, the Technology Committee provides ongoing training on all aspects of technological instruction. A review of sample course syllabi in the Educator Preparation Program revealed that technology is an important aspect in candidate learning objectives and outcomes, course assignments and exams, and course facilitation. Technology used in these courses, includes, but is not limited to the following examples: distance and online courses, podcasting, Tegrity, animated and voice enhanced Power Points, streaming video, Internet searches, chat boards, and PRS student remote clicker technology.

### **5b.5. How do unit faculty members systematically engage in self-assessment of their own teaching?**

Unit faculty have several tools to support systematic self-assessment of their teaching:

1) IDEA Center's Survey Form-Student Ratings to Instruction and Courses: The teaching performance of all faculty, regardless of status, who are instructors of record are evaluated each semester, using the nationally-normed Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA). Academic Policy Statement 820317 – The Faculty Evaluation System, Section 3 provides description of the procedures for using IDEA. The course evaluations ask students to rate the efficacy of the instructor and course materials on a five point scale on the IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction and Courses Form. All completed forms are sent to be scored at the IDEA Center, housed at Kansas State University. Summary reports for each class, as well as composite reports, are returned to the institution for distribution to individual faculty, department chairs, and deans.

Course evaluations by candidates provide feedback regarding attainment of course objectives and teaching effectiveness. The course report provides an evaluation of the faculty member's effectiveness with respect to course objectives and other critical elements of instruction. The report provides suggestions for improving teaching methods and styles through diagnostic reports.

2) Informal use of criteria in the IDEA Student Ratings Form may be used as an interim evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Instructors have the option to photocopy blank IDEA forms or create similar assessments and administer the evaluation to students during the mid-point of the semester. This information is reviewed by the faculty to determine where gaps exist in fulfillment of the course objectives and problems in course implementation and teaching performance.

3) Utilization of additional methods to assess teaching: anonymous feedback from students written in either a constructed or informal format; composite score and item analysis of exam/quiz grades; student competency level demonstrated on key assessments, in class and field experience; body language and feedback from students in class; amount and content of questions asked by candidates regarding assignments and aspects of course content; feedback from Department Chair/faculty mentor during class observations; feedback from supervisory teachers and partners in the school setting; and student postings on non-secured electronic web-sites such as [www.ratemyprofessors.com](http://www.ratemyprofessors.com) and [www.pickaprof.com](http://www.pickaprof.com).

**5b.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty teaching may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

## **5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship**

**5c.1. What types of scholarly work are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and unit's mission?**

Scholarship is one of the three fundamental elements in the SHSU mission statement and is emphasized the institution's goals. Scholarly and/or creative accomplishments are one of the three categories for

evaluating faculty as stated within the Faculty Evaluation System. Scholarly activities include, but are not limited to, production of basic and applied research, writing and publications, scholarly grant development, scholarly grant acquisition, presentations to professional and learned societies, and professional development directly related to scholarly and/or creative accomplishments. For other disciplines, scholarship includes forms of creative works and activities, such as instructional technology; poetry; painting; musical, dance, or theatrical performance or composition; and sculpture.

The unit actively promotes scholarship for all classifications of faculty and candidates. Scholarship is central to the unit's mission and goals. As stated in Academic Policy Statement 820317.4.04, each college determines specific performance standards related to scholarship from the input of respective faculty members at the department/school and/or program level. Within the unit, scholarly activities include, but are not limited to internal grants funded by the unit or institution; national, state, or privately funded grants; peer-reviewed publications in journals, invited publications, conference proceedings, or newsletters; non-peer-reviewed publications that relate to faculty appointment; book projects; presentations at state, regional, national, and international conferences; submitted manuscripts; development of scholarly websites, blogs, podcasts; senior editor, grant reviewer, conference proposal reviewer, journal reviewer, or on an editorial board.

**5c.2. In what types of scholarship activities are faculty members engaged? How is their scholarship related to teaching and learning? What percentage of the unit's faculty is engaged in scholarship? (Review the definition of scholarship in the NCATE glossary.) [A table could be attached at Prompt 5c.3 below to show different scholarly activities in which faculty members are involved and the number involved in each activity.]**

The professional educational faculty model best professional practices in scholarship which relate to teaching and learning. Scholarly activities conducted by the faculty typically relate to their academic appointment, area of expertise, scientific inquiry, and professional experiences. Collaborative scholarship activities involving faculty and candidates are encouraged within the unit. The College of Education Enrichment Fund provides money for scholarly endeavors for faculty and candidates at the graduate and undergraduate level. Faculty are recognized each year by the unit and institution for their outstanding scholarly contributions at the state, national, and international level.

An analysis of the scholarship component of the curriculum vitae of the unit Educator Preparation Program faculty for calendar years 2006, 2007, and 2008 indicate that 100 % (n=39) of the tenured faculty, 100 % (n=41) of the tenure track faculty, 95 % (n=107) of the part-time or adjunct faculty, 100 % (n=10) of the clinical faculty, and 50 % (n=1) of the graduate assistants were engaged in scholarly activities during each of these years. One hundred % (n=27) of the tenured and 100 % (n=6) of the tenure track affiliate Educator Preparation Program faculty in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences reported leading or participating in scholarly activities during these same years. Within the College of Arts and Science, 100 % (n=25) of the tenured, 100 % (n=14) of the tenure track, and 50 % (n=1) of the part-time or adjunct affiliate Educator Preparation Program faculty were engaged in scholarship during these years.

The Scholarship Activity Report, compiled from curriculum vitae, indicate the unit and affiliate Educator Preparation Program faculty member's commitment to scholarship at the state, national, regional, and international level. Faculty were awarded \$63,223,764.00 in grant funding for 417 research and educational projects. Faculty served as authors, editors, and co-authors in 401 book projects. Scholarly presentations were made at the local and state level (n= 1062 ), regional level (n=186), national level (n=1016) and international level (n=203). A total of 1,316 peer reviewed articles were authored and co-authored by faculty members. The Educator Preparation Program faculty has clearly demonstrated outstanding scholarly and creative accomplishments during the review of the curriculum

vitae.

Additionally, the COE 08-09 Productivity and Performance Report indicates that the number of faculty in COE who are tenured or on the tenure track for the academic year 2008-2009 was 74. The number of publications for these faculty members totaled 306, yielding a ratio of 1: 4.14. For the remaining 405 faculty in the University, there were 499 publications, yielding a ratio of 1:1.23. This difference represents a rate of publication which is 336 % greater than the other faculty of the University.

**5c.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty scholarship may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

## **5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service**

**5d.1. What types of service are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and the unit's mission?**

The faculty of SHSU model best professional practices in service to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution and the unit. The institutional mission statement reflects the importance of service among its constituents. Service is emphasized in the mission statement of the college and the broad elements of service are further highlighted in the mission statement of the COE Educator Preparation Programs, "Through excellent collaborative instruction, research and field experiences, the Educator Preparation Programs of Sam Houston State University provide candidates with opportunities to develop dispositions, skills, and knowledge that enable them to create an environment in which they plan, implement, assess, and modify learning processes, while serving effectively in diverse educational roles, reflecting meaningfully on their growth, and responding proactively to societal needs."

Service is an integral component of the SHSU Faculty Evaluation System (FES) Form 4: Service Activities and is significantly calculated into the merit, promotion and tenure. Outstanding service is recognized at the institutional level through the competitive "Excellence in Service Award" and in the unit through the "College of Education Outstanding Service Award." The overall institution and unit expectations of service are diverse and focus on improving the quality of the various professions; candidate, faculty, and university groups; and the school, private, public, sectors of the community.

Expectations of service at the institutional level includes service to students, colleagues, program, department/school, college, and the University; administrative and committee service; and unpaid service beyond the University to the profession, locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally, including academic or professionally-related public service.

**5d.2. In what types of service activities are faculty members engaged? Provide examples of faculty service related to practice in P-12 schools and service to the profession at the local, state, national, and international levels (e.g., through professional associations). What percentage of the faculty is actively involved in these various types of service activities? [A table could be attached at Prompt 5d.3 below to show different service activities in which faculty members are involved and the number involved in each activity.]**

Service to the P-12 schools, the community, and the profession is highly valued by the Institution, Unit, and the Educator Preparation Program. Faculty are recognized each year by the unit and institution for their outstanding service contributions. An analysis of the service component of the curriculum vitae of

the unit Educator Preparation Program faculty for calendar years 2006, 2007, and 2008 indicate that 100 % (n=39) of the tenured faculty, 100 % (n=41) of the tenure-track faculty, 95 % (n=107) of the part-time or adjunct faculty, 100 % (n=10) of the clinical faculty, and 50 % (n=1) of the graduate assistants were engaged in service during each of these years. One hundred % (n=27) of the tenured and 100 % (n=6) of the tenure track affiliate Educator Preparation Program faculty in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences reported active service involvement during these same years. Within the College of Arts and Science, 100 % (n=25) of the tenured, 100 % (n=14) of the tenure track, and 50 % (n=1) of the part-time or adjunct affiliate Educator Preparation Program faculty were engaged in service activities during these years.

Further analysis revealed that unit and affiliate faculty were members of 423 professional associations which serve the school, and numerous organizations at the local, state, national, and international levels. The types of service activities conducted by the Educator Preparation Program faculty in the P-12 setting include conducting inservice activities, mentoring supervisory faculty, judging academic competitions, coordinating school based conferences, and serving on committees. School-based programs facilitated in the unit that have received national recognition for outstanding service include: 1) The Texas Center for Academic Excellence- a distance based tutorial program for 5th and 6th grade students in need of academic reinforcement in math, reading and language arts; 2) The Tutors for Tots, Computer Companions, Sages and Scribes, Senior Readers, and Chicken Soup Group-full circle literacy programs that match candidates with school and community members; and 3) The Sam Houston Writing Project-a cooperative initiative dedicated to improving the instruction of writing and reading in East Texas schools. These programs and the numerous service activities conducted by the Educator Preparation Program faculty exemplify the motto of the institution, "The measure of a life is its service."

Additional examples of service within the unit include: serving as an officer in a state, national, or international organization; organizing governmental/volunteer sector activities; attending professional meetings; maintaining professional memberships; judging/facilitating events related to faculty appointment; organizing accreditation visits; acquiring facilities, equipment, and funding; and developing new courses and degree programs.

**5d.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty service may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

## **5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance**

**5e.1. How are faculty evaluated? How regular, systematic, and comprehensive are the unit evaluations of adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants?**

The unit evaluates the effectiveness of the faculty in accord with Texas State University System Rules and Regulations which require annual evaluation of all faculty. Criteria established in the Faculty Evaluation System policy are used. Tenure/tenure-track faculty members are reviewed on the basis of teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative accomplishments, and service. Non-tenure track faculty and graduate assistants are evaluated only on assigned duties. Performance serves as the basis for determining merit raises for tenured and tenure-track faculty, as well as faculty development, promotion in academic rank, contract review for probationary faculty, and retention of non-tenure track faculty. Additional evaluation criteria are used in governing tenure and promotion decisions of tenured/tenure-track faculty.

Teaching performance of all faculty is evaluated each semester using the nationally-normed IDEA

Center's Survey Form – Student Ratings to Instruction and Courses, discussed in 5.b.5. In addition, faculty members submit an annual review of professional activity to the department chair. This report includes an updated curriculum vita, a narrative of scholarly, research or creative accomplishments, and service activities for the most recent calendar year. These reviews are used to determine salary adjustments, merit considerations, faculty development, and are maintained as data for tenure recommendations.

All non-tenured tenure-track faculty are required to undergo a third-year review in addition to their annual review conducted by the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (DPTAC). The DPTAC reviews evidence of teaching performance, research productivity, and service. The purpose of the review is to provide guidance concerning the likelihood of the candidate obtaining tenure. If the faculty member's performance is not meeting departmental expectations, guidance is provided as what might increase the likelihood of a successful tenure decision. The general result is reported to the probationer by the department chair and dean.

All tenured faculty members are given a comprehensive performance evaluation "Post Tenure Review" every fifth year after receiving tenure, a promotion, returning to a faculty position following an administrative assignment, or after a previous comprehensive performance evaluation. This review makes use of FES records for the five most recent years. If the tenured faculty determine that the faculty member exceeds the accepted minimum standards of the unit, then that faculty member is certified as satisfying the Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty. Faculty performing below the appropriate minimum level are required to formulate and follow a Plan for Assisted Faculty Development to aid in regaining a level of performance that meets or exceeds the appropriate minimum. A table providing detail about hiring, retention, promotion and tenure over a three year period is available on the website.

**5e.2. How well do faculty perform on the unit's evaluations? [A table summarizing faculty performance could be attached at Prompt 5e.4 below.]**

Teaching effectiveness of all faculty, regardless of status, is evaluated each semester using the IDEA Center's Survey Form-Student Ratings adopted in 2005.

Data from the IDEA Center summary scores for the fall and spring semesters of calendar years 2006, 2007, and 2008 were used for this report. Student ratings are indicated on a 5 point scale. Results are compared between the unit, the institution, and the institutions using the IDEA System.

2006: Results of the Spring 2006 evaluations indicate the raw average scores of student ratings of progress on objectives of the unit exceeded those of the institution and the IDEA System for the period. Students reported improved student attitude toward the field of study after taking courses in the unit (4.2 rating). Results of the Fall 2006 evaluations indicate the raw average scores of student ratings of progress on objectives were 83% higher than those of the institution and the IDEA System for the period. Students reported an improved student attitude toward the field of study after taking courses in the unit (4.2) compared to the institution (3.9) and the IDEA System (3.9).

2007: Results in Spring 2007 indicate the unit raw average scores of student ratings of progress on objectives of the unit exceeded those of the institution and the IDEA System. Students reported an improved student attitude toward the field of study after taking courses in the unit (4.3) compared to the institution (3.9) and the IDEA System (3.9). Results in Fall 2007 indicate the raw average scores of student ratings of progress on objectives of the unit were 92% higher than those of the institution and the IDEA System for the period with the unit receiving the same rating as the institution for objective seven. Students reported an improved student attitude toward the field of study after taking courses in the unit (4.2) compared to the institution (3.9) and the IDEA System. IDEA Reports for each semester, are available in the Exhibit Room.

**5e.3. How are faculty evaluations used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service?**

The teaching performance of all faculty members are evaluated each semester, using the IDEA Center's Survey Form – Student Ratings which provides feedback to faculty about teaching effectiveness. Faculty also submit to their chair an annual report of their professional activity that includes a curriculum vita, a narrative of their scholarly, research or creative accomplishments, and service activities for the most recent calendar year. Non-tenured tenure track faculty are required to undergo a third-year review in addition to an annual report conducted by the departmental tenure committee (DPTAC). The DPTAC reviews IDEA summaries, research productivity, and service activities of the faculty to provide the candidate with guidance concerning the likelihood of the candidate obtaining tenure. If the faculty member's performance is not meeting departmental expectations, guidance is provided to increase the likelihood of a successful tenure decision. Tenured faculty members receive a comprehensive performance evaluation every fifth year after receiving tenure, a promotion, returning to a faculty position following an administrative assignment, or after a previous comprehensive performance evaluation conducted by the DPTAC. A faculty member who has received a negative judgment is required to formulate and follow a Plan for Assisted Faculty Development (PAFD). A copy of the plan is sent to the dean of the college and to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Multiple resources are available to assist faculty in their improvement of teaching, scholarship, and service within the institution and unit. The IDEA Center provides faculty with a diagnostic report for each course they instruct that emphasizes teaching strengths and also includes strategies to improve teaching efficacy.

**5e.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's evaluation of professional education faculty may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

## **5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development**

**5f.1. How is professional development related to needs identified in unit evaluations of faculty? How does this occur?**

Unit faculty members are expected to participate in professional development activities at the institutional, state, national, or international level each year. These self-reported activities are an important component of the annual faculty review conducted by the unit. It is critical for unit faculty to stay current on best practices and research in their field. Faculty are encouraged to provide evidence of these activities in their review portfolios. Criteria seven of the Chair's Evaluation of Teaching focuses on professional development, "Taking advantage of workshops/conferences designed to improve instruction." A score of three (range of one to five) indicates faculty have "met expectations" and have provided documentation for completing six hours of annual activities. To receive a higher rating, faculty must provide documentation that they have exceeded the average. Additionally, they must explain the benefit of their professional development to their courses, the department, the college, and the university.

Unit faculty seeking to receive merit considerations are evaluated on the amount and quality of professional development in which they participate each year. The COE Faculty Merit Guidelines indicate the categories of professional development activities that relate to FES Form 3: Scholarly and Artistic Endeavors and FES Form 4: Service Activities. Scores range from zero to five and faculty are requested to provide evidence to support the activities as well as document the relevance and benefit to all stakeholders.

A review of the professional development activities reported by unit faculty members for calendar years 2006, 2007, and 2008, indicate a high level of dedication for continuous improvement on the part of the faculty. The honors and awards, professional licensures, and professional memberships held by the

faculty during these years are in alignment with the NCATE definition of scholarship and reflect the mission of the institution and unit.

**5f.2. What professional development activities are offered to faculty related to performance assessment, diversity, technology, emerging practices, and/or the unit's conceptual framework?**

The institution and unit are committed to providing professional development opportunities to all levels of faculty and provide funding for faculty travel to support these activities. Twice each year a group of faculty attend the AACTE Institutional Orientation to build capacity for assessment and meeting national standards. The Professional and Academic Center for Excellence (PACE) serves the campus as a resource for learning and teaching. PACE promotes excellence by equipping faculty, administrators, staff, and students with resources designed to enhance their abilities to fulfill their respective roles as professionals and student learners. The Office of Multicultural and International Student Services provides workshops, services, and an annual leadership conference focusing on the vast elements of diversity issues facing faculty and students. The Intercultural Awareness Committee is a university-wide effort to develop multicultural workshops for all faculty and staff, to study the cultural climate of the university, and to work with student groups when campus-wide programs are planned. In addition, Grassroots: A Series of Conversations on Leadership in a Diverse Community, sponsored by the Student Advising and Mentoring Center, is a series of brown bag presentations offered to faculty and staff to enhance their professional understanding of interacting with various cultures in the workplace.

Professional development activities relating to technology are provided to faculty members by the Department of Computer Services, the Newton Gresham Library, and the Office of Academic Instructional Technology and Distance Learning. Technological skills are further enhanced through ongoing workshops provided by the COE Technology Committee. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment provides guidance for faculty to improve their assessment strategies for instructional and professional purposes. The COE Professional Development Committee provides ongoing workshops and presentations focusing on the various aspects of improving the professional growth of faculty in the unit. Assessment workshops and participation in CREATE activities, provided by the Office of the Associate Dean are directed to building assessment capacity within the unit. All faculty members are provided opportunities to integrate the conceptual framework and professional dispositions into their instructional strategies.

**5f.3. How often does faculty participate in professional development activities both on and off campus? [Include adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants.]**

All levels of faculty within the unit and institution are provided opportunities for professional development. The institution received a “compliant” rating for the provision of professional development activities during the SACS Spring 2009 review cycle. Graduate teaching assistants receive professional guidance from their faculty mentors and graduate committee members. Those graduate assistants pursuing the thesis track obtain research and professional writing skills through data collection, analysis, and the writing of the actual thesis. Adjunct/part-time and non-tenured tenure track faculty members are often partnered with a senior faculty member who serves as a mentor to the faculty. Faculty mentors offer their expertise and support to assist junior faculty in the improvement of class instruction, teacher effectiveness, and the enhancement of their professional scholarship. Table 5f.4. indicates the number of unit faculty who participated in various professional development activities during calendar years 2006, 2007, and 2008.

**5f.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's facilitation of professional development may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be**

able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

## Optional

### 1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 5?

The unit faculty and the affiliate faculty within the COAS and CHHS are highly qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching. The unit provides graduate teaching assistants, adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured tenure track faculty opportunities for collaboration in research and service projects; strategies to improve classroom instruction and teacher effectiveness; and professional development activities. Members of the Standard 5 subcommittee generated the following list of attributes of the unit as they relate to Standard 5:

1-The unit screens all graduate teaching assistants, adjuncts/part-time, and clinical faculty in addition to tenured and non-tenured tenure track faculty, in regard to level and content of degrees earned, licensure and certifications, expertise and experience in the P-12 school sector, service to the profession and the school sector, and the related areas of scholarship.

2-All levels of unit and affiliate faculty in the COAS and CHHS received outstanding student evaluations with scores higher than those of their respective colleagues in the field and within the institution.

3-Faculty embrace the NCATE definition of diversity and network with diverse populations in the school and professional setting.

4-Faculty are professionally active in state, national, and international organizations; attend and present at professional conferences; and have received honors and recognitions from these organizations.

5-The unit faculty are highly productive in the area of scholarly activities including the acquisition of grants; presentations conducted at the local, state, national, and international level; Tier 1, 2, and 3 scholarly publications; and books.

6-The unit and affiliate faculty are competent users of technology and incorporate technology into their instruction.

7-The unit values faculty service to the school and community sector as well as service to the profession.

### 2. What research related to Standard 5 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

## 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.

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

### 6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

#### 6a.1. How does the unit manage or coordinate the planning, delivery, and operation of all



## **programs at the institution for the preparation of educators?**

College of Education (COE) leadership from the faculty up to the Dean are qualified and dedicated to strong programs designed to prepare professionals in P-12 schools. The unit determines and provides to all candidates clear guidelines for how to become part of the program and how to successfully progress through the program.

The Dean of the COE serves as the unit head and has the authority to make decisions within the unit. She does so from the perspective of collaborative leadership, thus many are involved in the process of decision-making in the COE. The Dean works effectively with deans, department chairs, and faculty members of colleges across campus to resolve issues related to the preparation of educators and other professionals. The COE has two-full time associate deans, a Director of Educator Preparation Services, an NCATE coordinator and an Assessment Coordinator. An organizational chart provides an overview of the structure within the college including the five departments and the support offices. One hundred twelve full-time faculty members from the Colleges of Education, Arts and Sciences, and Humanities and Social Sciences have developed an infrastructure that supports ongoing communication and collaboration to ensure successful programming.

Committees of faculty from the COE and other colleges involved in educator preparation plan and evaluate programming. The Educator Preparation Advisory Council meets each semester to discuss data and program issues, involving faculty and staff from COAS and CHSS to provide support and guidance to the educator preparation program. Faculty and administrators from across the campus serve on the NCATE Standards Committees, and the Dispositions, Professional Concerns, and Assessment Committees. The Educator Preparation Leadership Team oversees coordination and administration of all initial certification programs, guiding admission and transition point decisions, practice testing and field experiences and other critical tasks. This group consists of the chairs of three departments, the UG Associate Dean, the Director of Educator Preparation Services, and the NCATE and Assessment Coordinators.

In Texas, it is the major department that designs the certification program for any secondary level teaching field. Semester credit hours in pedagogy may not exceed 24, if field experience is involved, if not, only 18 hours may be included in any degree. Thus, the relationship among departments is critical to preparing highly qualified candidates. The Associate Dean for UG & Accreditation coordinates program approvals by state agencies and oversees management of certification testing. A systematic process ensures that permission of the major department is obtained prior to approval for testing in the content area. Practice software and testing simulations are offered by the unit.

The Dean of Graduate Studies also works closely with the unit to support programs at the advanced level. The new COE Associate Dean for Graduate Studies will work with the Graduate Committee and the program coordinators for each advanced program to ensure coordination and effectiveness. The Office of Educator Preparation Services provides support and oversight of advising, field experiences, certification and TExES testing for the unit. Within this area, the Office of Field Experiences coordinates close to 2000 placements in all levels of field experience each semester in over 40 school districts. Additionally this group maintains a strong, collaborative working relationship with area school districts through the Sam Houston Innovative Partnership with Schools (SHIPS). Academic advising for transfer students and coordination of degree plan development is also housed in this department. Candidates registering for certification exams and applying for certification from the State of Texas work through the TExES/ExCET office.

The Sam Houston Advising and Mentoring Center (SAM Center) provides advising for all students in the University, including initial candidates. The Sam Houston Reading Center is staffed by graduate students and a director who are all licensed teachers. This group provides support in preparing for the

TExES certification exams. The Professional Academic Center for Excellence (PACE) provides support for faculty interested in improving their teaching or updating their technology skills. COE faculty are often engaged in providing workshops on effective pedagogy and technology integration to faculty across campus and within the COE. Service learning is a critical component being explored at the policy and practical level at the university.

**6a.2. What are the unit's recruiting and admissions policies? How does the unit ensure that they are clearly and consistently described in publications and catalogues?**

The unit has a recruitment committee dedicated to developing strategies for recruitment and to serve as recruiters for undergraduate and graduate programs within the College of Education. They evaluate, and develop strategies to ensure that candidates interact and work with other candidates from diverse, ethnic, racial, gender and SES groups in all graduate programs. Some release time is available for committee members. All recruitment materials are evaluated by staff in Human Resources. Additionally, the COE recently instituted a COE Ambassadors program. A major part of their responsibilities is the recruitment of students from high schools and community colleges into the programs in our college.

Each area of certification or each program area defines its own criteria for admission into the programs. These admission criteria are differentiated based on the classification and the demands of the program. All admission policies are available in publications as well as the undergraduate and graduate catalogs available online. Each program area works with administrative personnel to ensure that all information is up to date and accurate.

**6a.3. How does the unit ensure that its academic calendars, catalogues, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current?**

The unit works with the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs to ensure that academic calendars, catalogs, publications, and grading policies are accurate and current. Policies are updated on a regular basis and are approved by the Academic Policy Council with input from the University Faculty Senate. Specifically:

- The Academic Calendar for SHSU is set by the calendar committee.
- Catalogs for undergraduates are reviewed in even years; for graduates in odd years; updates are done online.
- The catalog review process goes from Associate Dean to Chairs, to Program Coordinator for catalog revisions; the revision process is also rerouted via chairs to the Associate Dean.
- Grading policies are in syllabi which are posted online.
- The university assessment tracking system is updated each semester (OATDB).

**6a.4. How does the unit ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling?**

Across the university, a number of programs exist to support students and assist them in being more successful. All of the services are visible and well advertised. Additionally, faculty can contact any of the offices directly if they have a concern about a specific student. Some of the services are:

- The award winning Sam Houston Advising and Mentoring Center (SAM Center): provides undergraduate advising. Additionally, it provides mentoring, study skills support, GRE/GMAT preparation, The Brown Bag Series (lunch time programming on a wide variety of topics), The First Alert Program (faculty contact advisors about concerns they may have about specific students. The

mentors then contact the student to determine appropriate levels or kinds of support). In addition to the SAM Center, COE students receive advising from the college advisor and faculty advisors as they progress through the program and near graduation.

- The Reading Center: provides support in reading college level materials, study skills support and TExES certification exam support.
- The Writing Center: provides support in writing at the college level.
- The Math Center: provides tutoring and support in college level mathematics.
- Career Services: provides career counseling and job fares.
- Counseling Center: provides a variety of services to students ranging from personality disorders, eating disorders to academic success.
- Student Services: provides social and group activities
- American Democracy Project: provides for service learning engagement and projects.
- COE Professional Concerns Committee: addresses issues dealing with dispositions concerns that occur with educator preparation candidates.

**6a.5. Which members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation? In what ways do they participate?**

All faculty in the COE, specific faculty in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Humanities and Social Sciences, members of the Sam Houston Innovative Partnership with Schools (SHIPS), representative students, and supervisory faculty all serve in roles dedicated to program design, implementation and evaluation. Committees formed within the college and across the university provide a strong base and excellent guidance and membership to our preparation programs. Specifically, the Technology Committee, the Professional Development, the Enrichment Committee, the Professional Concerns Committee, the Teacher Work Sample Committee, the Academic Review Panel, the Dispositions Committee, the Assessment Committee, the Graduate Faculty Qualification and Performance Committee, and the Elementary Advisory/Déjà vu Committee meet periodically and regularly to evaluate our existing programs and services, make recommendations to faculty and program areas and help with the implementation of changes.

Committees directly related to NCATE are ongoing and reflect our commitment to meeting standards. They are: The Conceptual Framework and Institutional Standards Committee, the Assessment Committee, the NCATE Steering Committee and Standards level committees for each of the six standards. These committees consist of faculty from across the college and university, the dean, associate dean, members of SHIPS, the field experience director and graduates of our programs.

**6a.6. How does the unit facilitate collaboration with other academic units involved in the preparation of professional educators?**

Committees, consisting of faculty from the COE and other colleges involved in educator preparation plan and evaluate programming (see Elementary Advisory Council/Déjà vu committee agendas, Data day agendas). The Educator Preparation Advisory Council, faculty and administrators from across the campus provide support and guidance to the educator preparation program. All program curricular decisions (changes and additions of courses to the program) undergo a rigorous review at the college, university, and state level through the curriculum process outlined in policy. Each program has an advisory board made up of faculty from the program area, former students, current people in the field and appropriate faculty from across campus. These boards advise and comment on program reviews and changes.

**6a.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit leadership and authority may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

## 6b. Unit Budget

### 6b.1. What is the budget available to support programs preparing candidates to meet standards? How does the unit's budget compare to the budgets of other units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other institutions?

Funding at Sam Houston State University (SHSU) is generally perceived as adequate. As is consistent with most public universities across the country, funding comes from state allocation or formula funding, tuition and student fees and other sources. The percentage of funding from the State of Texas has declined consistently over the years. The general fund for academic and administrative support portion of the university is approximately 34 percent state appropriation and 34 percent tuition and fees. The university does receive some grants and other types of support both federal and institutional. Budget updates provide additional information on the resources, as well as basic allocations of funds for academics, maintenance and buildings. A review of the financial data among the units on campus indicates equity and strong support for the College of Education.

The financial history of SHSU demonstrates financial stability. The Statement of Change in Unrestricted Net Assets exclusive of Plant has remained relatively consistent from fiscal year 2004 to fiscal year 2007. These statements demonstrate that SHSU has a sound financial base and financial stability. SHSU has been recognized in the past for the wise use of our resources. We value academic and student needs and thus spend approximately 48 percent of the total university budget on the academic requirements of the university. When comparing FTSE (Full Time Student Equivalency) costs, SHSU spent \$9,115. This was near the average of \$10, 580 spent within the Texas State University System.

There is only one other area within the university with a clinical component. It is a doctoral level psychology program and resources are consistent with those available to the unit.

### 6b.2. How adequately does the budget support all programs for the preparation of educators? What changes to the budget over the past few years have affected the quality of the programs offered?

The COE supports professional development in a number of ways. Travel for faculty to attend and present at conferences is reimbursed at an average rate of \$2000. Additionally, the college supports classroom and teaching expenses by providing travel funds, materials, software, hardware, and professional subscriptions when requested. Faculty report that anything needed to aid in their success is provided. Since 2000, eight faculty members from the COE have received institutional research and/or professional development grants totaling \$139,978.00. The COE and Graduate Studies also provide additional funding on a case-by-case basis. For example, 10 faculty from the COE will travel to present at the European Reading Conference, and travel will be supported in part by the Dean's office and Graduate Studies. Scholarships awarded to attract and support candidates is a source of pride in the COE. In 2008, \$242,900 was awarded in scholarships at the undergraduate and graduate level.

Over the past five years, funds allocated to the unit do not cover costs of educator preparation programs. In contrast to needs in other colleges, funds allocated for operations and maintenance support faculty travel to school district sites, placing an increasing burden on the unit as enrollment increases and site-based coursework and travel expenses also rise. In addition, funds are needed to support our data management system, necessary to our continued success in making program decisions. Changes in the funding structure have created dire concerns by the departments this semester. Forecasting of these costs, which are unique to educator preparation, does not appear to be considered in budgeting by the University. Without University support, a major portion of the data system cost will pass to students

beginning in Spring 2010, as a required materials cost in the gateway courses. We also anticipate restricting candidate choice for student teaching placements if travel funds are not increased.

The COE is home to the largest percentage of graduate students and generates more distance learning fees and University Center fees than any other college. However, there is concern that revenues from these funds will not be used to support unit programs when budget decisions are made. While growth in programs has contributed to the total overall budget used by the University to operate, the related allocations to the college have been significantly reduced for FY 2010.

The University and College Budgets are available for analysis on the NCATE website.

**6b.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's budget may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

Statement of Net

See **Attachments** panel below.

## 6c. Personnel

**6c.1. What are the institution's and unit's workload policies? What is included in the workloads of faculty (e.g., hours of teaching, advising of candidates, supervising student teachers, work in P-12 schools, independent study, research, administrative duties, and dissertation advisement)?**

Faculty instructional workload policies are governed by University policy and address teaching and any release or reassigned time for administrative duties. The majority of full-time faculty within the unit operate under a 3/3 teaching load. Faculty teaching doctoral courses operate under a 2/2 teaching load. Overloads are not permitted. In the rare case where a faculty member teaches more than three courses in a semester, he/she must teach one less course the following semester. Faculty receive reassigned time for program directorships and other administrative duties that require them to engage in recruitment, assessment or data collection. All department chairs receive reassigned time. In addition to our teaching load, faculty receive merit consideration for scholarly activities, committee service, and service to the unit or the university [http://www.shsu.edu/~vaf\\_www/Faculty\\_Handbook/](http://www.shsu.edu/~vaf_www/Faculty_Handbook/).

**6c.2. What are the faculty workloads for teaching and the supervision of clinical practice?**

Clinical faculty are well prepared and enjoy the same resources as regular faculty. Clinical faculty operate under a 4/4 teaching load. Mentors work with clinical faculty as well. The unit provides ongoing support to aid clinical, adjunct and graduate assistant faculty in their mission of providing quality instruction. Workshops are provided throughout the year to address such topics as: teaching evaluations, service, technology, etc. Additionally, clinical faculty, adjunct faculty and graduate assistants are provided with detailed syllabi and course outcomes. Course evaluations are required of all faculty and each faculty member (regardless of designation) meets with the department chair once each academic year. We are in the process of developing a survey of our clinical faculty to determine their satisfaction with the support they receive.

The College of Education adheres to the practice where the supervision of six student teachers is comparable to teaching one course. Faculty members rarely supervise more than six student teachers in any one academic year. Faculty may elect to supervise one student teacher each semester as a service to the unit. At the graduate level, supervision policies are defined by professional standards (i.e. CACREP)

and are implemented based on those parameters.

**6c.3. To what extent do workloads and class size allow faculty to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service (including time for such responsibilities as advisement, developing assessments, and online courses)?**

Workloads, described above are considered fair and do allow faculty to be actively engaged in the areas of service and scholarship. When possible, teaching preparations are limited to two different classes for new and tenure-track, non-tenured faculty so that they may establish their research agenda. Faculty teaching hybrid or online courses are credited with that course as part of their load. The university does have an online course creation policy provides for compensation for the development and substantial revision of an online course. Remuneration is provided to faculty who teach at off campus sites or at the University Center.

Additionally, faculty are involved in advising candidates at all levels. This has been an ongoing area of concern because the amount of advisees, particularly at the undergraduate level is large and generally falls on faculty from two of the departments. To address this discrepancy without harming the quality advisement received by the candidates, a plan to shift routine advisement of undergraduate students, aside from transfer students, to the SAM Center will begin Fall, 2009. Should faculty continue to advise, there exists a perception that the workload policy does not adequately reflect our reality when compared to faculty across campus. Accreditation, alone makes our job responsibilities different. The additional responsibilities that come from state and national educational agencies make an even bigger difference.

**6c.4. How does the unit ensure that the use of part-time faculty contributes to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the unit and its programs?**

SHSU recently underwent reaffirmation from the Southern Association for Colleges and Schools (SACS). All faculty, adjunct faculty, clinical faculty and graduate assistants were in compliance with SACS guidelines for teaching in our undergraduate and graduate programs. All adjunct faculty are qualified and bring a fresh perspective from the immediacy of the P-12 classroom experiences. Graduate students teach in undergraduate courses, where appropriate, freeing up doctoral faculty for research and graduate level teaching. Mentors are encouraged to work with new faculty, graduate faculty and adjunct faculty.

**6c.5. What personnel provide support for the unit? How does the unit ensure that it has an adequate number of support personnel?**

Secretaries, advisors, administrative assistants, technology support, assessment coordinators, field experience personnel, and an NCATE coordinator all add to the efficiency and effectiveness of faculty. Support staff are critical in the organization of how students progress through the program. The number of necessary support staff is evaluated by the Dean, Associate Dean and department chairs. We have been fortunate in that we have added support staff as our number and size of our programs have increased.

**6c.6. What financial support is available for professional development activities for faculty?**

Faculty are encouraged to attend and present at conferences. Faculty qualifications detailed under standard five reveal a faculty that is actively engaged in their respective fields. The Faculty Evaluation System (FES) is heavily dependent on rewarding faculty who are actively engaged in teaching,

scholarship and service. Travel budgets, while always an issue, are generous and allow for a wide range of professional activities. The unit provides a variety of activities and presentations throughout the year to support faculty in their professional endeavors (see flyers, etc from committees). At this time the average travel budget supporting professional activities is \$2500 for faculty within the unit.

**6c.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to personnel may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

Work Load
-----------

See **Attachments** panel below.

## 6d. Unit facilities

**6d.1. How adequate are unit--classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, the technology infrastructure, and school facilities--to support teaching and learning? [Describe facilities on the main campus as well as the facilities at off-campus sites if they exist.]**

SHSU is a wireless campus. The university is dedicated to a strong infrastructure and a master plan that will allow it to grow and modernize as the university community grows and changes. Most of the unit is housed within the Teacher Education Center (TEC), The Health and Kinesiology Center, and the Newton Grisham Library. The unit has outstanding facilities on and off campus to support candidates in meeting standards. In the past five years, major renovations have been carried out in the TEC building to update facilities, add classrooms and office space, add an instructional materials center, and allow for upgrading technological equipment. Plans to add additional space to the TEC within the next few years are included in the master plan. Classes held on-site in professional development centers benefit from traveling technologies that may not be available on the campus sites. The University Center, a state of the art building to the south, allows for classes offered there the same level of technology and comfort found on our main campus.

All faculty members have their own offices. Some adjunct faculty members and graduate assistants may share office space, but all have access to the newest technology. Each classroom in the TEC is equipped with a technology center that includes ELMO, VCR/DVD capabilities, and projection center.

The Department of Library Sciences uses facilities at UT Pan American, UT Brownsville, TAMU Laredo and ESC Corpus Christi to deliver its Valley MLS classes. Additionally, agreements with school districts in the greater Houston area and San Antonio provide classrooms for its use.

**6d.2. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit facilities may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

## 6e. Unit resources including technology

**6e.1. How does the unit allocate resources across programs to ensure candidates meet standards in their field of study?**

Resources are allocated across programs based on student enrollment and the mission of the particular program. Faculty, program areas and departments are directly involved in budgetary issues. Faculty are

surveyed each year about the types of materials or resources needed to successfully address candidate success. This information is funneled through program directors who examine program needs and pass on the resource needs to department chairs who share that information with the dean. The Associate Dean, whose main responsibility is educator preparation along with members of various committees like the Assessment Committee determine if resource allocation is contributing to candidate success. Any need for change is addressed in the next budget cycle.

**6e.2. What information technology resources support faculty and candidates? What evidence shows that candidates and faculty use these resources?**

All faculty and students within the unit have access to facilities that are up-to-date technologically. Standardized software packages are available to all COE faculty including publishing, web authoring, and multimedia development resources as well as the most recent Office Suite software packages. When additional software packages are needed, Computer Services evaluates the need, provides the software and offers training. Blackboard Learning System, a course management software, is available to all faculty for designing online and hybrid courses (the number of online and hybrid course offerings continues to grow every year as evidence that faculty are using these resources), and for supporting traditionally delivered classrooms, as well. Blackboard resources include: Interactive Web 2.0 tools such as wiki's, blogs, and group chats. Video delivery through Tegrity is also available through Blackboard. SHSU has purchased two islands in Second Life and, they are used actively within the unit. Webcasting resources and Windows Live Messenger is currently being installed on all of the unit faculty computers.

Faculty participate in brown bag (lunch time workshops) meetings where using technology has been addressed. All five departments in the unit deliver a portion of their program offerings online using Blackboard.

Computer lab space is available in the TEC (in addition to other labs found in buildings across campus) for faculty and their classes with 30 computers, scanners, a Smart board, printers and Internet access.

**6e.3. What resources are available for the development and implementation of the unit's assessment system?**

The unit offers Assessment Workshops and professional development to faculty members who have taken leadership roles in developing program assessments. Unit assessment data is reviewed annually with the entire faculty. Both unit and program assessments conducted within TK20, the data management system, supported submission of 14 SPA program Reports in 2008-2009. Assessment data at the program and unit level are provided to faculty on disc, for their use in program improvement. While capacity for assessment of student outcomes varies within the unit, the data management system streamlines dissemination of data and facilitates faculty access to dynamic reporting of course-based assessments. The Assessment Coordinator and the NCATE Coordinator are available to support development of assessments and with the implementation and use of TK20. Assessments and related rubrics are aligned within the system to state, national and professional standards so that performance data may be reported and analyzed by standard. Candidates use the system to submit assignments (artifacts) for assessment by faculty within TK20.

Support staff offer training sessions on the unit assessment system, transition points and the data management system to new candidates, existing candidates, faculty, university supervisors and mentor teachers involved in field experiences. Additionally, the Assessment Coordinator will personally aid a faculty member or student who needs individual support.



The unit would appreciate more financial resources allocated from the university to help with the expense associated with TK20. Currently, the departments assume the cost instead of charging the undergraduate students, however scarce resources may make this impossible in the future.

**6e.4. What library and curricular resources exist at the institution? How does the unit ensure they are sufficient and current?**

Newton Gresham Library (NGL) a contemporary structure with a large open plan (an acre on each of its four floors for a total of 125,513 net assignable square feet) that provides a functional environment supporting the needs of Sam Houston State University community. An online tour of the building is available on the Library's website. In addition to general access throughout the campus, users in the library can connect to the University's network through the wireless network, which covers the entire building, including over 100 computers located in labs and the Reference area. Users are able print to networked laser printers at no charge. Adaptive technologies are provided in the Reference area of the library. Library databases that support the unit include: Wilson Education Full Text, ERIC, JSTOR, and Physical Education Index.

The Newton Gresham Library, open 100 hours week, provides access to a collection of over 1.2 million books and journals. The library also offers access to a variety of electronic resources including licensed books, journals, and bibliographic/fulltext databases. The library provides access to 36,000 e-books, over 1200 electronic journals and 123 bibliographic/fulltext databases. Library resources are considered each time a new program is proposed to assure continuing support for unit candidates in all programs.

In addition, current curricular materials are housed in departments within the unit. For the initial candidates, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction houses curriculum resources and current textbooks adopted in the state. The Science classroom houses many curricular materials to support hands-on science instructional proficiency.

The Department of Language, Literacy and Special Populations houses an Instructional Lab for candidate use in preparing instructional materials for clinical teaching.

**6e.5. How does the unit ensure the accessibility of resources to candidates, including candidates in off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, through electronic means?**

The university aggressively and successfully secures resources to support candidates who are off-campus, or online. Our alternate route program is offered totally online as are programs in reading and educational leadership. All other programs have online components and courses available. Website space is available to all faculty and candidates and a number have developed their own sites. Electronic interlibrary loan is available to all of the unit faculty and candidates. Remote access connections allow candidates to use SHSU software, as well as, allowing faculty and candidates to develop their SHSU websites anywhere in the world. The TK20 system is available from off campus for both candidates and faculty, as is the Blackboard course management tool. Computer Services offers 24 hour, seven day service through their Help Desk to aid with technological problems.

**6e.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit resources, including technology, may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]**

**Optional**

**1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 6?**

There is an emphasis on shared governance at SHSU. Faculty have input into most decisions made by the unit about budgetary needs, the calendar, academic programs, technology purchases, etc. Committees report to the dean and/or associate dean and ideas are evaluated and usually implemented. While a significant part of department budgets go to the implementation of TK20, there is still a sense that faculty get the resources they need to be successful in the preparation of educators.

**2. What research related to Standard 6 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?**

Counseling faculty are doing research focused on conducting online internship supervision with students who have moved to other states or have moved to locations too far to attend supervision on campus. We are doing this to help improve distance supervision and to extend our ability to serve our students.

Reading faculty are engaged in evaluating the quality of participation and response in the online master's degree program in reading.

We survey our students at all levels, undergraduate and graduate, and their employers to aid with program evaluation and development.