NCATE
The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

GRAMBLING STATE UNIVERSITY

GSU P.O.Box 4219
Grambling, LA 71245
4/24/2010-4/28/2010

Type of Visit:
Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

Institutional Report

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?

Grambling State University (GSU) emerged from the desire of African-American farmers who formed the North Louisiana Colored Agriculture Relief Association to organize and operate a school in 1896. The Association requested assistance from Booker T. Washington of the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama. Charles P. Adams was sent to aid the group in organizing an industrial school, becoming its founder and first president. The school became a Normal school in 1928 offering two-year certificates as a state junior college, reorganizing in 1936 to emphasize rural education. GSU granted the first four-year degrees in teacher education in 1944. It became widely known as "A Venture into Rural Education." The addition of graduate programs in early childhood and elementary education in 1974 gave the institution a new status and a new name- Grambling State University, becoming a prime source of dedicated teachers serving communities in the rural south and throughout the nation.
Programs offered include a doctoral program in developmental education and two professional schools, nursing and social work. During the tenure of Dr. Raymond A. Hicks the university's fifth president, the university began implementing a desegregation settlement that provided funding for expansion of facilities and the development of new curricula. As a result of the agreement, a doctoral degree in education is now offered through the Louisiana Education Consortium (LEC), which includes Grambling State University (GSU), Louisiana Tech University, and the University of Louisiana at Monroe (ULM). Dr. Frank G. Pogue now serves as Interim President of Grambling State University.

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

GSU is a comprehensive, historically-black, public institution that offers a broad spectrum of undergraduate and graduate programs of study. Through its undergraduate courses of study, with a traditional liberal arts program, and its graduate school, with a professional focus, the university embraces its founding principle of educational opportunity. Committed to the education of minorities in

American society, the University seeks to reflect the diversity present in the world. The University advances the study and preservation of African American history, art and culture and is a community of learners who seek to contribute to their academic fields. GSU prepares its graduates to compete and succeed in careers related to its programs, to contribute to the advancement of knowledge, and to lead productive lives. The university provides its students a living and learning environment which nurtures their development for leadership in academics, athletics, campus governance, and in their future career pursuits. GSU affords each student the opportunity to pursue any program of study and to demonstrate reasonable progress. GSU fosters in its students a commitment to service and to the improvement in the quality of life for all persons, expecting that all persons who matriculate and who are employed at Grambling will reflect through their study and work that the university is indeed a place "where everybody is somebody." (Exhibit B1-2-1 GSU General Catalog, 2009-2011,p. 1).

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)]?

GSU, a member of the University of Louisiana System, is a selective admissions, state-funded HBCU. Located in Grambling, Louisiana, it is three miles west of Ruston, population of 20, 546 (U.S. Census, 2000). Monroe and Shreveport are metropolitan cities 36 and 60 miles, respectively, from the campus. GSU occupies approximately 375 acres, over 50 permanent buildings, a five-mile nature trail, an outdoor study pavilion, and an all purpose assembly building featuring a state of the art basketball arena.
Fall 2009 enrollment consisted of 4538 undergraduate and 454 graduate students (1881 male and 3111 female). Total in-state enrolment was 2737 in-state students, out-of-state enrollment was 1804, and international enrollment was 451. Among students enrolled in the undergraduate program 4347 were black, 140 were white, and 505 were other races. Among students enrolled in the graduate program 360 were black, 69 were white, and 25 were other races.
GSU is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), and by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). All of the university's teacher preparation and school leader preparation programs are approved by the Board of Regents and the Louisiana Department of Education (Exhibit B1-2-1 GSU General Catalog 2009-2011, p. 2).

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 College of Education has three academic departments: Curriculum and Instruction (C&I); Educational Leadership (EDL); and Kinesiology, Sport and Leisure Studies. It is supported by auxiliary service units: the Centralized Advisement, Referral and Evaluation (CARE) Center, the Educational Resource Center (ERC), the University Laboratory Schools, and the Office of Professional Laboratory Experiences (OPLE). The Office of Retention, though not housed administratively in the COE, is a support system created to supplement the instructional program at the University through the use of tutorials and computer-assisted instruction. There are currently 15 teacher preparation programs (eleven active) at the initial level and four at the advanced level. TeachGSU is an accelerated alternate path to licensure for candidates who are interested in obtaining certification in Elementary Education (Grades 1-5) or Special Education Mild/ Moderate (1-12). There are two advanced level programs that prepare personnel for postsecondary and other human service settings: Master of Science and Doctorate of Education in Developmental Education. These programs do not prepare candidates to work in P-12 schools and are not eligible for NCATE review. Tables 2 and 3 provide information about each program at the initial and advanced levels and their respective approval status as granted by the state and by specialized professional associations.

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	29	7	0	0	36

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

	Award Level (e.g.,	Number of	Agency or Association Reviewing	Program Report Submitted for	State Approval Status (e.g.,	Status of National Recognition of

Program	Bachelor's or Master's)	Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)	National Review (Yes/No)	approved or provisional)	Programs by NCATE
Art Education K-12	B.A.	2		No	Approved	N/A
Biology Education	B.S.	10	NSTA	Yes	Approved	Further Development Required
English Education 6-12	B.A.	21	NCTE	Yes	Approved	Recognized with Conditions
French Education 6-12*	B.A.	0	N/A	N/A	Approved	N/A
Early Childhood Education PK-3	B.S.	94	NAEYC	Yes	Approved	Recognized with Condition
Elementary Education 1-5	B.S.	100	ACEI	Yes	Approved	Recognized with Conditions
Mathematics Education 6-12	B.S.	15	NCTM	Yes	Approved	Further Development Required
Middle School Education 4-8 English**	B.S.	0 Not Started	NCTE	No	Approved	N/A
Middle School Education 4-8 Mathematics**	B.S.	0 Not Started	NCTM	No	Approved	N/A
Music Education, Instrumental K-12	Bachelor of Music Education	64	N/A	No	Approved	N/A
Music Education, Vocal K-12	Bachelor of Music Education	9	N/A	No	Approved	N/A
Physics Education 6-12*	B.S.	0	NSTA	No	Approved	N/A
Social Studies Education 6-12	B.S.	14	NCSS	Yes	Approved	Recognized with Conditions
Special Education Mild/Moderate Elementary Dual	B.S.	8	CEC	Yes	Approved	Recognized with Conditions
Kinesiology (Pedagogy K-12 Health and	B.S.	110	NASPE	Yes	Approved	Recognized with Conditions

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
Curriculum and Instruction	M.Ed.	3	N/A	No	Approved	N/A
Curriculum and Instruction - Reading	M.Ed.	7	N/A	No	Approved	N/A

Curriculum and Instruction - Technology Facilitator	M.Ed.	0 Not Started	N/A	No	Approved	N/A
Curriculum and Instruction - Technology Leader	M.Ed.	0 Not Started	N/A	No	Approved	N/A
Curriculum and Instruction Special Education Mild/Moderate Grades 1-5	M.Ed.	8	N/A	No	Approved	N/A
Special Education Early Intervention	M.Ed.	0 Not Started	N/A	No	Approved	N/A
Educational Leadership	M.Ed.	20	ELCC	Yes	Approved	Further Development Required
DevelopmentalEducation***	M.S.	27	N/A	N/A	Approved	N/A
DevelopmentalEducation	Ed.D.	59	N/A	N/A	Approved	N/A
Educational Leadership Curriculum and Instruction (LEC)	Ed.D.	3			Approved	
Educational Leadership (LEC)	Ed.D.	4			Approved	
Developmental Education***	Post Masters Certificate	0 Not Started	N/A	N/A	Approved	N/A

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.]

GSU's College of Education currently does not offer any off campus degree programs. TeachGSU, an alternative certification program for practitioner teachers to gain initial certification in Elementary Grades 1-5 and Special Education (Mild/Moderate) 1-12 is offered. The Special Education component of the program was recently redesigned and will become effective after state approval.

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.]

Louisiana State Department of Education changed the certification structure since the last NCATE visit. The Elementary Education Program is now Grades 1-5. The B. S. in Mathematics, Physics Education, and Biology Education are now Grades 6-12; the B.A. in French Education, English Education, and Social Studies Education are now Grades 6-12. Health and Physical Education is now Kinesiology (Pedagogy K-12 Health and Physical Education). There are no candidates enrolled in the French Education program.The following degree programs were approved by the State since the last visit: B.S. Special Education, Mild/Moderate Elementary/Dual; B. S. Special Education Mild/Moderate Secondary; B. S. Middle School Education 4-8 English and B. S. Middle School Education 4-8 Mathematics. Also approved was an

M. Ed. Program with concentrations in Early Childhood Education, Technology Facilitator, Educational Technology Leadership; Early Interventionist (Birth to 8 years). These programs have not been implemented due to state mandated budget cuts and spending restraints. The M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction was implemented Fall 2009. The M.Ed. in Special Education is scheduled for implementation Fall 2010. The University no longer offers Industrial Arts Education, Communication and Theater Education, nor Special Education PreSchool Non- Categorical. Advanced Program changes include the addition of the Master's Program in Educational Leadership (Educational Leader Level I).

The Unit has undergone major change in leadership since the last NCATE visit. Three different people served in the role of dean during the 2009 calendar year. The current dean joined the Unit on September 8, 2009. Two department heads are in a full-time, temporary status and the NCATE Coordinator role changed October 3, 2009. The Assessment Coordinator resigned 3 years ago and this had an impact on the Unit's assessment system. Recruitment and screening of applicants has been ongoing since that time. The position will be filled when a qualified candidate is successfully recruited. The leadership change goes beyond the Unit to the University. The role of President changed on October 13, 2009 and the then Provost filled that role until Dr. Frank G. Pogue was appointed Interim President on December 15, 2009. On January 31, 2010 the Provost resigned and an Interim Provost took leadership on February 1, 2010. The leadership is admittedly transitional but the Unit and University are stable because organizational memory is still strong. Changes in leadership are an asset to the Unit because it affords an opportunity to re-examine and revise its operational procedures, policies and practices.

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.]

Clarification for Tables 2 and 3
Exhibit B1-2-12 College of Education Handbook

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

Conceptual Framework Overview:
The Unit's Conceptual Framework depicts the outcomes, processes and proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills and professional dispositions embedded in the vision, mission and philosophy of the Unit. The tree model is a graphic representation of the Conceptual Framework for the College of Education (The Unit). The tree represents the dynamic model of the living entity that is the professional educator preparation programs at the University. The roots draw from the knowledge, skills and dispositions identified by the specialized professional associations and state and national standards. The candidates become Masters of Subject Matter Content, Facilitators of Learning, and Enhancers and Nurturers of Affective Behaviors and ultimately become Catalysts for Change in their educational settings. As candidates advance through an integrated and systematic assessment of the curriculum, instruction and impact on student learning associated with diversity and technology and aligned with professional, state and institutional standards, they grow as branches and leaves develop and reproduce on a tree.

Unit Vision: Producing knowledgeable, skilled, and compassionate educators and other school professionals "Where Everybody is Somebody."

Unit Mission: Providing quality teaching and learning which advances life-long learning and human experiences for teachers and other school professionals.

Unit Philosophy: Committing to excellence in teaching, scholarship, service, and professional development through life-long learning and the empowerment of learners.

Unit Purpose: Producing highly qualified teachers and other school professionals who demonstrate competency in their respective areas, exhibit characteristics of thoughtful practitioners, use best practices in all aspects of their work, advocate for children, and who are accountable to themselves, their

students and the profession. The Unit offers both certification and non-certification programs at the baccalaureate and master's levels.

Unit Goal: Ensuring that candidates acquire the professional skills, knowledge bases and dispositions that reflect best practices in research, service, teaching, and administration within the field of education.

Unit Institutional Standards: The institutional standards of the Unit reflect the University's goals for undergraduates and graduates. (www.gram.edu) Historically the mission of the university was to provide equal access for all; currently the university is a selective admissions institution. However, both the University and Unit continue to provide opportunities for professional and intellectual development for undergraduate and graduate students. In addition, the University and Unit seek to generate new knowledge while rendering service to the community and society. The Unit adheres to the University's mission by providing opportunities to strategically use the technologies available in a global society, as well as maintain an appreciation for diversity.

Knowledge Bases & Proficiencies for Initial and Advanced Candidates: All teacher preparation programs are housed with the COE, but content courses and faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences are integral parts of the teacher preparation unit (Unit). Through broad-based curricula consisting of research-based instruction, strategic field experiences and performance-based assessment, the curriculum and instruction, kinesiology/pedagogy, and educational leadership programs produce teachers and educational leaders. The content of the curricula is based on national standards of the Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) and Interstate Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), state standards (e.g. Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching [LCET], Standards for Educational Leaders in Louisiana [SELL], and Bulletin 746), regional standards (e.g. Southern Regional Education Board [SREB]) and unit standards. GSU has a PK-16+ Council designed to help foster collaborative partnerships between the university, area schools and the community under Louisiana's Blue Ribbon Commission on Teacher Quality which provides additional input. The council includes superintendents, school principals, teachers, administrators, and community leaders.
The candidate proficiencies related to the expected knowledge, skills and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards captured in three outcomes. Examples of the knowledge base theorists are incorporated with the outcomes.

1. Masters of Subject Matter Content: The Unit has established for this outcome the following program proficiencies:
1.1. Demonstrate knowledge of content that underlies professional competencies (McTighe, J., and Wiggins, G. 2004).
1.2. Apply knowledge of best pedagogical practices for use in the instructional process (Stronge, 2007).

1.3. Describe diverse strategies for interrelating disciplines in the instructional process (Banks, J. 2008).

1.4. Identify technology infusion strategies for diverse populations. Demonstrate creative thinking, construct knowledge, and develop innovative products and processes using technology. (ISTE 2009, Grabe and Grabe, 2001).

1.5. Plan effective lesson procedures and demonstrate effective delivery strategies (Wiggin and McTighe, 1998).

1.6. Interpret and implement appropriate and multiples measures of assessment (Popham, 2001; Carey, 2001).

1.7. Reflect on the value of practices, knowledge inquiry and critical thinking behaviors (Barell, 1998).

1.8. Identify personal, professional, and curricular values (Darling-Hammond, 1995).

2. Facilitators of Learning: Candidates should exhibit the following proficiencies/ competencies to facilitate learning within classrooms, buildings, and districts:

2.1. Demonstrate the effective delivery of standards-based instruction (Woolfolk, 2007; Miller and Darling-Hammond, 1992).

2.2. Create and maintain effective management strategies (organization of time, space, resources, activities (Walker and Shea, 1995).

2.3. Devise activities which promote active involvement, critical/creative thinking and problem solving skills for all students (Marzano, Pickering, Pollock, 2001; Spivey, 1997; Brooks and Brooks, 1999).

2.4. Demonstrate the use of diverse experiences that incorporate the underlying philosophy of education that is multicultural across the curriculum (Banks, 2001; Grant and Gomez, 1996).

2.5. Perform strategies that incorporate literacy learning across the curriculum (Vacca and Vacca, 1996; Rubin, 2000).

2.6. Apply strategies that accommodate diverse learner needs by selecting and using appropriate resources (Grant and Sleeter, 2007; Heward, 2003).

2.7. Analyze research that relates to strategies for promoting effective teaching and learning, and life-long learning in a global society (Marzano, 2003).

2.8. Commit to the continuing development of life-long learning in a global society (e.g., Dewey, 1916; Sternberg, 1997).

2.9. Relate knowledge of educational theorists to planning, lesson delivery, and classroom management (Jaggers, 2002).

2.10. Demonstrate an awareness of the social, cultural, political, economic and comparative context of schools and learners (Oakes, 1985).

2.11. Utilize technology in planning and presenting lessons, research, and professional development (Draves (2002).

2.12. Facilitate school improvement (Nanus, 1992).

2.13. Model best practices for teaching and learning (Zemelman, Daniels, Hyde, 1998).

2.14. Demonstrate competence as action researchers (Holly, Arhar, Kasten, 2009).

2.15. Demonstrate proficiency in the application of research findings (Holly, Arhar, Kasten, 2009).

2.16. Model best practices for implementing reading specific to content area (Behrens, Rosen, 2008).

2.17. Advocate for literacy and numeracy across the curriculum (Cooper, 2006).

3. Enhancers and Nurturers of Affective Behaviors: The expectation is that candidates and graduates exhibit the following competencies/proficiencies:

3.1. Display positive self-concept development and respect for others (Woolfolk, 2007; books on Reflective Practitioner; Shor, 1987; Standord, 1999).

3.2. Practice a positive attitude and mutual respect toward students, parents, and colleagues (Gerlach, 2003).

3.3. Display sensitivity to diverse learning styles and multiple intelligences (Armstrong, 2003).

3.4. Demonstrate sensitivity to the many facets of diversity (Banks, 2002).

3.5. Organize school, family, and community partnership (Heward, 2003).

3.6. Influence the development of healthy mental, physical and social lifestyles (Kunjufu, 1988).

3.7. Display a commitment to the improvement of student learning and school improvement (Marzano, 2003).

3.8. Display a classroom climate that is conducive to learning (Silver et.al. 2000).

Assessment System and Unit Evaluation:

The unit assessment system is designed to collect and analyze data on applicant qualifications, candidate performance, graduate performance, and unit operations. The goal of the system is to facilitate continuous self study to promote efficient and effective unit and quality program operations that positively impact three outcomes: applicant and candidate qualifications, initial and advanced candidate proficiencies, and graduate competencies. Assessments are aligned with state and national standards and the conceptual framework thus ensuring that data are used to enhance, expand, and improve curricula and instructional programs.

The GSU Conceptual Framework provides a system for ensuring coherence among the diverse curricular programs of study and the unit's assessment system. Specifically, the Conceptual Framework reflects the unit outcomes, and competencies/proficiencies as related to the system for assessing the overall operation of the unit. The unit's assessment system is based on teacher licensure tests (The Praxis Series), educational theorists/best practices research, state and national standards, specialized professional associations, federal mandates/ societal needs, graduate and employer feedback

As outlined in the Conceptual Framework, the unit's assessment system is designed to promote and produce teacher candidates and educational personnel who are masters of subject matter content, facilitators of learning, and enhancers and nurturers of affective behaviors. Specific assessment measures are utilized as candidates' progress through different phases of the program (entry, midway, advanced standing, and program follow-up). Efforts are made by the unit to help ensure that the candidates have a smooth transition from program admission to exit. The data collection process involves six transition points. Formal procedures

are used to track, monitor, and evaluate candidates' readiness as they move through each phase of the program.

Program improvement has resulted from data collected from various sources. Specific data include Praxis scores, portfolio assessment, and conferences with candidates Additional sources of data used to make program improvement are acquired through feedback from supervising teachers and employer surveys. Based on the feedback, on-going Praxis sessions are implemented. Professional accountability courses have been revised and expanded to reflect the current Praxis content and format. Additional faculty development seminars have been added to focus on assessment and technology.

Grambling State University seeks to mold candidates into effective classroom teachers and educational leaders and to provide scholars, professionals, educators and leaders who respond to the needs of communities by creating educational opportunities for all students regardless of individual differences.

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

In 2003, the Unit's conceptual framework emphasized preparing teachers and other school personnel to educate a PK-12 student population. The revised conceptual framework addresses the preparation of other school professionals as well by way of our advanced level programs. Six additional proficiencies were added to the list of outcomes entitled Skills: Facilitators of Learning to delineate that graduates will facilitate school improvement, model best practices for teaching and learning, demonstrate competence as action researchers, demonstrate proficiency in the application of research findings, model best practices for implementing reading specific to the content area, and advocate for literacy and numeracy across the curriculum as appropriate for the specific professional educator program. The overarching concept was added that graduates will ultimately become Catalysts for Change in their educational settings.
The use of an integrated and systematic assessment of the curriculum, instruction and impact on student learning has become more viable. Instead of just focusing on what our graduates have learned and can do, emphasis is placed highly on the graduates' impact on student learning. This impact is validated by the graduates' portfolios and artifacts of their students' work.
Finally, the tree graphic representation was revised. GSU stakeholders determined that it is necessary to make it known that continual emphasis on rigorous program delivery as well as assessment of feedback for program improvement are vital entities mandated by GSU's Conceptual Framework.This feedback is depicted by the leaves becoming a part of the soil (foundation) and then sending nutrients (graduates) back up through the tree (programs) to recycle continual productivity in PK-12 schools and in the global society. With the interaction of the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions that our graduates acquire, they indeed become Catalysts for Change, our new overreaching outcome.

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

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.]

Exhibit B1-8-1 Conceptual Framework Three Graphic and Strands
Exhibit B1-9-1 Alignment of State, Professional, and Institutional Standards
Exhibit B1-9-2 CF KSD Alignment with Signature Assessments

See Attachments panel below.

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 Standard1 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; 2007-2008; 2008-2009

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)	Praxis II: Elem. Ed. Content Knowledge 2008-2009	13	100%
B.S. Elementary Education (1-5)	Praxis II: PLT** Elementary 2008-2009	13	100%
	Praxis II: Elem. Ed. Content Knowledge 2007-2008	20	100%
	Praxis II PLT Elementary** 2007-2008	20	100%
	Praxis II: Elem. Educ. Content Knowledge 2006-2007	12	100%
	Praxis II: PLT Elementary** 2006-2007	12	100%
B.S. Special Education (Mild/Moderate Elem. Dual)	Educ. of Exceptional Students (CORE CK) 2008-2009	2	100%
	Educ. of Exceptional Students (MTMD) 2008-2009)	2	100%
	Praxis II: PLT 2008-2009	2	100%
	Educ. of Exceptional Students (CORE CK) 2007-2008	3	100%
	Educ. of Exceptional Students (MTMD) 2007-2008	3	100%
	Praxis II: PLT 2007-2008	3	100%
	Educ. of Exceptional Students (CORE CK) 2006-2007	2	100%
	Educ. of Exceptional Students (MTMD) 2006-2007	2	100%
	Praxis II: PLT 2006-2007	2	100%
Kinesiology b.S. (Pedag. K-12 Health and Phy.Educ.	Phy. Educ.: Content Knowledge 2008-2009	2	100%
	PLT (7-12)** 2008-2009	2	100%
	Phy. Educ.: Content Knowledge 2007-2008	4	100%
	PLT (7-12)** 2007-2008	4	100%
	Phy. Educ.: Content Knowledge 2006-2007	5	100%
	PLT (7-12)** 2006-2007	5	100%
B.S. Early Childhood Education PK-3	Early Childhood (0521) 2008-2009	4	100%
	Praxis II: PLT** 2008-2009	4	100%
	Praxis II: PLTPK-3)** 2006-2007	3	100%
	Praxis II: ECE (0020) 2006-2007	3	100%
B.A. Social Studies Education 6-12	Praxis II: PLT** 2007-2008	2	100%
	Content Know. Interpret. of Material 2007-2008	2	100%
	Praxis II: PLT** 2006-2007	5	100%
	Praxis II (0081) S. S. CK Interp.	5	100%

	of Mat.2006-2007		
B.A. English Education 6-12	Praxis II(0041)Lang. Lit. & Comp.: CK Ped. 2008-09	2	100%
	Praxis II: PLT** 2008-2009	2	100%
	Praxis II: PLT** 2006-2007	5	100%
	Content Knowledge Ped. 2006-07	2	100%
	Praxis II: PLT** 2006-2007	2	100%
B.S. Mathematics Education 6-12	Praxis II Mathematics: CK (0061) 2006-2007	1	100%
	Praxis PLT ** 2006-2007	1	100%
Bachelor of Music Education Instrumental (K-12)	Praxis II: PLT** 2008-2009	2	100%
	Praxis II Music Education Instrumental 2008-2009	2	100%
	Praxis II: PLT** 2007-2008	5	100%
	Praxis II Music Education Instrumental 2007-2008	5	100%
	Praxis II: PLT** 2006-2007	2	100%
	Praxis II Music Education Instrumental 2006-2007	2	100%

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 Unit has fifteen active Initial Undergraduate Programs (BA or BS) and five Advanced Programs: M. Ed.- C&I (implemented fall 2009); M.Ed. SP ED (implemented fall 2009); M.Ed.-Educational Leaders Level I; and Ed.D. in C&I and in EDL. Additionally, the Unit offers a post-baccalaureate alternative certification program, Teach GSU, for certification in elementary education (grades 1-5) and in special education (M/M 1-12). Three of the programs (ELEM ED 1-5, SP ED, M/M Elementary Dual, and Kinesiology K-12 HPED) that were reviewed in fall 2007 received National Recognition with condition. These will be resubmitted in March 2010 for review. There were 3 programs that were recently reviewed and received national recognition with Condition. These were Social Studies, English, and ECE. The programs needing further development are Mathematics, Science, and EDL. At this point none of the SPA reports submitted in October 2009 were returned "not recognized". The responses to those are in progress. The initial programs are nationally reviewed with the exception of the following: music, art, and the alternative certification program, Teach GSU.
Data from other key assessments that demonstrate the content knowledge of music, art (no program completers during the report period) and Teach GSU include course grades, grade point average, Teacher Candidate/Intern Evaluation, and Electronic Portfolios (that are evaluated by the university supervisor and their

cooperating supervising teacher). For example content assessment with ED 452 Advanced Seminar Methods includes subject matter knowledge within the lesson plan. The evaluation rubric for the report years indicates the mean performance for all baccalaureate candidates was 4.52 on a 5 point scale (Exhibit 1a2.1). The music candidates complete the course Senior Recital 412, a required performance demonstration of content. The candidates are evaluated by the Instrumental Music Education Rubric or the Vocal Music Education Rubric based on their area of specialization. From fall 2006 to Fall 2009 the candidates had a mean score of 3.5-3.8 on a 4.0 scale for items on the rubric (Exhibit 1a2-2). The ratings indicate that the candidates know the content and how to apply the content knowledge to techniques. The music majors also compiled Electronic portfolios which included examples of their work on the field while completing their student teaching experience (Exhibit 1a2-3). The Teacher Candidate/Intern Evaluation reflects the degree of knowledge in planning, classroom management, instruction, and professional development based on the LCET. The assessment is used to help determine the candidates' knowledge of content as related to the ability to deliver instruction (Exhibit1a2-4). The course grades include music courses in the Music Department and content based courses in the Department of C&I. For example, the content based course assessments include the Written Lesson Plan data and the Technology Infused Lesson Plan data (Exhibit 1a2-5). The data reflect that the candidates demonstrate exemplary content knowledge on both of the lesson plan assessments. No art majors completed the program during the target years. Content knowledge (CK) is also assessed at Transition Point 2 in the units' assessment system. Individuals seeking admission to Teach GSU must have a bachelor's degree, a minimum of 2.50 GPA or higher on a 4.00 scale, pass Praxis Pre-Professional Skills Test in reading (score of 174), writing (score of 173), and mathematics(score of 172), pass content specific examinations for Elementary Grades 1-5 (0014-ELEM ED CK) or SP ED M/M 1-12 (0014-ELEM ED CK, 0069- Middle School (MS) Mathematics, 0439-MS Science, 0089-MS Social Studies, 0049-MS ELA 6-12 Core Content Area Exams). In order to exit the program, candidates must receive an exemplary or fully acceptable rating on all CK competencies outlined in the Teach GSU final evaluation instrument (Exhibit 1a2-6).

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 Unit currently offers three masters degree programs, one of which has been nationally reviewed (Educational Leadership), and the other two were implemented for fall 2009 (M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction and M.Ed in Special Education). Key assessments for the recently implemented programs have been

identified and are components of the Comprehensive Assessment System, but have no reportable data.
In the LEC program, content in Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Leadership is measured through the eight (8) core courses in three ways, to include the following:
1) Signature assessments used for each course. Analysis indicated that a score of "2" or higher on a 3 point rubric for scoring signature assessments on core courses was achieved (Exhibit 1a3-1).
2) Course Grades. Analysis showed all (n = 19) candidates scored a grade of "B" or higher in each of the core courses (Exhibit 1a3-2).
3) Comprehensive Exam. There is a 100% pass rate on the comprehensive exam (written and oral). Students are required to successfully complete this exam before they are eligible to graduate. The examination specifications consist of a six-hour written component and a two-hour oral component.

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.]

Follow up surveys of graduates included two specific items on content knowledge.
1) "Knowledge of Subject Matter"
Aggregated data from the report years indicate that 5% of the program completers were very satisfied with their content knowledge preparation.
2) "Vocabulary terminology and facts in variety of fields of knowledge."
Aggregated data from the report years indicate that 71.4% of the program completers were very satisfied with their content knowledge (Exhibit 1a4-1).
The Employers' Survey includes one item specific to candidates' knowledge.
1) "Knowledge of Subject Area": Aggregate data from the report years indicate that 66.7% of employers strongly agree that graduates are competent in their subject matter disciplines.

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.]

Table 4a Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests for Teach GSU Candidates

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.]

In Table 4, the candidates also demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) and skills through mastery of the Praxis II (PLT) exam. Candidates' performance on the Instruction and Assessment component of the PLT exam (Instructional Strategies, Planning Instruction, Assessment Strategies), indicate that their performance is within average, 2008-2009, 83.3% scored within avg. performance, 5.6 % scored above avg. performance; 2007-2008, 70% scored within avg. performance, 10 % scored above avg. performance; 2006-2007, 61.5% scored within avg. performance, 15.4% scored above avg. performance. The Students as Learners component of the PLT exam also serves to measure the pedagogical knowledge. Data summaries across target years for that component follow: 2008-2009, 72.2% scored within avg performance, 16.7% scored above avg performance; 2007-2008, 75% scored within avg performance, & 2006-2007, 53.8% scored within avg performance (Exhibit 1b1-1).

The art & music teacher candidates in the initial program must take a series of courses that focus on PCK and skills. Key assessments focus on PCK in: ED 453 (Written Lesson Plan and On-Site Lesson Plan Delivery); Ed 402 (Technology Infused Lesson Plan). In these courses candidates plan and implement an instructional lesson that they present at the partnership school. Reading courses (ED 303 & ED 322) provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate PCK and skills. In 2006-2009 a music candidate completed ED 322, Fall 2008. On a key assessment for that course (Technology Infused Project) a candidate scored 90%, above the level of mastery score. Summer 2008, two candidates in music completed ED 303. On a key assessment (Literature-Based Word Recognition Skills Presentation) for that course, a candidate scored 80% and another scored 95% (Exhibit 1b1-2). Candidates designed and implemented instructional lessons, selected and utilized resources and assessments that met the diverse learner needs of students in their classes (Exhibit 1b1-3).

Music & art candidates complete ED 303 and 322. Candidates demonstrate PCK needed to help promote literacy learning across the curriculum. Mean scores of music candidates in ED 322 indicate candidates were knowledgeable about the course content. Scores follow: Fall 2009-95; Fall 2008-98.6; Fall 2007-80.4; Fall 2006 -99.5 (Exhibit b1-4). In ED 303, a key assessment that relates to content knowledge is the Article Critique assignment. The mean scores reflect candidates make excellent connections to content knowledge as related to current trends and

strategies that are reflected in their articles. The scores follow: Sp 2009-89.0; Sum 2009-92.6; Sp 2008-95.2; and S 2007 84.6.

For Teach GSU candidates, grades in curriculum courses measure PCK. Completers attained a grade of 3.0+ (4.0 scale) in all required pedagogical content courses. Scores for final grades earned in content courses required for ELEM certification ranged between 3.56 and 4.0 and SPED certification ranged between 3.00 and 4.00 (Exhibit 1b1). 100% of the completers in both certification areas met minimum expectation in all core pedagogical content courses for the reporting period.

Teach GSU candidates evidenced mastery of PCK and skills by passing Praxis II PLT examinations before exiting the program. Praxis II PLT data reflect a 100% pass rate for reporting period (Exhibit 1b1-6; Exhibit 2a.2.1; Exhibit 1c17).

Teach GSU candidates acquire and demonstrate necessary PCK and skills through required clinical/internship experiences in Transition Point 2 (Exhibit 1b-1-2; Exhibit 1b-1-3; Exhibit 2a.2.1). EDPT 452 & EDPT 453 are field based courses taken during their internship (Exhibit 1a-2-3).

Teach GSU candidates demonstrate PCK and skills through development and implementation of lesson plan artifacts required for EDPT 412 and EDPT 329 courses. Data indicate that 100% of candidates met target or acceptable expectations on lesson plan components (Exhibit1b1-7; Exhibit 1b1-8).

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.]

There are no key assessment data because the M.ED in Curriculum and Instruction was initiated in fall 2009. The M.Ed. in Special Education Mild/Moderate was also implemented in fall 2009.

LEC candidates in both Ed. D. programs in Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Leadership are required to complete 15 hours of Foundations Core courses. They include: LECF 700, Introduction to Doctoral Research; LECF 701, Applied Statistical Analyses; LECF 702, Evaluation Theory and Practice; LECF 703, Qualitative Research in Education, and LECF 704, Sociocultural and Diversity Issues. Candidates must score a "2" or higher on the 3 point rubric used to score signature assessment from these courses (Exhibit 1b2-1). Candidates must also achieve a passing score on the preliminary examination, which is designed to measure candidates' competence in: 1) educational foundations, 2) research, 3) statistics, and 4) general professional knowledge. All candidates have scored a "2" or higher on their assessments. All candidates have also passed the preliminary examination in the history of the program, with the exception of 3 candidates.

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.]

Follow-up studies for Teach GSU completers and initial BS/BA graduates provide information about their preparation in pedagogical content knowledge.

One specific item on the follow-up survey relates to pedagogical knowledge: "Awareness of different cultures and ways of life in the curriculum". Results on this item over the report years indicated that 40% of the graduates were very satisfied and 60% were satisfied with this aspect of their pedagogical knowledge preparation.

Employer follow-up surveys for the initial program graduates have two specific items related to pedagogical content knowledge. The results for those items follow.
1) "An awareness of different cultures and ways of life in the curriculum". Results for the report years for this item reveal that 83.3% of the employers strongly agreed and 16% agreed that graduates demonstrate this aspect of pedagogical content knowledge.
2) "An understanding of abilities, limitations, interests, and values of individuals". Results for the report years for this item reveal that 66.7 % of the employers strongly agreed and 33.3% agree that graduates demonstrate this aspect of pedagogical content knowledge (Exhibit 1b3-1).

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.)

State Supplements Statement Information

See Attachments panel below.

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.]

Initial teacher preparation program candidates complete several key assessments to demonstrate the extent of their professional/pedagogical knowledge/skills in facilitating student learning. These key assessments include the On-Site Lesson Plan Delivery (Exhibit 1c1-1) in ED 452, & ED 453. Both are taken prior to Student Teaching.

Initial candidates take ED 455, which includes 3 key assessments: Teacher Candidate/Internship Evaluation (TCIE), Impact on Student Learning, & the Electronic Portfolio. Results are displayed in Exhibit 1c1-2. For example, in ED 455 the Impact on Student Learning Assessment, candidates effectively apply research to classroom instruction. The rubric is comprised of 3 major components on a 4 point scale: Assessment Design, Data Analysis, Directed Questions. Summaries of mean score performances shown in Exhibit 1c1-3.

The TCIE provides further documentation of performance. Another key assessment that provides support for this element is the On-Site Lesson Plan Delivery activity. Results reflected in Exhibit 1c1-4.

Initial candidates take Reading/Literacy courses to demonstrate content knowledge and skills in reading. ECE candidates take ED 217, ED 325 ED 431, and ED 304. ELEM candidates take ED 303, ED 304, ED 325, and ED 431. SEC candidates take ED 322. To determine the impact of the candidates' performance (according to course grades) in reading courses, with their performance on the Praxis exam (ELEM Content 0014), the course avg of the Reading grades of ELEM candidates was compared to their ELEM Praxis exam score (Reading component). Exhibit 1c1-5 shows that the majority of the ELEM candidates scored well above avg on the ELEM content Exam. All teacher candidates take ED 328 to review high stakes test data to enhance the teaching-learning process. The total class had a mean score of 83.3 (Exhibit 1c1-6).

These courses, signature assessments, and data support that candidates demonstrate the competencies identified for the La Standards for reading. Candidates' scores on the PRAXIS exam demonstrate they are very knowledgeable of appropriate professional & pedagogical skills. A component of this examination provides assessments of facilitation of student learning. Candidate performance on section IV Students as Learners segment of Praxis are shown in Exhibit 1c1-7.

Data from the following key assessments indicate that Teach GSU candidates demonstrate professional and pedagogical knowledge & skills to support P-12 student learning: 1.) In Transition Point 2 candidates complete nine semester hours of PCK related coursework during the summer school session. The courses are specific to the candidates' area of certification. Data for the reporting period indicate that the average course grades range between 3.00 and 4.0. 100% of the candidates enrolled in the ELEM or SPED courses met minimum expectation (Exhibit 1a-2-1; Exhibit 1b-1-2). Candidates must develop lesson plan artifacts for practicum/internship courses (Exhibit 1c1-8). Data of the Written Lesson Plan Evaluation Form indicates that 100% of the candidates are competent in the

development and implementation of the components of the lesson plan design. In Transition Point 3 EDPT 452 and EDPT 453, candidates demonstrate ability to plan, develop, and implement on site lessons and assess student learning outcomes through completion of the Practicum/Internship and the Professional Portfolio. Scores ranged between 3.28 and 3.71 for reporting years. Candidates received target or acceptable ratings in: Planning, Management, Instruction and Professional Development. Scores for the Electronic Portfolio Presentation ranged between 3.14 and 5.00. Candidates received excellent or target ratings in: organization, content, visuals, mechanics, and delivery (Exhibit 1c1-9).
In the LEC program C&I candidates must complete 24 hours of core courses and must score a "2" or higher on the "3" point rubric for signature assessment for these courses.

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.]

For initial BS/BA candidates key assessments on lesson delivery (3 key components), PLT (Subcategory II and I), and on portfolio items (Professional Development Sub- component) provide data indicating that candidates develop competencies in considering school, family, and community contexts and prior student experiences; know major school of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and analyze educational research findings. The results of these key assessments are provided in 1c2-1and indicate that the candidates demonstrate the competencies at acceptable levels.

The key assessments for Teach GSU candidates and their performance on these assessments are also shown in Table 1c.5. In summary, these initial candidates demonstrate the competencies measured by the key assessment instruments.

The data from the Impact on Student Learning Assessment, the Student Teacher Portfolio and the Student Teacher Evaluations provide evidence that the initial teacher candidates are involved in a variety of experiences that help them to work with the family and community while participating in the Student Teaching experience. They also have numerous opportunities to apply and transfer "major schools of thought" about teaching and learning as they plan and implement the Written lesson Plan, the Technology Infusion Lesson Plan, and the On-Site Delivery Lesson. Afterwards they have an opportunity to review and reflect on the assessments of their University professor and their on-site cooperating teacher. The results of the licensure test (Principles of Learning and Teaching which was referenced previously) demonstrate that the candidates have a strong understanding of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are related to promoting effective teaching and learning. Candidates also have numerous

opportunities to analyze educational findings as they review current journals (Article Critiques) and other publications to help prepare numerous course projects and assignments such as the lesson plans and the Student Teacher Portfolio. They also have opportunities to review educational research findings (that relate to selecting and using appropriate resources, designing effective instructional planning and delivery, selecting and using multiple measures of assessments, providing for accommodations, technology integration, promoting Reading/Literacy skills across the curriculum) and make connections between major schools of thought and teaching and learning as they prepare for the licensure exams.

During the Practicum/Internship, Teach GSU candidates are provided with opportunities to apply theoretical concepts and principles to classroom settings. They also implement research-based best practices and methodologies that serve as a catalyst for enhancing learning outcomes of diverse student populations. An analysis of the Impact on Student Learning data indicate a mean score range of 3.36 - 3.40 on a 4 point scale in the following areas: assessment design (mean scores 3.40 – 3.48), data, analysis (mean score 3.36 – 3.40), and directed questions (mean score 3.36 – 3.40 over a three year period of 2007 – 2009).

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.]

There are no key assessment data for advanced teacher candidates because the M.ED in Curriculum and Instruction and the M.Ed. in Special Education were initiated in fall 2009.

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.]

Over the report period, follow up studies of initial candidates provide data on 3 items assessing completers' preparation for professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. The items along with assessment data for each are presented here.
1. "Skills and techniques directly applicable to a job"
20% of the completers indicated that they were very satisfied with the preparation for this competence, while 80% indicated they were satisfied with preparation for this element.

2. "Ability to utilize technology in the instructional process"
6% of the completers reported that they were very satisfied, 20% were dissatisfied with their preparation in this professional knowledge and skills competence.
3. " Ability to write clearly, correctly, and effectively"
40% of the completers were very satisfied with their preparation in this professional knowledge and skills competence, while 80% were satisfied.

Follow up studies of employers provide data on 7 items assessing program completers' preparation for professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. The items and the assessment data for each are presented here.
1. "Skills and techniques directly applicable to a job"
67. 7% of the employers indicated they strongly agree that program completers demonstrated skills and techniques directly applicable to a job, while 33% agreed.
2. "The ability to develop and adapt practices that address diverse learning styles"
83.3% of the employers indicated they strongly agree that program completers demonstrated the ability to develop and adapt practices that address diverse leaning styles, while 16.7% agreed.
3. "The experiences in relating to other people"
66.7% of the employers indicated they strongly agree program completers demonstrated experiences in relating to other people, while 33.3% agreed.
4. "Understanding of abilities, limitations, interests and values of individuals"
66,7% of the employers indicated that program completers demonstrated an understanding of abilities, limitations, interests, and values of individuals, while 33.3% agreed.
5. "The ability to use effective and oral communication skills"
66.7% of the employers indicated they strongly agreed program completers demonstrated the ability to use effective oral communication skills.
6. "The ability to use a wide range of knowledge in professional practice"
66.7% of the employers indicated that they strongly agreed program completers demonstrated the ability to use a wide range of knowledge practice while 33% agreed.
7. "Ability to utilize technology in the instructional process"
66.7% of the employers indicated that they strongly agreed program completers demonstrated the ability to use a wide range of knowledge practice while 33% agreed.

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 data from the key assessments that are included in Ed 455-Student Teaching demonstrate that the initial teacher candidates (art and music included) can assess and analyze student learning. These key assessments include: Impact on Student Learning, Student Teacher Portfolio, Teacher Candidate/Internship Evaluation. During the 2009 semester, (on a scale from 1-unacceptable-4-Target), 2 of the music candidates received 3 (acceptable) on each of the three components of the rubric. These components are Assessment Design, Data Analysis, and Directed Questions (Exhibit 1d1-1). No art education candidates during this timeframe.

Candidates in the Teach GSU program demonstrate that they can analyze and utilize assessment results to enhance instructional planning and to increase student learning through required competencies in the EDPT 452: Educational Practicum and Internship I and EDPT 453: Educational Practicum and Internship II courses (Exhibit 1d1-2).

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.]

Programs for advanced teacher candidates in the M. Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction were implemented fall 2009, as was the M.Ed. in Special Education. Key assessments for these programs are included in the Assessment System, however, there are no reportable data yet.

Licensure test passage requirement was not implemented until Cohort 3 entered

the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership in fall 2009.

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.]

Follow-up survey results for the initial program reveal that 75% of completers are very satisfied with their preparation and ability to help all students learn. Survey results reveal that 83.3% of employers are very satisfied with initial program completers' ability to help all students learn (Exhibit 1a-4-1).

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.

Table 5
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)	N/A	N/A	N/A

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.]

Candidates in the LEC program in Educational Leadership must complete 24 hours of core courses and must score a "2" or higher on the "3" point rubric for the

signature assessment from these courses: 1) LECF 700-Introduction to Doctoral Research, 2) LECF 701-Applied Statistical Analyses, 3) LECF 702- Evaluation Theory and Practice, 4) LECF 703- Qualitative Research in Education and 5) LECF 704- Sociocultural and Diversity Issues. Additionally, candidates must pass the comprehensive examination that is designed to measure student competence in 1) educational research, 2) research, 3) statistics, and 4) general professional knowledge. Candidates in the Ed. Leadership program have all scored a 2.68 (89%) or higher on their signature assessments and have passed the comprehensive examination (Exhibit1e2-1).

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.]

The first cohort of candidates in the Masters Degree program for Educational Leaders will be administered the follow-up survey in Spring 2010. The employer surveys will be administered after graduates have been employed in leadership roles for two years.

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.]

Explanation for Table 5

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.]

Candidates in the LEC program for both Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Leadership are required to work with diverse students through

experiences in the following courses: 1) LECF 704 Sociocultural Diversity, 2) LECL 721 Effective Teaching and Learning and 3) LECF 702 Program Evaluation (Exhibit 1f1-1).

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.]

Follow-up studies and employer surveys will be administered 2010 for graduates of the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership and after the graduate has been in a leadership role for the employer survey.

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?

The Unit has identified a set of dispositions that are common across all programs. These dispositions are based on the Conceptual Framework, Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching and other state and national standards. Moreover, the dispositions are applicable to both initial and advanced candidates. Dispositions are as follows:
3.1 Display positive self-awareness
3.2 Practice a positive attitude and mutual respect toward students, parents, and colleagues
3.3 Display sensitivity to diverse learning styles and multiple intelligences
3.4 Demonstrate sensitivity to the many facets of diversity
3.5 Organize school, family, and community partnerships
3.6 Influence the development of healthy mental, physical, and social lifestyles
3.7 Display a commitment to the improvement of student learning and school improvement
3.8 Display a classroom climate that is conducive to learning.

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.]

Six of the expected dispositions relate to fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Candidates respond to the Dispositions Inventory and the results for those dispositions relevant to fairness and that all students can learn are included in the results table (Table 1.g.2 Mean Disposition Scores for the 6 Relevant Dispositions).

The data clearly indicate that candidates demonstrate appropriate dispositions for fairness and belief that all students can learn. The mean scores on each item range from 4.61 to 4.71 on the five point scale.

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.]

Candidate responses on the Dispositions Inventory include one item indicating demonstrating of the professional dispositions appropriate in working with students, families, colleagues, and communities. The candidate responses to "Engage in collaborations and partnerships" show a mean score of 4.6 on a five point scale.

Additional assessments of student teaching and internships include items related to the dispositions of candidates. A summary of ratings for applicable items follows:
1. Adheres to professional protocol. Rating: Acceptable
2. Demonstrates competency. Rating: Acceptable
3. Demonstrates cooperative attitude. Rating: Acceptable
4. Collaborates with stakeholders. Rating: Acceptable
5. Acts ethically. Rating: Acceptable
These items are rated by the university supervisor.

Candidates' disposition in the Educational Leaders Level I Masters program are measured in the signature piece from various courses (i.e. EDLD 504, EDLD 505, EDLD 510) within the program. The candidates' ability to apply and articulate with students, families, colleagues and the larger context are measured.

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.]

Follow-up studies of program completers for the report period include a dispositions item as follows.
"Ability to withhold judgment, raise questions and examine contrary views"
Results on this item indicate that 20% were very satisfied with their ability to demonstrate this disposition, while 80% were satisfied. (see Exhibit 1c.4)

Follow-up Studies of Employers utilize two dispositions items. The items and the ratings for each follow.
"Ability to withhold judgment, raise questions and examine contrary views"
67% of employers strongly agreed that graduates displayed this disposition, while 33% agreed.

"Ability to think and act independently"
66.7% of the employers strongly agree that graduates displayed this disposition, while 33.3% agree.(Exhibit1g4-1)

In the Educational Leaders Level I Master's program, a follow-up Survey will be administered Spring 2010 to candidates who completed the first cohort in fall 2009. Surveys will be administered to all program candidates at the completion of each two year term. The employer surveys will be administered after graduates have been employed in leadership roles for two years.

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.]

Table 1-g-2 Mean Disposition Scores for the 6 Relevant Dispositions

See Attachments panel below.

Optional

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

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

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?

The Unit's conceptual framework (Exhibit B1.8.1 Conceptual Framework Tree Graphic and Strands) is aligned with state and professional standards (Exhibit B.1.9.1 Alignment of State, Professional and Institutional Standards) and serves as the foundation for the Unit Assessment System (UAS). The signature assessments are aligned with conceptual framework outcomes (Exhibit B.1.9.2 Conceptual Framework KSD Alignment with Signature Assessments). This alignment ensures that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies as articulated in the conceptual framework, the state's standards and the professional standards for both initial and advanced programs. The alignment also enables us to be efficient and focused on the data that are collected, which maximizes our ability to grow a culture of data-driven decisions in the Unit. The UAS is a blueprint for fostering a continuous cycle of planning, implementation and evaluation that ultimately documents that the Unit produces knowledgeable, skilled, compassionate educators and other school professionals.

The UAS is a centralized system that is comprehensive in the assessment of the Unit's operations, the quality of its initial and advanced programs, the performance of its candidates and the professional competencies of its graduates. A new dean was appointed during the fall of 2009. As part of the orientation process to the Unit and GSU, the newly appointed dean conducted an informal, internal review of the Unit's operations, including the assessment system. As a result, UAS was refined to include 1) a more defined approval process for implementing data-driven decisions, and 2) a Unit adoption of TaskStream with implementation in spring 2010.

TaskStream is not new to the Unit. When the State terminated its use of Passport, the Unit adopted and implemented TaskStream as the electronic portfolio system used by two degree programs: Doctor of Education in Curriculum and Instruction and Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership. These programs are attached to the Louisiana Education Consortium (LEC); GSU is one of three institutions in this consortium. TaskStream through its portfolio system enables the Unit to

collect candidate data, to provide faster feedback to candidates, and to communicate with candidates post-graduation. Systematic and periodic checkups are performed every semester to ensure candidates submit the required assessment (e.g., signature assessments, surveys, portal reviews) and faculty and supervisors evaluate the assessment on time. A calendar of assessment events is widely distributed as a means of ensuring the meaningful participation of those who can best help us ensure that data are collected (and used) to determine candidates' proficiencies as articulated in the conceptual framework, state standards and respective professional standards.

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 UAS is a comprehensive, systematic, standards-based assessment system and Unit evaluation is created through collaboration. The initial assessment system was designed to be implemented over a series of years from fall 2002 to spring 2005. Stakeholders included members of the PK-16+ Council, the Professional Education Council, College of Education Administrative Council, and departmental faculty from College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences. The initial Unit assessments have remained relatively unchanged except for changes in Louisiana PRAXIS scores or changes due to State redesign efforts. The initial program assessments, however, have changed and continue to change as members of the stakeholder groups review and revise assessments. (See Exhibit 2a.3.1 Table of Current Program Assessments; Exhibit 2a.3.2 Table of Program Stakeholder Committee Members). Stakeholders have met in individual work teams to review the data derived from the system, to determine applicability to measure candidate performances, to determine usefulness in informing decisions about candidates and Unit functions. In addition workshops and retreats were held to enable work teams to collaborate on assessments and to allow groups to collaborate across programs (Exhibit 2c.2.10 Assessment Retreat 2009; Exhibit 2c.2.11 COE Newsletter 2008; Exhibit 2c.2.12 Retreats October 2008 Agenda and Minutes; Exhibit 2c.2.13 Assessment Work Session April 25, 2008). SPA work teams collaborated with the Unit Assessment Committee (UAC) through the UAC chairs.

The UAC oversees assessment within the Unit. The assessment coordinator coordinates assessment practices within the Unit among programs: 1) analyzes data from various areas of the UAS, 2) disseminates data to program chairs and department heads, and 3) performs systematic and routine checks to ensure candidates submit required assessments and that faculty and supervisors evaluate the assessment on time. Proposed changes may be initiated at the program, department, or committee level and flow through the UAC. The UAC reviews and notifies the dean of proposed changes. The dean forwards changes to the COE Administrative Council (AC), which forwards to PK-16+ Council for review and recommendations. Their recommendations are considered in the final action taken by the COE AC. The UAS transition points were expanded in AY 2006-2007 to include portal transition points for the Louisiana Educational Consortium program, but upon recent review by the UAC the transition points were collapsed in an effort to streamline and more efficiently depict the UAS. This change was recommended by the UAC (Exhibit 2a.3.4 Minutes of Assessment Committee, see November 10, 2009) and reviewed by the PK-16+ Council (Exhibit 2a.3.10 Minutes of PK-16+ Council and PEC Meetings and Agenda, see February 23, 2010) and approved by the COE Administrative Council (Exhibit 2a.3.6 Minutes of CO Administrative Council).

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

The Unit and its programs take multiple steps to ensure procedures are fair, accurate, consistent and free from bias:
• Candidates at both initial and advanced levels are informed of program requirements at the time of program admission and during advisement each semester (Exhibit B1.2.14 GSU Academic Advisement Manual), and these requirements are detailed in Exhibit B1.2.1 GSU General Catalog, available online, and in program handbooks (Exhibit 2a.4.1 Initial and Advanced Program Handbooks).
• Course syllabi were standardized and course performance objectives and rubrics aligned with the conceptual framework and with state and professional standards. Program faculty provide candidates with course syllabi and rubrics at the beginning of each semester. Candidates also have "due process" procedures at GSU, Unit and program level. There is an appeals process for candidates stipulated in GSU catalog. Faculty also provide assessment accommodations for candidates registered with the Student Intervention Resource Center.
• The Unit uses multiple measures at each transition point (See Exhibit 2a.2.1 Table 6 Unit Assessment System Transition Points). Assessments are reviewed by program faculty to ensure assessments are free of racial and ethical stereotypes, poorly conceived language and task situations, and other forms of cultural bias that could unintentionally favor one candidate over another or impact candidate performance. Discussion between supervising faculty and cooperating teachers address issues of fairness, accuracy, consistency and avoidance of bias at the start of each semester during clinical practice. The diversity of the faculty in the Unit

also helps to ensure the elimination of bias.

• Standardized tests scores on ACT, SAT, GRE, PRAXIS I and II, and LATAAP provide the Unit with data based upon consistent, reliable, and nationally validated criteria on candidate performance to be used in comparative analyses and assurance of candidate mastery of content. The signature assessment for student teachers and interns (ED 455 Student Teacher/Intern Evaluation) is the previously validated Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching instrument used by state evaluators.

• When possible, multiple raters are used and data are triangulated to ensure validity and reliability. For example, several assessments at initial level are panel reviewed by members internal and external to GSU (ED 455 Electronic Portfolio, MUS 411 Juried Panel Recital, Art 422 Senior Exhibition). Advanced candidates comprehensive exams use multiple raters.

• Content validity has been a major focus of the redesign process over the past five years. Prior to approval, each course was examined by a team representing different disciplines who scrutinized both objectives and assessment for alignment with professional standards. The evaluators were brought in from outside of Louisiana to provide a broader perspective in the state review process.

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

The Unit maintains a plan for data collection, analysis and review (see Exhibit 2a.5.1 Data Collection, Analysis, Review Plan) that describes how data are used. Assessment data are collected at multiple points, and multiple assessments are used including both internal and external data. Data are regularly compiled, summarized, analyzed and used. For example, candidate data are used by programs to make decisions regarding candidate admission, matriculation, and program completion. Program assessments are used internally to measure program quality and manage and improve Unit operations and programs. SPA program reports are external evaluations used to strengthen the overall performance of the Unit and ensure that graduates have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to meet program standards. SPA program approval reflects on Unit and operations quality. Employer surveys are used to ascertain candidate proficiencies in the workplace as well as Unit and operations quality. Follow-up surveys also provide data for improvement of Unit operations (Exhibit 2a.5-2 Follow-up Survey; Exhibit 2a.5-3 Employer Survey).

GSU Course and Instructor Evaluations (Exhibit B1.2.16) are completed by candidates. Results of these evaluations are shared with faculty members to improve the teaching and learning environment and are used by departmental chairs during annual faculty evaluations as well as an indicator of Unit and program operations quality.

Faculty submit the Annual Faculty Report (Exhibit B1.2.17 Annual Faculty Report). Faculty evaluations by department chairs are conducted annually (Exhibit B1.2.18 Faculty Performance Evaluation Form) and feedback is used to improve faculty

productivity and to assist faculty in meeting tenure and promotion goals. Data also provide evidence of Unit and program operations quality. Tenure-track faculty are evaluated for tenure and promotion on criteria following procedures established in the Exhibit B1.2.11 GSU Faculty Handbook. Faculty are also evaluated by peers using the Exhibit B1.2.19 Faculty Peer Evaluation.

GSU supervisors and cooperating teachers are evaluated and data are used to make future assignments and used as an indicator of Unit and program operations quality (Exhibit B1-2-4 OPLE Student Teaching Handbook). These evaluations are completed at the end of each semester: 1) student teaching candidate evaluation of GSU supervisor and cooperating teacher, 2) cooperating teacher evaluation of GSU supervisor, and 3) GSU supervisor evaluation of cooperating teacher.

The annual Departmental Goals and Objectives Form (Exhibit B1.2.20 Administrative and Academic Support Units Forms) is used to guide the planning and operations of each department and is used as an indicator of Unit and program operations quality. Each fall, departmental faculty set goals, objectives, strategies, and performance measures for the upcoming fiscal year and evaluate performance measures from the previous year.

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.]

Table 6 - Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments
Exhibit 2a-3-1 - Table of Current Program Assessments
Exhibit 2a-5-1 - Data Collection Analysis Review Plan

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?

Historically, assessment data have been collected in the Unit, but the UAS implemented in 2002-2003 academic year provided structure and improved the process. The UAS included an Action Matrix delineating the data collection, analysis, summarization, and dissemination processes as well as timelines and detailed information on the who, what, and when of each process (see Exhibit 2b.1.1 COE Assessment Action Matrix). A Unit Assessment Committee (UAC) self study recently revealed that while data was systematically collected and analyzed, the dissemination and review processes were not as systematic. This prompted several changes in UAS: 1) UAS transition points (Exhibit 2a.2.1 Table 6 Unit Assessment System Transition Points) and 2) UAS data collection, analysis and review plan (Exhibit 2a.5.1 Data Collection, Analysis, Review Plan).

At the time of the 2003 NCATE visit, the Unit used PASSPORT, an electronic portfolio system, as a tool to support data collection, aggregation, and disaggregation. When PASSPORT changed ownership, the Unit had to decide to either remain with PASSPORT or switch. In 2006, the Louisiana Education Consortium (LEC) Board decided to utilize TaskStream as its new electronic portfolio system (see Exhibit 2a-3-11 Minutes of LEC Board Meetings). Since GSU along with Louisiana Tech University and University of Louisiana-Monroe comprise the three-university consortium offering two doctoral degrees (Doctor of Education in Curriculum and Instruction and Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership), Grambling switched to TaskStream with the other two universities. ULM took the lead in establishing a TaskStream LEC assessment structure and populated the system with assessments specific to the LEC and its courses which are taught at each of the three universities. Faculty at all three institutions were trained. In 2007, two training sessions were conducted to train the Unit's faculty on how to use TaskStream.

In summer 2007, however, the Unit's assessment coordinator resigned his position and GSU began a search for a new coordinator. As time passed, the doctoral programs remained the only programs using TaskStream. Although the college experienced challenges in finding an assessment coordinator, college faculty and staff across all programs and the Unit continued to follow the UAS schedule in the Action Matrix and continued to individually collect, analyze and summarize data from applicants, candidates, graduates and employers, cooperating teachers, GSU supervisors, faculty, and national testing services. Data were compiled and shared using MS Excel, SPSS and MS Word software and presented in table format as well as in graphs depending on how data are best represented. However, data collection began to decentralize in multiple places and in multiple formats becoming cumbersome for Unit faculty and administration.

With the change in College of Education Dean and GSU administration in fall 2009, a self study was conducted by the UAC. The committee streamlined the UAS for consistency and a clearer picture across programs collapsing the 13 portal transition points into six transition points across all programs (see Exhibit 2a.2.1 Table 6 Unit Assessment System Transition Points). To more efficiently and effectively monitor the processes, the number of events collapsed into four: assessment administration, data collection, data analysis and summary, and data usage. At each event the frequency and responsibility were clearly delineated (Exhibit 2a.5.1 Data Collection, Analysis, Review Plan). This recommendation from the UAC with input from Unit faculty and staff was reviewed by the PK-16 Council and adopted by the COE Administrative Council (see Exhibit 2a.3.4 Minutes of Assessment Committee; Exhibit 2a.3.10 Minutes of PK-16 and PEC Meetings and Agenda; Exhibit 2a.3.6 Minutes of CO Administrative Council). However, even with streamlined UAS, it was a challenge to fully integrate the UAS because data was housed in multiple formats and in multiple places.

In fall 2009 due to the absence of an assessment coordinator, the Associate Vice President/Planning and Institutional Research along with a faculty member appointed as a data analyst for the Unit were given the responsibility to centrally analyze and summarize and disseminate Unit and program data for review following the UAS scheduled dates (Exhibit 5a.5.1 Data Collection Analysis Review Plan). The data analyst is a faculty member in the Unit who teaches research and statistics classes and assumed the assessment coordinator's responsibilities in fall 2009. In fall 2009, all programs began to transition to TaskStream, and data from surveys and signature assessments from all programs are scheduled for collection via TaskStream in spring 2010 semester. Using the TaskStream electronic portfolio system will expedite the process to data review for program improvement. It also increases access to information since reports are posted on the TaskStream website making data accessible to faculty and administrators anytime with Internet access.

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?

The Unit only has programs on the main campus. The Unit does not have off-campus sites or distance learning programs although some courses are offered through distance learning.

Teach GSU (Practitioner Teacher Program) is an alternate certification program with concentrations in elementary and special education. The Teach GSU program does share common assessments with undergraduate initial programs (See Exhibit 2a.3.1 Table of Current Program Assessments) and the program is aligned with Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching Standards. The program assessments include dispositions inventory, grades in core courses, written lesson plan, practicum internship evaluation, impact on student learning, electronic portfolio, employer survey, and follow-up survey. The follow-up survey is to be mailed to

graduates of the Teach GSU program in spring 2010.

The Unit disaggregates data to review candidate performance on specific expected outcomes, to review the performance of candidates enrolled in specific Unit programs, and to review candidate performance in job placements by the programs they completed. These disaggregated data inform the Unit of efficacy of assessment tools by program and by specified program outcomes and of effectiveness of programs offered in the Unit in producing the professional educator who possesses the knowledge, skills, and dispositions explicated in the Conceptual Framework.

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

The Unit follows the procedures established by GSU as described in two documents: Exhibit B1.2.21 Code of Student Conduct Handbook and Exhibit B1.2.1 GSU General Catalog, 2009-2011 Undergraduate and Graduate. Complaints must be given to the GSU Judicial Officers and procedures followed as delineated in the Code of Student Conduct Handbook.

The GSU Catalog has procedures for student appeals of grades and academic suspension for undergraduates (p. 32 and 33, respectfully), and for graduate students (page 175). In all instances the appeals follow a chain of command. For appeals of grade, the procedure begins with the course instructor and continues to dean and, if necessary, to the vice president level. If the appeals relate to programmatic rules and regulations, procedures begin with the academic department and continues through to the college level and if necessary to the vice president level. The Unit follows GSU's policy, which is based on University of Louisiana System Board policy on formal candidate complaints and for their resolutions.

Maintenance of records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions are decentralized according to departments. When complaints cannot be resolved in a departmental level, then those complaints are forwarded to the Dean's office and records are maintained in the Dean's office.

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?

Data collected at each transition point are depicted in Exhibit 2a.2.1 Table 6 Unit Assessment System Transition Points. At each transition point, the Unit regularly and systematically examines admission data to determine candidate readiness and matriculation through its programs. For example, PRAXIS I data was used to structure a recommendation that candidates who have not passed PRAXIS I must by their sophomore year enroll in the Professional Accountability courses continuously each semester until PRAXIS I is passed (Exhibit 2c.1.1 Title III Grant PRAXIS Research Report; Exhibit B1-2-1 GSU General Catalog, see p. 134 for catalog description of professional accountability courses ED 208 and ED 209)

The Unit maintains a data collection, analysis, review plan (Exhibit 2a.5.1 Data Collection, Analysis, Review Plan) that details when assessments are administered, the frequency of data collection, the responsibility for data collection, the frequency of data analysis and summary, the responsibility for data analysis and summary, who evaluates and monitors use of data, and how data are used. During the past three years, the Unit has regularly and systematically examined data relative to its programs and has made changes relative to course assessments, clinical experiences, and programs. These are summarized in the Exhibit 2c.1.2 Table of Program Improvements by Program.

Program faculty review data on signature assessments each academic year. Changes occur for a variety of reasons, ranging from changes in state or national program standards, best practices, or identified needs. For example, if faculty perceive current signature assessments do not sufficiently measure program standards in a course and data supports this perception, then changes are made in the course and its signature assessments. Many of the changes in signature assessments in the last three years resulted from this type of change (see Exhibit 2a.3.3 Table of Program Assessment Changes). As an example of a change resulting from the national program standards and curriculum review, the Health and Physical Education program faculty created departmental level examinations to provide further insight into the effectiveness of its program: Level I-Sophomore Examination, Level II-Junior Examination, and Level III-Senior Comprehensive Examination. The faculty aligned level exam questions with required courses and the NASPE Standards. Candidate performance on exam questions was aligned with questions and with specific NASPE standard indicators so the analysis of data shows how candidates performed on each level exam by standard. Analysis of data has been used to determine where course materials and delivery of the materials need adjusting. Strategies to assist students include: study sessions, assigned readings, peer review sessions, using computer-based materials and materials relative to the area of weakness (Exhibit 2c.1.2 Table of Program Improvements; Exhibit 2a.3.8 Minutes of Department of Kinesiology, Sport & Leisure Studies Faculty Meetings, see October 30, 2008 and February 10, 2009). Students must pass the exams with a 70% to graduate.

Data from three sources caused the Office of Professional Laboratory Experiences (OPLE) to rethink field assignment procedures: 1) field experiences indicated a low

completion rate for freshmen field experiences, 2) GSU demographics indicated an increased number of students on financial aid, and 3) an increase was noted by OPLE staff in the number of requests to change assignments due to lack of transportation. This led OPLE to move freshman field experiences to Alma J Brown and Grambling Middle and High Schools due to their close proximity to campus. Additionally, in the last three years, to promote shared transportation and expenses, OPLE has assigned classes to a specific school when school grade levels and subjects at the school are matched to a candidate's area of certification (Exhibit 2a.3.7 Minutes of Curriculum and Instruction Departmental Faculty Meeting, see August 15, 2008).

Data such as candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions, standardized test scores (PRAXIS) and exit surveys are used to implement program changes. For example, PRAXIS I data was used to support the reopening of the PRAXIS lab and the continued support of personnel to oversee its operation.
Additionally PRAXIS II data was reviewed and new courses were proposed to support candidate passage (ED 375 PRAXIS II Preparation – Elementary Content Knowledge and KNES 349: Accountability in Kinesiology). Due to budget constraints these suggested improvements have not been implemented.

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

Over the past three years, Unit consideration of assessment data resulted in substantial data-driven-changes in courses, programs, and the Unit.

Standards alignment initiated changes in course signature assessments: ED 216, ED 330, ED 450, ED 452 and ED 453, ED 455, and ED 402 (Exhibit 2a.3.3 Table of Program Assessment Changes). Additionally, State redesign initiatives have prompted curriculum and programmatic changes (Exhibit B1-3-1 Special Education Redesign). The State approved the redesign for reading and literacy and numeracy which impacted courses: ED 217, ED 303, ED 304, ED 325, ED 322, and ED 431 (Exhibit B1-3-2 Reading and Literacy Redesign Grades 1-3; Exhibit B1-3-3 Reading and Literacy Redesign Grades 1-6; Reading and Literacy Redesign Grades 6-12).

Data-driven changes have occurred at the Unit level:
• Data from candidate course enrollments supported a change to establish a scheduling cycle of courses (Exhibit 2a.3.7 C & I Departmental Faculty Meetings, see November 20, 2006, March 20, 2007, August 15, 2008).
• Comparison of program admitted majors to non-admitted declared majors along with data on PRAXIS I passage rates, supported the initial opening and the two-year continuation of the PRAXIS lab with a full-time coordinator. Additionally, this same data has been used to support for the last three years regularly scheduling of PRAXIS professional accountability courses (ED 208 and ED 209) (Exhibit B1-2-1 GSU General Catalog, p. 134).

• PRAXIS I data was used to support a funded research grant that led to a policy change in initial teacher preparation programs. Effective spring 2010, the Unit requires all sophomores who have not passed the PRAXIS to enroll in PRAXIS professional accountability courses (ED 208 and ED 209) and to continue in these courses until all parts of PRAXIS are passed (see Exhibit 2c.1.1 Title II Grant PRAXIS Research Report; Exhibit 2a.3.7 C & I Departmental Faculty Meetings, see February 2, 2010 approval).
• PRAXIS I data supported the Unit sponsorship of an interdisciplinary workshop and collaboration with Arts and Science faculty to align courses with PRAXIS I and the design of strategies to promote knowledge acquisition for elementary education majors (See Exhibit 2c.2.1 Interdisciplinary Workshop).

One improvement impacted three programs. PRAXIS II data and SPA recommendations were used to leverage for faculty positions. Faculty with certification in English, social studies and mathematics were transferred to the College of Education in support of programs in those disciplines.

In the past three years the Unit has held two retreats (2008, 2009) and one assessment work session (2008). The work session held in April 2008 focused on program assessment revisions and standards alignment and included faculty from the College of Education and College of Arts and Science (see Exhibit 2c.2.11 COE Newsletter 2008). The retreat in October 2008, focused on providing stakeholders with an overview of the assessment system and participants included K-12 school partners, community leaders, faculty from College of Education and College of Arts and Science (Exhibit 2c.2.14 Retreat October 2008 Agenda and Assessment Minutes and Exhibit 2c.2.11 COE Newsletter 2008). The focus of the latest retreat held December 3, 2009, was to examine data summaries and make recommendations for program improvements (Exhibit 2c.2.12 GSU Assessment Retreat); these suggested recommendations were reviewed and after discussion tabled for further study by the PK-16 Council (Exhibit 2a.3.10 Minutes of PK-16 and PEC Meetings, see February 22, 2010).

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

Signature assessments data are used to determine candidate proficiencies which impact candidate matriculation and to examine Unit and operations quality (Exhibit 2a.5.1 Data Collection, Analysis, Review Plan). Faculty collect and review each semester the assessment data compiled from signature assessments. In the absence of an assessment coordinator, faculty created Excel data tables and data summaries to support signature assessment changes relating to state, professional and Unit standards or to change course strategies or delivery to promote learning. In fall 2009, the data analyst assisted faculty with data summaries. On TaskStream faculty grade candidate work as well as analyze and review candidate data. TaskStream increases faculty access to information since reports are posted on the TaskStream website making data accessible to faculty with Internet access.

Assessment data are also discussed as the need arises during college and departmental meetings and PK-16+ Council meetings (Exhibit 2a.3.5 Meeting Agenda of College of Education, e.g., April 4, 2006; Exhibit 2a.3.10 Minutes of PK-16 and PEC Meetings and Agenda). Faculty from the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences also serve on the PK-16+ Council and the Professional Education Council. In addition, departmental goals are discussed with faculty and goals are set based on data and targeted program goals. Faculty are given updates relative to candidate graduation data, PRAXIS data, PRAXIS lab operations, field and placement experiences, and recruitment efforts (Exhibit 2a.3.7 Minutes of C & I Departmental Faculty Meetings; Exhibit 2a.3.8 Minutes of the Department of Kinesiology, Sports and Leisure). Recommendations from departmental faculty have caused the COE Administrative Council and the LEC Board to review policy and procedures (Exhibit 2a.3.6 Minutes of COE Administrative Council; Exhibit 2a.3.11 Minutes of LEC Board Meetings, see May 22, 2006; August 12, 2009).

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

Data on individual candidate performance are shared with candidates by the course instructors and by advisors. Candidates must enroll in ED 201 Advisee Report during the first three transition points (Exhibit 2a.2.1 Table 6 Unit Assessment System: Transition Points). At each point, the candidate must meet requirements and has an opportunity to reflect on his/her performance on signature assessments to improve future performance. During clinical practice candidates meet regularly with supervisors to discuss performance, and upon exit, each candidate completes an exit interview requiring the candidate to reflect on his/her performance as well as examine aspects of his experience. Advanced candidates meet with major professors to complete required research reports and faculty give candidate feedback on the reports.

Faculty receive feedback from students (Exhibit B1-2-16 GSU Course and Instruction Evaluation) and from peers (Exhibit B1-2-19 Faculty Peer Evaluation). Faculty reflect on performance while preparing the annual report (Exhibit B1-2-17) and when receiving feedback from department chair (Exhibit B1-2-18 Faculty Performance Evaluation Form).

Data are shared among stakeholders (COE and Arts and Science faculty; PK-16 Council) in retreats and work sessions that focus on: 1) program assessment revisions and standards alignment (Exhibit 2c.2.11 COE Newsletter 2008); 2) providing stakeholders with an overview of the UAS (Exhibit 2c.2.12 Retreat October 2008; Exhibit 2c.2.11 COE Newsletter 2008), and 3) review and use of data for program improvements (Exhibit 2c.2.10 GSU Assessment Retreat) with recommendations for improvement forwarded to PK-16+ Council for advisement (Exhibit 2a.3.10 Minutes of PK-16+ and PEC, see February 2, 2010). Faculty are

members of the PK-16+ Council as well as members of SPA teams. SPA teams periodically review data and assessments related to candidate and program quality (Exhibit 2a.3.2 Table of Program Stakeholders).

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.]

Optional

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

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

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?

Initial Programs: Unit partners consist of area PK-12 school districts, university laboratory schools, professional development school partners, and the PK-16+ Council (which consists of partner school personnel, college of arts and science faculty, community partners, and students). The council collaborates in the design and implementation of field and clinical experiences that support candidates' development of knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to be a successful teacher. The delivery system requires a contract between the university and

participating school districts that delineates the state and university required qualifications of cooperating teachers and the responsibilities of principals in the assignment and supervision of student teachers and teacher candidates in the schools (Exhibit 3a.1.1). The Director of Office of Professional Laboratory Experiences (OPLE) in consultation with the principal assigns cooperating teachers for student teaching and field experience. (Exhibit B1-2-4 p3). University supervisors are assigned in consultation between the OPLE director and the professional education department heads. Field experience placements are made in consultation with school principals and OPLE. Field experience assignments support course objectives and are determined by the course instructor. The field experiences handbook outlines the procedures and expectations of all participants (Exhibit B1-2-3 p3). School personnel provide feedback on assigned students on the Record of Observation/Participation Experiences Log and evaluate teacher candidates' using the Field Experience Student Evaluation form (Exhibit B1-2-3 p17). University supervisors in consultation with mentors and principals where Teach GSU candidates are employed are also involved in the process.

Advanced Programs: In our Educational Leaders Level I Master's Program, the Board of Regents and the LA DOE sponsored several meetings, workshops, and a retreat to develop collaborative university/private provider/district partnerships. Members from the Southern Regional Educational Board (SREB), school district administrators, principals of selected school sites some Ed. Leaders faculty from GSU participated in these efforts funded by the Wallace Foundation. Numerous on-campus meetings were held with various stakeholders and representation from the SREB to evaluate the design, delivery and implementation of the internship experiences. Results of the experiences were recorded on a scoring guide provided by SREB (Exhibit 3a1.2 Scoring Guide for Core Conditions and Indicators of Program Design). In the LEC program, the site supervisor is the key person in the delivery and evaluation of the student's internship/field experiences (Exhibit B1-2-8, p. 57).

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?

Ongoing dialogs between the unit and school partners about field experiences/student teaching facilitate continuous refinement in the design, delivery, and evaluation of field/clinical experiences of initial level programs. Placement of student teachers, practitioner teachers, and teacher candidates is accomplished through consistent communication between the OPLE office and the principal or a designated administrator. This process fosters effective placements and improvement. Feedback from cooperating teachers/ principals is used to revise practices. A rating form used to provide an analysis of participants' performances in the field is one change resulting from this dialog (Exhibit B1-2-3 p. 17). Grades are assigned by university instructors for the assigned field experiences. Reciprocal evaluations between student teachers, university supervisors and cooperating teachers, provide a comprehensive assessment of all

participants in clinical experiences. Collaboration between the Unit and GSU laboratory schools is instrumental in the growth and refinement of field/clinical experiences. The Field Experiences Committee composed of unit faculty, PDS faculty, Arts and Sciences faculty, and Laboratory School faculty serves as an advisory council for changes in design, delivery, and evaluation. Recommended changes are submitted to the C&I Department for review and approval. The C&I department head initiates the appropriate change process. A recent change resulting from this process is the implementation of a common rubric for initial level field experiences that will be used to grade field experience (all levels) assignments in all courses. USe of this rubric (Exhibit B1-2-3 p.19) that was implemented spring 2010 is expected to improve evaluation of all levels of field expereinces lead to more effective identification of opportunities for improvement.

Contributions from the Wallace Foundation and the BOR assisted the Educational Leaders program through a series of workshops that provided open communication regarding the effective delivery of field experiences. The Field Experiences Committee is the major partner in the design, delivery, and evaluation of and implementation of field experiences. A representative from SREB assisted with evaluating the programs' design, content, and delivery. LEA administrators and principals participate in collaborative agreements that provide candidates with meaningful field experiences as they are mentored by effective leaders. On-going data for improving the internship/field experiences is also provided by central administrators and principals. The LEC Board formed a committee of site supervisors and university faculty to develop rubrics for the evaluation of field experiences at various sites (Exhibit B1-2-2-8, pp. 55-56).

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?

OPLE, in consultation with principals and unit faculty, facilitates appropriate placements for candidates' field experiences (3a.3.1). Faculty submit field experience projects and a class roll to OPLE. The director consults with school principals to identify appropriate school faculty to work with each candidate. OPLE maintains a record of field experiences and student teaching placements to ensure each candidate has experiences in a variety of settings (3a.3.2). Other factors considered in the placement of candidates are diversity of experiences, diverse populations in school site, classroom teacher and grade levels, and hardship. OPLE requests placement through the principal who identifies a class and teacher appropriate for the assignment. Cooperating teachers facilitate completion of assignments and an evaluation of the candidate's on-site behavior. The university instructor assigns a grade for the field experience. OPLE compiles and maintains data from the cooperating teachers' evaluations of students' performances. Because of insufficient return of useable evaluation forms, OPLE recommended and professional education departments approved a rubric that included completed evaluations as part of the field experience grade. Use of the rubric was

implemented spring 2010. Placement of Teach GSU candidates is initiated by the respective school system and candidate who is an employee of that system. These candidates are given field experience assignments in all required courses.

Student teaching assignments are made by OPLE. Principals recommend cooperating teachers who meet requirements (Exhibit 3a3.3). The professional education department heads assign university supervisors by candidates' certification area. University supervisors and cooperating teachers evaluate student teachers 3-5 times per semester using a rubric (Exhibit B1-2-4 p 27-29) to evaluate mastery of all components of all domains of the Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching (LCET). This instrument is aligned with the CF/SPA standards. Teach GSU candidates are evaluated by the university supervisor.

Within the Ed. Leaders Level I Master's program, the candidates and the faculty meet to decide the appropriate internship sites for students' experiences. Faculty schedule meetings with district personnel and/or the school principal to discuss and coordinate the internship experiences. The LEC candidate, the major professor and the approved on-site supervisor mutually decide on the internship site. An Internship Professional Development Plan is completed by the candidate and signed by the student and major professor (Exhibit B1-2-8, p. 51,). An Internship Site Supervisor Agreement Form is also completed by the student, with signatures from the site supervisor and major professor (Exhibit B1-2-8, p. 52).

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

Resource and expertise sharing between the unit and its school partners is continuous. Candidates continuously observe, evaluate and assist during field/clinical experiences and provide after school tutorial sessions for students. OPLE facilitates workshops for cooperating teachers and university supervisors that address topics for enhancing the teaching/learning experiences (Exhibit3a.4.1). Faculty facilitate professional development opportunities in partner schools and faculty from PK-12 schools participate in on-campus faculty development activities. All participating stakeholders have access to share school-based and university-based resources. For example, a laboratory (Exhibit 3a4.2) secured through Title III funding for strengthening skills in the use of technology in the teaching learning process is available to faculty and teachers in partner schools. Teacher candidates participate in partner school-based professional development activities.

Faculty in the Ed. Leaders Level I program conduct regular site visits to observe, document, discuss and participate in various internship activities. On-going communication takes place between the site supervisor and university faculty members. Workshops are conducted for site supervisors and meetings take place with participating school districts to discuss details about the internship

experiences. Principals are provided a letter delineating expectations of the candidates' experiences (Exhibit 3a4.3). LEC site supervisor observes, evaluates and assists in the evaluation of the student's internship experiences (Exhibit B1-2-8, p. 57). Doctoral candidates in clinical practice produce a portfolio that documents their professional development workshops, curriculum development involvement and their participation in grant writing of special projects for the school system.

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.]

Exhibit 3a-1-1 Contracts with School Districts
Exhibit 3a3-1 Field Assignment Process
Exhibit 3a3-2 Field Placement Data Chart
Exhibit 3a4-3 Educational Leadership 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?

Candidates in initial degree programs must complete all required courses with a minimum grade of C, demonstrate dispositions appropriate to teaching, achieve the required scores on specified PRAXIS examinations, have a cumulative GPA of 2.5 or above, and complete a minimum of 180 observation/participation hours to be admitted to student teaching (Exhibit 3b1.1). Teach GSU candidates must have an undergraduate degree with a minimum 2.5 grade point average, have taken and passed all PRAXIS 1 examinations, PRAXIS 2 content examination, and successfully complete the interview. To exit, candidates must submit passing scores on Praxis II examinations required for area of certification., document 180 teaching hours and complete a minimum of 270 hours student teaching (Exhibit 3b1.2). Candidates must also be rated 2 or above on all elements in the student teaching evaluation by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. Teach GSU candidates must successfully complete all coursework including the field experiences associated with on-campus courses, achieve a passing score on the PRAXIS II Principles of Learning and Teaching examination and receive passing scores on LaTAAP to exit the program.

Educational Leadership Level I Master's candidates are required to complete a minimum of 135 hours of field experiences (Exhibit 3b1.3). The candidates gather portfolio materials as part of their culminating assignment. In the formal internship class, candidates must also complete 30 clock hours of internship

experiences. In order to exit, candidates must complete and present an electronic portfolio to university faculty, site supervisors and students.
To participate in the internship, LEC candidates must complete the coursework outlined in the degree program and successfully pass the comprehensive exam. A rubric is used to evaluate each candidate's performance (Exhibit B1-2-8, p. 48). Candidates exit the program when 200 clock hours and a portfolio are completed. The supervisor signs the appropriate evaluation verifying satisfactory performance. Rubrics are used for both the internship and the portfolio to evaluate performance (Exhibit B1-2-8, pp. 46 &55).

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?

Field experiences for each course in the initial level programs are included in the state approved course design. Field Experience assignments are designed to meet specific course objectives aligned with Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching (LCET), applicable SPA standards, and the Unit's conceptual framework (Exhibit B1-2-4, p. 27-29). Field Experience assignments range from observation and limited participation in early courses to assuming responsibility for the full teaching load during student teaching (Exhibit B1-2-4, p. 16-19). OPLE collaborates with course instructors and school personnel to place students in an optimum environment for acquiring desired knowledge and skills. Course instructors include field experience performance in the grade for the course. Cooperating teachers evaluate the teacher candidates assigned to them using an evaluation form provided by the university). Instruments used for assessment of candidates' performance during field/clinical experience components align to the applicable standards. University supervisors evaluate practitioner teachers using the instrument based on

LCET standards, aligned to the Unit's conceptual framework and the standards of the applicable SPA. Culminating projects in the clinical experience are designed to measure impact on student learning, reflection, technology integration skills as well as candidates' ability to differentiate instruction and to develop plans to meet the needs of all students represented in the assigned classes. Teach GSU candidates complete the LaTAAP portfolio, which is assessed using the LCET rubric. In the Ed. Leaders Level I Master's program, candidates keep a log of their experiences and are required to secure signatures from the site supervisor and faculty member upon completion of the activity. Artifacts and class assignments are presented and evaluated within the program that are aligned with the unit's program goals and objectives, the conceptual framework, state and professional standards. This is reflected in all syllabi in the Educational Leaders Level I Master's program. Internship logs, rubrics and portfolios are reviewed by the major professors and program directors in the LEC program.

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

The use of available technology as an instructional tool is consistently modeled by faculty in initial level programs. Recognizing the need for increased access to educative technology, the director of OPLE secured a Title III grant (Exhibit 3a4-3) to equip a classroom with technology and software to increase faculty and candidates' skills. The Certification Support Specialist and the Technology Assistant work with individual and small groups of candidates to enhance technology use skills (Exhibit 3b4.1). Methods classes are assigned to this classroom to provide hands on experiences in the use of instructional technology. Field assignments in courses require candidates to observe and when permitted participate in the cooperating teacher's use of technology. Upper level courses require candidates to infuse technology into the instructional process. For example, field experience assignments for ED402-Instructional Technology Integration require teacher candidates to consult with the cooperating teacher to design and teach a technology infused lesson. Student performance on the technology-infused lesson is a component of the course evaluation. Student teachers' expertise in the use of technology has been strengthened by the increased use of technology in the schools in the area. Student teachers and interns are evaluated by their university supervisors and cooperating teachers on their use of technology as an instructional tool using item IIIA5 on the Teacher Candidate/Intern Evaluation instrument. Candidates are consistently rated 3-4 on a four point rating scale. Student teachers submitted electronic portfolios fall semester 2009 (Exhibit 3b4.2). A team of raters external to the university rated all of the student teachers three or above on a rubric using a four point rating scale.

Candidates in the M. Ed program use available technology in the teaching/learning process as they complete their field experiences. Candidates in the Educational Leaders Level I Master's program must develop an electronic portfolio as a requirement before the completion of the program. Various internship activities

require that candidates use technology. Candidates in the LEC program also use technology during the internship experiences and for coursework assignments.

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 initial programs the director of OPLE facilitates the selection of school-based clinical faculty in cooperation with school principals and based on criteria stated in the annual agreement between GSU and selected school districts. The director provides the principal with biographical information and the certification area of the candidate (Exhibit 3b.5.1.). Using that information, the principal recommends a cooperating teacher with the required credentials, is an effective mentor, has demonstrated outstanding teaching and learning practices, and seems compatible based on the candidate's biographical data. Teach GSU candidates are assigned a trained mentor and are monitored by the university supervisor.

For the on-going field-based experiences in the Ed. Leaders Level I Master's program, the supervisor must be a certified principal and willing to participate (Exhibit 3b.5.2).
In the LEC program, the supervisor must have at least a master's degree and serve in an administrative role in a school setting as well as agree to participate.

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

Workshops for university supervisors and new school-based clinical faculty are offered each semester for the initial programs (Exhibit 3b.6.1). All clinical personnel are provided a packet that contains handbooks, forms, directions for accessing on-line materials and other semester-only information. The strengthening of technology integration for school-based clinical faculty is supported through access to the on-campus SMART classroom (Exhibit 3b6.2). This room provides access to professional development resources as well as equipment for use by student teachers (3b.6.3) and cooperating teachers.

The Louisiana Leadership Excellence through Administrative Development (LaLEAD) of the BOR and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) offer leadership meetings and training workshops for partners in the Ed. Leaders Level I Master's program. Faculty members in the Educational Leadership program attended training meetings on 6/20/08; 3/20/09 and 11/18/09 in Baton Rouge, LA to gain additional knowledge on the role of departmental faculty, supervisors, etc. in internship experiences (Exhibit 3b 6.4). In the LEC program, faculty and on-site supervisors participate in-service orientation sessions and are advised of the standards of performance and requirements expected of LEC candidates. The field experiences/internship requirements are located in the LEC

Handbook (Exhibit B1-2-8, p. 53).

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?

Initial program clinical faculty members submit three to five evaluation reports for the assigned student teacher (3b7.1). These reports follow pre-teaching conferences, observations of lessons taught, and post observation conference. Cooperating teachers also monitor and sign weekly attendance/activity logs (3b7.2) that student teachers submit to the OPLE office weekly. Student teachers are required to submit lesson plans to the cooperating teacher the week prior to teaching for feedback from cooperating teachers prior to teaching the lesson(s). To strengthen this element, fall 2009 student teachers are submitting weekly goal sheets signed by the cooperating teacher. The following procedures ensure regular and continuous support for student teachers: 1) Student teachers are consistently evaluated by cooperating teachers and university supervisors, 2) regular conferences among the student teacher, the cooperating teacher, and the university supervisor, and 3) scheduled on-campus seminars (3b7.3).
M, Ed. Curriculum and Instruction candidates enroll in a teaching strategies seminar where they demonstrate their expertise as an agent of change by developing and implementing a plan for a total school environment that involves all school stakeholders in school improvement. The course instructor and a school-based mentor assist and evaluate the candidate in this endeavor. In the Educational Leaders Level I Master's program, candidates keep a log of their participation. Continuous feedback is provided to candidates; logs are reviewed and discussed with program faculty and each student (Exhibit 3b7.4). The LEC program directors provide initial advising to LEC candidates. After candidates are admitted, faculty assume advising duties.

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

Candidates in the M. Ed. Curriculum and Instruction program use current research in the development of the plan for a model learning environment in the ED 580 Teaching Strategies Seminar. Many courses in the program include objectives that require data analysis and use of current research findings. Candidates in the Educational Leaders Master's I program are required to take a variety of classes related to data analysis, to include the following: EDLD 502-Using Data in Instructional Leadership; ED 506-Instructional Improvement and Assessment; EDLD507-Using Research to Lead Change; EDLD 509-Evaluating Program Effectiveness, and EDLD 511 and 512-Capstone Project: Problems and Issues in Education. Class assignments require analyzing and reporting current research, issues, and trends. A capstone project (research proposal) is also required where candidates collect and analyze data related to a specific school problem. Candidates are required to gather and analyze data for the completion of the doctoral dissertation in the LEC program. Candidates continuously submit drafts of

the dissertation to the major professor and committee members for review and feedback.

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.]

Table 7 - Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program
Exhibit 3b4-1 Table of Technology Usa
Exhibit 3b4-2 Portfolio Data

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?

In the initial programs, based on data from fall 2005 to spring 2009 the average number of teacher candidates meeting requirements for admission to student teaching each semester is eleven. On average, 91% complete clinical practice successfully. The 9% that do not complete successfully have failed a PRAXIS exam that is a requirement for completing student teaching and 80-100% achieved the required score the next semester.

The average in the Educational Leaders Level I Master's program is 20-25 who enter an internship practicum and 100% successfully complete the experience. In the LEC program, approximately 3 doctoral candidates successfully complete the internship each year. The M.Ed. in Curriculum and instruction is a new program. The first cohort entered fall 2009.

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 teachers are required to maintain a developmental portfolio that is reviewed regularly by the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. These portfolios contain work products such as lesson plans, professional development activities, reflections, and work products used and/or generated while student teaching. Candidates are expected to have increased responsibility for classes until they have assumed the complete workload. Cooperating teachers mentor student

teachers on a daily basis and guide them in refining teaching and management skills (Exhibit 3c2.1). Weekly conferences and goal setting between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher ensure continuing communication and growth. University supervisors work with cooperating teachers and student teachers to facilitate continuing development of skills and serve as a resource for student teachers and cooperating teachers. University supervisors and cooperating teachers team to optimize growth of the student teacher. Principals monitor the experience and provide assistance and intervention when needed. University supervisors and cooperating teachers conduct three to five formal evaluations of each student teacher' performance in the classroom. Teacher evaluations are followed by a conference between the cooperating teacher and student teacher and sometimes the principal. University supervisor evaluations are followed by a conference between the university supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the student teacher to review the evaluation and to develop an improvement plan if needed. Teach GSU prepare a professional portfolio that is reviewed by the university supervisor and evaluated through the LaTAAP assessment process.

In the Educational Leaders Level I Master's program, the on-site supervisor and university faculty evaluate the performance of candidates in the internship and field experiences. A formal record of experience form is kept by each candidate as they participate in various activities. The site supervisor and the faculty member must sign the form as documentation of the completed activities (Exhibit 3c2.3). The site supervisor and the university faculty use rubrics to assess performance in the LEC program (Exhibit B1-2-8). The M.Ed. in C&I requires candidates to present a culminating project. The course instructor uses a rubric to rate the assignment that is reviewed by the department head.

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

In the initial programs, feedback and reflections from peers and instructors occur in the courses requiring field experiences. The syllabi for courses requiring field experiences include activities to be completed during the field experience. Opportunities for sharing feedback and reflections are addressed in the course design. University supervisors visit student teachers on-site, confer with the student teacher and cooperating teacher, review the developmental portfolio, and observe and evaluate the student teacher. A follow-up conference with the student teacher and the cooperating teacher is an integral part of the visit. Student teachers attend a series of one day seminars during the semester. Seminar activities are designed to support work at the school site. Student teachers maintain daily reflections in their developmental portfolios that are reviewed by the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor, and the principal, when requested. Periodic seminars for student teachers during the semester provide opportunities for sharing experiences and receiving feedback from peers and university faculty. Selected reflections from developmental portfolios are shared in these sessions.

The Ed. Leaders Level I Master's program includes several means of reflection and feedback incorporated in the course design, to include: 1)through candidates composing in their reflection journals in some courses in the program,2) by completing administrative relative projects assigned by their principal during the two year program, and 3) when faculty visit candidates at the school sites.

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?

Candidates in all initial level programs demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions for helping students learn. The grade that the candidate receives for the field experience in each course is one assessment used. Grading criteria for field experience assignments include criteria that address content knowledge and skills. Items on the host teachers' evaluation of the candidate address knowledge, skills, and dispositions with assessment of dispositions being most prominent. Field experience assignments in all courses are included in the course design and are a part of the final course grades. Three projects completed during student teaching provide summative data for evaluating candidates' proficiencies: 1) Observations by cooperating teacher and university supervisor(Exhibit 3c4.1), 2) Impact on Student Learning (Exhibit 3c4.2), and 3) Presentation of Professional Portfolio(3c4.4). Student mean scores on these projects are consistently 3.0 or above on a four point scale.

Data on the Ed. Leaders Level I Master's program is provided through rubrics, the field experience log form, portfolios and class presentations to document knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Rubrics are used in the LEC program to evaluate the portfolios that candidates submit (Exhibit B1-2-8, pp 55 and 56. Additionally, data is collected in the LECI 776 course and evaluated by the instructor teaching the course. A grade of "P" for passing, "F" for failure or "NC" for no credit is assigned to a student at the end of the course.

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?

Student teachers in initial programs are required to plan and teach a three week unit and develop a presentation that includes alignment of unit objectives with test items, conduct a pre test and adjust the unit plan based on test results, teach the unit, administer a posttest and calculate the level of increase in student learning. Student teachers use results to reflect on their teaching and its impact on student learning.
The Impact on Student Learning project demonstrates teacher candidates' ability to help all students learn. Candidates teach a unit following specific guidelines and calculate group and individual student growth. Comparisons of pre and post test

scores demonstrate levels of students' growth during the teaching of the unit. Other measures of teacher candidates' skills in helping all students learn are Items 1-5 of Domain I, Component A and Domain III, Component C of the Teacher Candidate evaluation. Teach GSU candidates are required to include a similar project in their portfolio for LaTAAP assessment.

Field experiences consistent with course goals and objectives are required in all courses for candidates in the M.ED in Curriculum and Instruction program. Field experiences and classroom experiences provide opportunities participate in developing approaches for enhancing student learning. The field experience is on-going throughout the two year Educational Leaders Level I Master's program. Courses within the program allow candidates to analyze data and respond to specific problems within the school. Additionally, some courses allow candidates to collect and analyze data and use the results to improve school environment. An Internship Proposal is the culminating (capstone) course requirement in EDLD 512 (Exhibit 3b8-1). The LEC program requires candidates to design, conduct and interpret qualitative and quantitative research and implement results in school settings. The activities are reflected in the LEC course syllabi throughout the program.

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?

For initial level programs, the OPLE director uses a chart of area schools that includes levels of diversity represented in the school to make assignments for field experiences and student teaching (Exhibit B1-2-3, p. 14-15). This process assures exposure of all teacher candidates to levels of diversity represented in the area. Assignments in specific courses and planning and executing lessons during student teaching require all candidates to plan for exceptionalities represented in the assigned setting. In addition to field experiences associated with courses, teachers in the Teach GSU program experience diversity consistent with levels of diversity in the area they are employed and plan lessons that enhance their students' knowledge and appreciation of diversity and the contributions of diverse groups in our society.

Candidates in the M.ED program complete course assignments requiring interactions in school environments to create plans for meeting the needs of all students. As practicing educators, they are also involved in assessing their own practices in relation to the diverse students in their classrooms. University faculty in the Educational Leaders Level I Master's program examine School Improvement Plans (SIP) in various districts and for each site chosen that candidates conduct their field experiences and internships. The plan indicates subgroups, to include the educational disadvantaged, race, gender, exceptionalities, etc. Candidates conduct on-going activities within the school and surrounding schools to ensure that a variety of subgroups are included. In the LEC program, candidates are

expected to plan and implement curriculum and instruction for various teaching learning styles, race, ethnicity, gender, social class and other exceptionalities.

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.]

Optional

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

The unit is very inclusive in having a broad base of participants involved in the development, implementation and evaluation of field experiences. The field experiences in the unit are grounded in the use of assessment data for making program improvements. Students are at the center of a triangulated analysis of data and the unit is does a good job of using multiple measures to determine the efficacy of students' field/clinical experiences. The use of data enables the unit and its partners to be proactive in identifying and resolving deficits in candidates' knowledge, skills and disposition so that when they complete their program they will be effective in the classroom.

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

Decreasing numbers of teacher candidates applying for clinical practice is a serious concern. Data indicated that student progress in the program was impeded by low passage rates on the PRAXIS 1 examinations. In addition, most students were not attempting to take the required examination until the second semester of the sophomore year. The OPLE office secured a Title III grant to implement initiatives to increase the numbers of declared majors passing PRAXIS 1 by the first semester of the sophomore year. Twenty declared majors in their second or third semester who have completed the English and Mathematics general education requirements successfully, have a 2.8 or above grade point average, and an entering ACT or SAT equivalent score of 16 or above are being selected and sponsored in taking the PRAXIS I examinations. The test results for these students will be analyzed to develop a profile of declared education majors who meet the PRAXIS 1 requirements.

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?

In the Unit both initial and advanced candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate various poficiencies related to diversity. Those proficiencies are clearly articulated in the outcomes of the Conceptual Framework. The proficiencies are: (1) describe diverse strategies for interrelating disciplines in the instructional process; (2) identify technology infusion strategies for diverse populations; (3) demonstrate the use of diverse experiences that incorporate the underlying philosophy of education that is multicultural across the curriculum; (4) apply strategies that accommodate diverse learner needs by selecting and using appropriate resources. (5) analyze research that relates to strategies for promoting effective teaching and learning in a global society; (6) demonstrate an awareness of the social, cultural, political, economic, and comparative contexts of schools and learners; (7) display positive self-concept development and respect for others (8) display sensitivity to diverse learning styles and multiple intelligences; and (9) demonstrate sensitivity to the many facets of diversity. Additionally, candidates at the advanced level are being prepared to take roles of leadership in educational settings that are highly diverse. GSU and the Unit provide curricular experiences for the development of those proficiencies "to help all students reach their full potential" which is a commitment outlined in GSU's mission statement (http://www.gram.edu/about/mission.asp) as well as the Unit's Conceptual Framework (Exhibit B1-8-1).

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?

The Unit requires coursework and creates experiences that enable candidates to develop diversity proficiencies. Also, field experiences afford candidates opportunities to apply understandings about diversity in a variety of settings. Diversity is a critical component in the placement of students in field experiences. Furthermore, professional development experiences such as research symposia are implemented on an annual basis in the Unit to enhance cultural responsiveness, instructional skills and contributions to the professional knowledge base. In addition, GSU promotes diversity through the Center for International Programs (http://www.gram.edu/international/about.asp) in which teacher candidates are actively involved.

The concept of diversity is infused throughout the curriculum, introduced at the 200 level, developed and emphasized at the 300 level and mastered and applied at the 400 level coursework. For example, awareness of the influence of diverse contexts is introduced early in ED 200 Human Growth and Development (Exhibit B1-5-1) and the emphasis increases as students advance in the program. The ED 200 course introduces social-cultural differences related to ethnic background, language, and gender as well as exceptionalities and learning differences. However, two required courses that specifically target candidate development of knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity are ED 312 Introduction to the Education of Exceptional Children and ED 317 Multicultural Education (Exhibit B1-5-1). ED 317 was added to the professional education course sequence to focus on the educational, sociological, and psychological principles of teaching diverse learners where candidates explore the philosophies, theories, strategies, and competencies required to effectively motivate, educate, direct, manage and evaluate learners in a diverse classroom. Field experiences in the course consist of 10 hours of observation and participation, the focus of which includes exploration of levels of cultural knowledge and acceptance of diversity within specific populations and engagement in microteaching activities for diverse learners. Another example is the ED 322 Teaching Reading in the Middle/Junior & Senior High School course in which candidates study strategies and materials that promote multicultural education in the content reading program. Exceptionalities are addressed in several of the courses cited. Moreover the academic content areas address diversity issues in methods classes (ED 452 Advanced Teaching Methods, ED 453 Advanced Teaching Methods II, ED 402 Instructional Technology Integration, ENG 455 Methods of Teaching English (Exhibit B1-5-1).

Teacher candidates engage in diversity embedded curriculum in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences as well as the College of Education. In ART 210 Visual and Performing Arts (Exhibit 4A2-1-2), teacher candidates study how the beliefs and values of various cultures affect the creation and production of art. ART 302 Teaching Young Children through the Arts (Exhibit 4A2-1-3) provides instruction on specific teaching strategies for diverse students. In MUS 319 Music Appreciation and MUS 415 and 416 Music History, candidates study music from non-western as

well as western cultures. In Foreign Language courses candidates study many countries (Spain, Latin America, US), study variety of dialects and engage in comparisons of cultures. In the mathematics methods course, candidates study diverse numerical systems and study cultural history regarding mathematics (Exhibit 4A2-1-4). In this course candidates are taught a variety of strategies to use with students at diverse achievement levels.

As advanced candidates progress through the program, they are provided with opportunities to continue developing skills in understanding and honoring diversity, demonstrating the ability to work effectively with students, parents and colleagues from various backgrounds and creating a transformative environment for student learning. Advanced candidates' skills in working with diverse populations are enhanced through a variety of projects and courses. The LECF 704 course examines diversity issues. An example is LECF 704 Socio-cultural and Diversity Issues in Education (Exhibit B1-5-1) in which candidates complete a cultural autobiography to enhance diversity dispositions (Exhibit 4A2-1-5, Exhibit 4A2-1-6). Sample data indicating advanced candidates' knowledge to adapt instruction and services to diverse populations are shown in performance on the LECF 704 Literature Research Paper (Exhibit 2a-2-2).

In a number of courses in the master's and doctoral programs, field experiences are required. These experiences generally take place in public school districts in north Louisiana. They occur in diverse settings and involve working with diverse groups of students, parents, school district personnel and community members (Exhibit B1-2-3).

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

The Unit assessment system includes a number of key assessments that measure candidates' knowledge, skills and professional dispositions related to diversity. These assessments are aligned with Conceptual Framework's diversity outcomes (Exhibit B1-2-13). Some of the assessments are used in various courses that focus on diversity while others are used during field experiences and clinical practices. Regular review of data on key assessments, as well as on courses that emphasize diversity indicates that candidates in both initial and advanced programs demonstrate proficiencies related to diversity reflected in their knowledge, skills and professional dispositions.

One key assessment tool that measures candidates' proficiencies related to diversity is the Dispositions Inventory. This instrument has been devised to help diversity awareness of candidates in three different transition points (Exhibit B1-2-13) as they progress in their respective programs. According to this data, candidates' professional dispositions have improved over time. For example the data show that in Transition Point 1 only 59.0% of candidates at the initial level demonstrate an awareness of the many facets of diversity rated as "always",

whereas in Transition Points 2 and 3 the percentage rises to 73.2% and 80.0% respectively (Exhibit 4A3-1-5). At the advance level, the data also indicate candidate dispositions at 50.0%, 83.2% and 80.0%, respectively (Exhibit 4A3-1-6).

Additional results of candidate improvement in diversity proficiency are shown in outcomes on the "Reconstructing Lives" assessment in the ED 200 Human Growth and Development course, in which each candidate is required to "walk in another's shoes" by reading a biography or autobiography of a successful person and then following a step-by-step process to analyze the achiever's problems and success factors to reconstruct the achiever's life. The final steps are reflecting on personal and professional lessons learned from the achiever and applying concepts learned in the course (Exhibit 4A3-1-3). In addition, sharing the results of the project exposes other candidates to a wider range of persons (categories of race, economic level, gender and ability). Not only are enhancements of diversity dispositions shown in performance scores but also in candidate reflections (Exhibit 4A3-1-4). Candidate proficiencies and dispositions are also noted in key assessments for the diversity-based courses ED 312 Introduction to the Education of Children and ED 317 Multicultural Education.

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.]

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?

The Unit emphasizes that faculty diversity is one of the important considerations in teaching and learning. Candidates are given opportunities to interact with diverse faculty, familiarize themselves with different teaching techniques, appreciate cultural and language differences, develop harmony within a multiplicity of individual differences, and prepare to work with students in a diverse society. The College is committed to providing its candidates with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be effective educators and community leaders in a global society.

GSU recruits, employs, and retains faculty members from diverse cultures, ethnicities, languages, religions, regional and national origins, and higher education backgrounds, which is a rich opportunity for our candidates to grow in knowledge. An analysis of faculty data reveals that the university faculty is characterized by adequate diversity to provide appropriate exposure and

experiences to candidates. They include individuals from a variety of countries and from the continents of Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, and South America.

Faculty of non-American national origins completed some or all of their higher education in their countries of origins, thereby bringing to the campus the dimensions of diverse educational systems and philosophies. These faculty work in several different departments at the university; therefore, candidates have opportunities for diverse interactions in different academic disciplines. In addition, the Unit's faculty have earned terminal degrees in a variety of institutions in the United States.

Although Grambling is historically and predominantly Black, the faculty is ethnically diverse as shown in Table 8. The faculty is also well balanced in terms of gender. Faculty belong to many different religions and religious denominations. Faith traditions represented among faculty include Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam and Judaism.

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

Faculty's knowledge and expertise help them to prepare candidates to work with students from diverse groups. Many faculty members have either studied and/ or taught in a number of national and international universities. Faculty experiences include numerous presentations and other scholarly activity throughout the United States where they have interacted with colleagues from diverse backgrounds. When faculty members return to the university, those experiences are shared for candidate capacity building. Furthermore, faculty experiences range from studying in countries such as The United States, United Kingdom, Jamaica, Nigeria, Kenya and Ethiopia, and also faculty have made academic visits to countries across the globe. They have made academic visits to Ghana, Lesotho, Ethiopia, South Africa, China, Turkey the UK and other countries. These experiences are shared with candidates on special academic diversity-related forums. Candidates gain from these experiences to augment and enhance their knowledge, skills and professional dispositions. As a result, these interactions have a great impact on the students from diverse groups. For example a faculty member who recently visited the continent of Africa made presentations on the educational systems and opportunities in Ghana, Lesotho, South Africa and Ethiopia (Exhibit 4B-1-1) Another Faculty member who made academic-related visits to China (http://www.gram.edu/News/update/udmarch06-2.pdf), as well as a one-year Fulbright Fellowship to Jamaica, also shared those experiences at faculty and candidate forums. In addition to International experiences, faculty members also have credentials and numerous professional development activities related to diversity as documented in faculty vita and scholarly activity (Exhibit 5a1-3-1, Exhibit 5c1-1-1, Exhibit 5c5-3-1).

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%	See Exhibit 5a2-1-1
Asian	0%	0%	0%	25 (10.3%)	
Black or African American, non-Hispanic	16 (80%)	7 (88%)	5 (83%)	158 (65.3%)	
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Hispanic or Latino	0%	0%	0%	7 (3%)	
White, non-Hispanic	2 (10%)	1 (12%)	1 (17%)	51 (21%)	
Two or more races	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Other	2 (10%)	0%	0%	0%	
Race/ethnicity Unknown	0%	0%	0%	1 (0.4%)	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Female	83%	25%	25%	44%	
Male	17%	75%	75%	56%	
Total	100% N=20	100% N=8	100% N=6	100% N=242	

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

GSU is an equal opportunity employer. GSU as well as the Unit makes several efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty. When vacancies occur, a wide search is conducted. Job openings are posted on the GSU web-site and other media, including The Chronicle of Higher Education. Also administrators and faculty members engage in recruitment efforts at professional conferences, through social networking in professional organizations. The College of Education continues to strengthen its efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty through adherence to the general policy and to the university's specific "Diversity Statement" which reaffirms its practice of employment that is inclusive and based on equal opportunity principles. The Unit currently has diverse faculty and will remain focused on retaining our diverse faculty.

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.]

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?

The teacher candidates have several opportunities to interact with local, national and international students. At the university level, there are broad opportunities for interaction with students from many areas (Exhibit 4C1-1-1). The Fall 2009 data show that students represent local, regional and national geographic locations. Nearly 10% of students come from abroad. At the Unit level, credible efforts are made to train, increase and retain a diverse core of candidates and to expose them to diverse experiences at GSU, Louisiana and ULM through cooperative partnerships. Currently the Unit has 17 candidates from the following countries: Antigua, Barbados, Belize, China, Poland, St. Lucia, Armenia, Cameroon, Nigeria, Trinidad/Tobago and Zimbabwe. Given this diverse population, faculty create many opportunities for candidate interactions through cultural forums and exhibits, educational experiences throughout the academic year. In addition, diverse sites have been secured for field experiences and placement decisions include specific consideration of diversity-related characteristics. Candidates have the opportunity to interact with other candidates from diverse groups through a variety of activities beginning in their freshman year. One of GSU's requirements is that all students enrolled from fall 2008 forward must complete 160 service-learning hours, which enhanced candidates' ability to work with diverse populations. Participation increases candidate exposure to conflict-resolution skills, socioeconomic differences, gender sensitive issues, cultural differences and language differences. The projects range from building with Habitat for Humanity to taking the leadership role in after-school tutorial programs or teaching international students about the U. S. Constitution. While engaging in the projects, the learners interact with other learners from different countries, socioeconomic backgrounds, genders, and cultures. They learn by interacting with their peers and others about diversity issues (Exhibit 4C1-1-4).

Also, proximity of the university to two predominantly white institutions (Louisiana Tech University and The University of Louisiana at Monroe) has provided opportunities for interaction among candidates in the three schools. Candidates interact and work with other candidates and with PK-12 students from diverse ethnic, racial, national, gender, and socioeconomic groups in their general education and subject specialty disciplines in many of the academic departments of the universities. Initial candidates take courses at Louisiana Tech through the Inter-Institutional Cooperative Program (ICP). Advanced candidates enrolled in Louisiana Education Consortium programs take courses at all three schools. Several teacher candidates are actively engaged in international student activities which enhance their knowledge, skills and dispositions regarding diverse populations (Exhibit 4C1-1-5).

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	1%	0%	0.2%	
Asian	1%	0%	0.3%	
Black or African American, non-Hispanic	95%	84%	87%	
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%	
Hispanic or Latino	1%	0%	0.3%	
White, non-Hispanic	1%	10%	3%	
Two or more races	0%	0%	0%	
Other	1%	4%	9%	
Race/ethnicity unknown	0%	2%	0.2%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	
Female	58%	68%	62%	
Male	42%	32%	38%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	

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

The College of Education has a Diversity and Multicultural Plan (Exhibit B1-2-10) which addresses issues of recruitment and retention. The Unit makes efforts to recruit and retain diverse candidates through several initiatives. The College makes conscious efforts to recruit other race candidates by working with the University and thus developing community interest, support and participation from all members of the community at large. The unit in cooperation with the university provides campus visitation programs for local and other race students and their parents. The unit also collaborates in a working relationship with teachers, counselors, and administrators in the secondary schools and community colleges in the service area.

The College engages in High School Day activities (http://www.gram.edu/admissions/HSDay/) whereby area schools send high school students and their teachers to the Grambling State University Campus for Visitation. On this day faculty from the College of Education meet with the students and impress upon them the college programs and explain to them the variety of areas of study in which they can pursue their studies.

4c.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to candidate 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.]

4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

4d.1. How does the unit ensure that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical practice?

The unit ensures that candidates present themselves as professionals participating in instructional and non-instructional activities both within and outside the immediate classroom environment. Candidates become familiar with their roles, responsibilities and professional dispositions during the initial Level One field experience by completing observation/ participation assignments which bear diversity elements. This experience allows candidates to understand the demands of teaching and learning in a diverse classroom environment and whether their interests and abilities are consistent with professional demands. They observe diverse classrooms at elementary, middle, and secondary school partners. As they progress through Levels I, II, III, and IV of the field experience enable candidates to apply and reflect on content, professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and professional dispositions. They identify and observe diverse strategies used in effective teaching as they plan, develop and deliver instruction. Candidates taking ED200, ED300, ED 312, and ED 317 (Exhibit B1-5-1) acquire skills and dispositions which promote professional dispositions and sensitivity to demographic including ethnic/racial, cultural, gender, socioeconomic, linguistic and ability differences. During their tenure, candidates demonstrate their ethical commitment to teaching in participating in microteaching, tutoring, preparation of teaching materials which reflect all students and help all students learn. Courses such as ED 317, and LECF 704 cover academic knowledge , skills and dispositions which ensure that candidates acquire and are sensitive to multicultural isues, as well as exceptioalities, inclusion and global perspectives. These course works, field experiences, and clinical practices are designed to help candidates understsnd the influence of culture on education and in the process acquire the ability to develop meaningful learning experiences to help all students. The unit has faculty who come from a range of cultural backgrounds and experiences that guide, build, and enhance understanding of diversity. The unit promotes exemplar cultural ad diversity symposiums, conferences, classroom activities based on the knwledge, skills and professional dispositions attained during field experiences and clinical practice (Exhibit 4D1-1-1).

4d.2. How diverse are the P-12 students in the settings in which candidates participate in field experiences and clinical practice? Please complete Table 10 or upload your own table at Prompt 4d.4 below. [Although NCATE encourages institutions to report the data available for each school used for clinical practice, units may not have these data available by school. If the unit uses more than 20 schools for clinical practice, school district data may be substituted for school data in the

table below. In addition, data may be reported for other schools in which field experiences, but not clinical practice, occur. Please indicate where this is the case.]

Table 10
Demographics on Sites for Clinical Practice in Initial and Advanced Programs

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	Students 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 work with faculty supervisors from the university and cooperating teachers from the school system to assist them in dealing with specific issues that may arise during the student teaching assignment. The candidates work with a school-based cooperating teacher who observes and gives them continuous feedback as they continue their student teaching. Student teachers plan for and address a wide variety of learner needs (social, emotional, physical, and intellectual) through assessment, daily lesson planning, teaching, and evaluation of a variety of learning experiences. Three formal observations (five for special education candidates) are required for cooperating teachers to rate the teacher candidates' performance using the LCET standards that address diversity and the unit's diversity outcomes. At the initial level for example, candidates are observed for lesson adaptation to diverse students. Candidates are expected to display their understanding of how elementary students differ in their development and how to create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse students. Each formal observation is followed by a conference with the cooperating teacher candidate to share results and offer suggestions for improvement. Finally, candidates must receive an acceptable rating in all domains on the final evaluation.

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.]

Table 10 - Demographics on Site for Clinical Practice in Initial and Advanced Programs

See Attachments panel below.

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

The unit ensures that its candidates participate in a variety of multicultural activities. Among these activities is the College of Education's Annual Research Symposia (http://www.gram.edu/education/symposium.asp) which were held during the last three years. The symposia involved faculty in the Unit and other faculty from GSU and several other universities. The first research presentation addressed 'Research on Cultural Diversity in Education'. The second research symposium particularly focused on the theme: 'Teaching Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students.' The third Symposium covered studies focused on 'Improving Rural Life and Education.' (Exhibit 4o1-1-1). Other diversity-focused conferences coordinated by Curriculum and Instruction faculty as well as collaborative efforts with the LEC doctoral program (Exhibit 4O1-1-2, Exhibit 4O1-1-3) held annually also engage faculty and students in diverse cultural professional development. Furthermore, the Center for International Affairs and Programs at GSU (Exhibit 4O1-1-4) conducts cultural activities in which college candidates participate in international cultural shows. These projects have had valued contributions to cultural awareness and diversity. In addition, diversity is infused into numerous activities including but not limited to the LA GEAR UP Summer Learning Camp grant (Exhibit 4O1-1-5; Exhibit 4O1-1-6) the Annual Spring Reading Conference, the Helen Richard Smith Teaching and Learning Symposium, and collaborative projects with community organization such The Links, Inc.'s Annual Cultural Extravaganza.

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

The unit continuously reviews teacher candidates' performance on diversity assessment instruments such Dispositions Inventory. Faculty frequently examine Conceptual Framework strands and seek to improve the program by updating syllabi based on Unit assessment feedback and best practices from the research. Also, reflections from field and clinical experiences are incorporated in ongoing research activity. Faculty continuously review results from the "Reconstructing Lives" project to enhance candidate exposure to the many facets of diversity.

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

Server Error in '/' Application.

Compilation Error

Description: An error occurred during the compilation of a resource required to service this request. Please review the following specific error details and modify your source code appropriately.

Compiler Error Message: BC30451: Name 'Response' is not declared.

Source Error:

```
Line 33: '         Response.Write("Session(""UserID"")=[" & sTemp & "]<br />")
Line 34:           If String.IsNullOrEmpty(sTemp) Then
Line 35:                 Response.Write("Who R U???" & "<br />")
Line 36:                 Response.End
Line 37:           End If
```

Source File: N:\Inetpub\wwwroot\AIMS\UAS\MakeFacultyXLS.ashx   Line: 35

Show Detailed Compiler Output:

Show Complete Compilation Source:

Version Information: Microsoft .NET Framework Version:2.0.50727.1873; ASP.NET Version:2.0.50727.1433
See Attachments panel below.

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

Faculty who do not hold terminal degrees for their assignments have at least a master's degree in their major field of instruction and/or state certification, which qualifies them for their teaching assignment. Seven out of 34 (21%) do not have terminal degrees. One member has extensive training in counseling through psychology while another member, (PK-3), has had extensive training and expertise by owing a daycare and has certified other daycares for operation in the state of Louisiana. The art professor is certified and has an M.A. in studio art and uses expertise through participation in regional art tours and festivals (Exhibit 5a1.1.1Table 11 Qualified Faculty).

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?

To ensure that the school-based faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or supervise, the unit uses information from applications, as well as the LaDOE website that contains information for all personnel teaching in the state of Louisiana on their types and levels of certification(s). The exhibit demonstrates that school-based clinical faculty are certified and qualified to lead, mentor, and evaluate teacher candidates. Moreover, 100% have state certifications with 71% earning a Master's Degree and 33% completing coursework above the Master's Degree. Additionally 71% have 10 years or more teaching experience. All are teaching in their areas of certification and meet the requirements for supervising teacher candidates. (Exhibit 5a2.1.1 List of School-Based Faculty).
The Masters' of Education programs in Curriculum and Instruction and in Special Education are relatively new (in their first year of implementation). They will utilize the teachlouisiana.net to place candidates in any school-based field experiences as well as allowing candidates working as educators to use their own classrooms and schools for action research and on-site laboratory experience. As was stated in Standard 3, for field-based experiences in the Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education programs, the unit requires that supervising clinical faculty have at least

a master's degree. For the Educational Leaders Level One Master's program, various districts agree to participate to provide educational field and clinical experiences and assist the university in identifying certified principals who are willing to work with educational leader candidates. Additionally, the supervisor agrees to internship activities outlined in the program.

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

Professional faculty have contributed numerous contemporary professional experiences with school settings. Faculty have been consultants and workshop facilitators in schools. Many have conducted tutoring projects through service learning, participated in February Reading Circles at the GSU lab schools, participated in Black History Celebrations at lab schools, judged science fairs at various schools, and distributed books to the elementary school. Two faculty are offering dual enrollment classes in Mathematic and English at Grambling High School. Two faculty have offered a creative writing seminar through Project Achieve to secondary students in Lincoln Parish for the past year (Exhibit 5a4.1.1 Documentation of Qualifications). Three of the four professional education faculty in the Educational Leaders program have worked extensively in the schools either as principals, mentors, or professional development providers. Most have been trained through the LA-TAAP program, and one conducts LA-TAAP trainings for mentors. They supervised teachers and provided workshops on literacy and writing. Additionally, they have offered their services to increase achievement on high stakes tests through test preparation sessions e.g., LEAP and iLEAP, ACT, and PSAT. Also, 71% are certified in P-12 schools (Exhibit 5a2.2.1 Certifications Held by GSU Faculty).

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.]

Exhibit 5a2-1-1 List of School Based Clinical Faculty
Exhibit 5a2-2-1 List of Certifications held by GSU Clinical Faculty
Table 11 Faculty Qualification Summary

See Attachments panel below.

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?

Faculty members have aligned all syllabi with the conceptual framework, Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching; Interstate New Teacher Assessment Support Consortium (INTASC); National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS); and where appropriate, SPAs; reading competencies and numeracy initiatives. Syllabi reflect Universal Design for Learning in their planning and methods for candidates to demonstrate learning (Exhibit B1.5.1 Syllabi for Education Courses; Exhibit B1.9.1 Alignment of State, Professional, and Institutional Standards). Course Objectives and Outcomes are clearly marked, and Standards are aligned with Objectives. The Conceptual Framework guides faculty practices in aiding teacher candidates in reaching goals. Best teaching practices are evident in how faculty infuses knowledge, skills, and disposition (KDS) into the teaching, learning, and assessment of each lesson. Signature assessments coupled with teacher candidates' performance data are tied to the KSDs. In the syllabi, the KSDs are indicated in each of the course objectives Exhibit B1.9.2 Conceptual Framework KSD Alignment with Signature Assessments.

The Unit's Conceptual Framework depicts the outcomes for initial and advanced programs: Masters of subject matter content, Facilitators of learning, and Enhancers and nurturers of affective behaviors. Faculty realize that they and their candidates must demonstrate knowledge across multiple venues. Instruction reflects current research by building background knowledge, using relevant examples in the instruction, and displaying knowledge of proactive and positive classroom management. This involves the creation of new learning environments that are student-centered and involve the principles of Universal Design for Learning which include multimedia; work and information exchange; active, exploratory, inquiry-based learning; critical thinking, informed decision making, and authentic real-world contexts Exhibit 5b3.2.1 Teaching Styles Inventory Data Summary.

The Conceptual Framework reflects the importance of the skills of the professional education faculty. Quality of teaching is one of the best predictors of low versus high academic achievement in all students, regardless of diversity. Therefore, the teaching that the candidates receive should be of high quality, that is, as consistent as possible with what faculty know currently to reflect best practices.

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

Faculty encourage reflection, critical thinking, problem-solving, and professional dispositions. Faculty utilize case studies, simulated and authentic class and field experiences, and key signature assessments that involve performance requirements and reflection to guide, challenge, and motivate candidates. Initial candidates are encouraged to master the skills and knowledge required for best pedagogical practices and practice connecting the theories, knowledge, and skills into a framework of teaching. They are encouraged to think about their students holistically, and to engage in ethical problem-solving. Advanced level candidates are expected to become thinking teacher leaders who can solve tomorrow's

problems by thinking beyond current parameters. Faculty use varied field experiences, and conferences both on-campus and off to promote reflection, and critical thinking and are careful to model the dispositions that candidates are expected to display. Data (Exhibit 5b3.3.1 Grasha-Reichmann Survey and Summary) show that faculty use multiple methods to encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem-solving, and professional dispositions and indicate that 67% of the faculty strongly agreed that "activities . . .encourage students to develop their own ideas about content issues"—reflection. 54% of the faculty strongly agreed that "small group discussions . . .help students develop their ability to think critically." 42% of the faculty strongly agreed that "my standards and expectations help students develop the discipline they need to learn"—professional dispositions, and 71% of the faculty strongly agreed that "I give students a lot of personal support and encouragement to do well"— professional dispositions. One of the results of the survey was that 92% of the faculty viewed themselves as Personal Models for the students.

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

Faculty use multiple methods for instructing and assessing candidates, evidenced by a pilot study of teaching styles (Nur-Hussen & Newman, 2008) (Exhibit 5b3.2.1 Teaching Styles Inventory Data). Faculty demonstrate that to get a clearer picture of a learner, not only should teachers use multiple assessments, but that assessments should follow more than one format. The study found that faculty used an average of ten teaching methods in their courses with a range of 3 to 14 methods reported. Data analysis indicated that 79% of the faculty encouraged candidates to read and write in journals, 55% required portfolios, 51% required précis, 79% utilized brainstorming and free writing, 89% required papers, 93% utilized discussions, 79% used cooperative learning, 79% also used case studies, 44% used role playing, 44% required debates, 75% used problem-based learning, 27% used service-learning, 44% used electronic and/or online delivery, 34% employed tutoring, and 62% used demonstration learning. Teacher candidates and other university students were surveyed to determine their preferred learning styles; findings confirmed that learning styles and instructional strategies used by faculty were congruent. Many of the styles promoted higher-order thinking (e.g., problem-based learning, case studies), and candidates indicated that these were styles of teaching that they felt helped them to learn.
Faculty use multiple methods of assessing learning (Exhibit 5b3.2.1 Teaching Styles Inventory Data.) Courses require multiple assignments and use multiple means of assessing learning. These assessments align with the CF and other national and state mandated standards. A listing of assessments is found in (Exhibit 2a.3.1 Table of Current Program Assessments). Faculty continuously revise assessments to align with evolving state-of-the-art content.

5b.4. How do unit faculty members incorporate the use of technology

into instruction?

Faculty use different types of technology in their courses. Many use Blackboard for varied amounts of instructional support from posting supplemental materials to hosting discussion forums to completely delivering the courses online Exhibit (5b3.5.1 Online Classes Listed on Blackboard 2009.2010). Faculty members have taken part in training for SmartBoards (Exhibit 5f10.1.1); (Exhibit 5f10.8.1 TaskStream Training Seminar). Faculty, regularly check out laptops and projectors for use in their courses (Exhibit 5b3.4.1 Sample Sign-Out Sheet for Technology). Additionally, advanced faculty have delivered courses either online or via compressed video. Course syllabi and responses from Faculty Teaching Style survey data (Spring 2009) indicate the use of technology throughout the programs (Exhibit 5b3.2.1 Teaching Styles Inventory Data). Computer generated documents and Internet searches are required for all courses that call for unit plans, lesson plans, papers submitted for evaluation, powerpoints, and final electronic portfolios. The survey revealed that 65% of faculty reported using technology in general, 44% reported using electronic delivery systems such as online discussion forums and providing supplemental materials. Additionally, faculty who teach advanced level courses reported using WebQuests, SPSS and interactive technology for teaching. Faculty also reported teaching candidates how to conduct professional education literature searches using technology such as EBSCO and ERIC. Faculty also report using electronic gradebooks, digital and video-cameras, and electronic exercise equipment for Health and Physical Education. Additionally, candidates integrate technology into the lesson plan as a part of Universal Design for Learning. Faculty have used webinars presented by professional associations to offer professional development opportunities to candidates as well as other faculty (Exhibit B1.5.1 Syllabi for Professional Education Courses); (Exhibit 5d10.4.1 CEC Webinars Powerpoints and Notes).

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

Faculty submit annual reports documenting their productivity. Faculty to respond to the teaching areas of "1 Relations to students and student activities," and "8 Activities relating to teaching." It also requires faculty to reflect upon accomplishments, factors that impeded performance, and new opportunities desired. (Exhibit b1.2.17 Annual Faculty Report). Faculty use Peer Evaluations and student evaluations as reflective instruments to assess their teaching efficacy. The student evaluations used by the university are placed online for students to complete each semester for each class they are enrolled. As an additional means of verifying teaching effectiveness, the unit made the decision to adopt a return to the in-course, paper-pencil format. The student evaluations are distributed near the end of the course by the faculty member who gives the surveys to a student to distribute to the class while the faculty member is away from the class. Upon completion, a candidate collects the surveys, seals them in an envelope, and returns them to the department head, who gives them to the Assessment

Coordinator or data analyst. This format produced more evaluations per course, and once the system was established, turnaround time to provide feedback to faculty regarding teaching improved from a year with the pilot sample in Fall 2008 (matching the university timetable), to one semester in Spring 2009, to five weeks for Fall 2009. Whether online or hardcopy format, data analyses take place after grades are submitted. Many faculty, desiring more specific and immediate feedback issue unofficial questionnaires and ask candidates to provide anonymous feedback about the course content, style of teaching and interactions, and solicit suggestions to improve the course. Professional education faculty in the initial and advanced areas use grades, grade distributions, and PRAXIS scores to track effectiveness and make adjustments to the course. These changes can be any of the following: more supplemental materials, more simulations, varying the order of the delivery of content, varying the candidate work samples, and collaborating with other faculty in the educational sequence. GSU faculty are required to use student evaluations as one means of determining teacher effectiveness for tenure, promotion, and for unit and university awards.

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.]

Evidence for 5b Candidate Evaluations of Faculty
Evidence for 5b Summary of Multiple Styles of Teaching
Evidence for 5b Data of Multiple Teaching Styles

See Attachments panel below.

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?

The Unit is committed to promoting effective teaching, innovative scholarship, and dedicated service. That commitment is reflective of GSU's mission statement as well as the unit's mission statement. Faculty engage in scholarly work as part of a process for achieving tenure, promotion and maintaining graduate faculty status. The Faculty Handbook states that "The responsibilities of a faculty member include teaching, research or creative activities, professional activities, university service and community service" (p. 46). The annual report requires faculty to document: research projects undertaken and research projects completed, productive and creative activities and activities relating to research. Scholarly activities are defined by the university in the Faculty Handbook under Appendix C—Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion. Faculty must engage in scholarship as a part of the tenure and promotion process. Faculty are expected to remain engaged in their fields and be familiar with trends and mandates regarding literacy, numeracy,

high-stakes testing and Universal Design for Learning. The expectation is that faculty will continue to attend and present at conferences, participate in P-12 school settings and activities, and model life-long learning for candidates. (Exhibit B1.2.11 GSU Faculty Handbook) and (Exhibit B1.2.12 COE Handbook).

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.]

Faculty are engaged in a variety of scholarly activities including publications, presentations at the state, regional, and national/international levels, and grant writing, evidenced by the activities reflected in the vitas. 83% of faculty has been engaged in scholarly research, published in refereed journals (36%), published books related to fields of study or interest from counseling to health, references for self-improvement (11%), and written book chapters (31%) (Exhibit 5c1.2.1.1 Samples of Books, Articles, Presentations). Most faculty presented evidence of submitting proposals related to their fields that were accepted for peer-reviewed presentations at conferences including state, regional, and national/international conferences (74%), over the last 5 years (Exhibit 5c1.1.1 Summary of Scholarship). Faculty have presented with initial candidates at the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Annual College of Education Research Symposia, giving candidates the experiences of presenting original research to a professional audience. During those same symposia, advanced candidates were afforded opportunities to review proposals, and act as moderators (Exhibit 5f10.5.1 GSU COE Research Symposia). Faculty often collaborated to write grants that have been funded at various levels. 50% of faculty have written or co-written grants that were funded. Examples of funded grants include Supporting Urban Science and Mathematics Teachers (SUSME) from the National Science Foundation $327,000; Service-Learning Grants $30,000; Air Force Research Lab in conjunction with Clarkson Aerospace Corporation Outreach to Science Teachers $100,000; Center for Mathematical Achievement in Science and Technology (CMAST) grant to work with teachers in science $2,500,000; Title III Strengthening Teacher Preparation $450,00 over 5 years; Louisiana Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (LAGEARUP) $37,000, $84,000, $104,000, $104,000, $104,343 and $104,374. Additionally, the unit has 4 existing and 1 new endowed professorships in the Departments of Kinesiology and Educational Leadership.

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.]

Exhibit 5c1-1-1 Table 5c Summary of Scholarship
Exhibit 5c1-2-1-1 Samples of Books, Articles and Presentation

See Attachments panel below.

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?

Faculty must engage in service as a part of the tenure and promotion process for consideration for Faculty Awards both for the institution and the unit. These service activities are defined by the university in the Faculty Handbook under Appendix C—Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion. The requirements for tenure, promotion, and merit raises evaluations are included in the COE Faculty Handbook. (Exhibit B1.2.11 GSU Faculty Handbook) and (Exhibit B1.2.12 COE Handbook). Faculty engage in service to the profession and the community reflective of the GSU's and unit's mission statements. Individual and collaborative service activities are accomplished on campus and in the community. Faculty serve their departments, their college, the university, GSU students, and the surrounding community, evidenced by annual reports and current vitas. Faculty serve as academic advisors, provide orientation for freshmen education majors, and sponsor student organizations. Off campus, faculty interact with and participate in P-12 schools and with other community partners.

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.]

COE faculty collaborate with COAS faculty to develop various teacher education degree programs. Many COAS faculty serve on committees and work on redesign of educational programs and program reviews for accreditation. There is cooperation in co-advising teacher candidates in content areas. Additionally, GSU works with other institutions (ULM and LaTech) to offer candidates an Ed.D in Curriculum and Instruction or Educational Leadership in the Louisiana Education Consortium (LEC). This arrangement allows faculty an opportunity to collaborate with peers from other higher learning institutions on dissertation committees, candidate internship projects, candidate advisement, and assessments. GSU hosted 3 educational symposia, where faculty had opportunities to interact with peers from within and outside of the state of Louisiana. Faculty direct both the SUSME grant for Math and Science Teachers (Exhibit 5d6.4.1) SUSME Grant and the LAGEARUP program, collaborating with faculty from the sciences and nursing

(Exhibit 5d6.2.1 LA GEARUP). 53% engaged in service to the community through affiliations with non-profit organizations such as Habitat for Humanity (Exhibit 5d6.2.1 Habitat for Humanity). Faculty participate in P-12 service activities for local schools (68%) and P-12 services to the community through churches or Boys and Girls Clubs (50%). Service activities include professional development workshops for teachers, school consultants, tutoring, ACT, PSAT, iLEAP and LEAP preparations, and instructing dual enrollment classes. On campus, faculty offered Praxis I and II workshops, sponsored student organizations, developed conferences and chaperoned students to conferences (Exhibit 5f10.6.1 Diversity Conference; Exhibit 5f10.7.1 Reading Conference, Exhibit 5f10-5-2 Research Symposium). Between F06 and F09, faculty provided professional service to professional organizations at International/national (39%), regional, state or local (39%) levels (Exhibit 5d6.1.1 Summary of Service).

Many hold memberships in professional organization such as National and Louisiana Association of Developmental Education, American Educational Research Association, International Reading Association, North Louisiana Reading Council, Louisiana Association of Teacher Educators, Kappa Delta Pi, National Council of Teachers of English, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Council for Exceptional Children, and American Alliance of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD). Faculty have been officers in professional organizations at the state and regional levels, and have served as proposal readers and moderators at conferences. Faculty serve the university through Faculty Senate, PK-16+ Advisory Council, Assessment Committee, General Education Committee, Grievous Committee, Curriculum Committee, Judicial Affairs Faculty Representatives, Satisfactory Academic Progress Committee, Appeals Committee, and Tenure and Promotion Committee.

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.]

Exhibit 5d6-1-1 Table 5d of Service
Exhibit 5d6-15-1 University Standing Committees

See Attachments panel below.

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?

Data from candidate evaluations, peer-evaluations and self-evaluations collectively contribute to the determination of fulltime-faculty's performance in the unit. The self evaluation is documented in the following ways: workload reports that identify

intent of activity, annual reports of actual activity both of which are submitted to department heads; and a subcategory for an item on the (Exhibit B1.2.18 Faculty Performance Evaluation GFPE) form (a document used by all faculty in the University). The (Exhibit 5e8-1-1Faculty Workload Form) is submitted at the beginning of each term and is a pre-measure of teaching, research and service and the annual report is a post-measure that is completed annually. The peer-evaluation form is completed by the department head, or other senior faculty in the unit (Exhibit B1.2.19 Faculty Peer Evaluation). The annual report is a qualitative instrument that is used in the unit as the foundation for completing the GFPE (a quantitative instrument) (Exhibit B1.2.17 Annual Faculty Report). The GFPE is a summative instrument that triangulates data from all evaluation instruments and presents a comprehensive view of faculty performance for teaching, scholarship, and service. All full-time faculty in the unit are evaluated in this manner, including tenure-track faculty. Tenure-track faculty, when eligible, must apply for tenure and prepare a portfolio for evaluation (Exhibit 5e7.3.1 GSU Tenure and Promotion Evaluation Rubric and Checklist). The current budget conditions are such that we have not had part-time faculty for several years. Part-time faculty are evaluated by candidates each semester and through peer evaluations as needed. Employing units are responsible for providing graduate assistants (GA) an annual written evaluation. Supervisors complete a form and meet with the GA to review performance. Completed evaluations consist of a completed evaluation form and any GAs' prepared responses.

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.)

Faculty in the unit perform well in the areas of teaching, research and service. An analysis of faculty workloads indicates that faculty have comparable workloads: professional activity is weighted toward teaching and service. There is minimal activity in research, especially during the current year, due to extra duty for accreditation preparation. The electronic candidate evaluations of courses (S09, F09) indicate that candidates have a positive perspective on faculty and courses in the Unit; 67%-83% (S09) and 60%-80% (F09) of responses were positive. The data indicate that the majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the items asked. For example, selected items from the instrument indicate that: instructor was among the best they had ever known (75% S09, 72% F09), course was among the best they had ever taken (73% S09, 65%), material was pertinent to their professional training (S09 76%, 75% F09) course challenged them to think (78% S09, 70% F09) and courses enabled them to apply concepts (79% S09, 78% F09). The paper evaluation had a similar trend. Faculty self-evaluation indicate strong productivity in research, teaching and service. Faculty in the unit had a mean total score 88 points (07-08) and 92 points (08-09) (out of 100 possible) for the last two years on the GFPE. All faculty (100%) scored above 70 points over the last two years; no mandatory improvement plans were necessary (Exhibit 5e9.4.1 Summary of Faculty Evaluations).

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

Unit faculty engage in a comprehensive, systematic evaluation process that ensures efficacy in teaching, research and service. Department heads have first responsibility for monitoring professional education faculty's performance and for collaboratively developing an improvement plan when necessary. For example, the GFPE reflects candidates', respective faculty, and supervisors' assessment of teaching, research and service. The unit expects a minimum score of 70 (of 100 points) on the instrument. Those who score lower than 70 work with their department heads to develop and implement a data driven improvement plan. Those who score below the mean on any component in the GFPE also collaborate with department heads on an improvement plan.
The peer evaluation is critically important because it gives faculty "an extra eye" on their performance in the classroom and it provides tangible feedback to faculty for targeted improvement (Exhibit B1-2-19 Faculty Peer Evaluation). This evaluation is conducted by the department head and other faculty peers at least bi-annually but more regularly if there is a need. The peer evaluation, coupled with the GFPE is the unit's way of ensuring that the assessment process results in positive improvement for teaching, scholarship and service. The faculty in the unit have earned decades of professional experience in the preparation of candidates and the potential for loss of interest and passion for the work is real. Therefore, the evaluation process involves dialogue and brainstorming between the faculty person and the department head to find ways to foster intellectual vitality (a task that is not easy during this current economic condition).

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.]

Exhibit 5e9-4-1 Summary of Faculty Evaluation

See Attachments panel below.

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?

Faculty and department heads work collaboratively to identify professional development needs and opportunities for growth annually. Areas for improvement in teaching, research and service (aligned with our Conceptual Framework) are standing priorities for professional development. Beginning in the Spring 2010 semester, the dean will conduct an annual needs assessment for professional

development so that the Administrative Council can use data across program areas to identify unit-wide training. This will enable the unit to have centralized activities to address professional development needs in a way that is cost efficient. As a result of external mandates, recurring needs for professional development across the unit are in the areas of technology and assessment.
As part of an on-going self-assessment process, faculty identify their own professional development needs and act proactively by attending university sponsored training/workshops, engaging in webinars or attending conferences. Faculty are committed to their continuous professional development, evidenced by their use of personal funds to attend national/regional professional meetings when institutional funds are not available.

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?

Faculty are offered many opportunities for faculty development, both on and off campus, which fit into the unit's conceptual framework requiring the demonstration of life long learning. The unit operates in an environment of frequent mandates for change from external powerbrokers, which requires faculty to be continuous learners. Many professional development activities are offered in the unit to update faculty on emerging practices. The CEC redesign included a webinar for the special education faculty, general education faculty and candidates. The CEC also had a webinar on diversity as part of the redesign process (Exhibit 5f10.4.1 CEC Webinars). Many of our candidate assessments are quantitative measures but faculty do not market themselves as data analysts or statisticians. Therefore the unit engages in assessment retreats where experiential learning activities refresh the quantitative skills of faculty and inform appropriate data-based actions. The unit partners with the Southern Regional Education Board, provides professional development for those who train educational leaders. The unit adopted Taskstream as an electronic assessment tool, and training for the effective use of this technology is underway. This training not only fosters faculty's knowledge of technology, it also promotes their cognitive confidence in the use of technology. The unit will receive four smartboards. Some faculty are trained to use this instructional technology and other faculty will be trained over the next two semesters (Exhibit 5f10.8.1 TaskStream Training).
The dialogue and collaborative interaction between department heads and faculty in the evaluation process identifies specific deficits in qualifications, skills or scholarship. The university's Title III program is a wonderful contribution to the unit's faculty development, especially during these economic times. Through Title III and other past sources of support, two faculty members earned a terminal degree (one no longer with the unit), nearly all have attended meetings to stay current on accreditation standards, and others have attended workshops to attain specific skills (Exhibit 5f10.2.1 Title III Information; Exhibit 5f11.2.1 Title III Summary). Several faculty members attended assessment training with ETS this year (Exhibit 5f10.9.1 ETS Workshop; Exhibit 5f10.10.1 ETS Participants).

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.]

Faculty participate in professional development as needed or as is required. Part-time faculty are afforded the same professional development opportunities of full-time faculty. Faculty schedule personalized training in technology as needed with the university's Information Technology unit and most participate in at least one workshop annually. The university operates in a paperless environment; faculty engage in training on grade submissions and other reporting techniques bi-annually (either by a specific class, workshop, meeting or individual tutorials) in order to stay current. Approximately 50% of faculty are trained for on-line instruction via blackboard and participate in training sessions biannually as a refresher. Due to the current state of the economy, campus-based professional development activities (workshops, webinars, teleconferences, etc.) are becoming prevalent and more frequent. Full-time tenured faculty travel to one or more off-campus professional meetings (e.g. NCATE, AACTE, SACS, etc.) at least biannually. Graduate assistants attend training related to their respective teaching duties annually (Exhibit 5f11-1.1 Sample of Conferences Attended).

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.]

Exhibit 5f10-5-1 GSU COE Research Symposia
Exhibit 5f11-1-1 Sample of Professional Development Conferences Attended

See Attachments panel below.

Optional

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

The unit is known in the state for having an exemplary LAGEARUP program where faculty effectively engage with secondary students and involve candidates in the experience. The LA-GEAR UP summer program has resulted in more students not only graduating from high school, but more have chosen to attend Grambling State University than any other university. Faculty in the unit facilitate the use of effective instructional strategies for faculty in other units of the university through various workshops. Faculty engage in continuous learning and stay current in their respective fields, which fosters timeliness and program redesign.
Faculty are noted for their caring and nurturing disposition. They stay in contact with many candidates long after the candidate has graduated. Candidates state that they are expected to be engaged in the learning. Advanced candidates

anecdotally remark that they are expected to contribute even to the lectures through active discussions of what they are seeing and experiencing. Initial candidates remark that they come to us and talk because "you'll listen to us"— even if we cannot solve the current problem, or if we have to give them bad news.

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

Teaching styles – What teaching styles are Professional Education faculty using in their courses? How do they decide which style to use with what course or level or need of candidates?
Learning styles—What learning styles are candidates bringing to the profession? How do those styles match the needs or strengths of their P-12 students?
Dispositions—How important are the dispositions that professional education faculty display with respect to the development of the dispositions of initial and advanced candidates?
Reconstructing Lives as impact upon teaching—how does the use of biographies impact the dispositions and knowledge of candidates with respect to their future students?

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?

The Unit has the leadership and authority to plan and implement all initial and advanced programs for education and educational leaders, as evidenced by clearly established policies that govern programs, student admission/retention, and faculty selection/ development. Personnel, facilities, and budget allocations support program quality and facilitate the development of professionals who meet the requirements of Grambling State University (GSU), the State of Louisiana

(Office of Teacher Certification), and standards for Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs).

There is a well-defined hierarchy of governance for professional education in the Unit which clarifies roles in the management and coordination of planning processes and facilitates smooth operations for program and service delivery in the initial and advanced programs. The Unit is under the direct supervision of the Office of Academic Affairs, headed by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs Exhibit 6a.1.1 GSU Org Chart. The Unit's governance structure consists of the dean, heads of the Departments of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I), Educational Leadership (EDL), and Kinesiology, Sport and Leisure Studies (KSLS) and two councils Exhibits 6a.1.2 Unit Org Chart, 6a.1.3 Councils.

During the fall 2009 semester, a review of the memberships and the function of the three councils showed an overlap of functions and membership of the Professional Education Council (PEC) with the College of Education Administrative Council (COEAC) and the PK-16+ Council. The resulting action was to merge the PEC with the PK-16+ Council. Thus, there are two active councils. (Exhibit 2a3-6 Minutes of COE AC) Decisions in the Unit are made through an inclusive model (Exhibit 6a1-4 Decision Flowchart) that moves issues/problems through a system of multiple levels of review/recommendations within the Unit and a means of fostering approval to appropriate entities external to the Unit.

Auxiliary service units facilitate operations for the preparation of educators through research, program development, consultation, technical assistance, and professional service. These units include the Grambling State University Laboratory Schools (K-5, 6-8, 9-12), CARE, ERC, OPLE, and PRAXIS Lab.

Unit is closely tied to the general operations of GSU and various education entities in Louisiana. Dean represents Unit in the administrative governance of GSU and serves as liaison between the Unit and the Louisiana State Department of Education. The Council of Academic Deans (CADs) meets monthly and dean shares pertinent information with the COEAC regarding scheduling, faculty professional development, departmental/staff needs, GSU and Unit policies and procedures, university operations and budget. The Graduate Council (GC) is made up of department heads who have graduate programs in their units, deans, and a student representative. CAD and the GC address GSU mandates and student/candidate issues. GSU and Unit committees meet regularly to assist in Unit responsibilities such as accreditation, curriculum, promotion and tenure, candidate appeals, state mandates and SPA requirements. Unit committees: curriculum, textbook adoption, technology committee, student appeals, promotion/tenure, faculty professional development, admissions, recruitment/retention, and assessment The relationship between councils and committees is in Exhibit 6a.1.5 Coun-Comm Relationship.

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?

Unit adheres to policies of GSU regarding recruitment/admissions. Primary recruitment rests with the Office of Admissions, the Center for International Affairs & Programs, and the Office of Graduate Studies. Faculty recruit at professional conferences; partners in school/ districts, candidates, and alumni also recruit. GSU students declare a major in education programs for initial certification but are not considered "candidates" until admission criteria for Unit are met (2.0 cumulative GPA and a completed application for review; transfer students must have 24 or more acceptable credit hours with a grade of "C" /higher or "P" and a completed application). Admission to advanced programs requires candidates be admitted to the School of Graduate Studies & Research (completed a Bachelor's/ Masters degree from accredited institution, cumulative 3.0 (4.0 scale) undergraduate GPA and a cumulative 3.0 (4.0 scale) graduate GPA, taken the GRE and 3 letters of recommendation. Admission requirements for Teach GSU include: bachelor's degree from accredited institution; minimum 2.5 (4.0) grade point average; pass PRAXIS I (or 22 ACT composite score or 1030 combined SAT); and pass PRAXIS content specific exam. Master of Educational Leadership requires evidence of current teacher certification, and minimum 3 years of successful teaching experience. The LEC program requires evidence of current certification as teacher or administrator, 3 letters of recommendation, etc. (Exhibit 2a.2.1 Table 6 Unit Assessment System). Faculty serve on standing committees in the Unit and GSU and monitor the content of publications/catalogues, which is the unit's means of ensuring clear and consistent information. Unit faculty also serve on the GC, which is responsible for reviewing the text for admissions in publications and catalogues for advanced candidates. Documents are sent to faculty and other essential personnel for review and comment prior to publication and public dissemination.

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

Maintenance of the accuracy in academic calendars, catalogues, publications, grading policies and advertising exceeds the purview of the unit; it is a university-wide function. The faculty, staff and administrators in the unit continuously monitor the academic calendar, catalogues, publications, grading policies, and advertising for accuracy of items that are germane to the unit. Inaccuracies are reported to the provost, who is the highest ranking academic representative in senior administration and can make essential changes. Copies of course syllabi are submitted to the department heads each semester to ensure that standards and policies are consistent with GSU's current mission and guidelines. Catalogue changes, publications, and other advertising materials are scrutinized at the faculty level first and then proceed through the system and ultimately rest with the provost who is held accountable by the university's governing board.

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

The Unit triangulates advising among a faculty advisor, the director of the CARE Center and the candidate in initial programs. This model allows for as much personalized advising as is needed by each candidate. All candidates in initial programs must complete academic advising contracts (regarding their plans of study) at the beginning of each semester. The CARE Center provides professional development sessions for faculty regarding program requirements so that information is consistently provided to candidates. Candidates must enroll in ED 201-Advisee Report three times during their matriculation, which is an additional means for the unit to engage in intrusive advising. Candidates are also informed of the advisement policies and procedures during First Year Experience courses, during university and departmental orientations and in conferences with respective advisors. Advanced candidates have faculty advisors and a graduate committee who share oversight for the academic integrity of advanced candidates' work. Advanced candidates' contact with advisors increases as they progress through their program.

GSU provides extensive counseling services through the University Counseling Center. Candidates are made aware of these services through orientation programs and the First Year Experience classes. Candidates can engage the Center's services on their own or through referral from Unit personnel.

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

The internal professional community (faculty in various specialty areas and support staff with specialized functions), is very much involved with the design, implementation and evaluation of the unit's initial and advanced programs. This involvement includes, but is not limited to: monitoring strategies for teacher candidates through their research, participation in professional organizations, collaboration with peers at other institutions, and collegial involvement with content faculty. The external professional community includes teachers and educational leaders in surrounding parishes, educational leaders in various entities in the State of Louisiana (i.e. the Department of Education, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, the University of Louisiana System and the Board of Regents) and professional organizations. The most meaningful and frequent interaction with the external professional community is through the creative exchange of ideas with the PK-16+ Council. This council consists of in-service teachers and educational leaders at the local level, along with other community leaders, former educators and candidate representatives (Exhibit 2a.3.2 Table of Stakeholder Committee Members). Members of the PK16+ Council critique portfolio presentations and are actively engaged in designing, implementing and evaluating candidates' service-learning activities. Content faculty in the Unit review key assessments, participate in the development of data

–driven program improvement plans, the redesign of programs and the preparation of SPA/NACTE documents. Feedback from officials in parishes where candidates are engaged in professional laboratory experiences is instrumental in strengthening program design and determining what curriculum changes should be implemented.

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

The dean of the Unit has a good working relationship with the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and with the dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Research. Content faculty from other academic units serve on the standard committees and are considered to be part of the unit since they also instruct teacher candidates. Content faculty are involved in collaborative work on curriculum development, report preparation and conducting research. They also participate in assessment retreats where data are used to make program improvements, as well as other professional activities in the unit. The Unit collaborates with area school districts for field experiences/clinical practice in the preparation of initial and advanced candidates. An example of collaboration at the advance level is the LEC, a consortium between colleges of education at GSU, Louisiana Tech, and the University of Louisiana-Monroe. The unit collaboration with the Professional Development Schools is mutually beneficial; partners work with candidates in real-world contexts and the Unit works with district personnel in professional development.

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.]

| Exhibit 6a-1-1University Organizational Char |
| Exhibit 6a-1-2 Unit Organizational Char |
| Exhibit 6a-1-3 Unit Councils PDF |

See Attachments panel below.

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?

The budget for the Unit is lean but adequate to deliver programs (Exhibit 6b.1.1 Budget) The budget has declined over the last three years for two reasons. One impact was the final dispensation of desegregation funds. Another impact was the

general condition of the national and state economies, which lead to budget reductions. The unit's budget had a 13% increase between the 2006-07 and 2007-08 academic years and then had a 20% decrease between the 2007-08 and the 2008-09 academic years. The fluctuation in the budget over the last three fiscal years is admittedly rather large, compared to the fairly small budget decline of comparable programs at GSU. Nonetheless, the unit still has a budget of $4.6M, (which does not include budget allocations of content faculty who are housed in the College of Arts and Sciences) and is adequate for the delivery of initial and advanced programs.

The budget for the Unit exceeds the budgets for other clinical components on campus. . In the 2005-07 academic year, the unit's budget was nearly three times that of the School of Nursing and it was nearly seven times that of the School of Social Work. A similar trend continues over each of the reporting years. The budgetary gap between the Unit and other clinical programs at GSU is narrowing but is still many times larger than other clinical programs. The budget per pupil varied across clinical programs between 2006-07 and 2009-10. 2006-07 data indicate the per pupil allocation for candidates was substantially less than nursing ($8,865) but considerably higher than social work ($1,127). This trend holds for 2007-08, 2008-09 academic years and for the current year as well (2009-10 $6,053 Unit; $9,119 nursing; $1,172 social work) Exhibit 6b.1.2 Comparative Budget Analysis.

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 budget is adequate for initial and advanced programs in the Unit and is comparable to the fiscal realities in the state and the country. There is little funding for institutionally sponsored grants for faculty research and travel to disseminate research. However, faculty continue to engage in research (sometimes at personal expense) and continue to publish scholarly documents so that candidates will have a quality learning experience.

The loss of travel funds is a deterrent to the ability of faculty to engage in collaborative efforts with peers at other institutions and it deters scholarly participation in professional activities. These budgetary changes only have affected the means by which faculty remain current in their field. Faculty engage much more frequently in research and other scholarly activities through the use of technology (email, electronic publications, webinars, teleconferences, etc.), a trend that will likely grow in the near future. The overall quality of the program, at this point, has not yet been affected. Classes that candidates need continue to be offered, support services continue to be readily available to candidates, and faculty continue to work with professionals who are external to the unit. This year there was a $1.4M mid-year budget reduction (Exhibit 6b.2.1 Mid Year Cut Memo) mandated by the State of Louisiana, a freeze on establishing new positions, and it

is anticipated that additional cuts to the budget will occur prior to the end of the fiscal and academic years. The future impact of the budget on the quality of the programs offered is undetermined. Title III funding softens the impact of reduced funding since it provides funds for faculty to travel to workshops and other professional meetings. The return of faculty to campus to share information is a way of attaining the effect of increasing returns of fiscal capital during a time of economic strain.

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.]

Exhibit 6b-1-1 Budget
Exhibit 6b-1-2 Comparative Budget Analysis
Exhibit 6b-2-1 Mid-Year Budget Cut Memo

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)?

The workload policies for the Unit are the same as GSU. Until the 2008-09 academic year, GSU's policy for a regular teaching load constituted twelve credit hours per semester. All full-time professional education faculty maintained this workload of teaching courses in the initial programs. Faculty who taught a combination of courses in initial and advanced programs also had a twelve semester hour workload. 9 semester hours was a full workload for faculty who only taught advanced programs. Teaching loads may vary depending upon other duties and assigned responsibilities associated with teaching, research, and service. Additionally, there are times when it may be necessary for either a faculty member or unit administrator to teach above that which is policy in order to keep teacher candidates on track for timely graduation. Although this policy is still in place, it is currently suspended. During the 2008-09 academic year the Provost announced that GSU would no longer use adjunct faculty, except in emergency circumstances due to fiscal constraints and that the 12 semester hour workload policy would be suspended due to fiscal constraints (now 15 hours). These circumstances still exist during the current academic year. The macro areas of work for faculty include teaching, research and service. Faculty are not alone in facilitating the learning experience of teacher candidates. Graduate teaching assistants work in some departments, (e.g. KSLS and EDL). Cooperating teachers (including GSU Laboratory teachers and principals and other professionals in

partner districts) supervise teacher candidates, work with seminar and methods courses, participate in professional development activities, and serve on numerous committees within the unit to identify areas for continuous improvement of programs. Faculty work with other professionals, such as PK16+ council and school personnel engaged in clinical experiences and this work is part of their workload. Faculty members work with the CARE Center to advise candidates in their respective initial programs and those who work in the advanced programs serve the advising function through one-on-one contact with the candidate and through work on graduate committees (ex. doctoral committees). The Unit strives to keep administrative duties to a minimum.

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

The faculty workloads for teaching and the supervision of clinical practice vary based on the number of candidates who meet the requirements for clinical practice. There is a full-time staff person who is primarily responsible for coordinating the field/clincial experience for candidates and is very involved in the assessment of the experiences. Faculty generally have fewer than 10 candidates to supervise in the clinical experience for initial programs. A cohort model is used for some of the advanced programs (last two years) and will soon have more than 10 candidates in clinical experiences. All will not be assigned to one faculty person. This should keep the workload both equitable and manageable.

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)?

The combination of the number of classes taught and the number of candidates in each class is such that the contact hours for each professor are fairly consistent in the Unit for initial programs. The contact hours for advanced faculty is much more varied since one of the advanced programs is part of a consortium and faculty have instructional responsibilities for some who are not "GSU" candidates. Nonetheless, all faculty in the Unit engage in the production of knowledge (teaching, research) and in service (both internal and external to Unit and GSU).

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?

Current economic conditions are such that there are no external (to GSU) part-time faculty in the unit. Part-time faculty have other duties at GSU; usually in full-time administrative or service positions. However, part-time faculty have the same

instructional expectations as do full-time faculty. They are expected to meet their classes as posted in the schedule, to accurately and fairly assess candidates' achievement, to have office hours to meet with candidates and to structure the learning experience in a manner that aligns with the conceptual framework. The department head in the area of work that the part-time faculty is placed has the first line of responsibility for ensuring that the integrity, coherence and quality of the unit and its programs are attained with all faculty, including those who are part-time. Part-time faculty are included in all essential meetings, workshops and retreats so that they can remain current with policies and procedure in the department, the unit and GSU.

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

There is one full-time employee assigned to the unit who is responsible for monitoring and maintaining technology (computers, smartboards, projectors, etc.) and for being a liaison between the college technology infrastructure and GSU's infrastructure. There is a full-time person who runs the PRAXIS Lab and helps candidates to prepare for the PRAXIS exams. A full-time person works with licensure matters for current candidates and alumni and fosters job placement for candidates. There is a full-time person assigned to run the Educational Resource Center and to handle media relations for the Unit. Each department head, the director of OPLE and the dean has at least one full-time administrative assistant. The unit had an assessment coordinator but the position was vacated three years ago. Several strong candidates were identified for the position but did not accept an offer; the search is still in progress and will be an additional support person for the Unit when the position is successfully filled. The Unit has an adequate number of support personnel to foster its operations and the intellectual development of candidates.

Currently the number of support personnel positions is adequate, but the Unit has little control over ensuring this to be true in the future. The dean and other administrators in the Unit are focusing on retaining support personnel in an effort to avoid the uncertainty of replacing support personnel. As support personnel needs arise, the dean works with the Provost, the Associate Vice President for Human Resources and the Vice President for Finance to meet the needs of the Unit.

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

GSU has Title III funds that are available for professional development activities for undergraduate faculty. Faculty use these funds to engage in continuous learning through workshops, conferences, webinars, etc. The unit also has a Southern Region Educational Board grant that supports professional development for faculty who teach in the Masters program for educational leaders.

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.]

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.]

The facilities are more than adequate to support teaching and learning. Each faculty person has a private office that is equipped with furniture and essential technology (telephone, computer hardware, computer software). There are two computer labs for faculty and candidate use and faculty can access the computer lab in the School of Graduate Studies. Candidates are also entitled to use computer labs in various locations around campus. The number of classrooms (lecture and seminar) available for instruction is a sufficient; many are equipped with SmartBoards. There is a mobile, wireless computer center that is available for instruction and several laptops that can also facilite learning outside the classroom. Candidates are given email addresses and it connects them to GSU's electronic information system. The library has access to several electronic databases, which facilitates candidates' ability to access literature and other essential resources to enhance learning.

Charles P. Adams Hall was built in 1969 and the structure contains 89,212 square feet of space. The administrative offices of the Unit and two departments, ERC, CARE, OPLE as well as space for graduate assistants, and classrooms are housed in Adams Hall. KSLS department office, faculty offices and classrooms are housed in the Assembly Center. Each department has a reception area, private offices for the department heads, and a conference room. The ERC contains a microcomputer laboratory, a materials production/multi-purpose room and a curriculum library/reading room. 10 graduate assistant office stations are located on the second floor as are instructional spaces: 11 classrooms, 2 seminar rooms and 2 amphitheaters (seating 118 and 180 persons). There is a dedicated document room that has curricular materials from school districts, materials for standards and access to technology for use by faculty and candidates.

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?

Some resources are essential across programs (ex. faculty, support personnel, technology, etc.) and assignment of resources is based on program need (equitably rather than equally). For example, a professor in the advanced programs passed in the spring of 2009 and there is currently a search underway to fill that position. This, however, did not prompt the need to create new positions in other program areas. The department heads, the dean and the COEAC monitor current trends and prioritize needs based on the value added to learning as outlined in the conceptual framework. Resource needs for the unit are then considered in the GSU's allocation process. The Interim President established a Budget Priorities Committee for GSU in the spring 2010 term. The dean works with the Provost to ensure that the budget needs of the Unit are part of the budget prioritizing process.

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

Candidates and faculty all have access to computer hardware and software. Faculty and candidates are assigned a "G number" which gives access to the Banner system. Candidates use this system to register for classes, to check schedules, to apply for financial aid, and to check grades earned in their classes. Faculty use this system to submit employees' information, to submit grades, to submit timesheets for payroll, to access leave forms, to update contact information, etc. Faculty and candidates also are assigned personal email accounts, which give them access to university-wide communiqués for emergencies and other essential information. Faculty and candidates also use email as an efficient communication instrument for short inquiries and to document communications. Blackboard is available and used to support teaching and learning in the unit and GSU at large. New SmartBoards are being installed in Unit. Most faculty in Unit are trained to use SmartBoards; refresher and beginning training for this instructional technology will take place over the next two semesters. The technology resource centers, both in the Unit and GSU, are available for both faculty's and candidates' use (Statistics Lab, PRAXIS Lab, Honors Lab Graduate Studies Lab, Faculty Development Lab, Library, etc).

Perhaps the best evidence that these resources are used is the presence of candidates in class; registration is predominately an on-line process. Other evidence that the technology is used is the submission of grades, which is also done on line. Requests for technology troubleshooting and the repair/restoration of hardware and software indicate the use of technology in the Unit. Initial and advanced candidates have extensive training in the use of technology, which culminates in the development and presentation of a professional electronic portfolio.

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

The Unit is currently reviewing and revising its assessment system. Internal and external human capital are available for the development and implementation of the unit's assessment system. The director of OPLE is working closely with the COEAC, faculty, and the Standard Two Assessment Committee to revise the assessment system and to ensure that it aligns with the newly revised conceptual framework. The Associate Vice President for Institutional Research has joined the Unit's efforts to ensure that the assessment system is compatible to the GSU's assessment processes. The facilities available include clean and safe work areas, adequate furnishings, and 24-hour access to technology. The unit has adopted TaskStream as an assessment tool and student technology fees were used for TaskStream. A consultant was hired (December 2009) to help faculty load their courses on this system. There is an on-going search for an assessment coordinator and funds are available to fill the position as soon as the unit can recruit a fully-qualified applicant.

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

The NCATE/ SACS Document Room have curricular resources from various school districts and are easily accessable for faculty and candidates. The ERC also has essential material for candidate and faculty use. The Unit also has a resource center that has curricular and other literature available for candidates' use. GSU library has a substantial amount of holdings that support initial and advanced program (both in print and electronic form) and a substantial portion of the library fiscal resources are allocated to the unit. (Exhibit 6e.4.1Library Resources) Curriculum resources are also available through the Laboratory Schools.

Faculty are invited to review materials to determine items that should be purged and to recommend items for acquisition in the Unit (NCATE Document Room, ERC). GSU's Library solicits input from faculty to purge dated material in the campus' library. The Library and Learning Resources Committee is a standing GSU committee that has representation from the Unit and other campus operations. This committee is responsible for material collections policy, development of library resources, physical facilities and the optimization of the library resources and services. The committee receives requests for holdings and prioritizes acquisitions against several criteria (including budget). Electronic access to literature and interlibrary loan from other universities enhances the unit's ability to have sufficient access to current materials.

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?

Candidates, regardless of program (initial or advanced) or class format (traditional

seat-time or distant learning) have equal access to resources through electronic means. Candidates are assigned a G-number that gives them access to GSU's electronic resources, including their email account. The library has several electronic journals, newspapers, books, and databases that facilitate learning and research. Distant learning candidates have access to faculty for electronic advisement and consultation as well as access to electronic library resources.

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.]

Exhibit 6e-4-1 Library Resources

See Attachments panel below.

Optional

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

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