

**INSTITUTIONAL REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OPTION**

**Fairmont State University
September 30 – October 2, 2012**

**Carolyn Crislip-Tacy, Associate Dean of SoEHHP
Van Dempsey, Dean of SoEHHP and Interim Dean of Graduate Studies
G.H. Budd Sapp, Professor, SoEHHP
Jaci Webb-Dempsey, Associate Professor, SoEHHP**

FSU Exhibits Website: <http://tinyurl.com/fsuexhibit>

Password: ncate

CONTACT INFORMATION: Please contact Jaci Webb-Dempsey at (304-685-9623) or jwebbdempsey@fairmontstate.edu or G.H. Budd Sapp at (304-290-9040) ghbudd.sapp@fairmontstate.edu.

SITE INFORMATION: FSU's exhibits website is housed in TaskStream. Information for reviewing exhibits in TaskStream is located in the Introduction to TaskStream – Navigating TaskStream Artifacts section of the website. Most linked documents are in PDF format. If you do not have Adobe Reader downloaded on your computer to read PDF documents please follow the directions on this site: <http://get.adobe.com/reader/>. Note: The Table of Contents for Exhibits is a downloadable document on the website homepage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Overview | 2 |
| Standard 1..... | 6 |
| Standard 2..... | 11 |
| Standard 3..... | 17 |
| Standard 4..... | 25 |
| Standard 5..... | 31 |
| Standard 6..... | 36 |

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OPTION

I. Overview and Conceptual Framework

I.1 What are the institution's historical context and unique characteristics? With its beginning as the first normal school in West Virginia, Fairmont State University (FSU) has played a critical role in the history of public education in the state. Founded in 1865, two years after the state was admitted into the Union, FSU first operated as the West Virginia Normal School at Fairmont, a private institution housed in the basement of the Quincy Street Methodist Protestant Church. Purchased by the state in 1868, it operated as a branch of the State Normal School at Marshall College until 1893 when the Fairmont State Normal School (FSNS) moved from the church to a new location with the capacity to better serve the region. That same year, James G. Blair became the principal, a title that was not changed to president until 1907. Blair convinced the state to include secondary school classes in the curriculum of normal schools, and began the move to a four-year curriculum. Blair's successor, M. Lizzie Dickey, was one of the first women to hold a high post in education in West Virginia. In early 1917, the school moved to the current 18.5 acre campus and became known as the "college on the hill" due to the geography of the location. In 1923, the Normal School was authorized by the Legislature to offer a four-year program but was to confine itself to training teachers. Renamed Fairmont State Teachers College in 1931, it became Fairmont State College in 1943 and in 2004 became a university, with the ability to offer graduate programs. A unique institutional feature of FSU is its relationship with the Community College that operates on its campus. Fairmont State Community & Technical College (FSC&TC) was founded in 1974 as part of Fairmont State College, and then received independent accreditation in 2003. The WV Legislature approved a bill in 2006 directing FSU and FSC&TC to once again share accreditation and FSC&TC became a Division of FSU and was renamed Pierpont Community & Technical College (Pierpont). In 2007, the Legislature reversed direction, requiring separate accreditation for FSU and Pierpont. Although FSU and Pierpont are now separate institutions with separate governing boards and separate missions, they continue to share a main campus and services. The institutions' shared physical facilities have been significantly improved and upgraded over the past two decades, including a new Education Building and significant upgrades in technology equipment, software, and infrastructure. Campus buildings are inter-connected by fiber optic cabling with Internet access available in all classrooms, offices, labs, and residence halls. In the midst of these changes, FSU has preserved its traditions and those of its region. A one-room schoolhouse museum on the main campus is a reminder of the institution's roots in teacher education. West Virginia is the only state to fall entirely within the cultural and geographic region known as Appalachia and noted American author, Appalachian folklorist, and FSU faculty member Ruth Ann Musick's work is showcased and her focus on Appalachian culture continues in the university's Frank and Jane Gabor WV Folklife Center, which opened on campus in 2011.

With a population of approximately 19,000, Fairmont is located 90 miles south of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and is the seat of government for Marion County. According to 2010 census data, 94% of residents are white, making socioeconomic status the most prevalent marker of diversity in FSU's immediate service region. The median household income for Marion County residents is \$38,115, significantly less than the national statistic of \$51,914, and 16.8% of residents are living below the poverty level (<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/54/54049.html>). However, the region is a study in contrasts as FSU is also part of the state's fast-growing high technology corridor. Recent data reveal that 92% of the 4,600 students attending FSU are in-state students, and many of them are from the immediate service region. More than 86% of FSU students receive some form of financial aid and many are the first in their family to attend college (<http://www.collegeportraits.org/WV/Fairmont-State>). FSU provides them with the opportunity to participate in more than 90 baccalaureate degrees, and graduate programs in Business, Criminal Justice, and Education. FSU is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC)

and will host its next onsite HLC accreditation visit in October 2012. The Unit's Initial undergraduate programs, Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT), and Advanced graduate programs to prepare special educators (M.Ed.) and reading specialists were recently refiled with the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE), and approved in February 2012 by the West Virginia Board of Education (WVBE). The Unit has had continuous accreditation by NCATE since 1954.

I.2 What is the institution's mission? The Mission of Fairmont State University is "to provide opportunities for individuals to achieve their professional and personal goals and discover roles for responsible citizenship that promote the common good." This mission is supported by a vision of FSU as an institution that "aspires to be nationally recognized as a model for accessible learner-centered institutions that promote student success by providing comprehensive education and excellent teaching, flexible learning environments, and superior services" and of graduates who will have "the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind necessary for intellectual growth, full and participatory citizenship, employability, and entrepreneurship in a changing environment." FSU considers its broad objective to be the education of its students as intelligent and productive persons, capable of participating in and understanding the world of the twenty-first century. As part of this vision, FSU "has a traditional interest in preparing teachers for public schools in West Virginia, as well as in other states. Recognizing the importance of able teachers to a progressive society, it requires outstanding academic performance of its teacher candidates and offers them sound professional training for elementary and secondary teaching." Further, as described on the FSU website, "specifically, the mission of Fairmont State University is to provide programs needed by those in its geographic service area, to the extent permitted by its financial and human resources and its assigned role in the state's system of public higher education" (<http://www.fairmontstate.edu/strategicplan/mission-vision-philosophy-and-objectives>).

I.3 What is the professional education unit at your institution, what is its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators, and what are the significant changes since the last NCATE review? The School of Education, Health and Human Performance (SoEHHP) serves as the professional education unit at FSU. SoEHHP faculty teach the professional education courses, and serve as content methods faculty in Elementary Education, Physical Education, Health Education, Family and Consumer Science, Computer Science, and School Library Media programs. Content methods faculty in Art, Biology, Business Education, English Language Arts, French, General Science, Journalism, Math, Music, Oral Communication, Social Studies, Spanish, Technology Education, and Theatre have appointments in their disciplines in the College of Liberal Arts, the College of Science and Technology, the School of Business, and the School of Fine Arts. All FSU faculty and administrators connected to education programs are convened by the SoEHHP Dean for Educational Personnel Preparation Advisory Council (EPPAC) meetings, along with representatives from the WVDE and partnering PK-12 schools. EPPAC is the comprehensive decision-making body for teacher education and initiates and coordinates Continuous Improvement (CI) efforts. The FSU Professional Development School (PDS) Partnership is housed in the SoEHHP and facilitates the collaborative partnership with administrators and faculty in 40 PDSs and at FSU. The Partnership supports the simultaneous renewal of teacher preparation and professional practice across institutions. The representative governance structure of the Partnership includes the FSU PDS Executive Committee, Liaison Network, PDS Coordinator Network, PDS Principals and Superintendents. Faculty members from units across the institution serve as FSU Liaisons – including the University President – to each of the PDSs. All Teacher Education Program field experiences and clinical placements are coordinated through the FSU PDS Partnership Office.

Since the last NCATE review significant changes have occurred on the FSU campus; including changes in leadership:

- The President serving during the last review resigned in 2008 and was replaced with an Interim for the 2008/09 academic year. In Spring 2009, a new President was hired and served in that position until Spring of 2011. The campus spent 2011/12 engaged in a Presidential Search with the Provost serving as the Interim President before being named President in April.
- A new Provost was named in 2007 and, as that Provost has been serving as Interim President, the Associate Provost has been serving as the Interim Provost since Spring 2011. The SoEHHP Dean serving during the last review left in 2005 and an interim Dean served until the current Dean was hired in 2006.
- In 2004, the current Dean of the Business School began serving as the Dean for the newly established Graduate Studies. In 2005, this position was reorganized and a new VP for Research and Graduate Studies was hired and the Graduate Studies Council was established. In 2009, leadership for Graduate Studies was again restructured and the Dean of SoEHHP began serving as the Interim Dean of Graduate Studies.

Institutional/Unit changes include:

- The institutional arrangement with Pierpont resulting from the separation from FSU has required ongoing negotiation and has impacted finances, shared services, and space on campus.
- As a result of the last HLC Accreditation process, the institution began piloting the use of TaskStream to serve as the archive and management system for institutional assessment, and as a catalyst to engage units and programs in more systematic development of an ongoing assessment and CI process.
- In Spring 2011, FSU adopted a new structure for General Studies organized around attributes rather than required courses that will be fully implemented in Fall 2013.
- At the time of the last NCATE visit, graduate program offerings were limited. Graduate programs are now established in Business, Criminal Justice, and Education. The SoEHHP has implemented two new graduate programs since 2010: Digital Media, New Literacies, and Learning; and, Exercise Science, Fitness, and Wellness.
- The PDS partnership moved from pilot status with 3 PDSs in one county school district to a fully functioning school-university partnership with 40 partnering schools across six counties. The Partnership has also established a collaborative governance system with an Executive Committee, Site Coordinator Network, Liaison Network, and an Administrator Network.
- The PDS Partnership was historically supported solely by legislative funding. In 2008, the SoEHHP began institutionalizing funding for liaisons and for administrative and staff support.
- The SoEHHP realigned education programs with the West Virginia Professional Teaching Standards (WVPTS), adopted by WVBE in April 2009, and cross-referenced alignment with the redesigned Conceptual Framework (CF) and Teacher Education Program Outcomes (see below, I.4).

I.4 Summarize basic tenets of the conceptual framework, institutional standards and candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions as well as significant changes made to the conceptual framework since the last NCATE review? The mission of Teacher Education at Fairmont State University is to *prepare reflective and responsive educators who possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn*. The SoEHHP serves as the intellectual, academic and professional center for the University in the preparation of new educators and support of practicing educators with the Unit's Professional Development School partners. From that center, the Unit collaborates with PK-12 and campus-wide partners to integrate in an interdisciplinary way the Teacher Education curriculum, field experiences, clinical practice, and assessment of candidates as shared University and Partnership responsibilities.

The Unit CF provides the structure and guiding principles that are necessary to accomplish this mission. The five WVPTS and their respective functions frame the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that

candidates must possess in order to facilitate learning for all students. The Unit CF includes meaningful integration of technology and responsiveness to diversity, which are aligned (respectively) with the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) National Standards for Technology for Teachers (NETS-T) and the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE) Standards (see I.5.c for all standards sets). Demonstrated competencies in the standards/functions empower candidates to function as reflective and responsive educators. The CF is based on research about effective teaching and learning best practices that apply to teacher candidates at the initial level as well as accomplished teachers at the advanced level. The CF and the WVPTS also are central guiding elements of the FSU PDS Partnership which provides a critical structure and context for teacher education and educator professional development (see CF White Paper).

Major changes in the CF relate to the transition from the INTASC Standards to the WVPTS as the framework for programs, and a move from the development of “teacher as informed decision-maker” to the development of “reflective and responsive educators with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn.” The new CF represents an institutional commitment to: (1) collaboration and programmatic commitments to culturally responsive teaching practice; (2) reflective professional practice to support a data-based instructional cycle and personal growth; (3) teaching practice that serves the needs of diverse student populations under a broad definition of diversity; and, (4) the effective and meaningful integration of technology in teaching and learning. These changes are represented in redesigned academic and field/clinical experiences and the structure of the assessment systems for initial and advanced programs. All teacher education programs are aligned with the WVPTS listed below.

WVPTS 1 Curriculum and Planning: Candidates will apply their knowledge of core content and pedagogy to set goals and objectives for learning based on state and national standards and local curriculum, and design instruction that engages *all students* in meaningful learning activities and includes a balanced approach to student assessment.

WVPTS 2 The Learner and the Learning Environment: Candidates will demonstrate their understanding of intellectual/cognitive, social, and emotional development, and other characteristics of the *diversity* of learners, in creating an environment of respect and rapport and a culture for learning for *all students*, and in the implementation of classroom procedures, behavior management, and organization of the learning environment to assure a focus on learning.

WVPTS 3 Teaching: Graduates will deliver meaningful learning experiences for *all students* by integrating their knowledge of content, pedagogy, the learner and the learning environment; engaging in the *reflective* instructional cycle of planning, instructing, assessing, and adjusting based on data; and applying a variety of communication, instructional, and assessment strategies in their teaching.

WVPTS 4 Professional Responsibilities for Self Renewal: Graduates will demonstrate their commitment to continuous self-improvement by engaging in *reflective* professional learning, collaborative practice with colleagues, reflection on practice, and investigation of ideas to improve teaching and learning that contribute to the renewal of the teaching profession and learning for *all students*.

WVPTS 5 Professional Responsibilities for School and Community: Graduates will demonstrate teacher leadership by participating in the development and/or implementation of the school-wide mission, strategic planning/continuous improvement process, curriculum initiatives, student support and management systems; and support a school-wide learner-centered culture by facilitating school, family and community connections, maintaining an environment that fosters learning for *all students*, and demonstrating a commitment to ethical and equitable behavior.

In 2011, in order to represent the CF holistically and facilitate the program assessment process, the Unit adopted the Teacher Education Program Outcomes to capture each of the five WVPTS standards, the Diversity and Technology strands, and the professional dispositions embedded in the CF (see Unit Teacher Education Program Outcomes, I.5.c). The missions of the University and the Unit correlate as both have the goal of providing opportunities for individuals to achieve their professional and personal goals and discover roles for responsible citizenship. The University and Unit work to ensure that graduates have the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and habits of mind necessary for intellectual growth, full and participatory citizenship, and employability. Additionally, the Unit as well as all the colleges, schools, and departments of the university embrace the institutional core values of scholarship, opportunity, achievement, and responsibility.

Standard 1 – Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.1 What do candidate assessment data tell the unit about candidates' meeting professional, state, and institutional standards and their impact on PK-12 student learning? Unit 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. The assessments used to collect the data are based on the standards that are aligned with the Unit's CF and are evidenced in various exhibits. Assessment data are collected, analyzed, shared, and used for continuous improvement as stated in the Unit's assessment system. Proficiency levels to meet the standards are determined through a variety of assessment data that include but are not limited to: grade point averages (GPAs); cut scores/pass rates on Praxis II exams (Content Area and Principles of Learning and Teaching - PLT); field experience (FE) assessment rubrics; student teaching (ST) assessment rubrics, disposition report forms (DRF); action research (AR) projects; and portfolios. Follow-up surveys indicate that graduates rate their preparation related to the Unit standards in the proficient to distinguished range and the employers "strongly agree" and "agree" that candidates are well-prepared to execute the Unit standards. In the fall of 2011, the Unit submitted its Curriculum Analysis Reports (CARs) to the WVDE as part of its program review process. The CARs were reviewed by statewide teams in the spring 2012 semester. Results of the CARs state program review process and may be found in the exhibits. Each CAR presented to the state contains the following: (1) contextual information; (2) assessments; (3) relation of assessments to standards; (4) evidence of meeting standards; and, (5) use of assessment results. The Unit submitted 23 initial programs for review to the WVDE which include: Art (PK-Adult), Biology (9-Adult), Business (5-Adult), Chemistry (9-Adult), Computer Science (PK-Adult), Elementary Education (K-6), English (5-Adult), Family and Consumer Sciences (5-Adult), French (5-Adult), General Math through Algebra (5-9), General Science (5-Adult), Health (5-Adult), Journalism (5-Adult), Mathematics (5-Adult), Music (PK-Adult), Oral Communications (5-Adult), Physical Education (PK-Adult); Physics (9-Adult), School Library Media (PK-Adult), Social Studies (5-Adult), Spanish (PK-Adult), Technology Education (5-Adult), and Theatre (PK-Adult). Advanced programs for review submitted to the WVDE include the following: Multi-Categorical Special Education (K-Adult) and Reading Specialist (PK-Adult). The Reading Specialist is also categorized as an "other school professional." An overview of the WVDE CARs decisions for initial programs include: "Recognized" (Elementary K-6, Mathematics 5-Adult, General Math through Algebra 5-9, Oral Communications 5-Adult, and Physical Education K-Adult); "Recognized with Conditions" (Art PK-Adult, English 5-Adult, French 5-Adult, Health 5-Adult, Journalism 5-Adult, Social Studies 5-Adult, Technology Education 5-Adult, and Theatre PK-Adult); "Not Recognized" (Biology 9-Adult, Chemistry 9-Adult, Computer Science PK-Adult, Family and Consumer Sciences 5-Adult, Physics 9-Adult, and School Library Media PK-Adult); and "No Decision Yet" (Business 5-Adult and Music PK-Adult). An overview of the WVDE CARs decisions for advanced programs include: "Recognized with Conditions" (Multi-Categorical Special Education K-Adult and Reading Specialist PK-Adult). It is important to note

that the institution and Unit has had several transitions related to multiple presidents (full-time and interim), multiple deans (full-time and interim), adopting the WVPTS in place of the INTASC standards, and utilizing TaskStream as its information technology related to the assessment system. The Unit has proceeded with its CI accreditation efforts throughout the various transitions. As a result of the aforementioned transitions, the Unit may report data related to two sets of standards and data may be housed in multiple information technology formats. Additionally, the WVDE CAR process only required one year of data if the Unit had transitioned to a new assessment (SPED for example). Even though one year of data may be reported, three years of data are available in the exhibits.

Content Knowledge: Initial Programs: The CARs include content knowledge assessments that are presented in the state program review process. Assessment data can be accessed via each report in the exhibits and represents disaggregated and aggregated data for each program. Assessment data included in the CAR reports include: GPAs; Praxis II Content Area exam pass rates; and, student teaching assessments. The Unit requires minimum GPAs of 2.75 in three areas: overall GPA; content GPA; and education GPA. Programs require a Praxis II Content Area Exam and the WVDE sets cut scores for each of these exams (with the exception of programs that do not have a Praxis Content Area Exam, e.g. Computer Science, Journalism, Theatre). Each candidate is also assessed with field experience and student teaching rubrics related to WVPTS Standard 1 (Curriculum and Planning) Function 1A Core Content which states: “The teacher has a deep knowledge of the content and its interrelatedness within and across disciplines and can move beyond basic content competency to assure student mastery of skills necessary for success in life and work.” Content GPA data indicate that candidates know the content they plan to teach. It is clear that Praxis II Content Area Exam pass rates are well above the required 80% benchmark identified by NCATE for certification licensure testing. Additionally, WVPTS 1 – Function 1A clinical experience assessment data demonstrate teacher candidates have deep content knowledge. MAT candidates’ assessment data are included in the aggregated results of the initial program CAR reports. Data for the MAT candidates has also been disaggregated for three years. See exhibits, MAT exhibits, and CAR reports for initial programs.

Content Knowledge: Advanced Programs: Content knowledge data for the programs at the advanced level similarly include GPAs, Praxis II Content Area exam pass rates, and student teaching assessment data (WVPTS Standard 1 Function 1A). The CARs provide information concerning aggregated and disaggregated content knowledge data for the advanced programs of multi-categorical special education (SPED) and reading specialist (READ). For clarification purposes, the SPED program and its assessment data will be addressed in Standard 1 elements as the only advanced program and the READ program will be addressed in the elements related to other school professionals only. Data for advanced program completers demonstrate that SPED candidates meet the requirements for content knowledge. SPED candidates’ GPAs in their content courses are 3.9 on a 4 point scale for 2008-2009; and 3.8 for both 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 respectively. The SPED program requires two Praxis II exams (0353 – Education of Exceptional Students Core Content Knowledge and 0542 - Education of Exceptional Students Mild to Moderate Disabilities) and the scores indicate that candidates on average are performing well above the state minimum expected scores of 146 for the Core and 153 for the MTMD with average scores 26 and 25 points respectively above the minimum passing score and thus above the 80 percent requirement. These strong scores provide confidence that candidates possess the knowledge and understanding of principles and practices related to the field of special education. Average ratings for WVPTS 1 – Function 1A (Core Content) on the student teaching assessment rubric for 2010-2011 were 3.43/4.0 and 3.65/4.0 (proficient to distinguished) and demonstrate candidates have deep content knowledge.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills: Initial Level. The Unit assesses pedagogical content knowledge and skills (as recommended by the CAR process) through an instructional Unit/planning assessment and the student teaching assessments. The Unit also utilizes the Praxis II Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam score pass rates of pedagogical content knowledge. These data sets

verify that teacher candidates understand the relationship of content and content-specific pedagogy delineated in standards. Elementary education candidates take the PLT K-6 and other content area candidates take the PLT 7-12 (with some exceptions, candidates take the PLT 5-9). The clinical experience and student teaching assessment rubrics include ratings on WVPTS 1 (Curriculum and Planning) and WVPTS 3 (Teaching) and their associated functions which are indicative of candidate pedagogical content knowledge and skills. The Unit requires each candidate to take EDUC 2201 (Instructional Technology) and each professional education course includes an assessment related to diversity and technology. Candidates are able to effectively integrate technology and information literacy in their teaching and apply culturally responsive teaching strategies to help all students learn. See exhibits, CAR reports, TaskStream, and course syllabi for further validation as applicable.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills: Advanced Level. Unit candidates in advanced programs demonstrate an in-depth understanding of pedagogical content knowledge and are able to select and use a broad range of pedagogical skills. Advanced level candidates take the PLT 7-12 (with some exceptions, candidates take the PLT 5-9). Some SPED candidates passed the PLT as an undergraduate and do not take the PLT in the advanced program. SPED candidates have a 100 percent pass rate as completers. The field experience and student teaching assessment rubrics include ratings on WVPTS 1 (Curriculum and Planning) and WVPTS 3 (Teaching) and their associated functions which are indicative of candidate pedagogical content knowledge and skills. SPED candidates were rated 3.43/4 and 3.65/4 on WVPTS 1 in fall 2010 and spring 2011 respectively and 3.38/4 and 3.73/4 on WVPTS 3 in fall 2010 and spring 2011. The Unit requires each advanced candidate to take EDUC 6305 (Advanced Educational Technology & Media) and each professional education course includes an assessment related to diversity and technology. Advanced candidates are able to implement culturally responsive teaching techniques as well as utilize 21st century skills and tools to promote student learning. Disaggregated and aggregated data sets for the SPED program are in the CAR report and exhibits. See TaskStream and course syllabi for further validation as applicable.

Professional and Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates: Initial and advanced candidates can apply professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills; they reflect on their practice; they consider the school, family, and community contexts in which they work; they know the major schools of thought related to teaching and learning; and they are aware of and analyze current research and policies to guide their professional practice. Ratings of candidates on their field experience and student teaching rubrics, specifically related to WVPTS 2 (The Learner and the Learning Environment), WVPTS 4 (Professional Responsibilities for Self-Renewal), and WVPTS 5 (Professional Responsibilities for School and Community), validate candidate proficiencies in professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. SPED (advanced) candidates were rated 3.48/4 and 3.76/4 on WVPTS 2 in fall 2010 and spring 2011 respectively; 3.25/4 and 3.69/4 on WVPTS 4 in fall 2010 and spring 2011; and 3.43/4 and 3.74/4 on WVPTS 5 in fall 2010 and spring 2011. Assessment data for initial candidates are in CAR reports and READ candidates' data are explained in "other school professionals" element. Candidates have multiple opportunities throughout the program to engage in reflective practice in their coursework, as part of their clinical experiences, in their action research projects, and in their portfolio. Reflective practices are documented in a variety of ways that include but are not limited to: Blackboard entries, TaskStream entries, reflective journals in field experiences and student teaching, individual class assignments and activities, and in the Showcase Portfolio.

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates - Initial Programs: All initial program candidates complete an action research project which assesses their ability to positively impact student learning. The action research project proposal rubric and action research final report rubric are aligned with the CF and five WVPTS. The rubrics have common criteria that each candidate addresses and include: Rationale (learning need, content, pedagogy/instructional strategy, and guiding questions); Context (school and community, classroom, and students); Literature Review (logic, summary, and sources); Plan (goals and objectives,

teaching, research, data-based instructional decision making, reflection, and timeline); Results (reflection on teaching, data analysis, conclusions about impact on student learning, comparison to results from related research, and implications for practice); and Writing (basic conventions, APA style, and readability). All candidates score in the proficient to distinguished range as noted in the data presented in the CAR reports.

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates - Advanced Programs: Candidates in the advanced program, multi-categorical SPED, demonstrate competencies to positively affect student learning. The Methods and Strategies Project challenges the advanced teacher candidate in multi-categorical special education to: 1) select and use active, evidence-based, engaging instructional strategies for specific students within their clinical placement classroom based on identified needs within the IEP document; 2) demonstrate the ability to create and use multiple assessments including pre-assessments, continuous assessments and performance based assessments; and 3) demonstrate ability to collect, report, and reflect on the data with regard to the success of the learning experience for the learners. The scoring rubric criteria include: contextual information; focus for learning or learning experience; specific short-term objectives connected to the student IEP documents; special learning strategies; special assessment strategies; and presentation and analysis of data for assessment of student learning. The rubric scoring scale ranges from below standard (0), standard (1), above standard (2), to exemplary (3). Candidates scored a cumulative average of 2.44/3 for 2010-2011, which was “above standard.” Candidates were also required to consider data on student performance as they planned, implemented, and assessed the success of student learning via a Video Analysis Project. SPED candidates scored a cumulative 4.58/5 on the video analysis criteria rubric or converted to a 91.55 percent which is another measure of the candidates’ ability to positively impact student learning. See CAR report for additional data.

Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals: Unit candidates in the reading (READ) specialist advanced program demonstrate the knowledge and skills expected in their field and delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Reading specialist candidates take the Praxis II Content Test (Praxis Series Subject Assessment Test 0300: Reading Specialist). The current passing score is 520. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction with a program pass rate of 94 percent. Course GPAs and field experience assessments are also utilized to verify reading specialist candidates demonstrate the knowledge and skills expected of those preparing to work in schools in other professional roles. Select courses (READ 6300 – Foundations of Reading & Writing; READ 6315 - Teaching Content Literacy; READ 6320 – Psychological, Social, and Linguistic Factors; READ 6370 – Administration & Supervision of Reading; and READ 6360 – Literature and Response) that were mapped to Unit, state, and professional association standards were utilized in calculating GPAs that demonstrate READ candidates knowledge in their field. READ candidate GPAs were 4.0/4.0 in 2008-2009; 3.96/4.0 for 2009-2010; and 3.97/4.0 for 2010-2011. WVDE policy requires READ candidates to complete one student teaching clinical and the assessment form utilized INTASC standards (not transitioning to the WVPTS until recently). The Unit categorized the ten INTASC standards into five broader categories (similar to the format of the five WVPTS). The five categories and associated INTASC standards include: Standard I: Content & Pedagogical Knowledge (INTASC 1- Content Pedagogy and INTASC 2 – Student Development); Standard II: Diversity in Teaching and Learning (INTASC 3 – Diverse Learners); Standard III: (INTASC 4 – Multiple Instructional Strategies, INTASC 5 –Motivation and Management, INTASC 6 – Communication and Technology, INTASC 7 – Planning, and INTASC 8 Assessment); Standard IV: Reflective Practice and Informed Decision Making (INTASC 9 – Reflective Practice and Professional Growth); and Standard V: Dispositions and Professionalism (INTASC 10). READ candidate ratings for Standard I and Standard III demonstrate their knowledge and skills and include: Standard I (3.5/4 and 4/4 for 08-09; 3.58/4 and 3.2/4 for 09-10; and 3.8/4 and 4/4 for 10-11) and Standard III (3.75/4 and 3.8/4 for 08-09; 3.7/4 and 3.6/4 for 09-10; and 4/4 and 4/4 for 10-11). All candidates are performing at a proficient to distinguished level. See CAR report as applicable.

Student Learning for Other School Professional: The “Assessment of Candidate Ability to Plan Instruction” is utilized by the reading specialist program to document that candidates for other professional school roles are able to create positive environments for student learning. This assessment requires candidates: to utilize what they know about individual children and general patterns of literacy development to plan curriculum and instruction; to design and implement authentic assessments to determine if students are meeting curricular goals; to reflect on whether the classroom instruction, materials, physical environment and social environment provide a variety of ways to meet these goals; and to effectively share detailed, factual information with families, other teaching professionals, and administrators. The data indicate that the candidates were able to plan for individual learners using a variety of assessment tools and enrichment/intervention strategies that support children’s literacy development with a 96 percent average on a 100 point scale. READ candidates are also required to complete an Action Research project as part of their final phase of coursework in the EDUC 6395 course. Candidates demonstrate their ability to positively impact student learning by effectively implementing a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, methods, curriculum materials, and assessments to support reading and writing instruction. READ candidate Action Research data indicate that candidates exceed minimum criterion of 80 percent in each of three years. Action Research rubric scores ranged from a cumulative score of 17.1/20 or 85.5 percent to 18.9/20 or 94.5 percent during the 2008- 009 through 2010-2011 academic years. See CAR report as applicable.

Professional Dispositions for All Candidates: Unit candidates at the initial and advanced levels know, develop, and demonstrate the professional dispositions expected of reflective and responsive educators which include the ideal of fairness and the belief that all students can learn. The Unit designed a Disposition Report Form (DRF) which aligns with the CF and dispositions are assessed systematically throughout the program. The DRF includes three overall categories and each overall category contains sub-categories: Responsible (attendance, punctuality, and preparedness; appearance and demeanor; initiative; and ethical issues); Reflective (self-assessment; and sound judgment); and Responsive (communication; fairness; collaborative; and respectful). Candidates may be assessed by the university instructor, PDS coordinator, and PDS liaison and are required to be assessed by the PDS host teacher. The form serves the purposes of assessing professional dispositions of candidates as well as recognizing exemplary dispositional achievement and reporting dispositional concerns. Prior to the design of the DRF, candidates were assessed as part of the field experience (FE) and student teaching (ST) assessment rubrics dependent on the INTASC rubric or the new WVPTS rubric. Candidate dispositional data are presented in relation to the DRF as well as data from the FE and ST assessment rubrics. At the initial level the majority of candidates are performing in the Proficient to Distinguished range on the DRF as well as the FE and ST assessment rubrics. At the advanced level (SPED), the following standard and functions on the ST assessment rubric were used to assess candidate dispositions - WVPTS 5 (Professional Responsibilities for School and Community): Functions 5I (Ethical Standards) and 5J (Professional Dispositions). Ratings in the academic year 2010-11 for 5I were 3.64 and 3.91 on a 4 point scale and ratings for 5J were 3.57 and 3.85 on a 4 point scale which represent the proficient to distinguished level. READ candidate dispositions were assessed via INTASC Standards II, IV and V. Standard II ratings were: 4/4 and 4/4 for 08-09, 3.1/4 and 3/4 for 09-10, and 3.4/4 and 4/4 for 10-11; Standard IV ratings were: 4/4 and 4/4 for 08-09, 3.8/4 and 3.4/4 for 09-10, 4/4 and 4/4 for 10-11; and Standard V ratings were: 4/4 and 4/4 for 08-09, 3.8/4 and 4/4 for 09-10, and 3.8/4 and 4/4 for 10-11. Assessment data are indicative that the Unit’s candidates exhibit the professional dispositions necessary to support student development and learning (see Dispositions data, 1.3.f).

Continuous Improvement: A thorough explanation of progress in continuous improvement across the Unit may be accessed via the exhibit document titled: FSU Reapproval Documentation 2011 Program Narrative. Since the adoption of the new WVPTS in April 2009, educators from 40 Professional Development Schools in six counties, county school district and school leaders, classroom educators, and

FSU faculty and administrators engaged in intensive continuous improvement work that reflects the new standards. FSU and PDS educators continued to work in planning, design, and assessment teams that resulted in the following continuous improvement changes: the design of an “Early Field Experience” (EFE Experience I in the new program design) that candidates would complete prior to admission to teacher education; redesign of existing field experiences (FE II and III in the new program design); redesign of student teaching assessments, including performance-based clinical rubrics and observation forms tailored for use by (1) classroom host teachers, site coordinators and other PDS educators, and (2) for use by FSU PDS Liaisons; design of two new “Instructional Design” courses to serve as pre-requisites for and complements to certification-specific methods courses and concurrent FE; preliminary examination of how technology integration would occur in the new program (using the ISTE NETS-T standards) and an audit of technologies and media available in PDSs; preliminary analysis and integration of diversity initiatives in the new program (this would lead to the adoption of the CREDE standards for culturally responsive teaching); redesigning the focus of an undergraduate special education course to emphasize a more applied knowledge base for classroom teachers; redesign of the action research program outcomes, including a scope and sequence process to integrate the action research knowledge base across the program of study (rather than isolated with one course); redesign of the portfolio process to have a more developmental strategy for portfolio assessment culminating in a digital showcase portfolio constructed during student teaching; redesign of the Human Growth and Development course to incorporate more elements of Education Psychology (leading to a revised course in the new program design); redesign of field experiences for graduate programs leading to initial licensure to align with more intensive undergraduate sequence; development of policies to move field experiences for graduate programs leading to initial licensure into PDS; redesign of the research course sequence to include a scope and sequence process to integrate the action research knowledge base across the graduate programs; and, full implementation of all program assessments (key assessments) with ongoing revisions as needed.

Plans for Sustaining and Enhancing Performance: The unit will continue its efforts in collaboration with the WVDE, NCATE, CAEP, and SPAs to prepare initial and advanced candidates who possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. As part of the CI process, the unit will regularly and systematically engage in a program review and assessment process to ensure that candidates continue to meet professional, state, institutional, and unit standards.

Standard 2 – Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

2.1 How does the unit use its assessment system to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations?

Assessment System: The CF is the foundation of and provides the framework for the Unit Assessment System and the assessment of candidates, courses, programs, and Unit operations, and for the collaborative implementation of the assessment process. The central concepts of the CF have been translated into a set of Unit Standards – the Teacher Education Program Outcomes, and CF commitments to the meaningful integration of technology and responsiveness to diversity are captured by alignment (respectively) with the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) National Standards for Technology for Teachers (NETS-T) and the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE) Standards (see I.5.c for all standards sets). The Unit assessment system is designed to: (1) support the annual analysis of candidate, course, program and Unit data to assess the implementation of the FSU Conceptual Framework (CF) and achievement of the Teacher Education Program Outcomes (see I.5.c); (2) assess and provide Initial and Advanced candidates with feedback on their performance of the West Virginia Professional Teaching Standards (WVPTS – see I.5.c) and other professional standards that define the content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teaching at a level appropriate for each phase of candidate development; (3) assess and provide Initial and Advanced candidates with

feedback on their impact on student learning; (4) assess and provide Initial and Advanced candidates with feedback on their demonstration of the common set of professional dispositions adopted by the Unit; and, (5) involve the professional community in collaborative implementation and evaluation of the Unit assessment system and CI process. The Unit assessment system operates on an annual cycle and includes groups representing all members of the professional community (see FSU Teacher Education Assessment System Overview, 2.3.a). These groups have aligned all Initial and Advanced programs, courses, and program and course assessments with the CF. In this comprehensive process of alignment, the Unit developed a systematic standards-based assessment system for evaluating all candidates at critical transition points as they matriculate through their programs (see Program-At-A-Glance Overviews, 2.3.a). In addition to reflecting the CF, integrated course and program assessments have been developed (see CAR Reports, I.5.d) and comprehensive Unit Key Assessments have been customized to align with applicable national professional standards (see 2.3.e). Programs have been redesigned and/or reorganized to support the Unit's developmental approach to candidate preparation which is also reflected in the assessment system, with phases of coursework and field experiences bookended by transition points where candidate progress is monitored and formative feedback is provided, leading up to the final clinical practice and program completion. This supports decision-making about candidate performance based on multiple assessments at admissions, transition points, and program completion. The assessment system also provides information on Unit operations. These data are collected via an Exit Survey deployed in TaskStream to candidates at the end of student teaching, a follow-up Graduate Survey administered online through Survey Monkey, and an Employer/Principal Survey administered by mail and online through Survey Monkey. The Exit Survey is designed to collect data about respondents' perspectives of the effectiveness of Unit programs in general, and specific program features in particular, in preparing candidates or graduates to demonstrate the CF and WVPTS in teaching practice (see 1.3.i). The Graduate Survey collects data about respondents' of the efficacy of their preparation during the first 3 years of teaching, framed by the CF and the WVPTS. The Employer/Principal Survey asks respondents to report on their assessment of the effectiveness of the preparation of Unit graduates to meet the WVPTS and other components of the CF. (see 1.3.i).

In addition to basic requirements for program admissions and matriculation - GPA, completion of required courses and field/clinical experiences, PRAXIS results – and program assessments designed to evaluate candidate development and demonstration of specialized professional standards, the Unit has identified a set of assessments for all teacher education programs. These assessments provide systematic opportunities to consider comparable data across all teacher education programs – Initial and Advanced – and for candidates to engage in capstone demonstration of teaching practice and dispositions. These assessments are also designed to enhance candidate marketability by providing prospective employers with comprehensive information about graduates' teaching performance aligned with the same standards they use to assess their faculty and by creating opportunities for candidates to engage in dissemination of their work to professional audiences. Unit Key Assessments include: (1) Performance-based Assessment of Clinical/Student Teaching Practice; (2) Action Research - design, implementation, and professional dissemination of Action Research during clinical practice to document impact on student learning; (3) Showcase e-Portfolio - development and professional presentation of a Showcase e-Portfolio to document candidate reflection on and achievement of the CF and WVPTS; and, (4) Dispositions - assessment of professional Dispositions utilizing the newly adopted DRF and field/clinical assessments. Each Unit Key Assessment was developed by collaborative groups of FSU and PDS faculty and administrators, candidates, and graduates as part of the ongoing CI process beginning in 2008. The groups regularly participating in the assessment process during the academic year analyze data to identify needs for improvement of Unit programs and Unit assessments and develop an agenda for collaborative Summer Work Teams each year. Initially the Summer Work Teams were focused on the redesign of the undergraduate programs (see CI Timeline, 2.3.h) and are now focused on final implementation of improvements to the Initial programs and ongoing development and pilot implementation of improvements to the Advanced programs. This process strategically used the redesign of the

undergraduate program as a “greenhouse” for designing and developing structures, curriculum features and assessments that could then be adapted and transplanted to strengthen graduate programs; first the MAT program, and now the Advanced programs (see 2012 Summer Work Teams, 2.3.a). This is an iterative process, as each new component of the Unit’s central assessment system is piloted and the assignment/requirement and the assessment process revised on the basis of feedback from candidates, graduates, and FSU and PDS faculty evaluators. Unit Key Assessments and other central assessments undergo several cycles of evaluation and improvement by the professional community. Once the process for implementing Unit Key Assessments (including forms/scoring rubrics, scoring guides, professional development for evaluators) has stabilized, tests of inter-rater reliability are conducted (see 2.3.d). In addition, the annual Course Assessment Plan (CAPS) process (described below) supports examination of fairness, accuracy, and consistency of candidate and course assessments across multiple course sections as faculty collaborate to examine findings and develop recommendations for improvement.

Data Collection, Analysis and Evaluation: In addition to the redesign and/or development of the programs and key assessments, the process for collecting, analyzing and evaluating assessment data documenting candidate performance of knowledge, skills and dispositions has also been redesigned. The assessment system has moved online, and the participation of the professional community has expanded. The FSU Assessment Committee adopted TaskStream in 2007/08 as the web portal the institution uses to support and archive outcomes assessment at the institutional, program, course, and candidate levels. The TaskStream platform includes two “sides” that are used for two different purposes in the Unit assessment system. The Accountability Management System (AMS) is used to document and support FSU’s institutional and Units’ program assessment processes, while the Learning Achievement Tools (LAT) are used to collect, analyze, evaluate, and archive assessments of candidate performance and products and to support a formative developmental portfolio system. The AMS is designed to document the annual institutional, program, and course assessment process completed annually by FSU faculty. The AMS houses program and annual Course Assessment Plans (CAPs), curriculum maps aligned with outcome and standards sets, assessment data reports, and data-based plans for improvement (see sample CAP, 2.3.d). The CAPS and the analysis of curriculum maps ensure adequate assessment of Unit goals, program and course outcomes, and the CF and standards. (see curriculum maps, 2.3.a) The LAT is designed to facilitate and document assessment of candidate teaching performance and work products and to generate aggregate and disaggregated reports by standards and outcomes (see sample LAT reports, 1.3.c). The SoEHHP has piloted the use of the LAT for the institution since 2009. Education programs now use the LAT systematically to archive assessment data that is analyzed as part of the annual institutional and program assessment process housed in the AMS, as well as the unit’s CI process. This central online system provides aggregate and disaggregated data reports for candidates, groups of candidates, candidates in traditional programs, candidates in online programs, and for Unit standards. This system also supports multiple evaluators for candidate performance and products, including PDS host teachers, FSU liaisons, and course instructors. Assessment results and artifacts (work samples, completed scoring rubrics and forms) are archived and candidates use them to build developmental portfolios in TaskStream that are assessed at program admissions, transition points, and program completion. The developmental portfolio system for Initial programs will begin full implementation in Fall 2012 as the first group of prospective candidates applies for admissions to the new undergraduate program. During the development of the assessment system for Advanced programs and transition to full implementation, Unit assessments and data are being transferred into TaskStream to build an archive and facilitate data analysis. In addition, this central assessment system includes evaluations of Unit operations. These include candidate exit evaluations conducted at the end of student teaching, administration of a follow-up graduate survey, and administration of an employer/principal survey. Each of these evaluations has been designed to align with the CF and the WVPTS and has been conducted annually using online platforms. The Unit is moving toward full implementation of the comprehensive assessment system for all initial and advanced programs in TaskStream by Spring 2013.

The Unit has a process and procedures for reviewing candidate concerns, complaints, and grievances. When isolated incidents or concerns are raised (1) by a candidate about a faculty member, or (2) by a faculty member about a candidate, a record of the concern is kept in the Dean's files. Should a noted concern on the part of either part develop into a pattern of concerns, or into a formal appeal or grievance, the process follows the procedures set forth in student handbooks and Student Grievance Policies on the FSU website (see 2.3.h). When a formal appeal or grievance is filed, all documentation concerning the issue in question is placed in the program/certification file in the Certification Office. Documentation of grievances and responses is compiled and reviewed annually (see Summary of Responses, 2.3.f).

Use of Data for Program Improvement: The assessment process is collaborative and involves groups that include faculty and administrators from the SoEHHP, Arts and Sciences, and the PDSs, and candidates and graduates in an annual cycle that involves collection, analysis and evaluation of both assessment data and the assessment system (see Unit Assessment System Overview – Program Review and Continuous Improvement Groups, 2.3.a). This cyclical analysis of program evaluation and performance assessment data informs improvements in programs and Unit operations (see Program Development and Continuous Improvement Process Timeline, 2.3.h, and table below). The Program Review and Continuous Improvement groups include a central comprehensive group:

- **Educational Personnel Preparation Advisory Committee (EPPAC)** – established by WVBE Policy 5100 – Approval of Educational Personnel Preparation Programs – is convened by the Dean of SoEHHP and consists of all FSU faculty and administrators connected to education programs with representatives from the West Virginia Department of Education and partnering PK-12 schools. EPPAC is the comprehensive decision-making body for teacher education and meets at least once a semester to review matters pertaining to the preparation and licensure of educational personnel and to initiate and coordinate continuous improvement efforts.

Unit/Institutional Groups:

- **SoEHHP Faculty** meet monthly during the academic year to consider all major programmatic decisions (e.g. program revisions, curricular changes, policy development, and searches).
- **Program Clusters** including (1) **Elementary, Reading and Special Education**; (2) **Technology, Digital Media, Psychological and Cultural Foundations**; and (3) **Health, Physical Education, Outdoor Recreation and Exercise Science** meet regularly to provide direction, stewardship and oversight for academic programs and faculty professional work.
- **Cross-Cluster Teams** focused on **Teaching and Assessment/Continuous Improvement**; **Student Recruitment, Retention and Success**; **Diversity**; **Technology Integration**; **Faculty Scholarship**; and **Marketing and Development** meet as needed to work on key emphases for the Unit.
- **Faculty Forums** are initiated to engage in deliberations, strategic planning, general discussion about major program issues, and to consider available data prior to formalizing decisions in SoEHHP Faculty meetings.
- **FSU Graduate Council** consists of faculty representatives from the schools and colleges offering graduate programs and ex officio members (the Provost and the Dean of Graduate Studies) and meets monthly to formulate, review, and recommend university-wide graduate education policies.

And Partnership Groups:

- **FSU PDS Partnership Network – FSU Liaisons** include all faculty and administrators serving as liaisons to the PDSs and meet monthly and during the summer as needed as a work team to further the professional development agenda of the Partnership and the Unit and to support and strengthen Teacher Education.

- **FSU PDS Partnership Network – PDS Coordinators** meet at least four times each academic year and as needed on subcommittees and Summer Work Teams to focus on key needs for improvement of programs and to develop and engage in professional development.
- **FSU PDS Partnership Executive Committee** includes representatives of the Partnership Networks, and PDS Principals and Superintendents and is convened at least two times each academic year by the Partnership Director to engage in strategic planning for the Partnership, develop the proposal and budget for legislative funding, and consider data related to teacher education, professional development, and the Partnership to identify needs for improvement.
- **Reading Specialist Program Advisory Team** includes representatives from counties and schools where the program has a significant presence; including current candidates, graduates, practicing reading specialists who have mentored candidates, central office staff, and program faculty who meet at least once each semester and during the summer as needed to consider program data and develop strategies and policy proposals for improving the program.
- **Special Education Program Advisory Team** includes representatives from local counties and schools and counties and schools in the Eastern Panhandle where the program has a significant presence; including current candidates, graduates, practicing special educators who have mentored candidates, central office staff, and program faculty who meet at least once each semester and during the summer as needed to consider program data and develop strategies and policy proposals for improving the program.

2.2.b Continuous Improvement

| IMPROVEMENTS MADE FOR UNIT OPERATIONS AND ASSESSMENT OF CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE | DATA EVALUATED TO INFORM IMPROVEMENTS |
|--|--|
| Revision of the Conceptual Framework to include an iterative focus on diversity, technology, and a commitment to fairness and the belief that all children can learn. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations of FSU and PDS Faculty from EPPAC and Partnership meetings |
| Expansion of the FSU PDS Partnership to 40 schools in 6 county school districts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK-12 administrator and faculty requests • Analysis of field/clinical placement data |
| Development of : (1) PDS Partnership governance structure, (2) Coordinator and Liaison roles to support candidate field/clinical performance, Action Research, Portfolio development and collaborative professional development, (3) expanded Host Teacher role and support for development of supervisory knowledge, skills and dispositions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of 2006 statewide WVPTQ study of PDS Partnerships recommendations and FSU Partnership results • Feedback from PK-12 partners • Recommendations to increase field/clinical hours in programs from PK-12 partners and graduates |
| Development of Unit, Program and Course Assessment System in TaskStream. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit of existing data archive • Analysis of data collection process |
| Redesign of Unit website to reflect focus on CF and to include resources to support the new structure of the PDS Partnership. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ad hoc committee recommendations • PDS Site Coordinator feedback • Liaison feedback |
| Alignment of all program and course outcomes to revised CF, WVPTS and other standards. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit of program and course outcomes alignment • Recommendation of EPPAC |
| Development of course assessments aligned with outcomes, and mapped against the revised CF, WVPTS and other standards. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit of existing program and course assessments for Program Realignment process |

| | |
|--|---|
| Instructional technology course required. Began piloting technology assignment/assessment sequence across UG program in preparation for redesign of all programs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WVDE requirement • Audit of existing technology assignments/assessments by faculty using ISTE NETS-T |
| Development and pilots of follow-up survey instruments aligned with WVPTS/CF and PDS Partnership structure for Exiting Candidates, Graduate Employers, and Graduates. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of existing follow-up data |
| INITIAL PROGRAMS - UNDERGRADUATE | |
| Redesign of the professional education course sequence to include a stronger focus on instructional design; including theoretical foundations of instructional decisions, assessment for learning, technology integration, culturally responsive teaching practices. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations of FSU and PDS Faculty from EPPAC and Partnership meetings • Praxis data |
| Redesign of the field/clinical sequence to increase hours and to include requirements that align with WVPTS/CF. Transition from Block (4-week concentrated preparation in general methods) to the ID I and II sequence for Elementary and Secondary programs and 16-week student teaching. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exit survey data • Recommendations of PDS Faculty and Summer Work Teams |
| Alignment of MAT field/clinical sequence with new UG sequence. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exit survey data • Recommendations of PDS Faculty and Summer Work Teams |
| Addition of Action Research project to document candidate impact on student learning and development and approval of EDUC 4485, one-hour Action Research course. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations of FSU and PDS Faculty on Summer Work Teams • Survey of candidates involved in pilot AR implementation in Block • Evaluation of CAPSL process and candidate products |
| Addition of Showcase E-Portfolio requirement to document candidate reflection on performance of WVPTS/CF and artifacts of practice and development and approval of EDUC 4486, one-hour Portfolio course. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations of FSU and PDS Faculty on Summer Work Teams • Survey of candidates and PDS principals involved in pilot e-portfolio implementation • Evaluation of hard-copy INTASC exit portfolio process and candidate products |
| Development of the FSU Liaison role to include mentoring and assessment of candidates' field/clinical experiences, Action Research, and Portfolios and communication with PDSs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations from FSU Liaisons, PDS Coordinators, PDS Host Teachers |
| Capstone Action Research Celebration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations of FSU and PDS Faculty on Summer Work Teams • Evaluation of opportunities to demonstrate professional dispositions and WVPTS 4 |
| Capstone PDS Showcase E-Portfolio Presentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations of FSU and PDS Faculty on Summer Work Teams • Evaluation of opportunities to demonstrate professional dispositions and WVPTS 4 |
| Proposal to drop the Library Science | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of enrollment data and CAR reports |

| ADVANCED PROGRAM FOR OTHER SCHOOL PROFESSIONALS – READING SPECIALIST PROGRAM | |
|---|--|
| Redesign of Clinical – move from summer reading program placements to PK-12 school-based placements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback and recommendations from Graduates • Curriculum analysis |
| Removal of Thesis course – addition of EDUC 6395 Action Research requirement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative CAR data analysis meetings |
| Portfolio requirement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative CAR data analysis meetings |
| Advisory Team established | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative CAR data analysis meetings |
| Redesign of program and Clinical assessment to align more closely with CF, WVPTS (as appropriate) and IRA standards | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative CAR data analysis meetings • EPPAC meetings • Recommendations from Summer Work Teams |
| ADVANCED PROGRAMS – SPECIAL EDUCATION | |
| Redesign of field/clinical sequence – increased hours and requirements tied to courses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback and recommendations from Graduates and Employers • Curriculum analysis |
| Redesign of program and Field/Clinical assessments to align more closely with CF, WVPTS and CEC standards | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative CAR data analysis meetings • EPPAC meetings • Recommendations from Summer Work Teams |
| Pilot of Video Analysis to strengthen clinical assessment of and support for candidate teaching performance in the online program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations from Summer Work Teams • Graduate faculty meetings |

Plans for Sustaining and Enhancing Performance: The Assessment System will continue to monitor Unit programs and the CI process. The institutional system maintained in Banner does not provide the most accurate and current information as students matriculate through programs and change specializations, interrupt their matriculation, and have changes in their life circumstances. To address the Unit’s need for up-to-date information and the ability to track individual candidates more easily, the Unit Certification Officer will lead an effort to design a demographic form to be built in TaskStream that will be updated by candidates at each transition point. This will also facilitate follow-up studies by graduates and will allow for the collection of additional data that is not available through the institutional database. Planning by 2012 Summer Work Teams is underway to complete the design and installation of the developmental portfolio system for Initial programs for full implementation in Fall 2012 as the first class of candidates who will complete the new undergraduate program apply program admissions (see

Standard 3 – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3.1 How does the unit work with the school partners to deliver field experiences and clinical practice to enable candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn?

Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners: The unit’s commitment to collaboration between unit and school partners is evident in the Unit CF and in the structures developed to support and sustain collaboration (see Exhibit I.5.c). At the center of the CF is the FSU Professional Development School (PDS) Partnership and other school partners. All programs, field experiences and clinical practice are

collaboratively planned, implemented and evaluated by the PK-12 community and Unit faculty and administrators. Two structures have been established to support this collaboration; the FSU PDS Partnership for Initial Programs and the Advisory Teams for Advanced Programs. The FSU PDS Partnership was established in 2005 with 3 PDSs in one county. In 2007 the PDS Partnership began a major expansion effort in response to interest from other public schools in the Unit service region and with the goal of providing each Initial candidate, and the majority of Advanced candidates, with field/clinical placements in a PDS. The expansion was coordinated by the Partnership Director, who provides leadership to the Partnership and also serves as the Director of Clinical Placements for all the Unit's programs. By 2008, the Partnership had expanded to include 40 PDSs in six counties. All candidates in Initial programs and the majority of candidates in Advanced programs now complete their field experiences and clinical practice in a PDS. The Partnership expansion led to the establishment of a formal governance structure for the Partnership, including the Executive Committee which facilitates Unit and PDS joint decision-making regarding activities, policies and budget matters. Two new roles were developed: (1) a faculty member or faculty team in each of the 40 PDSs serve as PDS Coordinators; and, (2) a FSU faculty member from SoEHHP or Arts and Sciences serves as the FSU Liaison to each PDS. In addition, the role of Host Teacher was expanded to include primary responsibility for supervision and assessment of candidate performance in field experiences and clinical practice. The Coordinator role was established in 2008, the Liaison role in 2009. PDS Coordinators meet regularly (at least twice per semester) as the Coordinator Network to: contribute to the CI process for programs; bring feedback on initiatives and program improvements forward from their PDS sites; engage in professional development for their role; and develop professional development and mentoring strategies for strengthening Host Teacher support for and supervision of candidates' field experiences and clinical practice. FSU Liaisons also meet monthly as a Network to engage in the CI process, serving to enhance communications and sharing of resources between the Unit and the PDSs, to support the supervision of candidates and candidates' Action Research projects and Portfolio development, and the professional development agenda in each PDS. Liaisons also serve to enhance communications and professional development related to teacher education across the FSU campus. Currently faculty from Liberal Arts, Science & Technology, Fine Arts, and the SoEHHP, as well as the Dean of SoEHHP, Director of the Center MultiCultural Affairs, and the University President serve as Liaisons. Periodically, on an "as needed" basis, Coordinators and Liaisons meet together to engage in the development of strategies for program improvement or professional development related to shared responsibilities for candidate supervision and support. The second structure for systematic collaboration to develop and improve programs and clinical experiences was developed in 2011 to strengthen the Advanced programs. Coursework in the Advanced programs is offered online and clinical practice is supported by site visits by program faculty and, in the Special Education program, by the use of teaching video analysis. The Reading Specialist and Special Education programs each have a Program Advisory Team including FSU faculty, the PDS Partnership Director, current candidates, graduates and public school partners representing PDS schools and districts, and schools and districts outside the PDS counties where historically there have been concentrations of program candidates. The Reading Specialist and Special Education Program Advisory Teams develop, implement and evaluate these programs and their field experiences and clinical practice.

The Executive Committee provides leadership to major Partnership activities (annual celebrations and professional development events), strategic planning (see Strategic Plan, 3.3a), Partnership policies, and the development of the annual grant proposal and budget submitted to the WVDE and the Arts for legislative funding to support partnership functions, including joint Unit and PDS professional development. This legislative funding supports the supervision of field experiences and clinical practice by PDS Host Teachers, coordination of teacher education and professional development in the PDS by Coordinators, and supplements funding provided by PDS counties to support professional development grants to the PDSs that require involvement of Liaisons and candidates (see Proposal for Embedded Professional Development Initiative, 2012 PDS Professional Development Grant Proposal, 3.3.a). Initial

candidates participate in the ongoing professional development agenda at their PDS as appropriate during field experiences and are full participants during student teaching.

Field experience and clinical placements for Initial programs are made collaboratively by the Partnership/Clinical Office, the PDS Coordinators, and PDS principals to ensure that requirements for certification are met and that candidates are placed with Host Teachers who have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to mentor their development and to support positive learning experiences for P-12 students. Field experiences and clinical placements for Advanced Programs are arranged to address the circumstances and certification needs of candidates and may involve the Partnership/Clinical Office, PDS Coordinators and Principals, Course Instructors/Supervisors for field experiences and clinical practice, and Principals and Mentor Teachers in partnering schools (see Placement Policies, 3.3b).

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice: Field experiences and clinical practice in all Unit programs are designed to provide candidates with a scaffolded sequence of opportunities to apply, reflect, and be assessed on their knowledge, skills and dispositions in a variety of settings. As they complete field/clinical requirements, candidates observe experienced teachers and are observed by both FSU/Unit and PK-12 faculty (see FE/Clinical Sequence & Supervision Overview, 3.3.e). All field/clinical requirements and assessments are designed around the Unit's CF and aligned with the WVPTS, ISTE NETS-T, CREDE Standards, and Unit Teacher Education Program Outcomes (see Curriculum Maps, 3.3.f). Requirements for clinical practice include assuming all the duties of the Host Teacher, which includes membership on instructional teams, as well as interactions with parents and community members; including Parent Teacher Conferences, supportive Workshops for parents, school community events, and so forth. Initial candidates design and implement Action Research projects and develop Showcase Portfolios that involve them in collaboration with peers and the use of information technology. The Early Field Experiences require candidates to volunteer with self-selected and Unit-selected agencies and organizations that serve children and their educational needs.

Online Advanced Program courses are offered through Blackboard and are designed to facilitate online Professional Learning Communities (PLC) where candidates use the platform's digital media such as threaded discussions, digital journals, and chats to collaboratively reflect on clinical or teaching practice and engage in peer review of field-based assignments. Select courses enhance Blackboard with the use of Google tools (blogs, webpage, etc.) to expand PLCs with peers and the larger educational community. Select courses, including EDUC 6301 Research in Education (a core requirement), also include requirements and assessments of collaborative group assignments. Candidates engage in regular reflection in either threaded discussions or digital journals about their clinical and experiences and connections between those experiences and educational theory. All Advanced candidates design and complete an action research project to systematically examine their teaching and impact on student learning. These projects are shared with other candidates in the PLC. Projects are built on theories of learning and are designed to support the effective implementation of a research-based teaching strategy to address an authentic student learning need in the clinical setting. In their PLC candidates share and provide critiques of peers' project design, instruction, assessments, collection of formative and summative data, analysis of data, implementation of 'action' improvements, and dissemination of findings via a multimedia presentation.

Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn: Candidates work collaboratively with PDS Host Teachers, FSU Liaisons, and other candidates to develop and implement their Action Research projects. In addition to face-to-face meetings where clinical faculty mentor projects, candidates in both the Initial and Advanced programs collaborate with one another and Unit faculty via required Blackboard threaded discussions as they design their Action Research projects, analyze data to inform improvement of their teaching and document impact on student learning. Candidates in Initial programs present the results of their projects to

candidates in earlier field experiences on campus and in their PDSs, while candidates in Advanced programs disseminate multimedia presentations of the results of their projects and teaching practices in a dedicated Blackboard discussion for peer review.

Programs, field experiences with co-requisite courses, and clinical practice provide multiple opportunities for candidates to explore and apply their developing knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn. In the Initial program candidates begin this process with Early Field Experience placements in a Diverse PDS and community programs delivered to meet the needs of struggling learners. Checklist requirements for these, all other field experiences, and clinical practice require candidates to systematically examine and apply what they are learning about meeting the needs of students with exceptionalities and those from diverse sociocultural groups in their work with PK-12 students in classrooms and schools.

3.2. The Unit is moving to target level on Standard 3:

| TARGET | RESPONSE & EVIDENCE |
|---|---|
| 3.a. COLLABORATION BETWEEN UNIT AND SCHOOL PARTNERS | |
| <p>Both unit and school-based faculty are involved in designing, implementing and evaluating the unit’s conceptual framework and the school program; they each participate in the unit’s and the school partners’ professional development activities and instructional programs for candidates and for children.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSU Unit faculty and administrators and partnering PK-12 faculty and administrators regularly collaborate to design, implement, and evaluate the CF and Unit programs in formal and informal structures and processes; including the Unit CI Process Groups and the PDS Partnership Governance Structure. • The PDS Partnership provides funding for grants to support Professional Development that require involvement of involve PDS and FSU liaisons and candidates (see List of Grants, 3.3a) • FSU liaisons regularly announce opportunities for collaborative professional development with PDSs at Liaison Network meetings and in email invitations to the Network. <p>Evidence: Artifacts related to the collaboration in CI process, professional development, and instructional programs are included throughout Exhibits.</p> |
| <p>The unit and its school partners share expertise and integrate resources to support candidate learning.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PDS Partnership Professional Development and Site-Based Grant initiatives involve PDS and FSU faculty, and candidates in a shared professional development agenda. • PDS Fellows serve as resources for the Unit and the PDS network, providing support for Unit faculty technology integration, developing Host Teacher training, etc. • Superintendents provide annual funding for FSU PDS Partnership initiatives. • Candidates and Unit faculty are encouraged to participate in professional development offered at the school and county levels. • PDS and partnering faculty and administrators participate in Unit assessment system, Unit faculty participate in collaborative grant writing, school-based research, and dissemination of research and successful professional |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>development and partnership practices at conferences and in publications.</p> <p>Evidence: PD and Grant Initiative proposals and reports (3.3.a); position description for PDS Fellows positions in Unit (see 3.3a); FSU PDS Partnership State Reports (3.3a); Scholarship Showcase (see 5.3.d).</p> |
| <p>The unit and its school partners jointly determine the specific placements of student teachers and interns for other professional roles to maximize the learning experience for candidates and PK-12 students.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placements for all field experiences and clinical practice are organized through the PDS Partnership office and involve the Director of Clinical Experiences, Unit faculty (as appropriate) and PDS and partner school faculty and administrators. <p>Evidence: Policies for placements reflect joint decision making (see 3.3.b).</p> |
| <p>3.b. DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE</p> | |
| <p>Field experiences allow candidates to apply and reflect on their content, professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and professional dispositions in a variety of settings with students and adults.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All candidates – Initial and Advanced – reflect on coursework; demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions in field experiences; and clinical practice through class and field-based dialogue journals; reflective writing requirements; ongoing portfolio development; online course discussions; and formative and summative performance-based assessment and self-assessment of clinical practice. • Becoming a “reflective educator” is a critical component of the CF, reflected in WVPTS 4 and Unit Program Outcome 4. • Field experiences placements are selected to expose candidates to a variety of classroom settings, Host Teacher practices, and student populations. The Early Field Experience in the UG program purposefully involves candidates in a variety of educational programs and placement in a Diverse PDS. <p>Evidence: Requirements for courses, curriculum mapping of WVPTS 4 (see 2.3.a), analysis of placement data.</p> |
| <p>Both field experiences and clinical practice extend the unit’s conceptual framework into practice through modeling by clinical faculty and well-designed opportunities to learn through doing.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements for field experiences and clinical practice in all programs – Initial and Advanced - are aligned with and assessed against the CF. • These requirements are communicated to PDS Coordinators and Host Teachers, and FSU Liaisons, who demonstrate, model, and/or assess performance of requirements. <p>Evidence: Checklists for field experiences and clinical practice are collaboratively developed, evaluated, and revised by Summer Work Teams (see 2012 Summer Work Teams agenda, 2.3.a). FE and Clinical performance-based assessments are aligned with the CF. Analysis of development of candidates documented by FE and Clinical performance-based assessment results at program transitions.</p> |
| <p>During clinical practice, candidate learning is integrated into the school</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PDS Coordinators establish a structure for teacher education programs in their schools, facilitated and |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>program and into teaching practice.</p> | <p>implemented by Host Teachers and Principals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student teaching candidates are required to fulfill the duties of their Host Teachers and participate in the implementation of the school strategic plan and curriculum, professional development agenda, and school-community activities. <p>Evidence: Candidate Exit Survey data document the effectiveness of the site-based teacher education program. PDS Host Teachers assess and support candidate readiness to assume fulltime duties.</p> |
| <p>Candidates observe and are observed by others.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field experiences and clinical practice in all programs are developmentally sequenced. Field experiences early in programs include focused, purposeful observation of teaching practice and effects of teaching practice on student behavior and learning. • Field experiences later in programs include requirements to tutor and/or teach small groups of students and progressively move candidates to planning and teaching a sequence of lessons. All field experiences are observed – formally and informally – and assessed by Host Teachers and Liaisons or supervisors. <p>Evidence: Checklist requirements provide guidance for candidate’s focused observations. PDS Host Teacher and FSU Liaison observations of candidates are archived in TaskStream.</p> |
| <p>Candidates interact with teachers, families of students, administrators, college or university supervisors and other interns about their practice regularly and continually.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and Responsibilities for FSU and PDS faculty (see 3.3.c) involved in field experiences and clinical practice of candidates, and the requirements for placements describe expectations for regular, ongoing interaction between candidates and FSU and PDS faculty. • PDS Coordinators and Principals observe candidates. • Observations include a pre-conference and a post-conference to discuss plans for and results of teaching. • FE and Clinical performance-based assessments are aligned with WVPTS 4 and 5, documenting candidate responsibilities for self-renewal and for interactions with the school community. <p>Evidence: Roles and Responsibilities documents for FSU Liaisons, PDS Coordinators and Host Teachers (see 3.3c). Curriculum maps for WVPTS 4 and 5 (see 2.3.a) document candidate “collaborative practice and reflection on practice with colleagues” and “facilitation of school, family, and community connections.”</p> |
| <p>Candidates reflect on and can justify their own practice.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During clinical practice candidates are required to dialogue journal with their Host Teachers in focused reflection on teaching practice, behavior management, and all aspect of their work with students. • Action Research projects require candidates to develop a research-based rationale for their teaching strategy or approach and reflect on the decisions they make during |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>implementation to improve teaching practice. Evidence: Excerpts from reflective journals and Action Research projects are required artifacts in Portfolios.</p> |
| <p>Candidates are members of instructional teams in the school and are active participants in professional decisions.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements for clinical practice include assuming the duties of the Host Teacher, which includes membership on instructional teams and participation in PLC, strategic planning, etc. • Candidates in Advanced Programs participate as members of instructional teams and PLC in their schools. <p>Evidence: Performance-based assessments and checklist requirements, online documentation of PLC participation.</p> |
| <p>Candidates are involved in a variety of school-based activities directed at the improvement of teaching and learning, such as collaborative projects with peers, using information technology and engaging in service learning.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates are required to participate in school-based professional development offered during placements. Examples include the participation of all candidates in Marion County schools in the districts PD 360 online PLC program, which included collaborative online sessions and after-school meetings and presentations. |
| <p>Candidates in advanced programs for teachers participate in field experiences that require them to critique and synthesize educational theories related to classroom practice based on their own applied research.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All advanced candidates are required to complete EDUC 6301 Research in Education, which prepares them to become critical consumers of research and to synthesize relevant research and educational theories to inform practice. • Advanced candidates complete Action Research projects that require them to develop a research-based and theoretical rationale for their teaching strategy or approach and decisions they make during implementation to improve teaching practice. • Co-requisite courses require candidates to engage in a variety of lesson studies, video analysis of teaching practice, and other projects that require the collection and analysis of data related to educational theories presented in the course. <p>Evidence: Assessments of Action Research projects, curriculum maps of course outcomes and assessments.</p> |
| <p>Candidates in programs for other school professionals participate in field experiences and clinical practice that require them to design, implement, and evaluate projects related to the roles for which they are preparing.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Specialist candidates are required to complete EDUC 6395 (Action Research) during their Clinical/Practicum. They design, implement, evaluate and disseminate projects focused on the selection and implementation of effective strategies for teaching reading to struggling readers. <p>Evidence: Assessments of Clinical practice (aligned with WVPTS and IRA standards) and of Action Research proposal, final report, and presentation.</p> |
| <p>Candidate projects are theoretically based, involve the use of research and technology and have real-world application in the candidates' field placement setting.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The course sequence in both Initial and Advanced programs includes study of educational theory, requirements to collect and analyze student data in preparation for the Action Research capstone requirement, and preparation for the meaningful integration of and professional use of technology. These features prepare candidates to meet concurrent course |

| | |
|--|---|
| | requirements to apply theory, research, and technology in their field experiences and clinical practice. |
| 3.b.c. CANDIDATES' DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION OF KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS TO HELP ALL STUDENTS LEARN | |
| Candidates work collaboratively with other candidates and clinical faculty to critique and reflect on each others' practice and their effects on student learning with the goal of improving practice. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates negotiate the design of AR projects with PDS Host Teachers and FSU Liaisons. Candidates in both the Initial and Advanced programs collaborate with one another and with FSU Liaisons via required Blackboard threaded discussions as they develop, implement, and analyze the results of their projects and their impact on student learning. Candidates in the Initial programs disseminate the results of their projects and teaching practice at the AR Celebration (organized as a professional conference) to one another and to FSU and PDS faculty, engaging in critique and discussion. Candidates in the Advanced programs develop and disseminate multimedia presentations of the results of their projects and teaching practice in a dedicated Blackboard threaded discussion (either in EDUC 6395 or SPED 6390) and are required to engage in peer review. <p>Evidence: Action Research artifacts, documentation of checklist activities in TaskStream, and assessments of presentations and peer review participation in Blackboard.</p> |
| Field experiences and clinical practice facilitate candidates' exploration of their knowledge, skills and professional dispositions related to all students. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early Field Experience 20-hour placement in a Diverse PDS Checklist requirements for field experiences include Diversity Strand Course assignments and assessments in co-requisite courses. Unit Key Assessments (Action Research, Portfolio, Performance-based assessments) are designed to facilitate candidate exploration and demonstration of CF. <p>Evidence: Assessments in TaskStream.</p> |
| Candidates develop and demonstrate proficiencies that support learning by all students as shown in their work with students with exceptionalities and those from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender and socioeconomic groups in classrooms and schools. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversity Strand Courses (see 4.3.c) Methods courses and additional required content-specific courses designed to support candidate development of proficiencies. |

Plans for Obtaining/Sustaining Target Level Performance: The Unit will continue to implement and refine its Program Review and CI process to make improvements to Field Experiences and Clinical Practice indicated by analysis of candidate, course, program, and Unit data. During the next cycle, this annual process will focus on the Advanced programs. 2012 Summer Work Teams for Advanced Programs have already begun focusing on this agenda and will develop strategies for implementation in the 2012-13 academic year. Completing the transfer of the assessment of all field experiences to TaskStream will be a priority, as will strengthened and formalizing relationships with schools outside the PDS network that provide placements for Advanced candidates.

Standard 4: Diversity

4.1 How does the unit prepare candidates to work effectively with all students, including individuals of different ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and/or geographical area?

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences: The most prevalent characteristics of diversity in the Unit's partnering PK-12 schools are associated with socioeconomic status and exceptionalities (see 3.3.f). The Unit has adopted NCATE's broad definition of diversity – encompassing race, class, socioeconomic status, gender, religion, geographic location, exceptionalities, cognition, previous knowledge, learning styles, sexual preference, language, culture – in order to support candidate development of culturally responsive teaching practices and dispositions that are transportable to other contexts. Preparing candidates with the knowledge, skills and dispositions to recognize diversity in all its forms, to understand the impact students' cognitive, social and culture experiences have on learning, and to be able to respond in their teaching practice is central to the CF and the Unit's programs. The Unit's adoption of the Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence (CREDE) Standards for Effective Pedagogy and philosophy supports this mission. The CREDE Standards describe research-based practices that have been proven to help all children learn, especially at-risk students whose ability to reach their potential is challenged by language or cultural barriers, race, geographic location, or poverty" (<http://gse.berkeley.edu/research/crede/>). Importantly, the CREDE Standards were also developed to be implemented across grade levels and content areas. While the WVPTS include a focus on deep understanding of the individual development and social and cultural experiences of learners, the CREDE Standards focus more specifically on mitigating risk factors associated with diverse student populations and the goal of helping all students learn, and provide candidates with a set of clear expectations and pedagogical strategies for culturally responsive teaching.

In 2010, the Unit began the process of developing a coherent, sequential Diversity Strand in all programs, both at the Initial and Advanced levels. An audit of existing course diversity assessments was completed and gaps were addressed. All courses and diversity assessments have now been mapped against the CREDE Standards in TaskStream. This supports the systematic documentation and analysis of the Diversity Strand. All courses either incorporate a focus on teaching diverse students in a comprehensive assessment or implement an assessment specifically designed to help candidates: (1) adopt a broad definition of diversity and the expectation that all students can learn; (2) understand their own socio-cultural identities and how they affect their development as culturally responsive teachers; (3) recognize the impact of cognitive and socio-cultural experiences on the lives and learning of students; and, (4) develop and practice culturally responsive and effective pedagogy. The reflection on the intersection among diversity and teaching and learning is required and strategically supported throughout programs, field experiences, and clinical practice with the goal of moving candidates from analysis of their own socio-cultural identities and learning experiences to analysis and response to the cognitive and socio-cultural identities contexts and learning needs of students (see curriculum maps of CREDE for programs and samples of Diversity assessments, 4.3.c). Each program includes course requirements that support the CF Diversity Strand:

- At the Initial level, candidates in the new undergraduate program are required to focus and reflect on the experiences of diverse students in all three of their Early Field Experience 1 placements and complete 20 hours in a PDS identified as serving a diverse student population (see list).
- The Initial undergraduate program course of study now includes EDUC 2240 High Incidence Disabilities for Educators, which includes a greater emphasis on the most prevalent disabilities candidates encounter in PK-12 schools as opposed to the former survey course.
- The new Instructional Design I and II sequence (EDUC 2260 and 3340) includes a focus on recognizing and responding to diversity in planning and teaching and requires candidates to

analyze learner identities and needs to inform planning, implement culturally responsive teaching practices in the concurrent Field 2 and 4 experiences, and reflect on the effect of their teaching on student learning. The sequence also includes application of theories of learning and learning styles to address student needs.

- The redesigned EDUC 3351 Inclusive Classroom Practices is also taken concurrently with Field Experience III (75-hours) and engages candidates in deep exploration of their socio-cultural identities through creation of Counter Narrative Digital Stories and design and implementation of a sequence of lessons and a focused lesson study that requires analysis of impact of the learning of all students (disaggregated by diversity).
- The Initial MAT program requires candidates to complete foundational coursework that includes sociological analysis of American schooling and historical and current issues related to diversity and candidates' sociocultural identities (EDUC 6300), and either EDUC 6304 Diversity and Disability or SPED 6320 Students with Special Learning Problems.
- Both Initial programs require EDUC 2265/6195 – UG FE 2/MAT FE 1, EDUC 3365/6295 – UG Field Experience 3/MAT FE 2, and EDUC 4496/4491/6495—Elementary/Secondary/MAT Clinical/Student Teaching. The major comprehensive Unit Key Assessments (performance-based assessment of clinical practice, Action Research, Showcase Portfolio) each assess candidate development and demonstration of their ability to help all students learn and require a focus on teaching practice with diverse learners.
- The Advanced programs each require coursework that focuses on adopting a culturally responsive teaching stance, including EDUC 6300 Foundations of American Education, EDUC 6304 Diversity and Disability or SPED 6320 Students with Special Learning Problems, READ 6320 Psychological, Sociological, and Linguistic Factors in Reading and Writing Ability.
- In the Advanced programs the major comprehensive Unit Key Assessments (performance-based assessment of clinical practice, Action Research, Showcase Portfolio) that assess candidate development and demonstration of their ability to help all students learn and require a reflective and applied focus on teaching practice with diverse learners.

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty: Approximately 10 percent of the Unit faculty are persons of color, with both male and female African/African American faculty members. One faculty member teaches in Foundations, one in Instructional Technology, and one in Special Education. The Special Education faculty member also teaches graduate coursework. Under current assignments of teaching loads, pre-major candidates may be taught by all three in the undergraduate programs, and will have at least one course taught by one of these faculty members representing diversity.

As part of a plan created by Student Affairs and the SoEHHP, the Director of the Center for MultiCultural Affairs (CMA) has a joint, tenure track appoint in the SoEHHP. As a result, the two offices collaborate on recruitment and support for students who may become education candidates. The CMA also works with the SoEHHP to support the CMA Diversity Fellows Program, where half-time minority doctoral students are recruited to FSU to serve as temporary faculty. The first of these Fellows, hired in 2011, is in the SoEHHP.

All faculty searches in the SoEHHP include incentives to recruit and hire diverse faculty through the Faculty Diversity Fellows Program. Under this arrangement ABD hires who have significant backgrounds working with or potential to work in areas of diversity may be hired as ABD, receive a professional development financial package, and establish a contractual agreement for early tenure and promotion.

Unit faculty have had recent experiences working with diverse PK-12 student populations, as well as expertise in preparing candidates to work with diverse PK-12 student populations; including students with exceptionalities and students of diverse sociocultural identities.

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates: The unit's undergraduate and graduate programs continue to work toward attracting diverse candidates. At the initial level, the CMA Director and the Director of Destination Education continue their efforts in the recruitment of diverse candidates. Additionally, the CMA and the International Student Organization plan regular events that allow candidates and the student population in general to interact with each other and share diverse experiences. The CMA Director conducts the summer Cultural Enrichment Camp, and also organizes the Hunt Arnold Minority Scholarships as recruitment strategies for FSU students, including potential educator program candidates. It is the hope of the Unit that by continuing work with middle grade and high school students in a variety of partnerships and summer programs (for example, the Future Teachers Academy, directed by a faculty member of color) that the numbers of students of color will increase in the Unit. At the advanced level, it is the goal of the unit to attract more students of color to the graduate programs. The diversity figures for the campus remain largely unchanged. The figures for the Unit also have remained stable.

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in PK-12 Schools: Candidates in all programs have opportunities to work with male and female PK-12 students from different socioeconomic groups and at least two ethnic/racial groups (White and African-American). Candidates are introduced to issues of race, class, gender and exceptionalities throughout their coursework and asked to reflect on their experiences working with and teaching students with these sociocultural experiences. They have an intensive focus on issues of diversity most consistently present in their clinical experiences – children from rural and low-income communities.

Appalachia has a distinct and historically well-recognized cultural context that is unlike any other area in the country, even other rural areas. Appalachia remains one of the victims of monolithic cultural stereotypes, and because West Virginia is the only state completely located within Appalachia, Unit preparation programs have unique opportunities in the preparation of responsive educators. While candidates do not confront on a daily basis many of the issues of ethnic diversity and cultural disengagement in their “face-to-face” relationships that persons in more ethnically and racially diverse communities experience, they do struggle with a socioeconomic fabric that weaves together poverty, social injustice, an oppressive labor history, a chronically stagnant economy, and a perception that West Virginians are intolerant because our communities are not ‘diverse’.

Unit programs are designed to offer unique insights into these issues of diversity, culture, and democratic participation, and go to great lengths to ensure that field experiences and clinical practice go beyond the immediate confines of the university community. In all programs candidates are introduced to research documenting the impact of the vast discrepancies between rural Appalachian dialect and standard English on literacy development and culturally responsive strategies for addressing this gap to help all students learn to read and write. Candidates are asked to make commitments to become members of learning and civic communities across a broad geographic area in north central West Virginia. This reflects a Unit commitment to provide: (1) educators to schools in rural settings; (2) field experiences and clinical practice in settings, that while limited in racial and ethnic diversity, that provide candidates with an important context for understanding the subtleties and nuances of educator practice in deeply rural settings and in Appalachian culture; and, (3) candidates with systematic preparation and ample practice to develop a culturally responsive teaching stance and practice.

In addition to a systematic focus on the region and its associated social and cultural diversity, as part of the CF Diversity strand, Unit programs include coursework and requirements for field experiences and

clinical practice focused on serving the needs of students with exceptionalities (described above). Demographic data for PDS and partner school student populations reveal opportunities for candidates in all programs to work with students with exceptionalities (see 3.3.f).

4.2.b Continuous Improvement

The Challenge of Creating a Diverse Culture and Community: In 2009 the SoEHHP publically and formally adopted a statement that outlines its commitment to creating and sustaining a diverse community and context for learning for all candidates, faculty, staff and community partners. This statement is located in the exhibits (SoEHHP Diversity Initiative Charge adopted 2009, see 4.3.g). All of the action steps noted below that have been part of continuous improvement have been either created or energized as a result of the impetus of drafting and adoption of this document.

| IMPROVEMENTS MADE FOR IMPROVEMENT OF CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE AND PROGRAM QUALITY | DATA EVALUATED TO INFORM IMPROVEMENTS |
|---|--|
| Revision of the CF to include the Diversity Strand | Review of course and field/clinical components content using (1) INTASC Standards (2008-09), WVPTS (2010-ongoing), and CREDE Standards (2010- ongoing) Course-based learning activities developed with assessments in TaskStream Review and mapping of CF to CREDE standards and WVPTS 2 (2009 – ongoing) |
| Adoption of CREDE Standards and Philosophy to inform and document diversity proficiencies. | Review of course and field/clinical components content using CREDE Standards (2010- ongoing) Course-based learning activities developed with assessments in TaskStream (2010 – ongoing) Review and integration of standards in program elements as part of WVBE Program Reapproval Process (2010-11) |
| Alignment with WVPTS 2 intensified focus on learning styles and adaptations for linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities | Course and field/clinical critique completed by FSU and PDS collaborative work teams (2008-ongoing) Course and field/clinical program components integrating WVPTS (2009-ongoing) |
| Requirement that all EDUC, READ and SPED courses include a Diversity assignment/assessment. | Result of the work of a “critical friends” group in 2008 who reviewed state of affairs related to diversity in the SoEHHP; “School of Education, Health and Human Performance Diversity Initiative” document noted above produced as a result of the group’s work” CREDE standards later adopted to frame the assignments/assessments |
| Development and integration of developmental Counter Narrative Digital Story project to explore candidate’s sociocultural identities and culturally responsive teaching stance, | Course assessments indicated a need to increase candidate reflection on commitment to and knowledge of culturally responsive teaching. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>beginning with pre-majors during Orientation (actually develop a digital story as an introduction/artifact for Admissions portfolio) and culminating in EDUC 3351 and EDUC 3352 (co-requisite courses).</p> | |
| <p>Development and integration of candidate, PDS and Unit faculty, and community member digital stories exploring sociocultural identities for the “Just Call Me Lawrence” Project. These digital stories are used in courses and the broader community as a catalyst for exploring diversity.</p> | <p>Result of the work of the Diversity Work Group, the Office of Multicultural Affairs, the Diversity Fellow and Unit faculty course integration efforts.</p> |
| <p>Development and implementation of strategies to recruit diverse faculty including: hiring statements for position descriptions; focused recruitment of applicants; incentives tied to doctoral degree completion for ABD candidates, professional development support and pursuit of promotion and tenure.</p> | <p>Development and piloting of “Diversity Fellow” strategy to diversify faculty search pools (2008). Implementation of recruitment strategies in all faculty searches (2008 – ongoing).</p> |
| <p>Development and implementation of the Diversity Fellows position</p> | <p>Implemented as component of collaborative efforts between the SoEHHP and VP for Student Affairs/Center for Multicultural Affairs(CMA) (2009-11) Diversity Fellow positions created as part of joint hire for Special Education faculty-CMA Director (2011), framework for possible academic locations of positions coordinated with Provost/FSU Deans 1st Fellow hired in the SoEHHP (2011-12)</p> |
| <p>Diverse candidate recruitment initiatives have been developed and implemented via: (1) CMA; recruitment of diverse candidates is a targeted focus of the Director’s visits to racially diverse regions (Baltimore, MD, Washington, DC), and (2) the Future Teachers Academy.</p> | <p>Outcome of joint hire noted above CMA Director activities coordinated with SoEHHP Dean’s Office and participating faculty (FTA, summer recruitment camps (focused on international and culturally diverse students) Hunt Arnold Undergraduate Scholarship used as a recruitment tool for potential education candidates</p> |
| <p>Diverse candidate retention initiatives have been developed and implemented via Destination Education</p> | <p>Based on 2009 analysis of retention data in education majors (compared to freshman identification of pre-major choice) Implementation of Destination Education to support 1st/2nd year FSU students/candidates in social, emotional and academic transitions to and at the University Particular emphasis on first generation college goers from Appalachian communities</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Creation of Diversity Work Group | <p>Initiative undertaken as a result of the joint hire noted above and the Diversity charge document</p> <p>Composition of group designed to address need stated in the Diversity charge document to build relationships with the broader community beyond the SoEHHP and the FSU campus</p> <p>Group convened in 2011 and work is ongoing</p> <p>Initial successes include securing grant support to do the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The “Just Call Me Lawrence” digital stories project; ○ Development of town hall meetings, public forums, and course activities using the digital stories; ○ Preliminary planning to design and implement a course/seminar on diversity for FSU faculty and staff; ○ Developing a campus wide plan for diversity initiatives |
|----------------------------------|---|

Plans for Sustaining and Enhancing Performance:

- 1) Continue refinement of CF diversity strand elements, including:
 - a. Development of additional learning experiences, assessment tools, and implementation in courses and field/clinical experiences;
 - b. Sustain a cycle of assessment to inform and revise program elements’ implementation;
 - c. Integrate annual findings on diversity components into Curriculum Analysis Reports (CARs)
 - d. Archive results of implementation and analysis in TaskStream database.
- 2) Continue and revise as necessary faculty professional development in understanding and use of CREDE standards and integration into courses and field/clinical experiences.
- 3) Continue to develop and revise – based on annual cycles of program data -- alignment of WVPTS 2 learning style and adaptations constructs related to linguistically and culturally diverse students.
- 4) Continue with development of the “Just Call Me Lawrence Project”, including
 - a. Completion of initial and subsequent annual additions of digital stories
 - b. Development of plan for and incorporation of stories as curricular components
 - c. Implementation of town hall meetings and public forum activities using the digital stories.
- 5) Continue to use the faculty recruitment diversity strategy in all faculty searches in the SoEHHP.
- 6) Continue to implement the Diversity Fellows initiative; broaden use of the strategy in other colleges/schools on campus; if possible increase the number of Fellows; engage in recruitment of Fellows into searches for tenure track positions at FSU.
- 7) Work with the CMA to aggressively recruit students from diverse communities to Fairmont State University and into educator preparation programs. Develop recruiting materials for educator programs that build connections with students from diverse communities.
- 8) Continue to work through Destination Education to:

- a. Revise as needed and further implement the Early Field Experience elements that focus on candidate experiences in out-of-school children’s lives and school-based experiences in most diverse PDS sites;
 - b. Further develop strategies to support pre-major candidates – particularly those who are the first in their family to attend college – in successful transitions into educator programs.
 - c. Continue to develop and implement current initiatives of the Diversity Work Group; expand membership and participation in the group; develop additional strategies and action steps that are embedded in the community and that embed the University in the community.
- 9) Create a faculty team (FSU and PDS) to develop a long range plan for working with English Language Learners, including:
- a. Applications in courses and field/clinical experiences as applicable;
 - b. Creation of new courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels for initial and advanced programs; and
 - c. Design and delivery of professional development support for PDS and University faculty, candidates, and community stakeholders.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

5.1: How does the unit ensure that its professional education faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators through scholarship, service, teaching, collaboration and assessment of their performance?

Qualified Faculty: There are 36 instructional personnel with appointments ranging from tenured/tenure track to those with adjunct instructor status. (See the Faculty Qualifications Chart [5.3.a] for details on individual faculty credentials.) Currently all but six tenure-track faculty members in the Unit have a doctoral degree. Of those six, two are currently ABD. Eighteen faculty members hold Graduate Faculty Status. Faculty members regularly present at state, national and in some cases international conferences. Faculty members are also involved in their professional field associations as conference presenters, organizational leaders, and reviewer/editors for professional publications. The Faculty Qualifications Chart (5.3.a) includes a sample of professional dissemination activities.

Staff professional support includes a full-time Certification Officer, a full time Director of the FSU PDS Partnership and a full-time Director of Destination Education (a program to support students in the transition from admission to the University through the first two years of the university experience to candidacy). There are staff additional staff members in the SoEHHP and support staff in academic program areas in other schools and colleges. One of the three in the SoEHHP provides primary support to the Teacher Education Clinical Experiences and to TaskStream.

Program elements and activities based in the PDS sites are led by a team of professionals that include the following: The Principal; the PDS Site Coordinator(s) (a lead teacher or teachers); the classroom-based host teachers; and the FSU PDS Liaison. The Site Coordinator selection is a collaborative process shared by the school and Partnership Director. The vetting process includes a set of collaboratively designed required and preferred qualifications as outlined in the Coordinator Selection Process document (5.3.c). The Principal, Site Coordinator(s) and Partnership Director identify qualified host teachers and field/clinical placements according to the Host Teacher Selection Policy and Roles document (5.3.c).

Examples of host teacher credentials and the Site Coordinators and role expectations are provided in the PDS Host Teacher Qualifications and Demographics and the PDS Coordinator Webpages link (5.3.b).

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching: Faculty credentials and professional skills and experiences in their content areas reflect a strong foundation in the areas they teach. The successful translation of this expertise is evidenced in candidate grade point averages, field and clinical performance as assessed by the WV Professional Teaching Standards, and performance on Praxis indicators of content knowledge. All instructional faculty in the Unit have been supported and engaged in the integration of pedagogical activities in diversity as framed by the CREDE standards and technology as framed by the ISTE NETS-T standards. This support and integration have included professional development and collaboration in the content and intent of the standards and the development of learning activities and assessments for all professional education program components. The undergraduate program sequence includes two courses (EDUC 2240 and 3351) that focus specifically on special needs learners and one course (EDUC 2201) that focuses specifically on technology integration. Technology integration at the undergraduate level is also reinforced through the development of an electronic portfolio by all candidates, a process that culminates in a capstone Showcase Portfolio course. At the graduate level all professional programs of study include required coursework in special needs learners (EDUC 6304) and in technology integration (EDUC 6305). In addition to the required assignments/assessments in courses to support the Diversity strand, the Unit also requires each course to implement a Technology assignment/assessment to provide candidates with opportunities to utilize technology skills as they matriculate through their programs.

All Unit faculty are evaluated by candidates through end-of-course assessments completed by university students. These assessments are facilitated through the University's Center for Teaching and Learning. Prior to the fall 2010 teaching evaluations were conducted through a contract with the IDEA Center. Beginning in the fall 2010 the University used an in-house instrument developed, supported and administered by the University. Each instrument includes a core set of 18 items that are similar in design and can be used for comparative purposes across the two instruments. An analysis across seven semesters based on use of the two instruments show that the Unit faculty members are scored by university students comparably to faculty University-wide, and in 95% of compared items Unit faculty average scores exceed University-wide scores. The two instruments as well as the average scores for the Unit ("Pro Ed") and The University ("FSU") are documented as exhibits (see 5.3.a).

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship: As part of annual faculty evaluation, all faculty members are expected to submit evidence of scholarship. This may include activities that range from traditional peer-refereed publications to conference presentations to participation to field and discipline related to professional development. While the University places its primary expectations in teaching excellence, faculty members are expected to provide minimum evidence in scholarship. Faculty examples of evidence of scholarship are included in the Faculty Qualifications Chart and in the Scholarship Showcase (5.3d).

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service: Faculty members are also expected as part of faculty evaluation to provide evidence of service to the university, their profession, and the broader community. This includes a range of activities at the college and school level, the University, professional affiliations, and engagement with external community partners in ways that extend the university as a professional resource. Examples representing faculty service are included in the Faculty Qualifications Chart (5.3.a).

The PDS Liaison Network provides a central opportunity for faculty to engage in service that directly engages schools and the education profession. This group has ranged from twenty to twenty-five faculty members from across the University (including the University President) who work directly with one or more PDS sites. Liaisons provide support and engagement linkages for the simultaneous renewal agenda for the PDS Partnership. Liaisons are the foundational component of support and mentoring for candidates in field and clinical experiences, action research, and digital portfolio development. The Liaison Network is self-governing, and meets monthly during the academic year to design, implement,

revise, and review activities and program components supported by the network. A list of the Liaisons and their credentials, and Liaison interfaces with State, national and international associations and conferences is included in FSU Liaison Qualifications (5.3.a).

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance: Faculty members are evaluated annually beginning in September with submission of credentials and evidence of professional work in TaskStream (see example of faculty portfolio in TaskStream, 5.3.f). Prior to 2008, these submissions were scored using a rubric that assessed teaching research and service and that culminated in the assignment of a rating between 0.00 – 3.99. These scores were then used to assign merit-based raises on an annual basis. In 2008, the Board of Governors suspended merit-based raises and the scoring process. In addition to the above, first and second year faculty are required to conduct probationary reviews of annual productivity. These reviews include peer and administrative reviews as well as a review by the Provost. Finally, faculty members seeking promotion and or tenure are reviewed at the peer, department, college/school and university levels (see templates, 5.3.f).

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development: Faculty may apply for support for professional development activities (e.g. travel, conference participation and presentations, professional association activities) through their Dean, the Provost, and the Center for Teaching and Learning. In addition, the FSU PDS Partnership provides professional funding for activities related to educator preparation and professional development related to PDS efforts. FSU PDS Liaisons may also access funds tied directly to Liaison activities to support participation in professional development activities at the state, national and international levels.

The SoEHHP, on behalf of all professional education faculty provides ongoing workshops and technical assistance activities to support professional development. These now include periodic activities focused on assessment, integration of learning outcomes tied to diversity and technology, action research, and archiving program structures in TaskStream. In addition, faculty are provided with support for summer work teams that focus on continuous improvement of program elements. In recent years these work teams have focused on areas including the following: the instructional design sequence; portfolios; action research; the Early Field Experience; and revision of field and clinical experiences. (The summer work teams always include both University and PDS educators.) Finally, faculty members are provided with support during “Opening Week,” a five-day sequence of collaborative professional development undertaken each semester in the week before classes begin.

5.2b Continuous Improvement/Plans for Sustaining and Enhancing Performance

Qualified Faculty: Since 2006 Unit faculty membership has grown through searches to include seven new tenure/tenure track faculty. This list includes professionals with multiple years of experience at other colleges and universities as well as in PK-12 teaching. Further faculty growth has been realized through non-tenure positions filled by faculty who are ABD and engaged in degree completion (2 colleagues). All faculty searches now conducted by the SoEHHP include language in postings to recruit faculty with an interest in and experience with school-university partnerships and community agencies. Searches also now include incentives to enhance the School’s ability to create a more diverse faculty. An example of these search components is included in the exhibits (5.3.a).

In 2008 the FSU PDS Partnership piloted a Faculty Liaison model to create a mechanism for University faculty to establish ongoing relationships with one or more PDSs. The goal of this structure is to support faculty and PDSs in building sustained relationships where the University Liaison becomes a part of the PDS professional community, and works with candidates at the site over multiple years. The Liaison also becomes part of the site’s sustained professional development strategies and agenda over time.

In the 2011-12 academic year the SoEHHP became the first college/school at FSU to hire a “Diversity Fellow.” The School collaborated with the Office of Multicultural Affairs to recruit a half-time doctoral candidate from another university who serves on the faculty and by virtue of identity and experiences, help to diversify the professional community. Details for this initiative are included in the exhibits. (4.3.g)

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching: Unit faculty and PDS-based educators now use TaskStream as the primary platform for common design, integration, implementation and assessment of learning outcomes. All course, field and clinical, and program outcomes data are archived and analyzed in TaskStream. Professional, state and institutional standards (WVPTS, ISTE NETS-T, CREDE, Specialized Professional Association/Content Area standards, SoEHHP and FSU learning outcomes) provide the frameworks for these assessments and the data generated. All faculty have been supported through workshops and technical assistance in the use of the standards, the framing of outcomes, development of scoring rubrics, and data analysis and reporting. A primary emphasis has been placed on the integration of outcomes for digital media and technology (ISTE NETS-T) and diversity (CREDE).

The SoEHHP now regularly convenes content methods faculty as part of the professional education faculty group to examine content area-specific data and results. The School has initiated the use of an annual cycle to review program data produced in each content area and update data summaries and implications on an annual basis. Data is disaggregated by content program, and provided to content area faculty. The Unit faculty and PDS educators use a standard structure for assessment of dispositions at the course, clinical/field, and program level. This includes a set of standard procedures for review of dispositional issues and consequential procedures related to matriculation.

Program changes have driven faculty examination of teaching practices; course development; redesign, revision and redesign of assessments; appropriate pedagogical uses of technology; design and implementation of the data system; and linkages between course and field/clinical program components. Program changes that have driven these changes include: integration of the WVPTS; mapping standards in courses to field/clinical experiences; redesign of the instructional design sequence; redesign of Special Needs coursework; redesign of learning theory program components; and, extension of the clinical experience to a full semester of student teaching.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship: The Unit (lead by the SoEHHP) has focused on building greater capacity to engage faculty in scholarship including the creation and adoption of the first guidelines at FSU for faculty scholarship that incorporate annual faculty research plans, differentiated load, and commensurate resource allocations. The SoEHHP is in the process of working with a campus-wide effort to further define faculty scholarship, load requirements, and definitions for graduate faculty status. A major goal over the next five years is to implement a structure for professional load that allows faculty to focus more intensively on scholarly activities. As part of that plan, the Unit will move individual faculty loads where requested and possible to 3+3 teaching responsibilities with articulated expectations for scholarship. The SoEHHP has formally approved a plan for faculty scholarship (5.3.d) and this plan has been endorsed by the Graduate Council.

In 2011 the Graduate Council created a committee to review expectations for faculty load and scholarship necessary for granting graduate faculty status. Currently eighteen members of the Unit faculty also hold the designation of Graduate Faculty. The Graduate Council has determined that the Boyer Model will serve as the foundation for framing scholarship campus-wide.

The FSU PDS Liaison network has driven an important advance in the Unit faculty’s role in supporting scholarship with the integration of Action Research. All candidates who are based in a PDS for field and clinical experiences work with a PDS Liaison who mentors and serves as a critic for the Action Research project. The procedural control of the Action Research project and process resides with the Liaison

Network, and Action Research is now a standing agenda item for the faculty. The annual process also culminates in a public “Action Research Celebration,” where faculty members serve as session moderators, critics, and model the process for program candidates. Unit faculty have also begun to engage in Action Research as a tool for informing and improving their own practice (see Scholarship Showcase, 5.3.d).

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service: The FSU-PDS Liaison Network provides a direct and continuous link for over twenty Unit faculty members who provide direct service to PDS and their school districts. The Liaison Network also links four of the University’s six colleges/schools in creating engagement and providing direct support to the Partnership and PDS sites. Liaisons work directly with the 40 PDS sites and their county school districts to set professional development agendas; support state and district agendas; design and initiate projects; and develop grant proposals to support site based initiatives. Educators in the PDS sites, as well as in county school district central offices are now regular participants in curricular teams, program development initiatives, and Partnership governance activities at the University.

Multiple members of the Unit faculty currently serve in the FSU Faculty Senate and on campus work groups and task forces. One member serves as the Senate President. Other members chair and serve on standing committees.

Representatives of the Unit have worked closely with the WVDE in the integration of the WVPTS. Since the adoption of the standards by the WVBE in April 2009 Unit faculty and leadership have presented on multiple occasions to the WV Commission for Professional Teaching Standards on implementation of the standards and emerging programmatic implications. Unit faculty have also been regular presenters and participants at a statewide conference in WV focused on PDS and partnership work. The Dean of the SoEHHP served as a founding member of the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) Board of Directors, and a faculty team from the PDS sites and FSU represents the FSU PDS Partnership at the NAPDS national conference each year.

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance: As part of a University-wide transition, all Unit faculty evaluations have been moved to a digital archiving process housed in TaskStream. Individual colleges and schools, while using a basic template built around teaching, research and service, may tailor details to unique needs and disciplinary contexts. A significant limitation in the current process for annual faculty review is the absence of analysis and scoring of faculty productivity scaled to a rating system as used in the past. To re-establish this component of the process, in 2012-13 SoEHHP faculty members will pilot a portfolio process where individuals create a professional portfolio documenting annual productivity. The portfolio will mirror artifacts that faculty are now required to document annually in TaskStream. This portfolio will serve as the basis for a peer review process for providing feedback and recommendations to Unit faculty, and for framing and benchmarking annual professional growth.

In May 2012 the FSU Faculty Senate voted to return to the use of IDEA as the system for evaluating faculty teaching. This change will re-establish a longitudinal data set, enable cross-unit comparisons of teaching and the examination of results in the context of multi-institutional comparisons.

In the last five years initial and advanced programs (undergraduate and graduate) have gone through significant revisions. This process has included revision and learning outcomes/assessments, and in some cases design of completely new courses. This process has included cross-disciplinary analysis of syllabi elements and teaching strategies. All key outcomes at the program level have been redesigned and Unit faculty have redesigned course and field/clinical components to parallel these changes.

Unit Evaluation of Professional Development: Through resources made available by FSU, the SoEHHP, the FSU PDS Partnership, and other sources, Unit faculty have access to professional development activities including the following topical examples:

- Blackboard training;
- TaskStream training in development of courses, field/clinical experiences, assessments and scoring rubrics, and data management ;
- Integration of diversity components based in the CREDE standards for effective pedagogy;
- Pedagogical applications for technology and digital media;
- Support and critique of AR and digital portfolios;
- Advising and mentoring support through Destination Education;
- Liaison support for PDS professional development; and,
- Development and use of learning assessments.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

6.1 How do the unit's governance system and resources contribute to adequately preparing candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards?

Unit Leadership and Authority: The Dean of the SoEHHP provides administrative leadership for education programs, and coordinates shared issues with other deans, chairs, faculty and PK-12 partners. In the SoEHHP all program review, revision, and implementation procedures and decisions come before the entire faculty. Faculty members participate in monthly faculty meetings and as necessary faculty sessions for program discussions. Issues related to all education programs are also taken before EPPAC each semester for review. A list of these review groups and summary statements of their roles can be found in the exhibits (6.3.a).

The FSU PDS Partnership includes 40 public schools, six county school districts, and the University. This office provides leadership and administrative support to all Partnership activities including field/clinical assistantships, professional development initiatives, the PDS Liaison Network, and TaskStream use. The Certification Office resides in the SoEHHP and provides support to all graduate and undergraduate candidates. This office is the central source for records on individual candidate program advising and matriculation, and provides support to all Unit faculty who mentor and advise candidates. This office coordinates all credentials issues with school districts and WVDE. Destination Education focuses on supporting successful academic and social transitions into and through college, and constructive engagement with pre-professional learning communities. The Director provides support to students on campus who may be interested in candidate programs and who are “undecided” as to major choice. The Director works closely with program area faculty in supporting student transitions into majors, and providing support and professional development for faculty advising and mentoring. The Director coordinates with campus offices for recruiting, admissions, orientation, counseling and advising to ensure seamless candidate support. Links are provided in the exhibits for campus-wide candidate support connections. More information on Destination Education can be found at the SoEHHP website.

Unit Budget: FSU deans have budget authority, and coordinate fiscal matters with the Provost, Budget Director, and VP for Administrative and Fiscal Affairs. Deans may request budget alterations through a planning process that begins in October with a budget request for the subsequent fiscal year. The document “Budget Planning Process” (6.3.f) in the exhibits outlines this procedure. Summary information

on the total FSU budget is included in the exhibits: 1) FSU 3-Year Operating Budget Summary (annual totals); and 2) FSU 2012 Budget (detailed one-year budget) (6.3.f).

The SoEHHP Dean has primary control over budget related to activities that support all campus candidate programs of study (i.e. field and clinical support, core professional courses, key assessments, Liaison Network, FSU Partnership). The Dean, in collaboration with other deans determines needs, and proposes budget requests. All deans have control within their college/school budget resources to support content-area specific needs (ex: science labs, art studios; methodology resources).

For purpose of campus comparison two academic unit budgets from FY 2012 are provided as exhibits (6.3.g): 1) The College of Science and Technology; and 2) The School of Nursing and Allied Health Administration. A comparable indicator for appropriations to colleges/schools budgets can be found in the “Expenses by Fund/Expenses by Account” totals (based on allocations on 7/1/11 of FY 12). These appropriations reflect the relative sizes, consumable needs, and varying program expense ranges. Appropriations to the SoEHHP indicate resources that adequately support educator programs.

| <u>College/School</u> | <u>Expenses by Fund/Account</u> |
|---|---------------------------------|
| College of Science and Technology | \$263,969.30 |
| School of Nursing and Allied Health | \$182,219.06 |
| School of Education, Health and Human Performance | \$226,150.10 |

As a second comparison and evidence of the relative fiscal state of support for the preparation of educators and for professional education initiatives, budgets for Personal Services are provided for two professional schools on campus. These budget allocations include lines such as faculty salaries, adjunct costs, overloads, and graduate assistantships. The SoEHHP is adequately funded in this area as well.

| <u>School</u> | <u>Personal Services</u> |
|---|--------------------------|
| School of Nursing and Allied Health | \$1,130,163.00 |
| School of Education, Health and Human Performance | \$2,340,481.64 |

Each dean controls a “Fund Managers Account” that includes program and course fees. Deans use these funds to support programs beyond funds provided in base budgets. These funds are used to support Unit activities, including the FSU PDS Partnership and the Liaison Network. These funds provide support for technology and professional development. An example of a monthly report of the SoEHHP Fund Manager Account is included in the exhibits (6.3.f; see budget line Fund 801500).

In addition to the funds described above, the Unit is also supported by funds generated by the FSU PDS Partnership. Through an initiative funded by the WV Legislature the Partnership can apply for annual grants. This process secures approximately \$110,000 in support per year. In addition, the Partnership receives approximately \$30,000 per year in support from the six partnering county district Boards of Education.

Personnel: Individual campus units determine faculty course loads and class sizes based on academic program needs. The expected load for all faculty members under normal contracts at FSU is 12 credit hours of teaching per fall/spring term. Faculty load frameworks include ranges of commitments in scholarship and service based on faculty interests and disciplinary expectations. Faculty members are required to meet minimum expectations in teaching, research, and service. In the SoEHHP all online graduate courses are capped at 25. Individual faculty members control the cap for their course sections and may at their own discretion raise the cap. Graduate enrollment is based on an entrepreneurial plan, and faculty are incentivized financially to raise the cap at their own discretion.

Professional education courses and content-specific professional courses are delivered predominately by tenured/tenure track and full-time non tenure instructors, with limited use of adjunct support and faculty overloads. The Unit is most dependent on adjuncts and overloads in the following undergraduate programs: Health, Physical Education; Family and Consumer Sciences; and, School Library Media.

All candidates in field and clinical experiences in PDS sites are mentored, supported, and supervised by PDS Liaisons who are members of the FSU faculty. Candidates in non-PDS placements or who are PK-12 teachers on a teaching permit are supervised under agreements with the school, site principal, and school district. In online programs in Special Education and Reading at the graduate level, FSU faculty work directly with candidates during field and clinical experiences. The Liaison role was adopted as a strategic improvement to the traditional supervision model. In all cases for all programs, all field/clinical experiences are coordinated and administered by the FSU PDS Partnership.

Budget and administrative support for Unit activities is provided through the Dean's Office in the SoEHHP. This support includes budget, personnel action, and administrative processing. This office collaborates with other campus offices as needed. In addition all programs are supported by the following offices/personnel. Details on these offices can be found at the SoEHHP website.

Advising and Certification – Full time Director of Certification; full-time program assistant;

Destination Education – Full-time director;

FSU PDS Partnership – Full time director, full time staff assistant; team of graduate assistants.

Through resources made available by the University, the SoEHHP, the FSU PDS Partnership, and other sources, Unit faculty members have access to professional development activities including the following topical examples: Blackboard; TaskStream; integration of the CREDE diversity standards for effective pedagogy; pedagogical applications for technology and digital media; Action Research; digital portfolios; advising and mentoring support; PDS Liaison activities; and, development of learning assessments.

Unit Facilities: The SoEHHP occupies the third floor of the Education Building and the first and third floor of the Feaster Center. Both facilities include faculty office space, instructional space, and computer/technology labs. The Education Building houses: six classrooms; a computer lab; one large conference room (up to 40 seats) and one small conference room (up to 12 seats); Certification Office; FSU PDS Partnership Office; Destination Education; and administrative offices. The classrooms include a tiered large group room (60 seats) and a resource room for Elementary Education. The tiered classroom and the Education classroom have symposium systems. All classrooms have either stationary digital projection or portable projection and smart board technology. The SoEHHP has portable laptops and I Pads available for classroom use. Classrooms in other campus buildings are similarly equipped, and also include content specific resource applications. Faculty have access to computer labs in the Library and the Falcon Center.

Unit Resources including Technology: Primary support for the Unit assessment plan is coordinated through the FSU Partnership Office as it is the interface between the campus-based and PK-12-based program components. TaskStream provides the foundation for technical capacity and elements of the assessment cycle. A staff member in the Partnership Office provides technical assistance to FSU and PDS educators and all candidates.

The Teaching and Learning Commons at FSU is designated as the single point of contact for all Fairmont State technology related support. The TLC provides general technology support and tool specific support for programs used at FSU, including Microsoft tools and Blackboard Vista. A complete description of the TLC supports can be located at the link <http://www.fairmontstate.edu/it/tlc>.

FSU Library resources include 227,680 books, bound periodicals, audiovisual materials, and microforms. The electronic holdings currently include 67,590 unique journal titles, 8,198 streaming videos, and 162,877 electronic books including downloadable print, audio and video available through the West Virginia Digital Entertainment Library Initiative (WVDELI). Marion Libraries Online (MARLO) is a shared library system with FSU, Pierpont Community and Technical College, Glenville State College, and the public libraries of Marion County. MARLO is the online catalog and contains the records of all materials, including streaming video, and the media available in the WVDELI. The main library houses an instructional materials center for PK-12 teaching resources. The main library houses a computer lab, coffee bar, group study rooms, and two large group multimedia classrooms.

6.2b Continuous Improvement/Plans for Sustaining and Enhancing Performance

Unit Leadership and Authority: The SoEHHP has been assertive in advancing strategies to enhance governance and authority to ensure coherent programs of study and effective collaboration with all partners in professional preparation and practice. The following offices, initiatives and structures have been substantially restructured or created:

- SoEHHP governance;
- FSU PDS Partnership (including field and clinical coordination, professional development initiatives with PK-12, and FSU faculty engagement with PK-12);
- Destination Education; and.
- Cross-campus collaboration including joint hires with the Center for Multicultural Affairs

Changes in how the Unit partners across campus and with PK-12 partners has created a culture where professionals now routinely collaborate on continuous improvement initiatives, done through annual cycles of collaborative summer and academic year work teams, faculty meetings and task forces, and Partnership governance. Please review the “Program Change Narrative” (1.3.a) for a review of this process and work done by FSU and PDS educators as collaborative initiatives.

The SoEHHP is currently in the process of implementing an organizational plan intended to enhance the ability to support and enhance program integrity, student experience, faculty work and staff support. The three areas of program clusters include:

- Elementary, Reading & Special Education
- Technology, Digital Media, Psychological & Cultural Foundations*
- Health, Physical Education, Outdoor Recreation & Exercise Science

[*Note: This cluster includes faculty in other colleges/schools who are content area methods faculty and part of the professional education faculty.]

Implementation and long term activities of these program clusters focus on the following:

- Identify and plan strategically for program area specific needs, opportunities and concerns;
- Data analysis and continuous improvement initiatives;
- Collegial and interdisciplinary work to provide support to students, programs, and faculty;
- Stewardship of programs within the faculty groups;
- Determination of faculty professional development needs and opportunities;
- Identification of programmatic needs that connect to other faculty groups and program clusters, and work in an interdisciplinary way to meet needs;
- Work with other faculty groups and program clusters to identify new programmatic, research/scholarship, and service and engagement opportunities; and,

- Particular emphases on the following responsibility areas:

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Quality of Teaching and Assessment | Faculty and student scholarship |
| Integration of technology and digital media | Diversity |
| Student Success and Retention | Development and securing funding |

Unit Budget: In 2009-10 the University completed a preliminary fiscal study of Graduate Studies to produce a cost-benefit analysis for long term strategic planning. On the basis of this work, 4.5 new positions were granted to colleges/schools with graduate programs, with the SoEHHP receiving 2.5 of those positions. The fiscal plan also includes annual allocations to graduate units to support: faculty professional development; library resources; academic resources and instructional technology; marketing and recruitment; and, program accreditation. The annually updated plan, titled “Graduate Studies 2010 Budget Analysis Narrative” is included in the exhibits (6.3.f).

Under an agreement with the Provost, President and Vice-President for Administrative and Fiscal Affairs, the SoEHHP is allowed to escrow annual fees to provide guaranteed fiscal support for faculty involvement in partnership activities. Under normal fiscal procedures a dean is only allowed to “carry over” 15% of a fiscal year’s balance of unspent fees. The SoEHHP is allowed to carry over a target of \$50,000, and that fund guarantees our ability to support and sustain our work with the PDS sites. This guarantee of resources allows us to make long term commitments to PDS partners (rather than operating on 12 month cycles only). These funds are used to support faculty who serve as Liaisons to the PDS sites.

To support FSU PDS Partnership initiatives, the Unit has restructured staff and faculty engagement (across multiple schools/colleges and academic departments), and have secured approximately \$775,000 in external funding (foundation, state, and county school district support) since 2005.

In order to support Unit efforts with the PDS Partnership, Task Stream assessment staff support, certification and Destination Education the Unit has strategically used open line faculty positions to create or supplement support positions. To address these budget alterations long term the Unit is working with the University administration to identify ways to back-fill these extractions from faculty line values.

Personnel: The creation of new initiatives and restructuring of existing ones has created greater capacity to support faculty in teaching, supporting candidates, and engagement with public school partners. TaskStream has enhanced faculty integration of assessments and ability to archive and use data. Destination Education has created greater capacity to mentor and advise candidates in the first and second year of college. The PDS Partnership and Liaison Network has established greater integrity in work with public schools and established stronger relationships between faculty and PDS sites. The network has also ensured that all candidates are supported in schools by FSU faculty.

To strengthen the infrastructure to support graduate programming and enrollment the Unit has established an entrepreneurial faculty salary plan. This strategy has allowed for enrollment sustainability and growth in individual courses while giving faculty more autonomy over management of course enrollment and growth, and collectively better fiscal management of the cost of instruction. Enrollment caps of 25 are set for each graduate course, and the instructor controls whether the cap is raised. If the instructor admits additional students, s/he receives supplemental salary based on the additional revenue, with a sliding scale to discourage raising enrollment to numbers detrimental to quality of instruction. This plan has also greatly reduced reliance on faculty teaching overloads.

The SoEHHP is in the process of securing four additional faculty lines to support programs in Health and Human Performance. Under current contractual arrangements, some coaches hired for NCAA sports have

joint contracts as instructors. The Dean of the SoEHHP, Provost and President are currently engaged in planning to separate these coaching/instructor contracts into separate assignments that are coaching or faculty only. According to current plans, two lines will be added in FY 13 and two in FY 14.

In March 2012 the SoEHHP forwarded to the Provost and President a request to close four program areas: Business Education; Family and Consumer Sciences; Computer Science; and, School Library Media. Based upon three months of analysis and deliberation, the faculty concluded that fiscal efficiencies could be created that will allow the SoEHHP to: (1) maintain and where possible increase funding for faculty and staff professional development; (2) supplement salaries through stipends and other salary enhancements; (3) focus open faculty lines and future searches on building greater program quality around a strategically manageable set of academic programs; and, (4) replace FACS with an emphasis more tightly focused on pre-school/pre-school special needs programming, and replace SLM with a program focused on digital media and technology. A smaller number of stronger program emphases will also create a better context for enhance staff support efficiencies. These program efficiencies will also create greater budget flexibility so support implementation of the new scholarship pan which requires differentiation in teaching load. This plan, included in the exhibits, was unanimously approved by the SoEHHP and endorsed by the Graduate Council.

Unit Facilities: In 2007 the SoEHHP repurposed space then being used as an open-schedule computer lab in the Education Building to create more offices. The expansion of other more modern facilities had greatly decreased use of the existing lab. The space was redesigned to create two offices for certification and advising staff, a faculty office, and an archive room for matriculation files. Files in the archive room are currently being digitized, and that space will be converted into two faculty offices. In addition, in 2006 an instructional space was converted into offices for the FSU PDS Partnership.

In 2009 and 2010, technology infrastructure (stationary digital projection, wireless capacity, and hardware) were updated in three classrooms. All classrooms were outfitted with smart board access. Two classrooms were outfitted with Symposium systems. In 2011 the wireless hubs and signal capacity were significantly enhanced in all classrooms.

Unit Resources including Technology: Since 2009 the Unit faculty have led the campus in the development infrastructure with TaskStream as a primary technological resource. This has included the creation and implementation of program, course, and field/clinical learning outcomes. Educator programs now include the design, implementation and archiving of key assessments. A staff member in the FSU PDS Partnership manages the TaskStream system, provides technical assistance to FSU candidates, faculty, staff, and PDS partner educators. Unit faculty have collaboratively designed and participated in emergent professional development in both assessment and the use of TaskStream to support themselves as a professional learning community.

In addition to the technology resources noted above, the following changes have occurred in the availability of resources that support candidates, faculty, and program quality.

- All faculty now have mobility through laptop technology.
- All classrooms have digital projection compatible with faculty laptop technology.
- Two classes (EDUC 3351 and 3352) are currently piloting the use of I Pad based activities.
- Candidates and faculty have access to flip video technology for practice teaching and digital video production.
- All classrooms can operate as totally wireless environments.
- The tiered classroom has been retrofitted for use as a point-to-point distance learning classroom.