BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
June 25, 2013 1:00-4:00 p.m.

Offsite BOE Team Members

Dr. Martha K. Ross, Chair
Mrs. Jodi L. Becker, Member
Dr. James L. Bowen, Member
Ms. Isabella M. Lindner, Member
Dr. Deitra Wengert, Member

Offsite BOE Team Observers

Ms. Christina Baumer, State Consultant
Ms. Patty Garvin, NCATE Staff
BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

The Purpose the of BOE Offsite Report

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

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

The BOE Offsite Team has conducted a thorough review of the Institutional Report and exhibits to produce this report; however, the BOE Onsite Team is not limited to these findings. If the team is unable to validate information, or if further or contradictory information is found, the Onsite BOE Team may request additional evidence and/or cite new concerns as areas for improvement.
I. Movement Toward Target
Please indicate the standard(s) on which the unit selected to demonstrate movement toward target:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard 4: Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard 6: Governance and Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Unit Standards

**STANDARD 1. CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS**
Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 Preliminary Findings

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

Professional and state standards continue to provide the foundation for quality programs at the initial and advanced programs. The unit currently provides 24 initial certification programs and 13 advanced programs. Of these programs, Edinboro University education programs are nationally recognized by 11 Specialized Professional Associations (SPA’s) and four other accrediting groups. Programs recognized with conditions, Science, and Mathematics, have made significant changes to assessments and curriculum to address the recommendations made by SPA reviewers. These programs have resubmitted reports for additional review. Health and Physical Education (HPE) are currently not recognized and have created a new assessment process with improved assessment instruments.

Teacher candidate content knowledge is demonstrated by state certification exams, teacher candidate GPA’s in major and GPA’s at time of graduation, and Instructional Assessment Plans. Reported data (Praxis II) show that teacher candidates meet or exceed the 80 percent pass rate for program completers on all required tests. Data from Title II reports 2008 – 2011 show a pass rate range from 96-99 percent. Additional content instruction has increased in all programs as a result of a recently adopted legislation from the Pennsylvania Department of Education. This law
specifically requires initial certification programs to include more preparation in the areas of special education and English Language Learners.

Content knowledge is also assessed in the Student Teaching experience. This assessment is required of all student teachers in the state of Pennsylvania (PDE 430). The unit has aligned its student teacher expectations with a new assessment the Teacher Candidate Performance Profile (TCPP).

Key assessments, scoring guides, data and summaries for the School of Education (SOE) programs related to pedagogical content knowledge are reported in individual program SPA’s. Key assessments for programs include course embedded assessments such as major projects, field experience evaluations, student teaching and internships. A review of the PDE 430 and the TCPP assessment also provide additional data regarding candidate pedagogical content and candidate teaching skills. One of the major categories (Category I: Planning and Preparation ) on this form is directly related to pedagogical content knowledge.

The unit uses multiple measures to assess candidate ability to act professionally, to use appropriate teaching knowledge and have the skills necessary to help all students learn. Some of these measures include GPA’s, observations, portfolio assessment, state certification exams, surveys and field/student teacher evaluations. The statewide student teacher assessment form, PDE 430 is used for all student teachers by EU faculty supervisors. This form includes for categories by which student teachers are evaluated. All four categories, Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instructional Delivery and Professionalism all relate to the knowledge and skills candidates need to be successful teachers in today’s schools. Data indicate that teacher candidates range from “satisfactory to exemplary” (the majority of supervisors state that candidates range in the “superior to exemplary” categories.

A review of clinical faculty surveys show that 90 percent of clinical faculty rate their student teachers in Developing to Target range on the form. The categories are clearly related to professional/pedagogical knowledge and skills. Data from alumni surveys indicate that 100 percent of graduates feel that the EU program prepared them “well” or “thoroughly” for teaching. Results from recent employer surveys indicate that approximately 94 percent of employers feel that EU teacher candidates are “adequately” prepared to “thoroughly” prepared to teach in their schools. Written comments from employers also state that they would hire another EU teacher candidate.

Candidates for advanced programs must meet university graduate admission requirements and the specific criteria for each graduate program. These criteria include specific undergraduate GPA’s, standard test scores and a valid teaching certificate.

Each advanced program for teachers has identified key assessments that demonstrate candidates’ pedagogical content, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills and their ability to impact P-12 student learning. These assessments are aligned with SPA standards. Assessment activities occur in classes within the curriculum. Descriptions of the required projects, the rubrics and rubric scores are presented for each semester that the course is offered.
Beginning in summer 2012, alumni and employer satisfaction surveys were developed and administered. The raw data are presented for the various assessments, but an analysis of these data, and how these data reflect on candidate preparation was not presented.

Programs for other school professionals are all recognized by their specialty organization through individual SPA review process or by a review by NCATE recognized accreditation body.

Advanced programs have key assessments that provide data reflecting a candidate’s ability to use pedagogical content knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching. Examples of some of these key assessments are surveys, unit plans, action research projects and case study analyses.

Data from employer surveys indicate that advanced candidates from EU are “adequately prepared to thoroughly prepared” to work in their schools.

Professional dispositions that candidates are expected to demonstrate are outlined in the unit’s conceptual framework. Policies related to the demonstration, assessment, documentation, review and remediation are outline in the unit’s Disposition Policy. Included in these policies are written implementation procedures for each program.

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

Unit programs at the initial level are reviewed by SPA’s and state reviewers. Faculty review their program reports and work to meet the SPA standards and recommendations made by reviewers which lead to programmatic change and improvement. Forms, processes and policies continue to be reviewed and revised as needed. The unit seeks information from outside stakeholders and accrediting bodies to ensure programs meet the needs of their students.

Advanced programs for teachers in Art, Early Childhood, Middle and Secondary and Special Education PK-8 are not reviewed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, however, the art programs are accredited by NASAD. These are online programs and data were available in the IR and accompanying exhibits. Advanced programs for school professionals have all been recognized by their respective SPA’s (NASP, IRA, ELC) or by other accrediting bodies (ASHA, CACREP). These programs have additionally been approved by the PDE.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

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

Not applicable to this standard.
1.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Evidence regarding a candidate’s ability to impact student learning at the initial level is documented in program SPA reports. Impact on student learning is formally completed by candidates as they create their Instructional Assessment Plan (IAP) and the Teacher Candidate Performance Profile (TCPP). The IAP requires candidates to demonstrate their ability to choose appropriate strategies for their students and to align learning with state standards. Candidates must develop a pre test/post test instrument so that candidates can analyze data and provide necessary follow-up. The TCPP is aligned with the PDE 430 form and ensures that candidates can provide developmentally appropriate learning for all students.

The unit has integrated new requirements of the PDE and new state standards. New dual certification programs are being developed to ensure that candidates are prepared for teaching in our nation’s schools. All programs have developed courses that include strong components of special education, diversity and ELL.

Work has been completed to better align courses with the unit’s conceptual framework. Candidates are more reflective about the unit’s goals and their own professional goals.

New survey forms are being used which better assess candidate progress, program goals and unit operations.

A new governance structure is in place to better meet the needs of the unit to ensure a system of “continuous improvement.”

Two advanced programs for teachers (SPED and Middle and Secondary) have adopted advanced standards from CEC and NBPTS, respectively. The ECED program had already been aligned with advanced NAECY standards. New assessments were developed to align with these standards and implementation began in summer 2012.

**Criteria for Movement Toward Target**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MOVING TOWARD TARGET</th>
<th>AT TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. <strong>AND</strong></td>
<td>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. <strong>OR</strong></td>
<td>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. <strong>AND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</td>
<td>There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. <strong>AND</strong></td>
<td>There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. <strong>AND</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCATE Offsite BOE Report Template for CI Visits. Updated May 2013
1.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No previous areas for improvement.

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

No areas of concern.

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

1. Speak with online candidates about details of their program.

2. How are dispositions reviewed in online programs? Are these assessed and the data used?

3. Will three years of aggregated and summarized data be available for all programs? A data table disaggregated by program and level would be helpful.

4. What is the status of the Foreign Language program? Was it SPA reviewed and if not, are there data on the program?

5. Interviews with liberal arts faculty regarding content knowledge of teacher candidates.

6. At the advanced level, how are internships assessed? Is assessment data available?

7. Follow up on programs that have not received national recognition, including health and physical education program. What changes have been made and what is their review status?

8. Summaries of data were available, but is there documentation of how data are analyzed by committees, programs and/or the unit?
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

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

The unit reports that its assessment system has been in operation since 2003 and was designed to reflect the unit’s conceptual framework of Effective Facilitators of Learning. More recently the unit has implemented a structure by which they can promote data collection that can be used to inform program change by providing regular and comprehensive information on candidate qualifications, proficiencies, graduate competence, as well as unit operations. To oversee the collection, review, and analysis of the unit it developed a group of Continuous Improvement Committees (CIC’s). A CIC was created for each of the following areas: conceptual framework, dispositions, clinical experiences, diversity, faculty vitality, and governance. Each of the chairs of the CIC’s are to meet regularly with the Accreditation Coordination Council (ACC) which is comprised of the dean, associate dean, current unit accreditation coordinator (UAC), past UAC, and the management technician responsible for data collection support. This group discusses unit assessment issues. The CIT began the regular review of unit operations in 2006 to consider revisions to the assessment system, governance structure, and unit-wide data such as exit surveys, diversity data, and the TCPP. Evidence was provided of six meetings since December 2009. The makeup of these groups does not appear to include stakeholders from outside of the unit.

The unit’s conceptual framework (CF) was developed in 2003-2004 using the national standards (Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) and the National Board Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) as well as NCATE standards; state standards (the Pennsylvania Department of Education’s Chapter 354 General Standards and Specific Program Guidelines for State Approval of Professional Educator Programs); and local standards (the university mission and vision statements, the School of Graduate Studies and Research mission statement, the School of Education’s mission statement, and the unit’s knowledge, skills and dispositions at the graduate level).

The CF consists of 10 belief statements about what constitutes a successful professional educator. The belief statements collectively describe the Effective Facilitator of Learning. From the belief statements the unit developed 12 exit outcomes for use in creating assessments that reflect the CF. Beginning in the fall of 2011 unit candidates reflect on the vision and belief statements for their entire program in light of every belief statement. Undergraduate candidates reflect at the beginning, midpoint and the end of their program and include all of the belief statements in their reflections. Graduate candidates reflect only at the beginning and the end of their program.

The IR states that the assessment systems for both the initial and the advance programs use five transitions points at which data are collected from various assessments to make decisions are
made about candidate performance. However, the matrix provided by the unit which describes the assessment system for the unit’s initial programs identifies six transition points. These include: admission to the university, candidacy, clinical experience, pre-student teaching, student teaching/graduation, and first-year professional. Though there are some current supports in place for first-year professionals, these are in their initial stages of development. Data from the admission to the university transition point includes SAT scores, demographics, high school deciles, and math and writing placement scores. Candidacy transition data includes cumulative GPA, Pre-service Academic Performance Assessment (PAPA) scores, technology survey results, and scores from standards-based assessments. From the clinical experience transition the unit collects cumulative GPAs, disposition survey results, diversity survey results, and more scores from standards-based assessments. For the pre-student teaching transition the unit collects data from the Teacher Candidate Performance Profile (TCPP) assessment and classroom observations. The TCPP is a 53-item assessment based on INTASC standards and includes the categories of planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction and professionalism. The unit provided TCPP data for 2009 through 2012. For the student teaching transition point the unit again collects cumulative GPAs, the Praxis/Pennsylvania Educator Certification Test (PECT) scores, TCPP assessment, Instructional Assessment Plan (IAP) scores, disposition survey results, diversity survey results, classroom observations, and PDE 430 scores. The unit furnished data for the dispositional surveys for fall 2009 through fall 2012 and for the diversity survey for fall 2010 through fall 2012. The IAP is an assessment that reflects candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. In the plan candidates must justify their practice based on data collected through pre- and post-instructional assessment and analysis. Completion of this assessment requires teacher candidates to provide evidence of impact on student learning. The unit furnished data from the IAP for fall 2009 through fall 2012. The PDE 430 is a statewide assessment used to evaluate student teachers in four categories of performance. Individual performance is rated on the form from unsatisfactory to exemplary. As this is a relatively new instrument there are only data for spring 2010 through fall 2012.

In the assessment system for advanced programs, five transition points are identified: admission, candidacy/GRIP (graduate requirements in progress), clinical experience, graduation, and first year professional. For the admission to the program transition, the unit collects candidate demographics and undergraduate GPA. At the candidacy/GRIP transition it collects standards-based assessments results, candidate first-year GPA, and disposition and diversity survey results. Standards-based assessment results are again collected at the clinical experience transition point. At the graduation transition, candidate cumulative GPA is collected along with Praxis II scores and diversity survey results. For the first-year professional transition, the unit collects data on placement rates, results from graduate and employer surveys, and certification information.

The unit has taken steps to ensure that unit and program assessments are unbiased, reliable, and valid. These steps include: programmatic discussion during the development of each assessment and rubric; posting of assessments and rubrics for candidate viewing prior to the submission of assignments; regular discussion of assessment results in unit meetings; development and implementation of the Program Analysis Report (PAR); the posting of all data from all assessments for review by all faculty; alignment of all rubrics to relevant SPA/INTASC/NCATE standards; and development of surveys using input from the professional community. The PAR was developed in spring 2012 to ensure that available data are viewed and discussed regularly.
All programs are to review the most current data and make recommendations for change with specific implementation dates. The PAR was recently revised to include goals and standards in order to ensure alignment.

In the fall of 2012 the unit developed a system to document formal candidate complaints. The system records the candidate’s name, the date and type of the complaint, and the resolution to the complaint. The information is stored on a secure server and is used to inform the SOE regarding areas of concern. During the 2011-2012 academic year adjustments were made to the protocol for registering complaints. A specific e-mail address was created for this purpose. If a candidate has contacted the instructor, advisor, and/or chair of the department and not resolved the issue, s/he may submit the complaint to the e-mail. The email inbox is checked daily by a representative of the dean’s office who records the complaint/concern in the database and creates a plan to resolve it. The protocol is fully described in the undergraduate catalog. These initiatives were formally approved by an assessment continuous-improvement team in November 2012 and implemented during the end of the fall 2012 semester.

For the purposes of data collection and analysis the unit uses the College of Education Information System (CEIS) which was created in 2005. This data warehouse is comprised of elements extracted from the university's student information system, Banner, and other sources. The system makes use of a professional report writing application (Crystal Reports). CEIS allows the SOE to use a flexible range of criteria to track candidate progress. To track the progress of the larger population of all its students, the university created second a database called RBASE based on the CEIS model. Due to a need to utilize information from beyond the SOE the unit began to incorporate elements of RBASE with CEIS. The university plans improvements as it implements a comprehensive data warehouse in 2013-2014 which will replace the RBASE/CEIS system.

Candidates receive feedback regularly and systematically through the use of LiveText, the unit’s accreditation support platform. The submission and evaluation of key assessments on this platform allows candidates to see results quickly to determine if they are meeting the standards of the assessment. Similarly, rubric scores, comments, and overall grades can be seen by the candidates as soon as an evaluation is completed. Also, the unit uses the Learning Management System (LMS) Desire to Learn (D2L) platform, to distribute unit and program data to all unit faculty. Any member of the unit can access D2L and see the latest data available for all programs and for the unit. The information submitted in LiveText is collected, aggregated by the UAC, and disseminated using D2L. Therefore, all members of the SOE have full access to the data, both program and unit, at all times.

Verification that candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions identified in the unit’s CF is achieved by use of the CF Reflection Assessment. The rubric for this assessment contains the criteria that candidates demonstrate a belief in fairness and that all students can learn. University supervisors also assess dispositions of teacher candidates at the conclusion of the student teaching experience through the PDE 430 instrument. The unit recently developed a School of Education Disposition Policy to support program and department disposition policies. The policies serve to identify issues related to dispositions in the early stages of the candidate’s
program of study. Policies include a procedure for documenting and remediating issues of concern.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

Not applicable to this standard

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

There have been several agents of change for the unit since the last NCATE visit. These changes were not always driven by data analysis. For example new legislation by the state, as well as a change in leadership in the SOE, led to significant changes to the assessment system and to the unit. The unit states that these changes have improved the effectiveness of the assessment system, and thus, have led to candidate and program improvement.

In May 2007 the Pennsylvania State Board of Education approved an amended version of Chapter 49-2 which required teacher education programs in the state to make substantive changes to their teacher certification programs to reflect a focus on Early Childhood, Middle and Secondary education, and an integrated approach to Special Education and ELL. For the teacher education program at EU this change provided an opportunity for faculty to revisit the assessment system in place at that time.

The unit revised the admission criteria for initial programs to reflect the changes in the certification requirements described earlier. Beginning in spring 2012, Praxis I tests, developed by ETS and used for many years, were replaced by the Pre-service Academic Performance Assessment (PAPA) test, developed by Pearson. New Pennsylvania Educator Certification Tests (PECT) have been developed as exit exams, in place of the Praxis II, for the Early Childhood, Special Education, and Middle Level candidates.

Changes in the unit’s leadership have also led to changes in the assessment system review structure. As previously described, the Accreditation Coordination Council (ACC) was created to oversee and direct the unit’s accreditation efforts. This council provides direction for the Continuous Improvement committees (CIC) which were formerly known as Standard Committees. The shift in name to CIC reflects the shift in culture away from strictly meeting each standard toward dealing with all issues associated with the unit.

Also as a part of the change in structure of the assessment system, the Educational Partners Advisory Council (EPAC) was started in fall 2011. This led to the use of additional data to guide program improvement. This group, which consist of superintendents and administrators...
from area school districts, meets once a semester at the university to discuss important topics affecting partnerships, clinical experiences, and impact of programs on P-12 student learning. Feedback from the EPAC group was used in the development and dissemination of an Employer Satisfaction Survey, creation of a 7-12 Special Education program, revision of field experiences, and the appointment of a full-time director to oversee all field and student teaching placements. Some changes in individual programs have also been made and did, in some cases, make use of data analysis. An example is the Early Childhood Education program, which has just completed a major program revision including reconfiguration of courses devoting more time to the development of lesson plans utilizing Backward Design, refining field experiences to include both embedded field into methods courses as well as creating a three week intense field experience in the core content specific methods courses, and adding ECED 380, a course in data driven decision making. These program changes are based on the analysis of candidate performance data, faculty analysis of the curriculum, and feedback from candidates on class discussions as well as cooperating teacher comments on field evaluation forms.

Also, the Special Education Option II program adopted the advanced CEC standards and developed five assessments in the spring of 2012. These assessments were utilized beginning in the summer 2012. Full implementation of these assessments should be completed in spring 2013 and data from some assessments is already being analyzed for effectiveness of the change. Another program change was the Masters in Middle and Secondary Education which adopted the National Board Standards in spring 2012. Though many assessments were already being utilized, specific assessments aligned to these, as well as the AMLE standards were chosen to be part of the graduate portfolio project to be completed prior to graduation. Beginning in spring 2013, each assessment within the portfolio will be evaluated separately in each designated course prior to portfolio submission.

A new Report of Supervision form has been adopted for all Secondary Science initial certification programs. This form is to be used by all university supervisors of student teachers and field candidates during their clinical experience. The form is used as a performance assessment in the science SPA. Through analysis and evaluation of the data received from this instrument, it was apparent that there was a lack of feedback on candidates’ ability to function successfully in a laboratory environment. This instrument now requires supervisors to observe at least one lesson in a laboratory setting or one lesson that includes an experimental procedure. In this way, supervisors will be assured of the candidates’ ability to plan for and implement proper instructional techniques, classroom management, and safety procedures.

In order to meet National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) standards, the Health and Physical Education initial certification program began using the technology survey – a unit assessment. Use of the survey revealed some areas of weakness in HPE 384, Technology Integration in Health and Physical Education. Though the data demonstrated that candidates were comfortable with mainstream technologies such as word processing, internet applications, PowerPoint, spreadsheets, etc., they indicated that candidates felt inadequately prepared in both knowledge and application of legal, ethical, and privacy issues. The discussion and evaluation of these topics have now been added as an objective to the HPE 384 course, to be implemented in spring 2013.
As a result of an examination of recent Praxis scores that revealed a slight decrease in the pass rate of the unit’s Reading program candidates, the revision of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment was a major focus for the Graduate Reading Program in the 2011-2012 academic year. Graduate Reading faculty carefully reviewed all major course assignments so as to align them with new SPA standards and ensure that they reflect current beliefs and practices in the discipline. Beginning in the 2012-2013 academic year, data collected from these new assessments are analyzed by faculty for the purpose of making recommendations for continued program improvement.

Faculty members in the Educational Leadership program redesigned the comprehensive examination in the summer of 2009 to reflect the changes in the national exam for educational leaders. They developed a 100 item multiple choice exam using the style of questions used in the new national exam. Previously, the national exam was comprised of essay questions. The exam was piloted in 2009 and data from the first pilot was reviewed and analyzed by program faculty. The results of the exam revealed content areas in which candidates were strong and the ones in which they needed improvement. This information was used to make improvements in program courses. Additionally, faculty members implemented a test item analysis and examined the frequency of missed questions and rewrote questions that were missed by more than 50 percent of those taking the exam. A second pilot was conducted in the fall of 2009 and the same process was followed to analyze the results.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MOVING TOWARD TARGET</th>
<th>AT TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMERGING</td>
<td>DEVELOPING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.</td>
<td>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.</td>
<td>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

2.3.a What AFIs are recommended for removal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>Apply to</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course assignments and rubrics are not consistently aligned to national</td>
<td>ITP,ADV</td>
<td>The programs have aligned courses and assessments to SPA standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. The assessment system is not regularly evaluated by its professional community.

   **Rationale:** The membership of key decision-making groups does not include stakeholders from outside of the unit.

2. It is not clear how programs and the unit as a whole use data to systematically initiate and monitor changes.

   **Rationale:** Limited evidence was provided to show that identified changes in the unit and programs were driven by analysis of data.

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

1. How are members of the professional community involved in the development and review of the unit assessment system?

2. Documentation of the data analysis that resulted in the continuous improvement changes identified by the unit.

3. Documentation of candidate complaints and their resolution. Is there a formal complaint process for advanced candidates as well as initial?

4. If candidates are not successful in transitioning throughout the program how are they advised? What is the process for working with candidates who are not successful?

5. Interviews with program faculty about PARs and how they review the data.

6. What is the status of the Assessment CIC with department chairs regarding fairness and accuracy?
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

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

Edinboro University School of Education (SOE) has built several collaborative partnerships to design, implement and evaluate field experience and clinical practices. These include the Professional Development School established with Erie City School District (ECSD) and the two more recent PDS partnerships. Along with placing candidates in the PDS, the university also places candidates in approximately 39 school districts. Both formal and informal collaboration is evident with these schools. Collaboration is also evident with P-12 administration and clinical faculty on the implementation and evaluation of field experiences.

The SOE has a formal collaboration agreement with Perseus House through a US Department of Education grant for professional development. There is also a memorandum of understanding with the Department of Defense to provide international clinical experience for initial candidates. However, even with the memorandum of understanding, it is not clear to what extent the university places students in this program. According to the IR, the university office of International Student Services developed a relationship with schools in China, but the extent of this program is not clear.

The unit created two formal collaborative advisory groups that have provided much needed insight and feedback. The Educational Partners Advisory Council (EPAC) is made up of superintendents and administrators from area school districts. Feedback from this group has led to changes in the offerings of the unit. The ECSD Academic Advisory Group consists of four higher education institutions working together to increase opportunities for P-12 candidates.

Through these collaborations and others in the community the unit has increased the instructional activities that candidates can take advantage of to gain experience and development knowledge, skills and dispositions directly in line with the conceptual framework. These collaborations include candidates in both initial and advanced programs.

Initial certification programs include four stages of field experiences as defined by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. These stages include observation, exploration, ‘pre-student teaching’ and student teaching. EU exceeds the state requirement for Stage 4 – student teaching by three weeks. Coordination of all internship/student teaching clinical experiences for initial programs is handled through the Office of Certification and Student teaching (OCST). The OCST is responsible for training supervisors and clinical faculty, determining required criteria and tracking placements to ensure candidates have diverse placements. All initial candidates are required to have a diverse placement in Stage 3 or 4. They also have required coursework that addresses diversity issues. Programs are responsible for coordinating their own early stage field experiences for their initial candidates. It is unclear if these experiences are tracked only by the individual programs or if the OCST keeps track of them as well.
Field and capstone experiences for each advanced program are embedded to be applicable to their fields of study. They are different durations and have different requirements based on individual SPAs. The field experiences emphasize hands-on real world involvement, many times in their home school, working with practicing professionals. It is unclear how these experiences are assigned and/or tracked for consistency or to satisfy the diversity of placements requirement. Because these field experiences for advanced teachers are often completed in the candidate’s own classroom, a diverse placement can be difficult.

Entrance and exit criteria for initial and advanced candidates are well defined through handbooks, syllabi and SPA reports.

Initial certification candidates demonstrate mastery of content through course grades, unit assessments and state mandated professional exams. The unit’s conceptual framework is reflected in all field and clinical experiences. Candidate reflection is predominant in all courses and field experiences. This reflection focuses on the conceptual framework, affect on student learning, diversity and teaching practice. The focus on reflection is also apparent in all aspects of the advanced programs, especially in the key assessments. Initial candidates are assessed in their ability to affect student learning through many key assessments and evaluations completed by university supervisors and clinical faculty. Advanced candidates have field assessments that assess their ability to affect student learning as well.

### 3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

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

The unit makes a significant effort to collaborate with stakeholders in the educational environment and the community. They have built partnerships with many school districts and community organizations that benefit their candidates. They are continuing to pursue collaborative opportunities, both formal and informal, in the best interest of their candidates. Candidates in all programs (initial and advanced) also have the opportunity to collaborate with other candidates, faculty and have multiple opportunities to participate in programs that take place in the community.

All initial and advanced programs require some form of field experience and/or clinical that gives the candidates multiple opportunities to gain knowledge, skills and dispositions in a real-world setting. The field experience requirement for the unit exceeds the state requirements in some programs. The emphasis on candidate reflection across all programs requires candidates to reflect in multiple ways throughout all stages of their required field experiences and internships. This enhances their learning and prepares them to become better professionals.
The unit has also made professional development a priority and to build partnerships with areas school districts and other places of higher education to provide needed professional development. Examples of this include their PD partnership with Perseus House Charter School, their Professional Development Schools, and joint conferences that have been held between the unit and area school districts. There were some changes that were made to the structure of the PDS’s due to lack of funding. The overall steering committee was not meeting. However, there is a plan to reinstate the steering committee this year, and their charge will be to assess the current structure and develop a plan to move forward.

The training and evaluation of clinical faculty is not as systematic as the unit would like it to be. They have begun to address these concerns and will be developing a plan.

The team feels that the unit is moving toward target on Standard 3 at the developing level.

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

Not applicable to this standard.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

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

3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No previous areas for improvement.

3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

No areas of concern.
3.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. Documentation of placements with the DOD partnership and the partnership created with schools in China. To what extent are these programs used? What is the success rate for these programs? How is it known whether the training and exit criteria are met?

2. Stage 1-3 field experience tracking. Is this only kept track of by the individual programs? Is this information shared with the OCST prior to their making the Stage 4 student teaching placements? How is the diversity of placements maintained?

3. Placement of advanced candidates in settings with P-12 students from diverse populations. What are the requirements at the advanced level for working in settings with diverse students? What process is used to track these placements? Do all advanced candidates have these experiences?

4. Clarification of the OCST director and the director of field experiences and student teaching. Are these the same people? What are their roles?

5. What did the unit learn from the evaluation of PDSs?

6. Will the agreement with the Perseus House continue?

7. According to the IR, the Steering Committee for the PDS’s was supposed to begin meeting again in the spring 2013. Did this take place? What was the assessment of the current structure and has a plan been put into place for the future?
Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

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

Edinboro University demonstrates through the University Mission a strong commitment to creating an "inclusive environment" in which students from a multiplicity of cultures, backgrounds, abilities and experiences are successful. This includes a nationally recognized commitment to serve students with disabilities. This effort was initiated more than 31 years ago - long before the Americans with Disabilities Act. Today, the university ranks first in the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE) in the number of wheelchair bound students and is ranked among the 10 top universities across the nation for service to students with disabilities.

The NCATE unit’s conceptual framework, Effective Facilitators of Learning, states a strong commitment to preparing all candidates to work effectively with all students. The unit gives evidence through the vision statement, “an understanding of our diverse and global society” and the first belief statement of the conceptual framework; “accept the requirement to build a civil society that focuses on respect and embraces diversity” reveals this commitment and informs curricular and experiential program decisions. Further evidence resides in the adoption of the diversity proficiencies to be integrated into each program and met by all candidates. This was clearly presented.

All unit programs design curriculum and provide “experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn” (NCATE, 2008, p. 34). This statement is evidenced by the fact that all programs adhere to national diversity standards set forth by their Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) or by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). In each program area, carefully designed curricular experiences are required so as to promote candidates’ abilities to “contextualize teaching and draw effectively on representations from the students’ own experiences and cultures” (p. 34). In the subsections of diversity course matrix and syllabi specific curricular experiences related to diversity are detailed.

Since the unit’s last NCATE visit, the SOE has made curriculum changes that now require additional coursework related to diversity. Specifically, Special Education Competencies must be embedded into all programs. To address this specific diversity issue as well as to meet state expectations, the Unit created two new courses, Introduction SPED 210 Introduction to Exceptionalities and SPED 370 Adaptations in Inclusive Classrooms. One of the two courses is required for all teacher preparation programs. Initial certification candidates are required to take
an additional education course specific to diversity, SEDU 271 Multiculturalism in American Schools which includes at least 60 hours of content related to English Language Learners.

The NCATE Standards, SPA standards, and the NBPTS form the foundation for the unit’s post baccalaureate teacher certification programs which include the Middle Level Program and Secondary Education Program. All standards include curricular requirements related to teaching diverse student populations. Advanced Programs in Early Childhood Education, Special Education, and Middle/Secondary Instruction all require candidates to take SPED 710 Seminar in Exceptionalities and SEDU 702 Teaching in the Contemporary Multicultural Classroom where they learn content related to children with special needs and diverse backgrounds. State and national standards were used as a guide to develop curricular experiences that promote candidates’ understanding of and ability to work effectively with diverse learners. Curricular experiences are aligned with major assignments embedded in the courses. All advanced programs expose candidates to diversity content in both traditional face-to-face courses and online courses. Two examples of advanced programs, diverse field experiences are the Reading Clinic and Educational Leadership Program.

The School of Education seeks to increase candidate experiences with a diverse faculty include a focused and intentional recruitment effort including attendance at conferences, participation in a system wide effort to work with specific doctoral programs in HBC’s and other institutions. The University Diverse Council and the university have continued to make a “good faith effort” to recruit faculty with expertise related to diverse student populations. There are 32 faculty teaching in initial programs, 10 males and 22 females, one faculty member is American Indian or Alaska native and the others are white. Unit faculty teaching in the advanced programs include seven males and 18 females, all are white.

The university has adopted a priority for the next academic year a focus on recruitment and retention of candidates of color to the teacher preparation programs. The university is also committed to increasing access and success for under-represented minorities. 2013 demographics of candidates in initial programs show 287 males and 636 females. Of these, seven are Hispanic/Latino, one is American Indian or Alaska Native, five are Asian, 19 are black or African-American, two are Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, 25 are two or more races and five are unknown, the remaining candidates are white. There are 183 males and 600 females in advanced programs, with three Hispanic, one Asian, 24 Black, 10 unknown and the remainder unknown.

Candidates have multiple opportunities for observations, academic activities in different schools throughout the four stages of field experiences in their undergraduate programs and throughout field and practicum experiences. These field experiences ensure that initial candidates have opportunities to extend and apply proficiencies related to diversity. These experiences allow candidates to apply their knowledge and skills regarding how to teach all students by differentiating instruction in a variety of settings. Each initial candidate is placed in at least one school setting that has a diverse student population and most offer placement opportunities for the candidates to become involved in the community. These experiences allow for the growth of each candidate's professional dispositions.
In the undergraduate and Teacher Certification Programs and Post Baccalaureate Teacher Certification Programs, every teacher candidate and field student is required to be placed in a school that has been designated as having a significant population of children of poverty, exceptionalities, and/or diverse ethnicity for at least one of their field experiences. Through an ongoing demographic study in which our student teachers are trained, the schools are ranked according to socioeconomic levels, numbers of children with exceptionalities, and ethnic diversity. It is not clear how the unit ensures that candidates in advanced programs for teachers have an diverse field experience.

PDS partnerships have remained strong since the last NCATE visit, and the unit is continuing to expand the experiences related to urban learners for candidates by developing relationships with an expectation of formal partnerships using the PDS model. PDS District Liaisons (PDS report 2010-2011) have played an integral role in developing a model that reflects the PDS nine essential elements district teachers and representatives visit EU’s campus to share insights about teaching in an urban setting, and district teachers have served on panels, as guest lecturers, and provided input in curriculum planning. The superintendent and teachers from the Erie School District have been invited guests at the Student Teaching Practicum during the mid-point of the student teaching experience and these informal sessions entitled “Poverty and the Urban Learner” have been extremely well received by our candidates, serving to further strengthen the reciprocal relationship between the university and district partners.

Other examples are the Philadelphia Urban Seminar a two-week residential urban studies program in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In summer 2012, an Erie Urban Seminar was designed to replicate the Philadelphia Urban experience and to make a positive connection with a local urban district. This is the first step in developing a program that will introduce students to an urban setting early in their college experience, with the hope that they will be better prepared for field experiences and student teaching. Plans also include an urban track which will include an increased number of urban field experiences as well as specialized curriculum to address the needs of learners in an urban setting.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

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

Not applicable to this standard.

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

Since the unit’s last NCATE visit, the SOE has made curriculum changes that now require additional coursework related to diversity. Specifically, Special Education Competencies must be
embedded into all programs. To address this specific diversity issue as well as to meet state expectations, the unit created two new courses Introduction SPED 210 Introduction to Exceptionalities and SPED 370 Adaptions in Inclusive Classrooms. One of the two courses is required for all teacher preparation programs. Initial certification candidates are required to take an additional education course specific to diversity, SEDU 271 Multiculturalism in American Schools which includes at least 60 hours of content related to English Language Learners.

PDS Partnerships and Seminars have strengthened the programs. PDS partnerships have remained strong since the last NCATE visit, and the unit is continuing to expand the experiences related to urban learners for candidates by developing relationships with an expectation of formal partnerships using the PDS model. PDS District Liaisons (PDS report 2010-2011) have played an integral role in developing a model that reflects the PDS nine essential elements district teachers and representatives visit EU’s campus to share insights about teaching in an urban setting, and district teachers have served on panels, as guest lecturers, and provided input in curriculum planning. The superintendent and teachers from the Erie School District have been invited guests at the Student Teaching Practicum during the mid-point of the student teaching experience and these informal sessions entitled “Poverty and the Urban Learner” have been extremely well received by our candidates, serving to further strengthen the reciprocal relationship between the university and district partners.

The Philadelphia Urban Seminar a two-week residential urban studies program in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In summer 2012, an Erie Urban Seminar was designed to replicate the Philadelphia Urban experience and to make a positive connection with a local urban district. This is the first step in developing a program that will introduce students to an urban setting early in their college experience, with the hope that they will be better prepared for field experiences and student teaching. Plans also include an urban track which will include an increased number of urban field experiences as well as specialized curriculum to address the needs of learners in an urban setting.

A major continuous improvement effort began in spring 2011 with a discussion of the diversity proficiencies. The assessment of candidate’s knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity through the unit’s Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory (CDAI) and the Multicultural Awareness Knowledge Skills Survey (MALSS-T) to be piloted in fall 2012. The Teacher Candidate Performance Profile (TCPP) and a dispositions policy should a candidate not display dispositions appropriate for the profession or working with a diverse student population.

The university has continued to make a “good faith effort” to recruit faculty with expertise related to diverse student populations.

There are also plans in place to recruit and retain candidates of color to the Unit teacher education preparation programs. The university has also become a lead school in Pennsylvania’s State System of Higher Education (PSSHE) Access to Success initiative.
Criteria for Movement Toward Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MOVING TOWARD TARGET</th>
<th>AT TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.</td>
<td>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. <strong>OR</strong> There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</td>
<td>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. <strong>AND</strong> There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AND</strong> There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</td>
<td><strong>AND</strong> There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</td>
<td><strong>AND</strong> There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No previous areas for improvement.

4.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. The opportunity for candidates to work and interact with a diverse faculty and diverse candidates.

   *Rationale:* Diversity demographics indicate limited numbers of diverse faculty and candidates.

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

1. Meet with candidates and program directors to confirm information provided in the Institution Self Review regarding the Post Baccalaureate Teacher Certification program curricular requirements related to teaching diverse student populations.

2. Meet with candidates in the Advanced Programs in Teacher Education regarding the SPED 710 Seminar in Exceptionalities and SEDU 702 Teaching in the Contemporary Multicultural Classroom to determine the extent of experiences and requirements to promote candidate’s understanding of and ability to work effectively with diverse learners.

3. Assessments (CDAI) and (MAKASS) data related to candidate’s proficiencies for helping all students learn. What systematic data are being collected regarding candidates diversity proficiencies?

4. The status of Special Education dual certification program in secondary education?
5. Status of the proposed recruitment and retention of candidates of color to the unit teacher education preparation programs.

6. The university has also become a lead school in Pennsylvania’s State System of Higher Education (PSSHE) Access to Success initiative and the implications of the program to the teacher education unit. Meet with leader(s) of project to discuss status.

7. How many candidates participate in Philadelphia and Erie Urban seminars?

8. Data that show how the unit ensures that all candidates have the opportunity to work P-12 students from diverse backgrounds.
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

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

The Edinboro University education faculty have earned doctorates or exceptional expertise. All tenured and tenured track faculty hold terminal degrees in their field. All faculty employed as full or part-time temporary instructors have terminal degrees or extensive expertise in their field. All faculty have expertise in the content area in which they supervise. In some cases faculty are listed as temporary, par-time or adjunct and there is some discrepancy between the names/numbers of faculty in the exhibits. Clinical faculty are licensed in the fields that they teach or supervise and are “highly qualified” according to the state or recognized for their competence in their field.

The faculty are evaluated based upon teaching, academic advising, scholarship, service and mentoring of junior faculty. Teaching effectiveness is highly valued at the university. The Statement of Promotion Policies and Procedures, Statement of Tenure Policies and Procedures and peer evaluation process document and clearly define the standards for measuring effective teaching and define evidentiary pieces that faculty must include in their promotion and/or tenure materials to document teaching effectiveness. Both tenure and promotion to ranks are contingent upon significant evidence that a faculty member is effective as a teacher. Faculty have access to and utilize technology in their teaching, particularly in on-line courses. Many faculty have been recognized for their teaching effectiveness.

The faculty demonstrate scholarly work in their fields of specialization with work supporting the mission of the university and the conceptual framework of the unit. Continuing scholarly growth is expected of faculty and this can take a variety of forms including presentations at conferences, publications and grant submissions, as well as program development and evaluation, research projects and continuing education.

Faculty provide service, collaboration and leadership to the university, unit, P-12 schools and community. Service is emphasized through both the annual reviews within the Schools of Education and the promotion and tenure guidelines of the university. Faculty are actively engaged with colleagues in P-12 schools and with faculty across the university.

The university conducts systematic and comprehensive review of faculty member’s teaching, scholarship, service, collaboration with the professional community, and leadership in the institution and profession. The intent of the review is not only to evaluate but also to identify areas for professional development. The faculty evaluation criteria and procedures are referenced in Article 12 in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
Professional development is planned based on identified needs that are identified in faculty evaluation. The unit provides opportunities for faculty development, new knowledge and skills as they relate to the conceptual framework, performance assessment, diversity, technology and other emerging educational practices. Professional development is supported by the university through sabbatical leave for research. Professional development is available on campus through the Technology and Communications department, the Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs and the Dean’s Office. In addition, faculty are encouraged and supported to attend and present at professional conferences. A formal mentoring program for new faculty is provided by the SOE and each new member is assigned a departmental mentor.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

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

Not applicable to this standard.

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

To better ensure that clinical faculty are meeting the needs of candidates, a process is being developed to provide an avenue for candidates to provide feedback on their mentoring experiences. Changes in how candidates evaluate on-line instruction have also been implemented.

As part of the new governance structure beginning in fall 201, one of the continuous improvement committees (CIC) focuses on faculty vitality. This committee is charged with monitoring and enhancing faculty professional development. As part of their work, they surveyed faculty regarding future professional development topics. In addition, faculty are now meeting once a semester on unit related issues.

Departments have also initiated their own professional development sessions.

A new faculty mentoring program has begun, with a mentoring plan being developed by the Dean’s office, which is supplemented by departmental activities.

Renovation of Butterfield Hall will be completed in fall 2013 and this will be the primary location of the professional education instruction. Renovations will include state of the art technology upgrades as well as faculty upgrades. The Dean’s Office will be housed in Butterfield
Hall. This will definitely be an asset to faculty, students and the educational programs at the university.

**Criteria for Movement Toward Target**

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

**5.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)**

No previous areas for improvement.

**5.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard**

No areas of concern.

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

1. Check syllabi and interview faculty, candidates, and graduates on professional practices on teaching including the faculty use of a variety of instructional methods, integration of diversity and technology into the teaching, knowledge content, supporting candidate reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions.

2. Interview faculty about their roles in helping candidates develop proficiencies in professional, state and institutional standards and apply research, theories and current developments to their fields.

3. What has been learned from the Clinical Faculty Survey and Results?

4. Interview faculty regarding the new governance structure.

5. Interview candidates about the strengths of their faculty.
6. Assessment of faculty and assessment of candidate performance of faculty through student evaluations – how is this being done?

7. How successful is the mentoring program working? What are the results? Are mentors evaluated by junior faculty?

8. How are part-time/adjuncts mentored and evaluated?

9. Clarify the number and category of faculty re: temporary, adjunct, part-time, etc.
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

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

Since the last onsite visit, a number of changes have occurred in the organization and governance of the unit. Beginning in 2008, in response to Pennsylvania Department of Education Chapter 49-2 legislation, a reorganization of programs and department occurred within the School of Education to align programs with new certifications and organize departments to better deliver quality programs. These changes were implemented in fall 2009. With the hiring of a new dean in 2011, a governance structure was designed and implemented to reflect a culture of continuous improvement, create a more coherent unit structure with representation from across the university and to focus on broader issues of accountability and accreditation. The current governance structure consists of the Accreditation Coordinating Council (ACC) to oversee program and unit assessment, Continuous Improvement Committees (CIC) who focus on broader issues than just NCATE standards and keep the unit faculty informed and current. The Continuous Improvement Team (CIT), made up of chairs of the CIC’s, discuss overlapping issues of assessment and accountability, and facilitate collaboration and distribution of information across the unit. Members on all of these committees represent all initial and advanced programs across the unit. Issues that impact the whole unit are decided in this structure and then appropriately moved as appropriate through the university approval process.

Candidates have access to enrollment, advising and support services through catalogs, websites, advisors, program handbooks and various support offices.

The budget for the unit is proportional to other similar units on campus and during the last three years, the SOE has received additional funding to support for instruction and the reorganization of the school. Funding for a full-time associate dean position, an additional clerical support member and a full-time assessment coordinator has been hired during the last few years.

The APSCUF/PASSHE collective bargaining agreement defines the workload policies for all faculty, including supervision. The standard workload is 12 semester hours for undergraduate courses or combination of undergraduate/graduate, nine semester hours for graduate courses, and 20 student teachers per FTE faculty. Additional compensation is provided for teaching online courses. Part-time faculty are hired by the department and due to budget restrictions, increasing numbers have been needed. However, additional faculty lines have been allocated to the SOE for 2013-14.

Butterfield Hall previously housed most unit programs and operations, as well as classrooms for on-campus and distance learning and clinical spaces to support the Counseling and School Psychology programs. In has been under renovation and transformation and will reopen in fall 2013 to house most of the unit faculty and programming. In addition, music education, Speech-Language Pathology and health and physical education programs are housed in their own
buildings, all of which have been built or renovated in the last ten years. Candidates and faculty also have access to the Baron-Forness Library, the Academic Success Center, Technology and Communication Help Desk, tutoring and training/information through LiveText and other university databases

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

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

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

Not applicable to this standard.

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

New leadership for the SOE and state mandates have led to substantive changes to the curriculum and governance structure, with an emphasis on a culture of continuous improvement. These changes have included curriculum revisions to ensure more preparation for future teachers in instructing diverse learners and the realignment of programs to reflect certification grade range changes.

Increased field work has been integrated in programs and a full-time position was created for a Director of Field Experiences and Student Teaching.

To reflect the changes in programs, departments were reorganized to reflect new certifications. The unit governance structure was also changed to provide across the unit representation, a focus on a culture of change and accountability, and enhanced communication.

To provide more deliberate feedback to the unit on program design and collaboration with P-12 schools, an advisory committee, Educational Partners Advisory Council (EPAC) has been created.

Changes and upgrades to facilities to provide state-of-the-art technology, model instructional techniques, and to facilitate interaction and communication across the unit will be completed in fall 2013.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MOVING TOWARD TARGET</th>
<th>AT TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMERGING</td>
<td>DEVELOPING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target</td>
<td>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target</td>
<td>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target level rubric for this standard.</td>
<td>Level rubric for this standard.</td>
<td>Level of the rubric for this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AND</strong> There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</td>
<td><strong>OR</strong> There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]</td>
<td><strong>AND</strong> There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No previous areas for improvement.

### 6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

No areas of concern.

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

1. Meeting with dean and other appropriate administrator(s) related to the budget allocation process and future planning.

2. Meet with task force that is discussing future reorganization within the unit.

3. Meet with part-time faculty to discuss how they are hired, mentored, supervised, evaluated, and participate in review of assessment data.

4. Visit buildings that house unit programs.

5. Visit the library and other centers that support candidates and faculty.

6. IR indicates that increased numbers of part-time faculty have been needed within the unit due to budgetary constraints. The exact numbers were not available as an exhibit. How many have been used by each program and how has this impacted the faculty, curriculum and candidates.

7. Meet with EPAC to discuss their recent discussions and actions.
Sources of Evidence

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