Addendum to Offsite Report:
Continuous Improvement Pathway

University of New Orlean’s Response to the
Board of Examiner’s Offsite Report

September 2015
Since submission of the NCATE Institutional Report in March 2015, several changes have occurred in the Unit, specifically related to leadership and proposed modification of the college structure (Al.a). Effective July 1, 2015, Dr. Darrell Kruger resigned as the dean of the College of Education and Human Development (COEHD). In order to assure strong leadership and continuity in the Unit, Dr. Kevin Graves, Interim Dean of the College of Liberal Arts (COLA) was appointed as the Interim Dean for the COEHD. This appointment, along with the creation of a Teacher and Accreditation Specialist position, have been key in assuring that the day-to-day operations and accreditation preparation continue to progress without disruption. Dr. Graves has an education background and is knowledgeable of Unit and university policies, budgets, and educational culture. Since stepping into this new role, Dr. Graves has provided strong leadership, opportunities for shared governance, and a vision to move the Unit forward.

In light of existing and anticipated future budget reductions in Louisiana, a proposed plan to address the structure of the Unit focuses on the COEHD becoming a School of Education under the College of Liberal Arts. The purpose of this change is related to the consolidation of administrative and support duties, which are currently duplicated across colleges. The academic programs that have been identified for the 2015-16 school year will remain intact and teacher candidates and faculty will not experience significant change, except for an improvement in efficiency of the Unit. The fall 2015 semester will be used to facilitate conversations, analyze outcomes, and develop a plan to ensure a smooth transition. The intent is to seek approval from the University of Louisiana System and the Louisiana Board of Regents in fall 2015, followed by anticipated implementation in 2016.

The larger context that drove program reduction and structural reorganization includes four factors: (a) Hurricane Katrina in August 2005 and loss of students and faculty that followed for the last decade; (b) a significant reduction in state funding over the last 7 years; (c) changing governance systems from the Louisiana State University to the University of Louisiana System; and (d) the Louisiana Board of Regents raising student admission standards. The net result of these external factors has been a significant loss
of students and faculty/staff at the University and within the Unit. The Unit had over 2,000 students pre-Katrina in 2005; in fall 2014 the Unit had just under 900 students (AI.b). From fall 2010 to fall 2014 the Unit lost nearly one-third of all students. In 2004 the COEHD had 55 faculty, then 36 in 2007 (AI.c). The Unit presently has 24 full-time faculty, 12 are teacher education faculty.

Despite the identified challenges, the Unit has seen an increase of 37.21% in the awarding of undergraduate degrees and an increase of 44.44% in graduate degrees, from the 2009-10 academic year to the 2014-15 academic year (AI.d). Faculty have more than ever demonstrated determination, resiliency, and commitment to providing outstanding educational opportunities.

The proposed changes of moving from an underfunded COEHD to a smaller school within the College of Liberal Arts will consolidate administrative roles and bolster opportunities for collaboration with faculty from that college. This structure will enable the Unit to enhance current programs and to be creative in developing new ones in order to address the needs of the community.
STANDARD 1: CANDIDATES 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. What did the evidence reveal about the Unit continuing to meet this standard?

CAEP advises that programs recently terminated but still serving candidates must be included in the scope of this review. Data on these terminated programs will be presented as an addendum after the offsite review is complete.

Programs that were recently terminated but are still serving candidates include: PK-3 undergraduate program, PK-3 (MAT), middle school social studies (MAT), middle school English (MAT), middle school mathematics (MAT), middle school science (MAT), mild/moderate – middle school (MAT), significant disabilities (MAT), masters degree in special education – deaf/hard of hearing (MAT), M.Ed. in Special Education, Ph.D. in Special Education, and Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction. As requested, data for these programs is included in the addendum. Data for assessments presently used are found in exhibits A1.1a-f (A1.1a, A1.1b, A1.1c, A1.1d, A1.1e, A1.1f). Data from older versions of assessments are found in exhibits A1.1g-m (A1.1g, A1.1h, A1.1i, A1.1j, A1.1k, A1.1l, A1.1m).

Programs were not eliminated due to teacher candidate performance; rather, they were terminated due to factors such as low enrollment, loss of faculty (i.e., retirements, hiring freezes), and budget cuts. Faculty meetings, discussions, and review of extensive data led to these decisions (A1.1n). The faculty addressed program array in over 20 hours of
meetings. Faculty representatives also served on the university’s Faculty Governance Committee (FGC).

As the Unit eliminated programs, faculty sought alternate paths to meet the needs of candidates. For example, for early childhood certification, an alternate path was identified for undergraduate candidates to enroll in the elementary program with a plan to embed early childhood content in the existing elementary education courses. Candidates must then pass the early childhood PRAXIS to earn licensure in that area. The M.Ed. in Special Education was integrated into the existing M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction. In addition, “Teach Out” plans have been identified and implemented for eliminated programs, with candidate completion required by fall 2016.

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. Not all continuing programs are nationally recognized at this time. Reviews indicate common concerns across first SPA program submissions as well as specific concerns by program.

Rationale: Trends among current SPA program reports indicate (1) lack of alignment of assessments and data with SPA standards, (2) lack of data from at least two administrations of some assessments, and (3) concerns about the quality of rubrics. In addition, recent licensure test results in secondary social studies fall below the 80 percent pass rate required by NCATE.

The Unit submitted fourteen SPA reports on March 15, 2015. The results of these reports indicate that twelve of the fourteen programs were “recognized with conditions.” Faculty members are working to address areas identified as “not met” and “met with conditions” in order to resubmit by the stated deadlines (A1.4.1a).

The secondary social studies undergraduate and MAT programs received “not recognized” ratings. Additionally, Title II data indicate that the Unit’s weakest program is
secondary social studies. These concerns are linked to several factors, including the absence of a full time faculty member dedicated to the program and changes in the ETS social studies content test in January 2012. An action plan has been developed to address the major issues associated with the program. A full time faculty member, who is secondary social studies certified, will serve as the program coordinator. Funding has been allocated to secure a consultant identified through the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) to support the program coordinator. Collaboration with the consultant will focus on program alignment with national standards and will include new and revised assessments and rubrics. Since the interim dean of the Unit is also head of COLA, there are expanded opportunities to work across departments. For instance, a vacancy advertisement for a position in geography includes a preference for someone who possesses Louisiana licensure in the area of secondary social studies. Joint appointments across colleges will provide an opportunity for program enhancement through shared resources.

When ETS changed the secondary social studies content test, the Unit saw a decrease in the PRAXIS test scores for enrolled teacher candidates. This concern has been discussed in meetings with faculty from institutions across the state, many of which have experienced the same decreases. A comparison with state results shows that the Unit’s scores are at or above the state’s average in 5 out of 7 categories (A1.4.1b). Scores in the areas of geography and behavioral sciences fall slightly below the state’s average. PRAXIS data will be analyzed in conjunction with social sciences faculty from COLA to map test content with courses in order to better identify and align program course requirements.

2. Not all advanced programs present narrative and assessment data that demonstrate candidates’ continuing development of knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn.

Rationale: It is not clear from the data presented that the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction program contributes further knowledge, skills, and dispositions to its
completers or that program level requirements related to field and clinical experiences and diversity issues are managed.

From 2010-2012, the mid-program assessment comprised a portfolio. Using the National Board Certification model, the Unit had candidates submit a portfolio of three to five papers, which was then assessed by the candidate’s major advisor. Recognizing the need that candidates demonstrate oral competency, the faculty of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction changed to an oral assessment in 2012. Between 2012 and 2014, the oral interview assessing the candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions was informal and conducted by the major professor. To increase the rigor, in 2014, the process was formalized whereby the meeting would take place with three professors and scored by a rubric. For the final assessment for the M.Ed. in Curriculum Instruction, candidates had two choices. They could complete the comprehensive exam or complete a field-based project that would demonstrate their knowledge and skills in a specific curriculum area (IR1.4.c7).

Effective fall 2015, the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction now has two major assessments to measure candidates’ knowledge, skills and dispositions. These assessments provide two points of data collection: the mid-program assessment and the final assessment. The mid-program assessment will be completed in EDSP 6981. Candidates will write and orally present their research on a contemporary issue that demonstrates competency in theory-practice-research interaction. This paper and oral presentation will demonstrate candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The final/capstone assessment will take place in EDSP 6060. Candidates will engage in an action research project and oral examination to demonstrate further evidence of their knowledge and skills.

Teacher certification is a criterion for admission to the M.Ed. programs in both Curriculum and Instruction and Special Education. In addition, assessing dispositions is part of the process of most undergraduate programs. Therefore, the faculty had not adopted a specific assessment disposition for the incoming already-certified masters’ candidates. Instead, as part of the mid-program oral assessment, faculty members
focused on candidates’ dispositions of professionalism, communication, and diversity. For example, if candidates made statements that revealed a lack of cultural competence, the faculty members further questioned the candidates’ understanding and sometimes recommended further course work to address both knowledge and dispositions toward diversity. However, in fall 2015 faculty made the decision to use the current dispositions form designed for the initial certification programs in the assessment of M.Ed. candidates’ dispositions. This review will be included in the mid-program assessment.

Teacher candidates in the advanced programs are already certified teachers. Most field experience requirements are met in the schools in which these candidates are employed. Of the 52 M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction candidates from fall 2012 through spring 2015, 93% have job placements, which include schools from a five-parish area in Louisiana including Orleans Parish (38%), Jefferson Parish (40%), St. Bernard Parish (15%), St. Tammany Parish (2%), St. John Parish (1%) and in Picayune, MS (1%). The placements range from prek-12th, and in diverse settings from public (79%), including Recovery School District and charter schools, to private (4%), to parochial (23%) (A1.4.2). Four candidates were not employed as teachers, having enrolled as full-time masters’ candidates directly after receiving undergraduate degrees. They completed field experiences in diverse settings.

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

1. What trends are evident when three years of data for all key assessments are available?

Data reviewed across three years did not show new trends, although a closer look revealed the range of strengths and areas for growth. Data for assessments presently used are found in exhibits A1.1a-f (A1.1a, A1.1b, A1.1c, A1.1d, A1.1e, A1.1f). Data from older versions of assessments are found in exhibits A1.1g-m (A1.1g, A1.1h, A1.1i, A1.1j, A1.1k, A1.1l, A1.1m).
**Conceptual Framework Assessment** – In the past three years, two different tools were used to measure candidates’ pedagogical knowledge and understanding of the Unit's Conceptual Framework. Each assessment was based on the Conceptual Framework that was used at the time of administration. Averages were above the “Reasonable” rating for initial certification candidates. Candidates who did not pass received a prescription for further development.

**End of Semester Evaluation** – In the past three years, two different tools were used to measure candidates’ progress. Both tools indicated that candidates were strong in the areas of collaboration with mentor/cooperating teachers and engaging in the professional community. Strengths were noted in developing critical thinking skills, knowledge of diversity, and promoting a positive classroom environment. Areas for improvement include managing classroom behavior and developing a common definition of social justice with all stakeholders.

**Dispositions Reviews** – The Dispositions Reviews are designed to describe professional dispositions that candidates must enact in their practice with colleagues, students, families and communities. Dispositions data show candidates performing mostly at the Appropriate or Consistent/Sophisticated levels. Candidates who did not score at an acceptable level met with the program coordinator and were referred to the Review and Retention Committee.

**Teacher Work Sample** – Review of three years of data for the teacher work sample are consistent with the one year of data reported in the Institutional Report. There were no significant areas of weakness detected over the last 3 years. This assessment is the Unit’s measurement of candidates’ impact on student learning.

**M.Ed. in Educational Leadership** - Analysis of program assessments has revealed several general weaknesses that the faculty are addressing. First and foremost, candidates have indicated more supports needed for their Internship experiences. Current initiatives to support this area are pre-internship meetings with all supervising mentor principals as well as a revised set of expectations and deliverables for all
mentors. Visits to all schools hosting interns will be conducted in the first few weeks of the internship semester.

A second important area of weakness was “collecting and using data” (ELCC 1.2) which emerged as a weakness in the Clinical Supervision assessment. While candidates collected sufficient data, there was a typical lack leveraging this data in post-observation conferences with teachers being observed. Expectations for the conduct of a post-observation conference will be specified so that the use of observation data is a required element.

2. **What are the final results for all program reports submitted to SPAs?**

The Unit received reviews of SPA Reports submitted in March 2015, indicating that twelve of the fourteen programs were “recognized with conditions”. Two programs received “not recognized.” Faculty are developing reports in response to these decisions ([A1.4.1a](#)).

For the two programs not nationally recognized, the Unit is working collaboratively with CAEP/NCATE advisors and is seeking consultants to provide support.

3. **What trends appear when descriptions and data for recently eliminated programs that are still teaching out are integrated into the narrative and exhibits for Standard 1?**

There are no major changes in trends when data from eliminated programs are included since candidate performance was acceptable for all programs. Programs were not discontinued due to candidate performance but rather on factors mentioned earlier, such as lack of human and financial resources. For example, the early childhood enrollment may appear low, but this is due to the fact that candidates were not allowed to enroll, based on an inability to staff faculty positions.
4. What additional insight into leadership training is available once narrative and evidence for the Ph.D. in Education Administration are integrated in the addendum for onsite review?

The Ph.D. in Education Administration includes the following assessments: qualifying exam, general exam, and final dissertation defense. As this narrative indicates, considerable changes have been made in the requirements for these exams over the past two years.

In the fall of 2014, the two candidates who defended their dissertations passed the defense; however, the rubric was under development at this time, and wasn't applied. The passing scores were derived by the faculty committee for each candidate.

On the general exam, two candidates attempted and passed the exam. Again, the rubric was under development at this time, and wasn't applied. The passing scores were derived by the faculty committee for each candidate. Qualifying exams were administered to five candidates, and four passed, resulting in an 80% pass rate. The stated goal of 75% passing has been met.

In the spring of 2015, rubrics were used for assessment purposes. Four out of four dissertation defenses earned passing ratings from the faculty committee. The Student Learning Outcome (SLO) goal was for candidates to score acceptable or target on each of the 14 components of the dissertation rubric. This goal was not met, as only two of the four candidates met this target. The weakest area on all dissertations was "developing claims." As a result of this data, the faculty added a measure of candidate performance in this area to the qualifying exam that candidates take early in their careers. On the general exam, one candidate took the exam, and scored acceptable or higher on all components of the general exam rubric. For the qualifying exam, six exams were administered, all six candidates received passing scores. The rubric for these qualifying exams underwent significant revisions in May 2015 and is being finalized for fall 2015 (A1.5.4).
5. What additional insights are available once complete Title II reports for the most recent three years are available? Complete reports should include all narratives, test scores and passing percentages at the program level, as well as summative, Unit level data. When the N of a program is less than 10, the pass rate should be calculated using ETS Data Manager.

Trends over the three years of data show that teacher candidates perform well. Title II reports confirm what Unit data show about candidates’ performance at or above state levels in most areas. Title II data indicate the weakest area as secondary social studies (A1.5.5a- A1.5.5b). The Unit is in the process of addressing this area in several ways, as identified in section 1.4

6. What additional evidence is available to document the effectiveness of the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction? Although not a licensure program subject to SPA review, relevant program level questions include candidate content and pedagogical knowledge, candidate impact on student learning, enhancement of the ability to insure that all students can learn (diversity), and further clinical experiences that promote candidate effectiveness.

See response to question 2 in section1.4 above.

7. Are candidates who take but do not pass state licensure exams before student teaching allowed to student teach? If not, what plan exists for either remediation or degree completion?

Candidates who do not pass PRAXIS are not allowed to student teach. The college develops a prescription plan for candidates who fail PRAXIS. The plan includes faculty advising, identification of weak areas, and use of preparation materials online as well as resources available in the COEHD Resource Center. In addition, in areas of math and English candidates may seek assistance from the UNO Learning Resource Center (i.e., UNO Writing Center and UNO Math Tutoring Center).
8. What are the results of licensure tests for completers of the Integrated to Merged elementary and secondary programs? Are candidates required to pass both a special education and a discipline specific content test or just one state licensure exam?

Completers of the integrated to merged program have a 100% passing rate. Candidates in the IM program are required to pass licensure exams in both disciplines: specific content and mild moderate (A1.5.8a, A1.5.8b, A1.5.8c).

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.

2.3.a What AFIs are recommended for removal?

No AFIs are recommended for removal at this time.

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFI Number &amp; Text</th>
<th>Apply to</th>
<th>AFI Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The unit does not regularly and systematically summarize, analyze, and evaluate data for program and unit improvement.</td>
<td>ITP,ADV</td>
<td>Multiple examples of the unit's systematic analysis of data at the program and unit levels are presented in the IR. Additional support has been requested in the Addendum and will be solicited from on-campus interviews for triangulation of evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

No areas of concern are identified for this standard at this time.

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

1. Interaction among tools for the Assessment system (WEAVE, WebStar, PeopleSoft, LiveText). How are data shared from multiple sources with stakeholders?

The Unit relies primarily on 5 tools for Assessments. Exhibit A2.5.1a identifies how data is shared with stakeholders.

A) PeopleSoft is the mainframe application for the entire university that includes all human resources, financials, candidate records, and academic resources such as the course database, curriculum, etc. WebStar is the module of PeopleSoft that manages candidate records including course scheduling, candidate registration, and candidate academic records. Faculty input candidate attendance information as well as midterm and final grades. Candidates learn of their grades through WebStar.

B) LiveText – course enrollments are imported from PeopleSoft and used to populate candidate enrollment in specific courses in LiveText. LiveText is the primary tool used for data collection of unit and program assessments, exit surveys of graduates of the teacher education programs, documentation of field experience hours and demographics, assessment surveys of college coordinators and cooperating teachers. LiveText also serves as the vehicle for and repository of candidates’ assignments and portfolios. All candidates in the initial certification, educational leadership, and counseling programs are required to purchase LiveText.

C) Moodle – is the platform used by the University for course delivery. Instructors deliver content, including syllabi, lectures, assignment discussion quizzes and grades. Candidates participate by receiving content in various formats, submitting
assignments, communicating with instructors and classmates, and accessing grades. Faculty may use Moodle for course delivery. However, unit and program assessments must be posted and scored in LiveText.

D) WEAVE – is an electronic system that includes planning for and the evaluation of assessment outcomes for all departments university wide (IR2.4.g2).

E) Faculty 180 – is a data storage program. Faculty are required to post updated credentials and activity data at least once a semester. Data entries include teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, grants, thesis/dissertation committee service, professional service, institutional service, community service, other professional accomplishments, professional development, & curriculum vitae. This data is used to generate reports on annual evaluations as well as promotion/tenure reviews.

2. More information is needed about WebStar and its use for advanced programs versus LiveText.

WebStar is the tool that manages candidate records including course scheduling, candidate registration, and candidate academic records. It is not used to post or score any assessments or assignments as noted in the original IR.

LiveText is the platform used by the Unit to post and grade assessments for candidates seeking initial certification (including Educational Leadership) and counseling degrees. At this time, only those candidates are required to purchase and use LiveText for Unit and program assessments.

Moodle is the platform used by the university for course delivery including posting and scoring assignments. Faculty in initial and counseling programs have the option to post and score assignments (with the exception of Unit and program assessments) in Moodle. Moodle is available for all initial and advanced programs.
3. More information regarding the Assessment Committee, membership, interaction of the committee with program faculty, and involvement (aggregation vs. analysis) with data. Is this committee primarily concerned with candidate progress at the initial level or does it include advanced programs?

Over the last 7 years the Assessment Committee has changed. Seven years ago, membership included representatives from each department in the Unit (Educational Leadership, Curriculum & Instruction, Special Education, Educational Foundations) as well as the assessment coordinator. In 2012, discussions focused on teacher education and eventually the participation of the Chair of Educational Leadership, Counseling, and Foundations was lost. Also that year, an assessment coordinator was hired and joined the committee.

Simultaneously, faculty numbers declined. The bimonthly Program Improvement Meetings, attended by all teacher education and leadership faculty, became heavily focused on the development, implementation, reporting, analysis and refinement of assessments (IR2.4.g1). The captains for each of the NCATE standards, including the assessment coordinator, who all attended the Program Improvement Meetings became the assessment committee for the Unit (A2.5.3).

This Assessment Committee has recently addressed Unit assessment issues for advanced programs such as ways dispositions are measured and where data on Unit and program assessments are housed. Presently individual departments (Special Education, Curriculum & Instruction, Educational Leadership) develop, administer, and score assessments for advanced programs. The scores are compiled on Excel spreadsheets. Individual departments analyze the results. These results are documented in WEAVE as a way of indicating achievement of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) (IR2.4.g2).
4. How does the assessment coordinator function with other stakeholders, including candidates, program faculty, assessment committee, assistant dean, and the dean of the college?

The assessment coordinator interacts with stakeholders when conducting numerous tasks (A2.5.4a). The assessment coordinator provides stability within the Unit and ensures that faculty receive and evaluate assessment data gathered throughout the semester. With this position in place, procedures have been established that sharpen the skills of faculty in relation to the assessment of candidate performance and the quality of the programs offered (IR2.4.d).

5. The IR alludes to a pilot by BOR regarding alumni satisfaction. What data do the Unit currently have regarding its graduates or employers of its graduates?

The Board of Regents posted a document titled 2011 Louisiana Employment Outcomes Report that lists the graduates employed immediately following graduation as well as 18 months later (A2.5.5a).

In addition, The “Louisiana Teacher Preparation Data Dashboard” provides additional information on the quality of graduates from the Unit’s program. This documents includes data on: a) impact on K-12 students, b) demonstrated teaching skill (re: COMPASS), c) overall impact and demonstrated teaching skills, and d) value added-scores (A2.5.5a).

In the summer of 2015, the Interim Teaching and Accreditation Specialist distributed a survey to 25 principals who employed COEHD graduates in an effort to collect data systematically. The survey was intended to be a pilot, and the instrument and results will be discussed at the Program Improvement meeting at the beginning of the fall semester (A2.5.5b)

The Unit also collects information from College Coordinators who speak with school principals. Informal conversations often occur regarding the quality of graduates during school site visits, professional team meetings, and meetings with district level personnel.
6. How does the Unit work with other university units (e.g., Institutional Research) for data regarding Unit operations?

Institutional Research submits data to the Unit on enrollment, candidate retention, and graduation rates. This provides the opportunity for transparency and dissemination to stakeholders on the UNO website. In addition, each program in the Unit submits a report to WEAVE, a software system used to demonstrate institutional effectiveness. Through this database, the University requires each academic program to identify goals, objectives, and outcomes based on professional standards. Each semester faculty are required to review programs and determine if specified outcomes have been accomplished. Additionally, programs must identify assessments that are to be submitted as findings to determine attainment of program goals. At the end of each semester, department chairs are required to input data, respond to whether goals have been accomplished, and create action plans for identified areas of concern within their program (IR2.4.G2).

Faculty are required to post updated credentials and activity information on a data storage program called Faculty 180. Data includes entries for teaching, scholarly and creative productivity, grants, thesis/dissertation committee service, professional service, institutional service, community service, other professional accomplishments, professional development, & curriculum vitae. This data is used to generate reports on annual evaluations as well as promotion/tenure reviews.

In addition, numerous examples of collaboration and sharing of information occur between faculty in the Unit and other colleges. For example, the faculty in the Department of Mathematics contributed to a program assessment regarding NCTM standards, analyzed course content to determine where NCTM standards applied, accompanied Unit faculty to workshops on the development of the PARCC assessment and reported proceedings to colleagues in the Department of Mathematics, and provided suggestions for courses that might need to be amended or deleted in the program for teachers of mathematics.
7. How long have the three disposition reviews been in place? What are the procedures at the graduate level?

The Unit has had a disposition review process since the fall of 2006 for the initial certification programs (A2.5.7a). Over the years, revisions have taken place in terms of the forms and the process. Concerns expressed regarding the original disposition reviews included:

   a) the form: faculty and cooperating teachers were concerned some items were difficult to score and that the form was too lengthy.
   b) the process: faculty were concerned that in some cases they did not know the candidates well enough to complete the 1st review.

In fall 2013, a new form and process were implemented (See IR1.4.e). Initially the first review included a 50 question self-survey. Candidates expressed concern about the length, redundancy, and content of the form; faculty thought the data was unwieldy and unproductive. Thus, in fall 2014, the first review was changed to the same form as Reviews 2 & 3 and is now used for the candidate self-assessment Dispositions Review 1.

For the fall 2015 semester, the M.Ed. program in Curriculum and Instruction will include a dispositions review. Faculty will assess the candidate and the candidates will complete a self-assessment related to dispositions.

The M.Ed. in Educational Leadership uses a clinical field survey which includes items to assess candidate dispositions (A2.5.7b). It is completed by mentor principals.

There is a teach-out program in place for the Ph.D. in special education and curriculum and instruction. Both programs required three letters of recommendation which often have served to indicate a candidate’s disposition. Additionally, a teach-out program is in place for the M.Ed. in Special Education. All candidates are required to write a philosophy statement which serves as an indicator of the candidate’s disposition.
8. More information is needed about the Student Status review completed during various transition points. Does this occur for each candidate? How does the Prescriptive Plan work in relation to the Student Status Information sheet? Does this occur at both the initial and advanced levels?

The academic counselor and the assistant dean complete a student status review on every candidate during the various transition points for the initial certification programs. Generally, a student status review does not lead to a referral to the Review and Retention Committee; however, if a faculty member has a concern about a candidate, the referral is made. The Review and Retention Committee discusses the specifics of the situation and invites the candidate to a meeting to voice his/her perspective. A prescription plan may be developed based on the discussions of the committee and this plan is documented on the student status information sheet. The Review and Retention Committee is open to candidates in both the initial and advanced programs.

9. Who are the members of the Review and Retention Committee and the Grade Appeal Committee?

A listing of the representatives for all committees can be found in exhibit A2.5.3.

10. Are the processes the same at both the initial and advanced levels for the Review and Retention Committee and the Grade Appeal Committee?

The Review & Retention process is the same for the B.S. and MAT programs. Initial and advanced programs have the option of referring candidates to this committee. However, the handbooks for advanced programs list alternative guidelines for issues related to retention of candidates in particular advanced programs. (2.5.10a).

The Unit follows the same procedures as the University for Grade Appeals (2.5.10b). Both initial and advanced programs follow these guidelines. Each department has its own committee for grade appeal (A2.5.3).
11. Does WebStar have a similar support mechanism for advanced programs or are there plans to transition all programs to LiveText?

WebStar does not serve as a tool for course delivery as was indicated in the initial Institutional Report. Faculty in the Unit use WebStar primarily for recording attendance, mid semester grades and final grades.

WEAVE serves as a tool to report Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for each program for all departments in the university. Assessment results are used to report the level of achievement for each SLO in a program.

At this time, the Graduate Coordinator of the M.Ed. program in Curriculum and Instruction maintains an Excel spreadsheet with the results of candidates’ assessments. The spreadsheet is forwarded to the assessment coordinator. Data from these Excel sheets are used to report on Student Learning Outcomes in WEAVE. Thus, there is a central repository for reporting the results of the program assessments.

Candidates in the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership use LiveText to develop comprehensive portfolios and log field experiences. Scores for program assessments are compiled on Excel spreadsheets. This data are then used to report Student Learning Outcomes in WEAVE.

Data for transition points for the Ph.D. program in Educational Administration include qualifying examination, proposal defense, generals, and dissertation defense. Generals and dissertation defense forms are completed and reported to the graduate school.

Faculty have discussed the possibility of transitioning the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction to LiveText. However, there is reluctance to do so because of the cost to candidates and the belief that the use of a spreadsheet is satisfactory. Faculty in the advanced programs will reopen that discussion in the fall.
12. Do advanced programs also have a 0 credit course prior to clinical experiences?

No, the advanced programs do not include a zero credit course. The 0 credit course for initial candidates is designed to provide support for portfolio development to meet SPA standards. Candidates in the M.Ed. program already possess teaching credentials and have demonstrated knowledge and skills in their area of concentration.

13. What is the ongoing role of the professional community in the assessment system?

There are various ways that the professional community assists in the Unit’s assessment system. Seven years ago, a PK-16 Council served as an advisory board to the Unit. However, participation declined and it was dissolved. In 2011 and 2012, a new Advisory Board of stakeholders from the community convened (A2.5.13a). Dean Kruger (2013-2015) chose to gather information regarding the programs from smaller groups instead of advisory boards (IR1.4.j).

In addition, the Unit collaborates with stakeholders through the following activities:

- Student Teaching and Internship Handbooks are discussed with the principal and cooperating teachers in the schools. These handbooks are also posted on the Unit’s website. Comments and experiences of school personnel have shaped various iterations of both handbooks.
- A Candidate Assessment Handbook is posted on the Resources link for candidates. The handbook is revised regularly based on national, state and Unit changes.
- The Advisory Board for the integrated/merged special education program review assessments for this program (A2.5.13b).
- Faculty in the integrated/merged special education program conducted a partnership faculty work session with community stakeholders (A2.5.13c) to discuss the strengths and areas of concerns for requirements for this program.
Faculty in the integrated/merged special education program hold meetings each semester with special education administrators from school systems in the area to discuss their program including requirements and assessments (A2.5.13d).

A Field Experience Handbook is posted on the Resources link for candidates and discussed in courses. This handbook will be shared with teachers in the field for their input (A2.5.13e).

Initial candidates complete an exit survey on the quality of their programs.

Initial candidates complete an assessment survey on their college coordinator and cooperating/mentor teacher.

Faculty in the Departments of Mathematics and Science consult with faculty in the mathematics and science program on topics related to specific assessments.

School personnel complete assessments on student teacher and intern candidates and offer suggestions for revisions.

Faculty in the integrated/merged special education program work closely with school faculty to develop assessments for the practica in that program.

The integrated/merged program has served as an effective model for an advisory board for the Unit. This group has examined the assessments in the integrated/merged program, offered suggestions for changes in the assessments as well as the program. It is the Unit's intent to expand this board to include more representatives from the general education and educational leadership in order to serve as the advisory board for the Unit.

14. What is the process and timeline of candidate assessment data and its systematic collection, aggregation, and analysis for candidate and program improvement?

It is clear that the Unit has a strong candidate assessment program (A2.5.14a & A2.5.14b) that involves seeking the opinions of various stakeholders such as candidates, graduates, instructors from other colleges outside of education, school system personnel and administrators, parent organizations.
Furthermore, the Unit provides candidates with clear descriptions of their programs’ assessments at various transition points. Additionally, in courses where assessments are placed, instructors focus on providing detailed instructions and rubrics for each assessment. Candidates can also meet with an advisor for additional information.

The Unit, with the assistance of the assessment coordinator, has a systematic way of disseminating the assessments and collecting data. The data entry day has helped to ensure that data for each semester are submitted. The assessment coordinator provides faculty with aggregated and disaggregated data in the following semester. Faculty then review the data with a focus on program improvement and necessary changes for Unit assessments.

The data is used to support the quality of the Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) as well as the accomplishments of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in the University’s accountability system, WEAVE. And finally, if new assessments are developed and implemented, faculty are attentive to comments and suggestions for further development of these assessments.

The Unit recognizes there is always room for improvement. The Unit would like to expand the advisory board that is presently in place for the integrated/merged program to include more general education stakeholders for initial and advanced programs. This would help strengthen the systematic review of the assessments as well as the process. Faculty have not always examined the data available from Praxis scores. This semester we will initiate an annual analysis of this data in a program improvement meeting.

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.*
3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

No areas of concern are identified for this standard at this time.

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

1. How are data from the Cooperating Teacher evaluation (Exhibit 3.4.d.1) and College Coordinator evaluation (Exhibit 3.4.d.2) utilized?

At the end of each semester, the Coordinator of Clinical Practice (CCP) reviews the results of the cooperating teacher and college coordinator evaluations. Results of the college coordinators’ evaluation are shared with each individual who is assessed (A3.5.1). This enables the college coordinators to be aware of areas of strengths and those for improvement. In some instances, the CCP meets with the college coordinator to discuss an area of concern and ways to improve.

In reference to the cooperating teachers, results are used to determine whether a teacher will continue to serve in that capacity. Areas of strengths are noted so that appropriate matches for future candidates may be determined. If a candidate provides a negative rating or comment, the CCP reviews previous evaluations of this clinical practice faculty member to determine whether there is a pattern. She also communicates with the college coordinator to further assess the area of concern. Depending on the outcome, a decision may be made to discontinue the use of a specific cooperating teacher.

2. How are field experiences and clinical practices designed, delivered, and evaluated with school partners and others?

School partners are key in planning and implementing meaningful field experiences and clinical practice. Ongoing communication and collaboration take place in the identification of clinical practice faculty to support candidate learning, assess performance and develop and execute activities aligned with the Conceptual Framework
and Common Core State Standards. For clinical practice experiences, all placements are made based on the recommendations of school site administrators and adherence to state requirements. School-based clinical faculty are asked to review requirements in the student teaching handbook, which were originally developed jointly, to ensure relevancy and to revise as needed. Clinical faculty play a vital role in the daily mentoring and assessing of candidate performance in the field.

The Unit partners with several schools and agencies to design, deliver, and evaluate field experiences.

- Teacher candidates enrolled in the science methods course are accompanied by their professor to Davies Elementary School where teachers adjust their daily schedules to accommodate the candidates and work with them to plan and implement lessons. Candidates are able to secure materials to support lesson development from both the school site and the COEHD resource center.
- In the practica in integrated-merged, field assignments are planned in collaboration with the assigned teacher for each candidate.
- Teacher candidates enrolled in EDUC 1010, partner with the New Beginnings Charter Schools to provide tutoring through the Literacy Alive program. Candidates are trained by the district’s literacy facilitator on the techniques and materials to be utilized during instruction.
- The math professor collaborates with school site personnel to schedule Lesson Study Open Houses at the school site of graduate level candidates.
- The professor of the non-fiction literacy course partners with a different school each semester to have candidates read orally to students and often receives requests from schools to participate.
- Candidates enrolled in library science courses had the opportunity to work with the professor to plan, identify resources, and physically set up libraries at schools that were devastated by Hurricane Katrina.
- Field experiences are planned with organizations that have non-traditional hours to accommodate MAT candidates who may be employed in fields other than teaching, such as Junior Achievement, Upward Bound, and Start the Adventure in Reading (STAIR).
• Professors also identify program completers who performed in an exemplary manner and who are familiar with the quality and expectations of the programs to open their doors and hearts to pre-service professionals. Additionally, MAT students who are currently teaching guide classmates to effective certified teachers in their school sites for field experiences.

3. **The Unit reports technology seminars in partnership with professional organizations to candidates. What is the content of these seminars and how are they evaluated?**

Technology seminars focus on topics, such as: LiveText, Promethean Board, and Smart Board. Several of these training have been provided in conjunction with Kappa Delta Epsilon (KDE). These sessions are planned based on candidate feedback from exit surveys and course evaluations indicating that stronger emphasis must be placed on the integration of technology in the curriculum (A3.5.3) [A3.5.3a, A3.5.3b, A3.5.3c, A3.5.3d].

4. **How does the Unit track all initial and advanced field placements? Particularly diversity of placements?**

Professors are responsible for ensuring that field experience requirements are met. Teacher candidates in initial programs are required to document field placements through the completion of a LiveText form for every course each semester. This form requires submission of demographic data, including gender, exceptionalities, ethnicities, and English language learners (A3.5.4). The assessment coordinator receives all of the data and downloads it into a spreadsheet.

Candidates in the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership document all field experience work in a LiveText portfolio. Course instructors review and assess the portfolio and communicate results to candidates. Although currently, candidates in the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction program are not required to purchase LiveText, in the future they will be required to document field experiences via a public form in LiveText.
5. How does the Unit evaluate candidates in the M.Ed. Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Leadership programs who are employed and completing field experiences at their site?

Professors are responsible for ensuring that field experience requirements identified for each course are met. Field experiences are generally linked to specific assignment and/or projects required for course completion (A3.5.5). Candidates in Curriculum and Instruction complete numerous field experience hours though the program does not stipulate a specified number.

Candidates in the Educational Leadership program complete an internship at their school site. They are assessed by their mentoring principal, as well as faculty who visit on site. Candidates also develop a field experience portfolio.

6. In what ways are P-12 practitioners involved in program design and evaluation?

In the Educational Leadership program a clinical field evaluation form is utilized (A2.5.7b). This form is completed by both the candidate and their mentoring principal in the semester prior to internship (EDAD 6895), and then again at the end of their internship. Faculty also conduct a site visit for each candidate and meet with the principal for a one-on-one conversation about the candidate’s progress. Information related to other programs is provided in question #2 above.

7. How is the performance of candidates in the Curriculum and Instruction program evaluated? What role does P-12 partners have in the evaluation of these candidates?

Most candidates in the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction are employed in school districts. Therefore, they have ongoing interaction with students and opportunities to collaborate with their P-12 peers and administrators. Thus candidates are immersed in meaningful field experiences.
8. How does the Unit document dispositions for advanced candidates during internship experiences?

The M.Ed. program in Curriculum and Instruction does not include an internship component. However, in fall 15 the Unit will institute a dispositions process for candidates in this program during the mid-program assessment.

The M.Ed. in Educational Leadership has an internship course where candidates must complete 300 field experience hours. The program uses a clinical field survey which includes items to assess candidate dispositions (A2.5.7b). It is completed by mentor principals.

The Ph.D. in Educational Administration does not include an internship.

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.

4.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. It is not clear that candidates in the advanced teacher program have knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity.

Rationale: There is limited information regarding diversity in the M.Ed. Curriculum and Instruction program in terms of curriculum, assessments, and data on candidate proficiencies.
For three years, from 2010-2012, the mid-program assessment comprised a portfolio. Candidates submitted three to five papers that demonstrated the competencies as per the National Board Certification model. The portfolios were scored by the candidate's major advisor. As this process demonstrated only the candidates’ writing abilities but not speaking ability, the faculty of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction changed to oral communication in 2012. Between 2012 and 2014, the oral interview assessing the candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions was informal and conducted by the major professor. To increase the rigor, in 2014 and align the assessment with the Conceptual Framework and with the final assessment, we formalized the process whereby the meeting would take place with three professors (See IR1.4.c7).

With the termination of the M.Ed. in Special Education faculty decided to redesign the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction. The program now incorporates add-on certificates in special education, English as a second language, and reading specialist. Each of the courses in these areas require field experiences with diverse students. The program also includes four required courses for all candidates and mid-program and final program assessments.

A consideration for the M. Ed. program is to give candidate’s choice. Designing the curriculum in this way was a considered and collaborative decision by the faculty. Because one criterion for entrance into the program is teacher certification, faculty members knew that many of the candidates had little choice in their undergraduate programs. State and college requirements dictate much of the undergraduate curriculum in the field of education. Hence faculty wanted to afford graduate candidates greater latitude in selecting courses of study.

Diversity in the curriculum of the M. Ed. is addressed in various ways. In each area of specialization, issues of diversity are addressed. Virtually every course that candidates can elect to take to complete their M.Ed. degree addresses one or more dimensions of diversity including English language learners, students with exceptionalities, and diversity of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation. For example if candidates are earning an add-on certification in reading, their required courses (EDCI 5432, 6434,
6436, 6438, and 6493) address diversity of ability, research regarding reading achievement of males and females, and culturally relevant pedagogy when designing curriculum. The mid-program assessment and final assessment provide evidence that the M.Ed. program further contributes to the candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

2. It is not clear that candidates in the advanced teacher and other school personnel programs have opportunities to work with diverse students in P-12 schools.

_Rationale: Candidates in the M.Ed. in Curriculum Instruction and Educational Leadership programs may conduct their clinical experiences in P-12 schools where they are employed. There is a lack of information regarding the diversity of these schools for candidates in these programs._

Teacher candidates in the advanced programs are already certified teachers. Most field experience requirements are met in the schools in which these candidates are employed. Of the 52 M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction candidates from fall 2012 through spring 2015, 93% have job placements, which include schools from a five-parish area in Louisiana including Orleans Parish (38%), Jefferson Parish (40%), St. Bernard Parish (15%), St. Tammany Parish (2%), St. John Parish (1%) and in Picayune, MS (1%). The placements range from prek-12th, and in diverse setting from public (79%), including Recovery School District and charter schools, to private (4%), to parochial (23%) (A1.4.2). Four candidates were not employed as teachers, having enrolled as full-time masters’ candidates directly after receiving undergraduate degrees. They completed field experiences in diverse settings.

In spring 2015, 25 candidates were enrolled in coursework as a part of the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership program. Of this number, 96% were employed by school districts in the Greater New Orleans area including Orleans Parish (21%), Jefferson Parish (42%), and St. Bernard Parish (37%). These placements ranged from prek-12th, and were
in public/charter schools (96%) and parochial schools (4%) (A4.4.2). One candidate was not employed during the semester.

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

1. What is the “hidden curriculum” in schools (p. 28 of Institutional Report, last paragraph)?

The hidden curriculum comprises the unintended lessons or values that emerge within classrooms and schools. Beyond the intended lessons of school subjects, implicit messages are communicated to students – whether academic, social, or cultural messages. The hidden curriculum is often unexamined or unacknowledged.

2. What opportunities do candidates have to interact with diverse peers?

In courses, the professors’ strategies for engaging undergraduate, MAT, M.Ed., and Ph.D. candidates with the content involves both discussion and collaborative and cooperative work in class as well as outside of class for various assignments (A4.5.2). Such collaborative and cooperative work naturally involves candidates interacting with diverse peers. Candidates’ attendance at the Distinguished Urban Educators’ Series lectures, participation in such organizations as KDE and such events as Apples to Hearts (e.g. feeding the homeless), enable candidates to interact with diverse peers.

3. Are MAT candidates included in the undergraduate or graduate enrollment numbers?

MAT candidates are included in graduate enrollment numbers.
4. How does the Unit demonstrate that candidates in the advanced teacher program have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to support the learning of all students?

Candidates in the advanced programs demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions through the completion of course assignments, projects, and interaction with professors and peers. Successful completion of coursework, including field experiences, enables candidates to progress through the program of study.

5. How does the Unit demonstrate that candidates in the Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Leadership programs have opportunities to work with diverse students in P-12 schools?

According to the Cowen Report, *The State of Public Education in New Orleans 10 Years After Hurricane Katrina*, schools in the Greater New Orleans area are comprised of diverse populations of students. The multi-faceted array of private, public and charter schools enable candidates to engage in diverse experiences. The decentralization of Orleans Parish School Board and the increase in charter schools have changed the landscape of education in the city of New Orleans. The structure of schools in the city has changed from one system operating over 100 schools to schools being operated by the state, Orleans Parish Schools Board direct-run, Orleans Parish Schools Board non-network charters, and twelve charter management organizations. This move to enhance parent choice has abolished attendance districts and has provided opportunities for students to participate in an often competitive process to enroll in schools aligned with their interests and needs. Over 93% of the students who attend public schools in New Orleans attend charter schools. Eighty-three % of students enrolled in public schools in the city are deemed to be “economically disadvantaged.” Additionally, 2,800 students are enrolled in private/parochial schools through the voucher system. Students enrolled in Orleans Parish schools during the 2014-15 school year by race/ethnicity were 1.6% Asian, 5.1% Hispanic, 7.2% White, 84.2% African American, and 1.8% Other. This is the climate in which the majority of our teacher candidates live, work, learn and study. This Cowen Report article is available at this link.
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.

5.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

No areas of concern are identified for this standard at this time.

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

1. How are clinical faculty, part-time faculty, and/or adjuncts utilized in the overall facilitation and development of candidates? What evidence exists to verify performance of these individuals?

All part time and adjunct faculty possess earned doctorates and/or master’s degrees. Additionally, all part time and adjunct faculty possess current or past certification in the fields in which they teach or supervise. Clinical faculty, both higher education and school based, have contemporary professional experiences as teachers, principals, liaisons and/or consultants in school settings at the levels they supervise.

School based clinical faculty are selected through a process based on their educational qualifications and recognition as effective teachers in their districts and schools. Clinical faculty members must also meet the state of Louisiana’s requirements for student teacher supervision. This includes current certification and a minimum of 3 years of successful teaching experience in the content area/grade level being supervised, and one of the following: National Board Certification, LATAAP Assessor Certification, a master’s degree, or effective ratings on COMPASS evaluations. In advanced programs
for other school professionals, clinical faculty must be certified, have degrees and/or training giving them expertise in the area of specialization being supervised, and have 5 or more years of teaching and/or administrative experience.

In addition, the Unit’s higher education clinical faculty members have substantial experience supervising student teachers both as university supervisors and as consulting teachers in their previous school settings. Some of the Unit’s professional education clinical faculty also have experience as liaisons to schools and engage regularly in consultation and professional development relationships with area schools and districts.

2. How are P-12 clinical practice school professionals evaluated? What evidence exists to verify performance of these individuals?

At the end of each semester, the Coordinator of Clinical Practice (CCP) reviews the results of the cooperating teacher evaluations. Results are used to determine whether a teacher will continue to serve in that capacity. Areas of strengths are noted so that appropriate matches for future candidates may be determined. If a candidate provides a negative rating or comment, the CCP reviews previous evaluations of this clinical practice faculty member to determine whether there is a pattern. She also communicates with the College Coordinator to further assess the area of concern. Depending on the outcome, a decision may be made to discontinue the use of a specific cooperating teacher (A5.5.2).

3. Provide updated vitae on all Unit faculty, including teaching, scholarship, and service activities.

Vitae for all Unit faculty will be provided during the onsite visit.
4. What aggregated data does the Unit have for faculty performance and evaluations?

The University of New Orleans follows identified protocol in the evaluation of all faculty, regardless of contractual or tenured status. University of Louisiana System Board of Supervisors PPM "Review of Faculty Ranks " directs that all faculty members should be evaluated at least annually by the department chair/head with a review by the dean (A5.5.4a). Thus, all full and part time faculty are currently evaluated on a calendar year since the University transferred governance boards in the middle of an academic year. The evaluation protocol includes four components: teaching, research, service and an overall assessment of performance. Adjunct faculty are typically assessed only on teaching. Instructors and faculty appointments in non-tenure track lines are typically not evaluated on research.

Faculty are also evaluated by candidates as part of the course evaluation process conducted for all courses taught at the university (A5.5.4b). Board policy states that each institution must utilize a system of periodic faculty evaluations by candidates with the improvement of teaching effectiveness as a major focus of such evaluations.

5. This number was omitted in the offsite review report.

6. What do the data indicate about candidates’ evaluations of faculty teaching?

Data attained from candidate course evaluations show that Unit faculty are highly skilled in course preparation and in delivery of instruction. Four semesters of data were available from the office of testing services. Prior to fall 2013 the office of testing services used a different evaluation and storage system. Data prior to 2013 were not available for this review.

In the area of course preparation, faculty were rated on a scale from 0-5 with 0 being Can’t Assess and 5 being Strongly Agree. In course preparation, Unit faculty scores ranged 4.21-4.93 in this two-year period.
Candidate evaluations also show that the Unit faculty score very high in the area of delivery of instruction with scores ranging from 4.22-4.89. In this area the rating scale is also 0-5, but here 0 is Can’t Assess and 5 is Almost Always.

Three years of data from the annual performance review, conducted by the chairs of the departments, have been compiled and the results show that the Unit faculty are satisfactory in the areas of teaching, research and service.

7. How is teaching effectiveness of faculty determined?

Teaching effectiveness is determined through performance evaluations completed by each supervisor, in addition to results from student course evaluations. The supervisor completes the evaluation instrument and conducts a conference with the faculty member to discuss the ratings. The evaluation tool addresses: teaching, research, service and an overall assessment of performance. Adjunct faculty are typically assessed only on teaching. Instructors and faculty appointments in non-tenure track lines are typically not evaluated on research.

8. What “meaningful data” is gathered from student assessments and student feedback to inform faculty efforts and improve program quality and candidate performance?

One instrument used to measure student outcomes is the Teacher Work Sample. Data provides faculty insight on candidates’ proficiencies in setting goals, planning assessments and instruction, collecting data, and reflecting on areas of strengths and those for improvement. Results from this instrument have assisted faculty with improving programs by addressing the use of technology to analyze data and formative and summative assessment development.
9. What are the results of bi-monthly meetings held to analyze candidate assessment data and reflect upon faculty performance? How are data being utilized to inform faculty efforts and improve candidate performance?

Program Improvement meetings are held bi-monthly and are led by the assessment coordinator and the interim teaching and accreditation specialist. These meetings are data driven and inform the overall process of program improvement. Items discussed at these meetings include: candidate dispositions, key assessment results, course redundancy and improvement, field experiences, and updating of course syllabi to reflect state and national standards.

As a result of these meetings the Unit faculty have used data to revise the Unit Conceptual Framework, identify teacher roles, and revise assessment instruments (IR2.4.g1).

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.

6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. It is not clear whether the Unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations that are at least proportional to other Units on campus with clinical components.

Rationale: The IR provides the budgets for each college on campus but does not provide information on whether other colleges have programs with clinical components and whether budgets for these programs are comparable.

The dean consulted with other deans on campus to determine whether they have clinical-type components for any of their academic programs. At the time of writing, the
deans of the College of Liberal Arts (COLA), College of Sciences (COS), and College of Engineering (COE) indicate that they have no clinical–type programs similar to teacher education. In the initial IR the Unit reported college-level comparative budget allocations but could not get granular-level clinical-type data by college from the UNO budget office.

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

1. How does the Unit facilitate collaboration between Unit faculty and faculty from other Units in the institution involved in the preparation of professional educators?

Each year before catalog changes are submitted to the Registrar’s Office for the academic year, all secondary education programs are reviewed by the assistant dean and/or faculty in the COEHD. Chair/faculty in the Curriculum and Instruction Department contact the department chairs in the COLA and COS to ensure that they are aware of any catalog course revisions that might affect the subject areas in the secondary education programs.

The Education minor was implemented in the fall 2010. Prior to this semester the COEHD, COLA and COS collaborated to develop the curriculum for the education minor. Curricula in the COLA and COS were reviewed by faculty from the three colleges. The COEHD faculty verified all education courses required by the Louisiana Department of Education and approved all subject area courses. If candidates in the COLA or COS have curriculum issues pertaining to the education minor, the assistant dean or academic counselors in the respective colleges contact the assistant dean or academic counselor in the COEHD to resolve the curriculum issues.

Additionally, faculty in Curriculum and Instruction collaborate with faculty in other colleges to review course content, offer professional development, and discuss program changes. The proposed move of the COEHD to a school of education, under the COLA will bolster opportunities for collaboration with faculty from that college.
2. What is the membership of the Teacher Education Council and what groups do they represent?

Members of the Teacher Education Council are identified in Exhibit A2.5.3b.

3. What is the membership of the program and college advisory councils and what groups do they represent?

Exhibits A2.5.3 and A2.5.13a provide membership information for university and college committees, councils, and advisory groups.

As mentioned in the IR, given that the COEHD teacher education faculty numbers have decreased significantly post-Katrina, the Unit has essentially used a model best characterized as governance of the whole. This is accomplished through frequent program improvement meetings which are conducted every two weeks during the academic year. Teacher education faculty meet to discuss all curricular and related aspects of undergraduate and graduate programs. Decisions are reached by consensus and relevant program changes are effected through requisite governance committee systems including Courses and Curricula.

With regard to P-12 members of the professional community, the dean of the COEHD communicates and interacts each month with 12 superintendents (South Central Louisiana Association of School Superintendents) for input on their needs and the Unit’s current program array, including add-on and other certificate programs. Moreover, the coordinator of clinical practice is in contact daily, weekly, and monthly with P-12 educators and school leaders. Feedback from these stakeholders is incorporated into improving the Unit’s programs.
4. How does the Unit’s budget allocation compare to other Units on campus with clinical-type components?

The deans’ responses from other colleges confirm that these data are not available because they do not have clinical-type programs.

5. What are summer “profits” and how are they allocated?

The summer profit model refers to colleges keeping a percentage of surplus revenue (once costs are covered and a tax is paid to central administration) to be used for faculty development including conference travel (A6.5.5). The model was used in summer 2013 and summer 2014. The COEHD generated in excess of $50,000 in each of those years and funds were utilized for faculty travel and the purchase of software for research amongst other things. Because of a deficit in 2015, the university did not offer the summer profit model 2015.

6. Besides information technology, what other facilities and resources are available on campus and at partner schools?

There are several resources available for candidates, including: the UNO Learning Center, the COEHD Resource Center and Children’s Library, Counseling Center, Office of Career Development, Driftwood newspaper, International Student Center, Student Health Services, Fitness Center, UNO Press, Neighborhood Story Project, campus radio station WWNO (NPR Affiliate), and the COEHD Facebook page. During the clinical practice semester, candidates participate in professional development activities and faculty meetings provided by partner schools and districts. Candidates have access to school site technology, libraries, and instructional materials. Some faculty from partner schools serve as guest speakers in courses.

The Earl K. Long Library, situated in the heart of the campus, provides a wide array of resources and services to support the learning and research needs of teacher
candidates. Over 100 computers are available in the 1st Floor Learning Commons, along with research and technical assistance. Additionally, the library

The Earl K. Long Library has a variety of resources and services to support distance education students and faculty. Distance learners can access the library’s website 24/7 by logging in through the E-Z proxy server to search research databases and locate books and journal articles. A vast number of articles are readily available as electronic full-text and numerous e-books in a wide range of subjects are also available on students’ desktops. For materials not available through the library website, distance learners can request books and articles through the Interlibrary Loan Service. Librarians offer personalized research assistance to individual distance learners, and they also collaborate with faculty to provide tailored instruction for classes, along with electronic subject guides. As a starting point, or for guidance along the way, the Interlibrary Loan Librarian serves as the designated liaison for distance learning students and faculty.