

School of Education CASAA Report

2012-2013

1. **What are the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for your unit?**

Candidates (students) completing a degree in the School of Education must be able to demonstrate the five strands of the Conceptual Framework (the underlying structure in the School of Education that gives conceptual meaning to the unit's operations through an articulated rationale and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, faculty scholarship and service, and unit accountability) which includes Knowledge, Diversity, Pedagogy, Professionalism, and Technology. The successful candidate must be able to demonstrate the following outcomes:

Knowledge

- Teacher candidates (students) in initial programs of study will develop an extensive content knowledge base in order to reach and teach all learners in a diverse society.
- Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs of study will develop in-depth content knowledge and will be recognized as experts in the content they teach.

Pedagogy

- Teacher candidates (students) in initial programs of study will develop pedagogical skills that result in improved learning and achievement for a diverse population of learners.
- Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs of study will demonstrate expertise in pedagogical knowledge through leadership and mentoring.

Diversity

- Teacher candidates (students) in initial programs of study will demonstrate an understanding of diversity and its impact on learners, other constituencies, and the greater society they serve to improve teaching and learning.
- Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs of study serve as role models by actively promoting a school climate and culture that values differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socio-economic status, age, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographic areas.

Professionalism

- Teacher candidates (students) in initial programs of study will demonstrate professionalism as they interact with students, parents, colleagues, and others.
- Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs will be role models for fairness and integrity in working with their colleagues, students, families, and the community at-large.

Technology

- Teacher candidates (students) in initial programs of study will utilize multiple classroom technology resources and tools to improve teaching and learning.
- Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs will be aggressive advocates of the benefits of instructional technology and will make available the necessary resources to acquire the latest technology tools.

Unit goals can be found by visiting <http://www.uamont.edu/education/PDFs/UnitGoals.pdf>

The School of Education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). School of Education has been NCATE accredited since 1968 and will be

seeking **continuing accreditation** in the fall semester of 2015. The School of Education must seek reaccreditation every seven years. The NCATE Reaccreditation Letter can be found by visiting

<http://www.uamont.edu/Education/pdf/NCATE%20Letter.pdf>

1a. How do you inform the public and other stakeholders (students, potential students, the community) about your SLOs?

The School of Education informs the public and other stakeholders about the student learning outcomes by placing the outcome results on the [School of Education website](#), in stakeholders' reports, in syllabi, on recruitment materials, in the [Teacher Education Handbook](#), and in the [Internship Handbook](#).

2. Describe how your unit's Student Learning Outcomes fit into the mission of the University.

The School of Education seeks to fulfill the university mission through the following student learning outcomes. The outcomes are aligned to state and national standards and are a direct reflection of the UAM mission.

Knowledge

The SOL's indicated below reflect the School of Education's efforts to enhance and share knowledge, to preserve and promote the intellectual content of society, and to education people for critical thought, which is a component of the UAM mission.

1. Teacher candidates in initial programs of study will develop an extensive content knowledge base in order to reach and teach all learners in a diverse society.
2. Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs of study will develop in-depth content knowledge and will be recognized as experts in the content they teach.

Pedagogy

The SOL's indicated below reflect the School of Education's efforts to ensure opportunities are founded in a strong program of general education and are fulfilled through contemporary disciplinary curricula, which is a component of the UAM mission.

1. Teacher candidates in initial programs of study will develop pedagogical skills that result in improved learning and achievement for a diverse population of learners.
2. Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs of study will demonstrate expertise in pedagogical knowledge through leadership and mentoring.

Diversity

The SOL's indicated below reflect the School of Education's efforts to enable students to synthesize knowledge, communicate effectively, use knowledge and technology with intelligence and responsibility, and act creatively within their own and other cultures, which is a component of the UAM mission.

1. Teacher candidates in initial programs of study will demonstrate an understanding of diversity and its impact on learners, other constituencies, and the greater society they serve to improve teaching and learning.
2. Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs of study serve as role models by actively promoting a school climate and culture that values differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socio-economic status, age, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographic areas.

Professionalism

The SOL's indicated below reflect the School of Education's efforts to ensure opportunities in higher education for both traditional and non-traditional students and strives to provide an environment which fosters individual achievement and personal development, which is a component of the UAM mission.

1. Teacher candidates in initial programs of study will demonstrate professionalism as they interact with students, parents, colleagues, and others.
2. Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs will be role models for fairness and integrity in working with their colleagues, students, families, and the community at-large.

Technology

The SOL's indicated below reflect the School of Education's efforts to enable students to synthesize knowledge, communicate effectively, use knowledge and technology with intelligence and responsibility, and act creatively within their own and other cultures, which is a component of the UAM mission.

1. Teacher candidates in initial programs of study will utilize multiple classroom technology resources and tools to improve teaching and learning.
2. Educators and other school personnel in advanced programs will be aggressive advocates of the benefits of instructional technology and will.

3. Provide an analysis of the student learning data from your unit. How is this data used as evidence of learning?

The School of Education has carefully aligned the five strands of the conceptual framework to state and national standards and the Danielson Frameworks for Teaching model for all initial and advanced programs to provide validity for its own program. Specific assessment

identified as signature assessments have also been aligned with these standards to provide the School of Education with the data necessary to determine if candidates (students) are meeting the unit goals. There are seventeen major assessments that are considered undergraduate unit assessments for the School of Education. The seventeen assessments are completed by all undergraduate teacher education candidates (students) seeking a teaching licensure regardless of their program of study. Based on analysis of the data, the School of Education was able to determine degree areas that were performing significantly higher or lower than other degree programs. Based on the data below the School of Education was able to conduct an analysis of the overall performance in each of the undergraduate programs based on the same assessment and same standards.

Rubric	P-4 Early Childhood		Middle Childhood		PE Licensure		Overall Mean	SD	N
	mean	N	mean	N	mean	N			
128:1st Formative TCRI Cooperating Teacher Intern I	2.3	26	2.3	7	2.2--	6	2.3	0.5	42
130:2nd Formative TCRI Cooperating Teacher Intern I	2.5	26	2.7++	7	2.5	6	2.5	0.5	42
131:1st Formative TCRI University Supervisor Intern I	2.2 ++	26	2.0--	7	2.1	6	2.1	0.6	42
132:2nd Formative TCRI University Supervisor Intern I	2.3	26	2.5++	7	2.1	6	2.3	0.6	42
133:Summative University Supervisor Intern I	2.5	26	2.7++	7	2.5	6	2.5	0.6	42
134:Summative Cooperating Teacher Intern I	2.7	26	2.8++	7	2.6--	6	2.7	0.5	42
135:1st Formative TCRI Cooperating Teacher Intern II	2.7	27	3.0++	3	2.6--	3	2.7	0.4	33
136:2nd Formative TCRI Cooperating Teacher Intern II	2.8++	27	3.0++	3	2.5--	3	2.7	0.5	33
137:1st Formative TCRI University Supervisor Intern II	2.7	27	2.4--	3	2.8++	3	2.7	0.5	33
138:2nd Formative TCRI University Supervisor Intern II	2.8	27	2.5--	3	2.9++	3	2.8	0.4	33
139:Summative University Supervisor Intern II	2.9++	27	2.8	3	2.8	3	2.8	0.4	33
140:Summative Cooperating Teacher Intern II	2.8	27	3.0++	3	2.9++	3	2.8	0.4	33

The data above are based on an unacceptable (1), acceptable (2), or target (3) scale. The scores on shown for internship I are lower than those indicated in internship II. This is a positive indication of growth in the candidates (students) over a period of time. Based on a two tailed t-test candidates (students) in the Middle Childhood Program performed statistically significantly higher than the average at the $p < .01$ level on seven of the twelve assessments listed above. Candidates (students) in the Physical Education Program performed statistically significantly

higher than the average at the $p < .01$ level on three of the twelve assessments listed above. Additionally, candidates (students) in the Physical Education Program performed statistically significantly lower than the average at the $p < .01$ level on five of the twelve assessments listed above. Candidates (students) in the P-4 Early Childhood Program performed at the average level on all twelve assessments. Despite the data indicating differences in program performance, the average scores indicate that all programs were performing at the acceptable to target range on all twelve assessments. It is through the alignment of the conceptual framework to the state and national standards that the School of Education can state with confidence that candidates (students) that score at the target or acceptable level on state and national standards have also met the unit goals for student learning outcomes. The School of Education is confident that candidates (students) in all programs are performing at a level that indicates they are meeting the units learning outcome goals.

The data below are based on an unacceptable (1), needs improvement (2), acceptable (3), or target (4) scale. The data below were collected from the teacher work sample portfolio. All undergraduate candidates (students) must complete a teacher work sample portfolio during internship II. The data below indicate that the candidates (students) in the Physical Education Program performed statistically significantly lower than the average at the $p < .01$ level on two of the five assessments listed below. Even though the Physical Education candidates (students) performed, lower than average all candidates (students) were within the acceptable to target range. It is through the alignment of the conceptual framework to the state and national standards that the School of Education can state with confidence that candidates (students) that score at the target or acceptable level on state and national standards have also met the unit goals for student learning outcomes. The School of Education is confident that candidates (students) in all programs are performing at a level that indicates they are meeting the units learning outcome goals.

Rubric	P-4 Early Childhood		Middle Childhood		PE Licensure		Overall Mean	SD	N
	mean	N	mean	N	mean	N			
173:Portfolio Task 1: Context for Learning	4.0++	27	4.0++	3	3.7--	3	3.9	0.5	33
174:Portfolio Task 2 Planning Instruction and Assessment	3.8	27	3.7	3	3.8	3	3.7	0.5	33
175:Portfolio Task 3: Instructing Students and Supporting Learning	3.7	27	3.7	3	3.8	3	3.7	0.5	33
176:Portfolio Task 4 Assessing Student Learning	3.5	27	3.6++	3	3.2--	3	3.4	0.5	33
177:Portfolio Task 5: Reflecting on Teaching and Learning	3.8	27	4.0	3	3.7	3	3.	0.5	33

Candidates (students) at the graduate level are scored based on the Specialty Professional Association (SPA) standards. The following information is based on the SPA requirements.

Master of Education in Educational Leadership program was designed to meet all of the ELCC standards. Each of the six assessments were developed to insure that the standards were being addressed and to demonstrate how well the candidates were meeting those standards.

Over a three-year period, spanning from 2010 to 2013, ELCC standard 1 was scored 147 times. The data generated from standard 1 indicate that 8% (12) of the 147 times standard 1 was scored, candidates were scored unacceptable, 56% (82) of the times candidates were scored acceptable, and 26% (53) of the times candidates were scored target. ELCC standard 2 was scored 148 times during this period. The data indicate that 4% (6) of the 148 times standard 2 was scored candidates were scored unacceptable, 50% (74) of the times candidates were scored acceptable, and 46% (20) of the times candidates were scored target. During this time ELCC standard 3 was scored 83 times. The data indicate that 2% (2) of the 83 times standard 3 was scored, candidates were scored unacceptable, 39% (32) of the times candidates were score acceptable, and 59% (66) of the times candidates were scored target. ELCC standard 4 was scored 148 times during this period. The data indicate that 2% (2) of the 114 times standard 4 was scored candidates were scored unacceptable, 54% (62) of the times candidates were scored acceptable, and 44% (36) of the times candidates were scored target. During this time ELCC standard 5 was scored 75 times. The data indicate that 16% (12) of the 75 times standard 5 was scored candidates were scored, acceptable, and 84% (63) of the times candidates were scored target. ELCC standard 6 was scored 74 times during this period. The data indicate that 3% (2) of the 74 times standard 6 was scored candidates were scored unacceptable, 29% (21) of the times candidates were scored acceptable, and 68% (51) of the times candidates were scored target.

Data stayed relatively consistent between the years 2010-2011 and 2011-12 on standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 all indicating that a minimal number of scores were unacceptable. In the 2012-13 year data indicated there were no scores that were unacceptable.

Note, that the N for the following charts indicate the number of times the standard was scored.

Data Overview for 2011-2012							
Assessment	ELCC Standard	N	Mean	Unacceptable %	Acceptable %	Target %	Semester
Overview of Data	1	24	2.7	0%	33% (8)	67% (16)	2012-2013
Overview of Data	2	27	2.8	0%	17% (5)	83% (22)	2012-2013
Overview of Data	3	24	2.9	0%	11% (3)	89% (21)	2012-2013
Overview of Data	4	24	2.8	0%	22% (6)	78% (18)	2012-2013
Overview of Data	5	15	2.9	0%	22% (3)	78% (12)	2012-2013
Overview of Data	6	18	2.7	0%	33% (6)	67% (12)	2012-2013

Data Overview for 2010-2011							
Assessment	ELCC Standard	N	Mean	Unacceptable %	Acceptable %	Target %	Semester
Overview of Data	1	57	2.1	12% (6)	70% (40)	18% (11)	2010-2011
Overview of Data	2	55	2.1	7% (4)	71% (39)	22% (12)	2010-2011
Overview of Data	3	25	2.3	4% (1)	60% (15)	36% (9)	2010-2011
Overview of Data	4	48	2.2	3% (2)	76% (36)	21% (10)	2010-2011
Overview of Data	5	30	2.9	0%	13% (4)	87% (26)	2010-2011
Overview of Data	6	34	2.6	5% (2)	26% (9)	68% (23)	2010-2011

Data Overview for 2009-2010							
Assessment	ELCC Standard	N	Mean	Unacceptable %	Acceptable %	Target %	Semester
Overview of Data	1	66	2.1	11% (5)	65% (46)	24% (15)	2010-2011
Overview of Data	2	66	2.3	6% (3)	61% (41)	33% (22)	2010-2011
Overview of Data	3	34	2.5	3% (1)	47% (16)	50% (17)	2010-2011
Overview of Data	4	42	2.3	2% (1)	64% (27)	33% (14)	2010-2011
Overview of Data	5	30	2.9	0%	13% (4)	87% (26)	2010-2011
Overview of Data	6	22	2.6	5% (1)	27% (6)	68% (15)	2010-2011

Content Knowledge

The candidates content knowledge was examined through assessments that addressed ELCC Standards

1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Based on the data discussed in the overview it can be seen that the majority of the scores were within the target to acceptable range on all standards. Standard 3 was scored at the target level more times than other standards. This information indicates that candidates can apply knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the school organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating the school management and operational systems. Candidates demonstrate that they are almost as strong on Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6. Standard 1 was scored unacceptable more times than any other standard; however, these scores only made up 1% of the collective scores. There was an increase in the number of number of acceptable scores on Standard 1 from 2010-11 to 2011-12. Additionally, there was an increase in the number of target scores from 2011-2012.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

The candidates professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions were examined through assessments that addressed ELCC Standards 2, 3, and 4. Based on the data discussed in the overview it can be seen that the majority of the candidates are scoring within the target to acceptable range for these standards. Standard 3 was scored at the target level more times than other standards. This information indicates that candidates can apply knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the school organization, operation,

and resources through monitoring and evaluating the school management and operational systems. Standard 2 was scored unacceptable more times than any other standard; however, these scores equaled less than 1% of the collective scores. There was an increase in the number of number of acceptable scores on Standard 1 from 2010-11 to 2011-12. Additionally, there was an increase in the number of target scores from 2011-2012.

4. Based on your analysis of student learning data in Question 3, include an explanation of what seems to be improving student learning and what should be revised.

Each year the faculty review the data to determine the areas that need to be addressed. Based on the data in all programs the faculty began a curriculum alignment review to determine where in the curriculum each standard was being taught and how the standard was being assessed. Based on the review there were changes made in how the instructions for each assessment were worded to ensure clarity. Additionally, there were numerous faculty meetings to discuss the assessments to ensure that every faculty member understood the intent and purpose of the assessment. The faculty are confident that these minor changes for clarity are what increased the overall scores of candidates. The faculty in the future will explore how to ensure that there are less areas that are statistically significantly different in how they perform on all assessments within the School of Education. The faculty will also explore the areas of possible bias in the assessments to determine if there needs to be changes in the assessments or rubrics to better ensure that the program assessments are free of bias.

5. Other than course level/grades, describe/analyze other data and other sources of data whose results assist your unit to improve student learning.

The School of Education uses multiple strategies and assessments to measure the effectiveness of the unit program quality. These include the analysis of demographic data to ensure that signature assessments are fair, consistent, accurate, and free from bias, the quality of faculty lectures and presentations; the quality and availability of advisors; the quality of assessments; and the variety, quality, and supervision of field and internship experiences. They are assessed using disaggregated data from items included in candidate (student) internship surveys, graduate surveys, and employer surveys.

Specific assessments identified as “signature assessments” have also been aligned with these standards to provide the School of Education with the data necessary to determine if candidates (students) are meeting the unit goals. Starting the 2011-12 year, the School of Education added demographic analysis to the assessment system. The School of Education reviewed the data collected from all programs and rubrics to ensure that the signature assessments are fair, consistent, accurate, and free from bias. This analysis ensures that all candidates (students) have the same opportunity to learn and to demonstrate that learning. The data from this analysis allows the School of Education to determine if differentiated instruction for various age, ethnic, and gender groups is taking place or if differentiated instruction is needed for those groups. Differentiated instruction could include tutoring, additional advising time, referrals for student services, and additional assistance with course work.

The demographic data allows the School of Education to target areas of concern to enhance student learning and to increase retention in the programs. It is important that faculty think about the diversity of the candidates in the education programs and how that diverse background can and does impact their learning experience.

	African American		White		Asian		American Indian or Alaska Native		Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander		Hispanic/Latino		All Students		
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	SD
2011-2012 Overall results	3.0--	73	3.2+	250	3.0--	1	2.7--	1	3.0--	1	2.6--	5	3.2	334	0.48
2012-2013 Overall results	2.5--	148	2.7-	436	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.0	5	3.1	589	0.48

Based on a one-tailed t-test, with a p value of less than .01, it was determined that in 2011-2012 all candidates other than white candidates scored significantly lower on all assessments. Based on a one-tailed t-test, with a p value of less than .01, it was determined that in 2012-2013 African American candidates scored significantly lower than others on all assessments. The School of Education will continue to watch this area over the coming academic year; however, it appears that the African American population is consistently lower than other groups.

	Male		Female		All Students		
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	SD
2011-2012 Overall results	3.2	132	3.1	202	3.2	334	0.48
2012-2013 Overall results	2.8	204	2.8	385	3.0	589	0.48

Based on a one-tailed t-test, with a p value of less than .01, it was determined there was not a significant difference between males and females scored on all assessments during the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic years. The School of Education did notice that the candidates scored slightly lower in the 2012-2013 school year than the year before. This will be an area that the School of Education will continue to monitor over the next year to determine if this should be an area of concern or if there are outliers in the 2012-2013 data.

	17-20		21-25		26-30		31-35		36-40		41-45		46-50		51-55		All Students		
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	SD
2011-2012 Overall results	3.1	52	3.1	149	3.2	32	3.3++	35	3.2++	27	3.3++	18	3.4++	7	3.3++	9	3.2	334	0.48
2012-2013 Overall results	3.0	106	3.2	264	2.9	61	3.3++	55	2.8	48	2.6--	30	3	10	3	15	3.0	589	.48

Based on a one-tailed t-test, with a p value of less than .01, **it was determined that candidates between the ages of 31 and 55 scored significantly higher on all assessments during the 2011-2012 academic year.** Based on a one-tailed t-test, with a p value of less than .01, **it was determined that candidates between the ages of 31 and 35 scored significantly higher on all assessments during the 2012-2013 academic year.** **Additionally, it was determined that candidates between the ages of 41-45 scored significantly lower on all assessment during the 2012-2013 academic year.** This will be an area that the School of Education will continue to monitor over the next year to determine if this should be an area of concern or if there are outliers in the 2012-2013 data.

The School of Education utilized the above information during the review of the program data to ensure that no population was marginalized in the data collection process. Based on the above data the School of Education was confident that the data provided was fair and free of major bias.

The internship survey is administered at the end on internship II. The survey is anonymous to allow candidates provide information that is free from the possibility of retribution.

During the 2011-2012 academic year candidate (student) responses indicated that 70% strongly agreed, 17% moderately agreed, and 13% agreed that the teacher education program helped them to develop the knowledge and skills they needed to be effective teachers. Candidate (student) responses for the 2012-2013 academic year indicated that 50% strongly agreed, 25% moderately agreed, 13% agreed, less than 1% disagreed, 3% moderately disagreed, 9% strongly disagreed that the teacher education program helped them to develop the knowledge and skills they needed to be effective teachers. The School of Education reviewed the data for the 2012-2013 academic year and based on positive comments on the survey provided by candidates (students) the data maybe skewed. The School of Education will monitor this data for another academic year before making changes to the program based on this survey.

The Teacher Education Program has helped me develop the knowledge and skills to	Strongly Disagree		Moderately Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Moderately Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013
Understand the central concepts and processes of inquiry of the subject matter I teach.	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	9	9	31	16	45	33
Create learning experiences that make subject matter meaningful to students.	0	3	0	1	0	0	6	4	6	7	33	18	45	33
Use alternative theoretical perspectives and research to guide instructional decision making and reflection on practice.	0	2	0	2	0	0	7	4	7	8	31	17	45	33
Use knowledge about individual differences to plan, deliver, and analyze instruction.	0	3	0	1	0	0	3	4	7	9	35	15	45	33
Plan meaningful learning experiences that promote student achievement and engagement in learning.	0	3	0	1	0	0	4	4	6	9	35	16	45	33
Use a variety of instructional strategies to promote student achievement and engagement in learning.	0	3	0	1	0	0	4	3	8	7	33	18	45	33
Use a variety of formal and informal assessments to evaluate classroom learning and teaching.	0	3	0	1	0	0	5	5	8	9	32	15	45	33
Create and maintain a safe and productive learning environment.	0	3	0	1	0	0	5	4	7	9	33	16	45	33
Use technology in planning, delivery, and analysis of learning and instruction.	0	3	0	1	0	0	7	5	9	7	29	17	45	33
Support and expand student literacy skills.	0	3	0	1	0	0	9	5	8	8	27	16	44	33
Model effective communication.	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4	10	8	29	17	45	33
Foster relationships with the home, school, and community to support student learning and well-being.	0	3	0	1	0	0	5	4	6	8	33	16	45	33
Display beliefs, values, and behaviors that guide the ethical dimensions of professional practice.	0	3	0	0	0	1	7	4	8	8	30	17	45	33
	0	39	0	11	0	2	73	54	99	106	411	214	584	429

During the 2011-2012 academic year candidate (student) responses indicated that 67% strongly agreed, 18% moderately agreed, and 15% agreed that the teacher education program provided with candidates with a variety of field experiences, that they would recommend UAMs education program to someone else, and that the instructors taught them to think critically. Candidate (student) responses for the 2012-2013 academic year indicated that 51% strongly agreed, 25% moderately agreed, 13% agreed, 2% moderately disagreed, 9% strongly disagreed that the teacher education program helped them to develop the knowledge and skills they needed to be effective teachers. The School of Education reviewed the data for the 2012-2013 academic year and based on positive comments on the survey provided by candidates (students) the data maybe skewed. The School of Education will monitor this data for another academic year before making changes to the program based on this survey.

Indicate how much you agree with each statement	Strongly Disagree		Moderately Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Moderately Agree		Strongly Agree		Total	
	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013
I was involved in a variety of learning experiences in my classes.	0	3	0	1	0	0	5	5	12	10	28	14	45	33
My field experiences helped me relate principles and theory to teaching practices.	0	3	0	1	0	0	7	4	8	7	30	18	45	33
The Teacher Education Program at UAM helped me develop as a professional.	0	3	0	1	0	0	4	4	7	8	33	17	45	33
If someone asked me whether he or she should enroll in the Teacher Education program at UAM, I would say yes.	0	3	0	1	0	0	7	5	11	8	27	16	45	33
Issues of exceptionality and cultural diversity as they relate to teaching and learning were covered in my classes.	0	3	0	1	0	0	7	4	7	7	31	18	45	33
My instructors in the Teacher Education Program encouraged me to think critically and self-reflect.	0	3	0	1	0	0	7	3	7	9	31	17	45	33
As a result of the Teacher Education Program, I have developed confidence in my abilities as a teacher.	0	3	0	1	0	0	9	2	6	9	30	17	45	33
	0	21	0	7	0	0	46	27	58	58	210	117	314	231

During the 2011-2012 academic year candidate (student) responses indicated that 57% rated the courses in the teacher education program as excellent, 30% rated the courses good, 9% rated the courses above average, and 4% rated the courses as average. Candidate (student) responses for the 2012-2013 academic year indicated that indicated that 50% rated the courses in the teacher education program as excellent, 25% rated the courses good, 15% rated the courses above average, 10% rated the courses as average, 2% rated the courses as fair, and 2% rated the courses as poor. The School of Education reviewed the data for the 2012-2013 academic year and based on positive comments on the survey provided by candidates (students) the data maybe skewed. The School of Education will monitor this data for another academic year before making changes to the program based on this survey.

Please rate the following aspects of the courses you completed as part of the Teacher Education Program.	Poor		Fair		Average		Above Average		Good		Excellent		Total	
	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013
Quality of lectures and other presentations given by faculty (e.g., clarity, relevance, organization).	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	16	10	23	16	45	33
Availability of your advisor.	0	2	0	2	3	5	3	3	10	6	30	16	45	33
Quality of academic and personal advising.	0	2	0	2	3	4	2	5	10	5	29	17	45	33
Quality of assessments of your work (e.g., fair, relevant, informative).	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	5	16	11	20	13	45	33
Professional quality of faculty.	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	8	13	5	26	20	45	33
	0	4	0	4	10	16	21	24	65	37	128	82	225	165

During the 2011-2012 academic year candidate (student) responses indicated that 70% rated the field experiences in the teacher education program as excellent, 22% rated the experiences good, 2% rated the experiences above average, 3% rated the experiences as average, and 1% rated the experiences as fair. Candidate (student) responses for the 2012-2013 academic year indicated that indicated that 70% rated the field experiences in the teacher education program as excellent, 20% rated the experiences good, 3% rated the experiences above average, 3% rated the experiences as average, 1% rated the experiences as fair, and less than 1% rated the experiences as poor. The School of Education reviewed the data for the 2012-2013 academic year and based on positive comments on the survey provided by candidates (students) the data maybe skewed. The School of Education will monitor this data for another academic year before making changes to the program based on this survey.

Please rate the following aspects of the field experiences (e.g., pre-internship, internship) you completed as part of the Teacher Education Program.	Poor		Fair		Average		Above Average		Good		Excellent		Total	
	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013	2011-2012	2012-2013
Quality of placements (e.g., At a good site? Did you have good models of teaching?)	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	12	6	31	24	45	33
Variety of experiences (e.g., school sites, grade levels, classrooms)	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	9	5	34	25	45	33
Quality of supervision from your university supervisors.	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	11	5	32	26	45	33
Quality of supervision from your cooperating/cooperating teachers.	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	9	4	35	27	45	33
Opportunities to work with students of diverse ethnic, socioeconomic, and cultural backgrounds.	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	9	6	34	23	44	33
Opportunities to work with a variety of students in authentic contexts	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	9	8	33	22	45	33
Opportunities to work with students with exceptionalities(e.g., gifted and talented, special needs, 504, Title I, etc).	0	0	2	1	3	1	4	2	8	10	28	19	45	33
Opportunities to work with teachers of diverse ethnic, socioeconomic, and cultural backgrounds.	0	0	1	0	4	4	2	0	12	11	26	18	45	33
	0	1	5	5	13	10	9	9	79	55	253	184	360	264

The data derived from this survey was used to determine if there were any changes needed in the courses, field experiences, or pedagogy being taught in the program. Based on the data presented the faculty are confident that any changes made in the assessment and instruction from earlier data presented will positively impact the data from the survey in the future.

The School of Education has implemented several efforts to ensure professional community involvement and to maintain fairness and freedom from bias in its assessments. The School of Education solicits formal review and feedback from its Teacher Education Committee, which includes both university and P-12 representation, during the annual Stakeholders Meeting each spring, and through graduate surveys and principal surveys.

The principal survey and graduate survey were revamped in 2011-2012 to align better to the conceptual framework. This alignment will provide data that will assist the School of Education in assessing candidates (students) that have graduated and are currently teaching. The two surveys are exactly the same this enables the School of Education to analyze the data to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between how well the graduates believed they were prepared and how well the hiring principals believed the UAM School of Education graduates were prepared. The data below indicate that employers believe that candidates (students) that complete the UAM education program are on average satisfactorily to strongly prepared for the position for which they were hired.

Employer/Principal Survey	2011-2012	2012-2013
How well are UAM graduates prepared to	Rating Average out of 5.0 45% Rate of Return	Rating Average out of 5.0 52% Rate of Return
Monitoring students' progress using strategies that are appropriate to learning outcomes.	3.71	3.80
Interpreting data from standardized assessments.	3.52	3.58
Employing a cycle of planning, implementing and evaluating instruction.	3.57	3.60
Providing constructive feedback on students' individual work and behavior.	3.71	3.70
Analyzing the effects of your teaching on the learning environment and student outcomes.	3.67	3.65
Engaging in self- improvement and professional development activities.	3.90	4.00
Using a variety of strategies to engage students in critical thinking.	3.52	3.61
Engaging students in learning activities and projects that require them to demonstrate problem-solving skills.	3.52	3.53
Analyzing students' learning needs to accommodate linguistic and cultural differences.	3.33	3.41

Encouraging the exploration of diverse points of view.	3.43	3.50
Following the Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct for educators.	4.05	4.50
Modifying instructional plans based on assessment of student outcomes.	3.67	3.67
Working collaboratively with parents and families to meet students' needs.	3.81	3.90
Working with other faculty and school administrators to improve the educational experiences of students.	4.00	3.98
Maintaining an orderly and disciplined classroom conducive to student learning.	3.76	3.88
Using technology as a resource to enhance student learning.	4.10	4.50
Using technology for personal and teacher productivity.	4.00	4.10
Using technology to engage students in authentic, complex tasks.	3.76	3.88

The data below indicate that candidates (students) that complete the UAM education program believe they are on average satisfactorily prepared for the position for which they were trained with the exception of interpreting data, problem solving skills, and use of instructional technology. Candidates (students) believe that they were prepared at a fair level in those areas indicated as exceptions.

Graduate/Completer Survey How well are UAM graduates prepared to	2011-2012 Rating Average out of 5.0 33% Rate of Return	2012-2013 Rating Average out of 5.0 32% Rate of Return
Monitoring students' progress using strategies that are appropriate to learning outcomes.	3.11	3.15
Interpreting data from standardized assessments.	2.56	3.57
Employing a cycle of planning, implementing and evaluating instruction.	3.22	3.30
Providing constructive feedback on students' individual work and behavior.	3.56	3.75
Analyzing the effects of your teaching on the learning environment and student outcomes.	3.10	3.20
Engaging in self- improvement and professional development activities.	3.44	3.56
Using a variety of strategies to engage students in critical thinking.	3.10	3.35

Engaging students in learning activities and projects that require them to demonstrate problem-solving skills.	2.80	3.00
Analyzing students' learning needs to accommodate linguistic and cultural differences.	3.20	3.33
Encouraging the exploration of diverse points of view.	3.50	3.75
Following the Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct for educators.	3.33	3.60
Modifying instructional plans based on assessment of student outcomes.	3.00	3.05
Working collaboratively with parents and families to meet students' needs.	3.00	2.90
Working with other faculty and school administrators to improve the educational experiences of students.	3.22	3.40
Maintaining an orderly and disciplined classroom conducive to student learning.	3.30	3.25
Using technology as a resource to enhance student learning.	3.00	2.90
Using technology for personal and teacher productivity.	2.80	2.90
Using technology to engage students in authentic, complex tasks.	2.89	2.80

6. As a result of the review of your student learning data in previous questions, explain what efforts your unit will make to improve student learning over the next assessment period. Be specific indicating when, how often, how much, and by whom these improvements will take place.

The School of Education at the University of Arkansas at Monticello continues to refine a comprehensive assessment system that addresses national, state and Specialized Professional Associations standards. The assessment system was developed through the collaborative efforts of teacher education faculty, public school educators and our candidates. The process began in the Fall of 2006 with the appointment of an Assessment Committee and continues today. The Unit Assessment System is aligned with the conceptual framework and uses assessments that are consistent with the demands for greater accountability and focus on our candidates' ability to impact student learning.

In response to changes in NCATE accreditation standards, the assessment system of the professional education program is focused on candidate outcomes rather than program inputs such as the course syllabus. This focus has resulted in the development of and a greater emphasis on performance assessments to evaluate our candidates as they matriculate through the program. Data on candidate performance from both internal and external assessment measures have been compiled and are used to evaluate and improve the Unit's effectiveness, as well as the program's final outcomes—its graduates.

The tables included in the report indicate what and when the data are collected, from where/whom the data is collected, when the analysis is preformed, when the report of the data is disseminated to the faculty, and the standards for which the data is correlated. The data analysis tells us which program or programs need to be improved. No areas were noted that need immediate change. Areas were noted that need to be monitored. Based upon the data collected this year and the analysis of that data the following areas were noted.

Area to be	When Reviewed	Who Will Review
Using technology for personal and teacher productivity.	Yearly	Instructional Technology Faculty, Program Coordinators, Assessment Coordinator, Dean
Using technology to engage students in authentic, complex tasks.	Yearly	Instructional Technology Faculty, Program Coordinators, Assessment Coordinator, Dean
Engaging students in learning activities and projects that require them to demonstrate problem-solving skills.	Each Semester	All faculty, Program Coordinators, Assessment Coordinator, Dean
Interpreting data from standardized assessments.	Each Semester	All faculty, Program Coordinators, Assessment Coordinator, Dean

7. What new tactics to improve student learning has your unit considered, experimented with, researched, reviewed or put into practice over the past year?

The School of Education has placed a greater emphasis this year on the Common Core State Standards and how those standards are incorporated in the curriculum for the school of education. This is an important part of preparing the teacher of tomorrow. The School of Education faculty have incorporated more of Robert Marzano’s nine essential instructional strategies into their daily teaching. This was implemented so that faculty could model for candidates (students) what is expected of them in the public school classroom. This implementation was decided based upon feedback from internship cooperating teachers and principals, which indicated that new teachers needed to be more aware of the nine essential strategies. The School of Education faculty have integrated more instructional technology into their teaching by utilizing interactive whiteboards, slates, iPads, iPods, and instructional websites.

8. How do you ensure shared responsibility for student learning and assessment among students, faculty and other stakeholders?

The School of Education host an annual stakeholders meeting that includes members of the community, principals, superintendents, teachers, faculty from other university units, School of Education faculty, and candidates (students). During this meeting, stakeholders are presented with information regarding new School of Education programs, new rules and regulations

governing teacher preparation, NCATE updates, and curriculum changes within School of Education programs. Stakeholders have an opportunity to participate in round table discussions and voice concerns about past and future events.

The School of Education has a candidate (student) comments and concerns form available online for students to communicate directly with the dean any issues or concerns that they may have. The dean responds to all candidate (student) concerns and the response is documented and placed in the NCATE files with the name of the candidate (student) removed for privacy.

Candidates (students) serve as members of the Teacher Education Committee and serve on the UAM Graduate Council as voting members. Both of these allow candidates (students) to have input on a number of matters dealing with program decisions as well as candidate (student) matters.

Candidates (students) were actively involved in the recent Higher Learning Commission visit for the approval of the new online Master of Physical Education and Coaching degree. Candidates (students) were interviewed and participated greatly in the visit.

9. Describe and provide evidence of efforts your unit is making to recruit/retain/graduate students in your unit/at the University. (A generalized statement such as “we take a personal interest in our students” is not evidence.)

The School of Education continued for the fifth year the Pinning Ceremony for candidates (students) admitted to teacher education.

The School of Education hosted the fourth annual hotdog picnic to help keep candidates (students) actively engaged in campus events. Welcome Back flyers were given to every candidate (student) taking an education course and candidates (students) were contacted by their advisor personally welcoming them back in the spring. The School of Education believes that events such as these keep candidates (students) in regular contact with faculty outside of regular advising.

Additional the proposal was drafted, submitted, and accepted to move all of the graduate degree programs to a 100% online delivery format. The School of education also has added classes to the schedule at night and online to make access easier for undergraduate candidates (students) that have families and/or jobs.

Specific recruitment activities are listed below.

<u>Date</u>	<u>General Studies Students</u>	<u>No. Of Personal Emails</u>
7/6/12		60
7/12/12		12
7/16/12		12
7/27/12		28
8/2/12		36
8/9/12		10

8/10/12		12
<u>Date</u>	<u>Associated of Arts Majors</u>	<u>No. of Personal Emails</u>
6/11/12		27
6/12/12		38
<u>Date</u>	<u>Biology Majors</u>	<u>No. of Personal Emails</u>
6/13/12		60
<u>Date</u>	<u>Chemistry Majors</u>	<u>No. of Personal Emails</u>
7/5/12		27
<u>Date</u>	<u>Math & Science Majors</u>	<u>No.</u>
10/18/12		5 attending meeting 8 personal contact (freshmen-seniors)
<u>Date</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Number</u>
8/14/12	Faculty & Staff Personal Welcome Back Flyers	25
10/17/12	UAM Majors' Fair, Gibson Center, 11:00-12 Noon 20 Interested Participants' Signatures	20 emails
11/3/12	A.D.E. "Becoming an Arkansas Teacher", Nov. 3, 2102 • One student from event is a M.A.T. student presently	13 emails
11/20/12	Mary Whiting's College Fair, Interested Ed. Students	38 emails 8 letters
11/3/12	A.D.E. "Becoming A Teacher" Career Fair, Holiday Inn Airport	
11/18/12	UAM University Scholarship Award Winners	15 letters
12/17/12	UAM University Scholarship Award Winners	11 letters
12/18/12	Mary Whiting's College Fairs, Interested Ed. Students	44 emails 19 letters
12/18/12	UAM University Scholarship Award Winners	18 letters
12/18/ 12	Weevil Welcome Day, 5 Education Interested Students, Day #1	10 emails 2 letters
	Weevil Welcome Day, 30 interested Future Students, Day #2	28 emails 2 letters
12/18/12	UAM University Scholarship Award Winners	18 letters
12/19/12	Mary Whiting's College Fair, Interested Ed. Students	57 emails

		3 letters
12/20/12	Mary Whiting's College Fair, Interested Ed. Students	17 emails
12/21/12	Mary Whiting's College Fair, Interested Ed. Students	59 emails
		32 letters
2/1/13	UAM University Scholarship Award Winners	29 letters
2/22/13	UAM University Scholarship Award Winners	4 letters
3/6/13	Personally Contacted Students on Lack of Progress	6 emails
3/8/2013	UAM University Scholarship Award Winners	13 letters
3/27/13	UAM Career Fair, Gibson Center, 10:00-1:00 p.m., SOE Booth	
3/28/13	Praxis Test Review Workshop, 12:30-1:30p.m. Trainers: Dr. King and Barbie Johnson	
4/15/2013	SOE Pinning Ceremony (mainly for retention)	18 participants 102 attended
	KDPi International Education Society served	11 attended
4/19/13	20 th Annual, Mary E. Benjamin Educational Access Conference, UAPB, with 12 Interns	
4/20/13	A.D.E. 2013 Educators Career Fair, LR Metroplex/Team Summit Center, 9:00 a.m. -12 Noon	11 interested
	• Two students from the event are now enrolled in the SOE	
4/22/13	UAM Scholars' Day Advisement, Harris Hall, 1:3 p.m.+ Entire Faculty scheduled	
4/24/13	SOE FREE Hot Dog & Hamburger Picnic with UAM Jazz Band, Willard front lawn, 11:30 -12:30 p.m. Simmons Bank Cooking *Recruitment & Retention Efforts	
	Warren High School's "Career Club" attended	16 students
	Attendees	63 students
	KDPi International Education Honor Society	14 members
	SOE Faculty, UAM staff attended	

TOTALS:

EMAILS: 614

LETTERS: 174

FLYERS/TABLE TOPPERS: 25

The School of Education has a Recruitment/Retention Committee that has developed an ongoing detailed plan for the recruitment and the retention of candidates (students). Below is the complete retention plan for the School of Education.

University of Arkansas at Monticello

School of Education

Retention Plan

UAM School of Education Mission/Vision Statement

The University of Arkansas at Monticello School of Education is committed to the development of highly qualified professional educators who are caring and competent practitioners and who are dedicated to meeting the needs of a changing and diverse society. The UAM School of Education faculty, teacher candidates, and prospective building level administrator candidates serve the communities through active participation in academic studies and field experiences that develop high level competencies in content knowledge, pedagogy, professionalism, and diversity. The UAM School of Education, in close partnership and collaboration with partnering schools and the arts and sciences, is dedicated to providing the highest level of teacher training and excellence in southeast Arkansas.

The UAM School of Education Retention Plan

The UAM School of Education (SOE) plan for retention is guided by the unit Conceptual Framework. The SOE is committed to bridging the gap in supply and demand of high quality teachers in Arkansas schools by aggressively recruiting a diverse population of prospective candidates, and offering challenging curricula and programs that will retain students in the SOE.

The UAM School of Education Retention Coordinator will be the facilitator for the implementation of the UAM School of Education's Retention Plan. The goals will be effectively achieved through the following actions.

Action Statement 1: The School of Education (SOE) Faculty will continue to promote retention of students by using research-based instructional strategies that require students to be active participants in learning and positions faculty to be facilitators of learning.
(CF: Knowledge, Pedagogy, Technology, Diversity, Professionalism; NCATE Standards 1, 5 & 6)

Action Statement 2- The SOE Kappa Delta Pi advisor and student members will create promotional materials and activities to promote a more diverse membership in the honorary educational society.
(CF: Diversity; Professionalism; NCATE Standard 4)

Action Statement 3- The SOE recruitment and retention coordinator will create a web-based resource site to provide materials and tutorials for UAM School of Education student success. Students not passing the Praxis I exam on the first attempt will be required to complete online tutorial programs and take an assessment to determine their learning and to provide documentation of program completion to the SOE Recruitment and Retention Coordinator.

(CF: Knowledge; Technology, Pedagogy; NCATE Standards 1, 2, and 4)

Action Statement 4- The SOE faculty will participate in additional professional development to better utilize instructional strategies that positively impact student learning and meet the needs of the diverse student population.

(CF: Diversity; NCATE Standard 4)

Action Statement 5- The SOE dean and faculty will continue to promote additional opportunities to immerse teacher candidates in diverse public school settings to interact with faculty, peers, and public school students and teachers from diverse backgrounds, cultures, races and genders, and to better perfect their skills.

(CF: Diversity; NCATE Standards 3,4, and 5)

Action Statement 6- The unit assessment system data will be reviewed at the end of each semester by the SOE Curriculum/Assessment Committee to determine areas of concern in teacher candidate performance and to develop strategies for program improvement as needed.

(CF: Knowledge, Pedagogy, Diversity, and Professionalism, NCATE Standards # 1, #2, #4, #5)

Action Statement 7- Faculty will better utilize degree audits as a tool to track appropriate student progress toward graduation and encouraging participation in pre-registration

(CF: Professionalism, Diversity; NCATE Standards # 1, #2, #4, #5) (Action Statements 7, and 13)

Action Statement 8- The School of Education will continue the SOE Pinning Ceremony and create an “Intern of the Year” award.

(CF: Professionalism, Knowledge, Pedagogy; NCATE Standard 5)

Action Statement 9- The School of Education will better meet the needs of students by increasing student accessibility to coursework through additional online instruction.

Action Statement 10- The School of Education will seek financial assistance for students through additional grants to pay Praxis I, Praxis II and PLT test fees for candidates with financial needs. (CF: Diversity; NCATE Standard 4)

Action Plan

Action Statement 1: The School of Education (SOE) Faculty will continue to promote retention of students by using research based instructional strategies that require students to be active participants in learning and positions faculty to be facilitators of learning. (CF: Knowledge, Pedagogy, Technology, Diversity, Professionalism; NCATE Standards 1, 5 & 6)						
Strategy	Actions	Who	Resources	Outcomes	Assessments	Time
Adjust instruction to meet diversity of learning styles	Review of information on learning styles, thinking styles, & personality differences, & Marzano's High Instructional Yield Strategies	School of Education faculty	Internet resources, supplemental resources, modeling by instructors, professional development workshops	Communication enhanced, instruction improvement, student/teacher understanding	Student evaluations; signature assessments	Bi-annually

Action Statement 2- The SOE Kappa Delta Pi advisor and student members will create promotional materials and activities to promote a more diverse membership in the honorary educational society. (CF: Diversity; Professionalism; NCATE Standard 4)						
Strategy	Actions	Who is responsible	Resources	Outcomes	Assessments	Time
Increase diversity of KDPI members	Open membership letters to all teacher candidates with a 3.00 average	Kappa Delta Pi counselor	Letters, one-on-one communication	Increase diversity membership by 25%	Number of diverse membership is increased by 25%	Each semester
	Recruitment activities planned by Kappa Delta Pi members	Kappa Delta Pi counselor & membership	Community members, Kappa Delta Pi members, SOE faculty, flyers, news stories	Increase diversity membership by 25%	Number of diverse membership is increased by 25%	Each semester

Action Statement 3- The SOE recruitment and retention coordinator will create a web-based resource site to provide materials and tutorials for UAM School of Education student success. Students not passing the Praxis I exam on the first attempt will be required to complete online tutorial programs and take an assessment to determine their learning and to provide documentation of program completion to the SOE Recruitment and Retention Coordinator. (CF: Knowledge; Technology, Pedagogy; NCATE Standards 1, 2, and 4)

Strategy	Actions	Who is responsible	Resources	Outcomes	Assessments	Time
Find new supplement materials to refine & enhance skills needed to be successful on Praxis I exams.		Teacher Center Coordinator/Retention Coordinator	Internet	More teacher candidates entering SOE teacher education	Data on number of attempts on Praxis exams	Bi-annually

Action Statement 4- The SOE faculty will participate in additional professional development to better utilize instructional strategies that positively impact student learning and meet the needs of the diverse student population. (CF: Diversity; NCATE Standard 4)

Strategy	Actions	Who is responsible	Resources	Outcomes	Assessments	Time
Adopt research-based instructional strategies to increase retention	Review learning styles, thinking Styles, & personality styles information	Dean, Coordinator of Teacher Education	Internet resources, supplement texts Internet resources, <u>Classrooms That Work</u>	Retention & communication increased with candidates	Student evaluations Increased rate of admission to teacher education	Ongoing

Action Statement 5- The SOE dean and faculty will continue to promote additional opportunities to immerse teacher candidates in diverse public school settings to interact with faculty, peers, and public school students and teachers from diverse backgrounds, cultures, races and genders, and to better perfect their skills.

(CF: Diversity; NCATE Standards 3, 4, and 5)

Strategy	Actions	Strategy	Resources	Outcomes	Assessments	Time
Increase ability of candidates to perfect instructional strategies and impact student learning	Expand School of Education Immersion Program to additional districts	Collaborate with school principals, teachers, and superintendents	School of Education; Public Schools	Exposure to variety of teaching styles, diverse students. learning styles, diverse faculty teaching skills	TCRI ratings; student learning assessments	Ongoing

Action Statement 6- The unit assessment system data will be reviewed at the end of each semester by the SOE Curriculum/Assessment Committee to determine areas of concern in teacher candidate performance and to develop strategies for program improvement as needed.

(CF: Knowledge, Pedagogy, Diversity, and Professionalism, NCATE Standards # 1, #2, #4, #5)

Strategy	Actions	Who is responsible?	Resources	Outcomes	Assessments	Time
SOE Curriculum and Assessment Committee to bi-annually review program data & develop strategies w/ program committees for improvement	Program committees meet bi-annually to review data to determine if changes need to be made. Changes are formed if needed and reported to the curriculum & assessment committee	NCATE coordinator, curriculum & assessment coordinator and committee, program coordinators & faculty	SOE faculty, data system, program committees	teacher & administrative candidate performances move to Target	Signature assessments, dispositions, Praxis exams	On-going

Action Statement 7- Faculty will better utilize degree audits as a tool to track appropriate student progress toward graduation and encouraging participation in pre-registration (CF: Professionalism, Diversity; NCATE Standards # 1, #2, #4, #5) (Action Statements 7, and 13)						
Strategy	Actions	Who is responsible?	Resources	Outcomes	Assessments	Time
SOE Faculty improves advising of candidates through analysis and degree audits	SOE faculty will be made aware of the importance of critical analysis of candidates' programs through degree audits to track student progress	Dean, Recruitment & Retention Committee, chairperson	UAM assessment system, degree audits, SOE faculty, candidates, UAM catalogs, SOE Program planning sheets	Increase in number of graduates in a timely fashion	Graduation rates	Ongoing,

Action Statement 8- The School of Education will continue the SOE Pinning Ceremony and create an "Intern of the Year" award.						
Strategy	Actions	Who is responsible	Resources	Outcomes	Assessments	Time
Retention of students/teacher candidates through enhancing professionalism.	Host a SOE pinning ceremony for teacher candidates newly admitted to the teacher education program and announce "Intern of the Year" award	Dean, Coordinator of Teacher Education	university administration; SOE faculty; Kappa Delta Pi members	retention in the SOE program	Improved retention of teacher candidates and admission to teacher education program	Annually

Action Statement 9- The School of Education will better meet the needs of students by increasing student accessibility to coursework through additional online instruction.						
Strategy	Actions	Who is responsible	Resources	Outcomes	Assessments	Time
Increase number of online course offerings and evening classes	Place additional sections of fall and spring schedules	Dean; Graduate Program Coordinator; Faculty	Blackboard	Improved student progression toward degree	Graduation Rate	ongoing

Action Statement 10- Seek financial assistance through additional grants to pay the Praxis I, Praxis II and PLT test fees for teacher education students with great financial needs. (CF: Diversity; NCATE Standard 4)						
Strategy	Actions	Who is responsible	Resources	Outcomes	Assessments	Time
Seek funds for student assistance for fees associated with Praxis I, II and PLT	Write grant for \$10,000	Teacher Center Coordinator/Retention Coordinator	Wal-Mart Foundation or other sources	Earlier first attempts on Praxis exams	Data on number of attempts on Praxis exams	annually