INSTITUTIONAL REPORT ADDENDUM

Northwest Missouri State University
March 7, 2014

Overview:

In the spring of 2012 two major events reshaped our assessment and data collection efforts: Missouri adopted the Missouri Standards for the Preparation of Educators (MoSPE) and Northwest Missouri State University began using the Tk20 comprehensive data management system. Several things happened because of these two events. Our curriculum and assessments were realigned from the 11 standards contained in the Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP) to the 9 new MoSPE standards and its associated quality indicators as outlined in the Growth Guide outlined in the new Missouri Educator Evaluation System (MEES) (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. overview 1 Teacher Growth Guide). Along with the standards realignment, common key assessment rubrics were reconfigured for use within the on-line Tk20 data management system.

At this time, individual programs were also asked to develop on-line rubrics for program specific key assessments that conformed to basic scoring criteria so that the data gathered within the system could be compared between the individual programs. Prior to this, individual programs had been collecting data on their own key assessments in a variety of ways making analysis of the data across the programs difficult. Introducing a standardized 0-4 level scoring scale to the rubrics for all key assessments, however, did complicate displaying three years of data.

The parameters and types of data collected from the spring of 2012 through the spring of 2013 differ from the data collected prior to these changes. For example, in the case of our common performance assessment, the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), the realignment of the rubric changed the scoring levels from a 3-point range (0 – 2) to a 5 point range (0 – 4). This was done to emulate the developmental columns associated with the MEES evaluations. The data tables in the program narratives have been updated to specifically reflect the semester reported to clearly indicate where the change in data collection occurred (see program narratives in our secure website: https://secure.ecollege.com/nwms/index.learn?action=welcome; username: ncate, password: nwncate). Both TWS rubrics are included as exhibits (see addendum exhibits Ad. Ex. overview 2 TWS Rubric Pre Fall 2012; Ad. Ex. overview 3 TWS Rubric Fall 2012; Ad. Ex. overview 4 TWS Rubric 2013).

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Off-Site Report Page 4: “There is no updated information on the submission of SPA reports”

Prior to our NCATE review in 2005 a few programs chose to submit program reviews to their associated SPA organizations. The results of these reviews (from 2000) are included in the AIMS system. In Missouri, programs are not required to submit reviews to SPA organizations and due to the extensive changes educator preparation has been undergoing over the last two years, none of our programs chose to undergo SPA review for this cycle. The prior reports in the AIMS system could not be removed but these should not indicate recent submissions to a SPA.

Off-Site Report Page 4: “Issues related to program narratives and key assessments”

As mentioned earlier, the program narratives have been updated to clearly indicate the semesters for which data are being reported and the number of candidates in the data set. The data tables contained in the narratives have been reformatted to reflect the changes in data collections prior to fall 2012 and beginning fall 2012. The “secondary education” column in the tables do include all the secondary programs. Please see program narratives in our secure website: https://secure.ecollege.com/nwms/index.learn?action=welcome; username: ncate, password: nwncate.

All dispositional assessment forms completed on our advanced degree seeking students are identical, and can be found in addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 1.1.1 Advanced Ed. Candidate Disposition Inventory. These dispositional forms collect data on our students in regards to their professionalism and other aspects of their disposition. These data are collected at different points in the students' academic careers to trace growth. Students are assessed by the assessor's level of agreement with statements about professional disposition using a Likert scale from Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Not observed (data removed), Agree=4 and Strongly Agree=5. An explanatory table is below.

Advanced Disposition Name	**Completed By:**	**Completed When:**	**Implemented How:**
First Disposition	One supervisor reference of the advanced candidate in place of a letter of reference	Upon application to an advanced/graduate education program	Sent by the student to their reference. Completed, sent to the graduate office and then sent to the TESS office to be uploaded on Tk20
Midpoint Disposition	The student's advisor or an instructor who has had the student in a course	Upon completion of 9-12 credit hours in an advanced education program	Sent through Tk20 to the advisor or instructor in the form of a survey
Final Student Disposition	The student	During the final semester of their advanced education program	Sent through Tk20 to the student in the form of a survey
Final Advisor Disposition	The student's advisor	During the final semester of their advanced education program	Sent through Tk20 to the advisor in the form of a survey

Off-Site Report Page 5: "Unclear what "specific scoring available through Tk20 means"

The institutional report indicated "specific scoring would be available for examination through the Tk20 system. By this we meant candidate work that shows faculty feedback and scoring would be available during the on-site visit. Team members will be able to examine such work through our secure system when you arrive on campus.

Off-Site Report Page 6: Return rate of DESE administered follow-up survey

The Beginning Teacher Assistance Program survey (BTAP) is administered by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) to first-year teachers and their administrators. The return rate, especially among the principals surveyed, is not good. The limited data we have been able to access is quite positive, however the small n-size makes analysis of the data difficult. As we continue to move forward with the changes to educator preparation in the state we hope to devise a plan to capture more of this information to determine program effectiveness.

Off-Site Report Page 6: Summative evaluation scoring

The data reported for the summative evaluation of student teaching reflects an average of all student teachers in a particular semester on a particular item. These averages are calculated from the scores submitted by the university supervisors. While the scores given by the cooperating teachers are incorporated in the course grade earned by the student teacher, the data reported for the summative evaluation reflects only the scores given by the university supervisors.

Off-Site Report Page 7: Disposition surveys

There are 21 items listed in the Educational Candidate Disposition Inventory (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 1.1.2 Educational Candidate Disposition Inventory). This instrument is used to evaluate dispositions during the student teaching experience. Note in the scoring scale, a "3" is interpreted as "not observed". We wanted to remove these responses and analyze the data from scored observations. In this semester the numbering of the categories will be changed to place the "not observed" option at the end thus allowing the data to reflect a 1-4 point range.

We began using this instrument during practica experiences also, however we found that due to the limited interaction cooperating teachers had with the candidates during these experiences, many of the responses were listed as "not observed". Therefore we polled faculty, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers to identify those items most important and most relevant to the early experiences. The Mini Educational Candidate Disposition Inventory (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 1.1.3 Mini Ed. Candidate Disposition Inventory) contains 7 of the items from the larger inventory. This mini inventory is completed by cooperating teachers during the practica experiences as well as by faculty during coursework and by candidates as a self-reflection exercise.

1.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate:

1. Is this correct that the MSEd Secondary allows for candidates to obtain certification?

   The MSEd degree, in and of itself, does not lead to initial certification. That said, we do admit post-baccalaureate students with non-education undergraduate degrees into the MSEd programs and allow them to work towards initial certification and complete a master's degree simultaneously. Additional coursework is needed to meet the professional education requirements and often additional courses in the content area are needed to meet specific requirements for certification. These additional requirements are listed in the Teacher Certification Contract filed for each post-baccalaureate student seeking initial certification (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 1.5.1 Teacher Certification Contract).

2. Key assessments listed in program narratives do not always match data.

   As discussed previously, the data gathered by programs for key assessment changed somewhat in the spring of 2012 with the realignment to the new MoSPE Standards and the implementation of the Tk20 data management system. The data tables in the program narratives have been updated to reflect the specific semesters for which data are recorded to clearly show the differences in the data when they occur. Please see the updated program narratives in our secure website. Click on the "NCATE Syllabi and Vitae link, then click on the "Program Narratives Addendum" button located at the left of the page: (https://secure.ecollege.com/nwms/index.learn?action=welcome).

3. Can the process for collecting disposition data be described?

All dispositional assessment forms completed on our advanced degree seeking students are identical and can be found in addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 1.1.1 Advanced Ed. Candidate Disposition Inventory. These collect data on our students in regards to their professionalism and other aspects of their professional disposition. These data are collected at different points in the students' academic careers to trace growth. Students are assessed by the assessor's level of agreement with statements about professional disposition using a Likert scale from Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Not observed (data removed), Agree=4 and Strongly Agree=5. An explanatory table is below.

Advanced Disposition Name	**Completed By:**	**Completed When:**	**Implemented How:**
First Disposition	One supervisor reference of the advanced candidate in place of a letter of reference	Upon application to an advanced/graduate education program	Sent by the student to their reference. Completed, sent to the graduate office and then sent to the TESS office to be uploaded on Tk20
Midpoint Disposition	The student's advisor or an instructor who has had the student in a course	Upon completion of 9-12 credit hours in an advanced education program	Sent through Tk20 to the advisor or instructor in the form of a survey
Final Student Disposition	The student	During the final semester of their advanced education program	Sent through Tk20 to the student in the form of a survey
Final Advisor Disposition	The student's advisor	During the final semester of their advanced education program	Sent through Tk20 to the advisor in the form of a survey

4. What is required for admission to advanced programs?

   Criteria for admission to Advanced Programs are outlined beginning on page 16 in the Graduate Catalog (http://www.nwmissouri.edu/academics/catalog/pdf/cat1315_grad.pdf). Specific admission requirements for individual programs are outlined in the program narratives.

5. What is the return rate on the candidate surveys?

   The return rates for the surveys are low. As indicated in the data table, at the time of submission for the institutional report, n=1 for the Educational Leadership survey and n=5 for the Guidance and Counseling survey. These data are from the fall 2012 semester.

6. What is the source of the competencies found in the secondary education alignment chart?

   The competencies listed in the left-hand column of the secondary education alignment chart come from the Standards contained in the Missouri Educator Evaluation System (MEES). The standards and associated quality indicators are outlined in the Growth Guide (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. overview 1 Teacher Growth Guide).

7. What happens to candidates who have difficulty in passing exams, completing coursework and field experiences?

   There are support services in place to aid candidates who are struggling with coursework and exams. The Talent Development Center (TDC) offers group and one-to-one tutoring for the general education courses offered on campus. They also offer tutoring services on request for other upper-level courses. The TDC offers workshops to assist students with test taking skills; they also offer tutoring for the sections of the Missouri General Education Assessment (MoGEA) required of all teacher candidates for admission to the Professional Education Program. The Supplemental Instruction (SI) program offers extracurricular peer tutoring groups for traditionally tough classes. Study sessions are led by students who have completed and earned high grades in the courses covered by the study group. SI's provide 3 regularly-scheduled study review sessions a week. SI sessions are available for many of the general education courses required of teacher candidates as well as for many of the upper-level courses offered.

   Candidates struggling in their field placements receive additional visits and mentoring by their university supervisors. A development plan is created in conjunction with the cooperating teacher to assist the candidate to experience growth during the experience.

8. What is the complete and accurate list of programs?

   The list of programs in the original exhibit grouped all the alternative certification programs together in one category. The list of programs supplied by DESE outlines each alternative certification program separately. The reconfigured complete list is in addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 1.5.2 List of Education Preparation Programs.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

Off-Site Report Page 14: Area for concern – unit does not regularly and systematically use data

The unit has made strides towards regularly and systematically using data from various sources to improve program and unit operations. At the courses level, adoption of the MoSPE standards in Fall 2012 led all programs reviewed their assignments to ensure that all of the new standards were adequately assessed. Some courses had to add assignments in order to make sure each standard was assessed properly across each program. The Elementary Education program took this review process very seriously, reviewing and modifying assignments collected from students. Substantial improvements were seen in scores taken from the student teaching summative evaluations from Fall 2012 to Spring 2013 in areas as diverse as content knowledge, classroom management and their ability to reflect (see addendum exhibit 2.4.1 Elementary Education Summative Results). These changes were shared with the Elementary Education program via the program narratives developed for this accreditation review. Further curriculum and assessment reviews will take place according to the ASET calendar.

2.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate:

1. How does the unit regularly evaluate measures to monitor candidate and program effectiveness? What data are shared and with whom? What are the systematic timelines for sharing? What data indicate the results of these changes and ongoing continuous improvement?

   At the program level, data are reviewed systematically according to the ASET Assessment Calendar (see addendum exhibit 2.5.1 ASET Assessment Calendar). Discussion of the data reviewed can be found in the minutes from previous ASET meetings (see addendum exhibits Ad. Ex. 2.5.2a through

Ad. Ex. 2.5.2i). All of these data are then disaggregated by program and shared by email with program coordinators. Agendas for the ASET meetings outline the data to be reviewed (see addendum exhibits Ad. Ex. 2.5.3.a through 2.5.3.i). The data reviewed at the Spring 2013 unit retreat can be found in the following exhibits:

- Ad. Ex. 2.5.5a PEU Data, Shared with Program
- Ad. Ex. 2.5.5.b Advanced Program Data, Shared with Programs
- Ad. Ex. 2.5.5.c Total Disposition Analysis, Two ASET Meetings
- Ad. Ex. 2.5.5.d Disposition Data, Shared with Programs
- Ad. Ex. 2.5.5.e BTAP Data

These data mainly focused on average transition point data for our education programs. These data were shared with each program, advanced and initial, by email to the program coordinators. Lists of ASET committee members are given in the addendum exhibits (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 2.5.4.a, Ad. Ex. 2.5.4.b, and Ad. Ex. 2.5.4.c).

When necessary, individual meetings were held with program coordinators to develop strategies on how to improve assessment data. For example, a meeting took place between the assessment director and the coordinator of the Spanish Education program when it was determined that their PRAXIS passage rate was below the required 80% level. After this meeting, it was decided that the program leaders would provide students with more study material, take the exam themselves to become more acquainted with it, and also include more language lab work in courses in order to familiarize students with audio exams. Due to the small size of the Spanish Education program, the unit has not had an opportunity to determine whether these changes have had an effect.

Data are also shared with the professional community. Both ASET and COTE include P-12 professionals. In addition, pertinent key assessment data are shared with the community at large. For instance, when the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) moved to replace the CBASE with another exam, the Missouri General Education Assessment (MoGEA), the PEU decided to assess student data. The PEU sought to review the effects of standardized exams on student diversity in the unit. From past research, it was established that standardized exams are typically biased against students who are racial or ethnic minorities. The unit examined whether there was a statistically significant difference in the percent of African American and White students from Northwest who were able to pass each subtest of the CBASE. When it was found that there were significant differences in separate subtests, members of the unit presented the results both to the state Missouri Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (MACTE) conference, and with Missouri legislators (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 2.5.6 CBASE and Race Data Presentation). We feel that this discussion helped many institutions to reconsider the cut scores they were planning to use for the MoGEA exam in order to minimize the detrimental effects to candidate diversity.

There is a structure in place to analyze programmatic changes. Besides data collected at each transition point, some of our richest data are collected using surveys with our student teachers. Two of the most useful are the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP) survey, and the Content Methods Course Evaluation (CMCE). These surveys are sent via TK20 for student teachers to complete at the end of their experience. The survey examines how well their program as a whole prepared them to student teach (BTAP), and specifically how well their methods course prepared them (CMCE) for their student teaching experiences. These results are aggregated using Tk20 and sent to the Field Experience Director. Then, they are disaggregated and sent to each program coordinator to review and determine if any changes need to be made to their program. These surveys have been in use on Tk20 since the Fall 2012 semester, and the latest results disaggregated by program are from the Fall 2013 semester (see addendum exhibits Ad. Ex. 2.5.7 BTAP, Tk20 Data and Ad. Ex. 2.5.8 CMCE, Tk20 Data).

2. How are data shared with candidates? How does candidate reflection and improvement of their performance in order to impact student learning occur at both the initial and advanced levels? How are candidate data regularly and systematically used for analysis and evaluation of programs and unit operations?

    Student experiences are evaluated systematically and regularly through the use of student teaching assessments, key assessment results with their course instructors and with their advisors during transition points. Initial and advanced candidates receive support and feedback to impact student learning at all transition points. When candidates apply to enter the teacher education program or student teaching, they must be permitted to do so by their advisor. Advisors can now use the advising section of Tk20 to quickly view their advisees' test scores, GPA and key assessment results. Using these, advisors can share the data with students and assist them in making adjustments that will ensure their success. In addition, initial candidates are assessed using Mini Ed. Candidates Disposition Inventory during their practicum experiences (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 1.1.3). The Mini-Disposition is completed by an on-site cooperating teacher. Students can view the results of these forms in the "observation" section of their Tk20 accounts and determine if they need to make any changes to their clinical behavior. Initial and advanced students can see results of their key assessments in the "courses" section of their Tk20 accounts. This includes exam results, GPA and rubric results, such as the Research Project Rubric.

    Clinical experiences are evaluated in a variety of ways in a systematic fashion. Clinical experience cooperating teachers and university supervisors are evaluated by student teachers using the Cooperating Teacher Evaluation and University Supervisor Evaluation on Tk20 (see addendum exhibits Ad. Ex. 2.5.9 University Supervisor Evaluation and Ad. Ex. 2.5.10 Cooperating Teacher Evalaution). These surveys are completed near the end of the student teaching experience. This is an opportunity for student teachers to provide feedback on their supervisors and teachers. The results on each teacher and supervisor are averaged and given to the Director of Field Experiences. After reviewing the results, the director can choose to stop partnering with a supervisor or teacher if they are overwhelmingly negative. These results are reviewed every semester since the Fall of 2012.

3. What evidence indicates that TK20 is effective and useful for candidates, unit faculty, and PK-12 partners?

    A variety of changes are taking place in student teaching and other clinical experiences based on policy changes from DESE. These include student teachers having one dominant placement spanning at least 12 weeks; additional placements after that may be made to focus on content of their minors. Supervisor and cooperating teachers are being asked to provide feedback to student teachers on a weekly basis.

    Whatever changes take place in clinical experiences, can be evaluated in a variety of ways using Tk20. We will gather more data from cooperating teachers, including their highest level of education and their years of experience, using a cooperating teacher survey sent to them via Tk20. This information is currently being gathered but a Tk20 survey will greatly increase the efficiency of data collection. Also, a survey is in development for Secondary Education students to complete during their second practicum clinical experience. This survey will provide feedback on how prepared they were to have this experience. Review of all of these assessments and their data will be added to the ASET calendar.

    In order to gain data on how easily the clinical supervisors and cooperating teachers can use Tk20, surveys on this topic are sent to both groups. The results to these surveys are reviewed by the

Assessment Director at the end of each semester of student teaching to determine if any changes need to be made to the way the program is implemented (see addendum exhibits Ad. Ex. 2.5.11 Tk20 Survey Results from Cooperating Teachers and Ad. Ex. 2.5.12 Tk20 Survey Results from University Supervisors). These results indicate the perceived effectiveness of Tk20 among these users has increased in all categories only from Spring 2013 to Fall 2013.

Changes made specifically based on student feedback are evaluated systematically and regularly. Student teachers complete an evaluation of the Tk20 system each semester (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 2.5.13. Tk20 Survey Results from Student Teachers). The results from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013 show that student teachers' views of the efficiency and effectiveness of Tk20 has improved substantially each semester. The students are assessed using a variety of key assessments throughout their academic careers and finally by their university supervisors using the summative assessment during student teaching. Using Tk20, students can see all of these results, from cooperating teacher and university supervisor observations to standardized exam results to course-based assignments. Faculty use was also evaluated through a survey (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 2.5.14 Tk20 Survey Results from Faculty Members).

4. What is the policy for dealing with formal complaints? How are candidate complaints and resolutions documented?

   The process for handling formal complaints is outlined under Complaint Resolution on the Northwest Missouri State University website (http://www.nwmissouri.edu/facts/complaintresolution.htm). The on-line comment card (http://www.nwmissouri.edu/aboutus/comment.htm) is used for both complaints and for quality improvement. Any Northwest students may explain their complaints, praises, or suggestions. These comments go straight to the President's office where they are reviewed and sent to appropriate supervisors. Comments addressing academic issues are sent to the Provost's office and addressed accordingly. Complaints regarding faculty members are sent to the appropriate college deans and then to department chairpersons who discuss the issues with their faculty members. If a student making the complaint is not satisfied, then he/she may appeal to the department chairperson and then to the dean, and finally to the provost. Actual documentation of complaints and resolutions are filed in the Provost's Office and may be examined upon arrival on campus.

5. How does the unit ensure accuracy, fairness, elimination of bias, and inter-rater reliability in key assessment for initial and advanced programs?

   Unit-wide data are assessed as mentioned previously, during ASET meetings and during other meetings, such as retreats. In order to ensure that all assessments are accurate, fair, unbiased and reliable, the unit has to evaluate data collection and student assessment procedures at each student transition point for both initial and advanced programs. For initial programs, some common key assessments are standardized. For instance, our general education assessment (formerly the CBASE and now the MoGEA) is a standardized exam, as is our certification exam (currently the PRAXIS II, in the Fall of 2014 a content exam created by Pearson). We assume that these exams have been tested for validity, reliability and created to minimize bias. In addition, both the summative evaluation and the Teacher Work Sample have rubrics aligned directly with DESE standards. Trainings have been created and provided for university supervisors, who score both the summative evaluation and the TWS. These same trainings are available to faculty members who act as second-scorers for the TWS. The use of multiple scorers increases score accuracy and reliability. In addition, when the TWS is replaced by the state-mandated Missouri Pre-Service Teacher Assessment (MoPTA) in the Fall 2014 semester, 75% of the assessment will be scored by off-campus scorers. This will also increase reliability and reduce bias. Finally, all other key assessment rubrics are developed using the DESE MoSPE standards, with a familiar 0-4 scoring range to increase reliability.

Specifically focusing on the Teacher Work Sample (TWS), it has been in use as the culminating performance assessment since 2002. When DESE created their new MoSPE standards, it was modified from its previous form (see addendum exhibits Ad. Ex. overview 2 TWS Rubric Pre-Fall 2012) into a new version based on the MoSPE standards for the Fall 2012 semester (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. overview 3 TWS Rubric Fall 2012). Finally, after discussion during a unit retreat on reliability issues regarding the new rubric, it was revised again in order to assist scoring for the Spring 2013 semester (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. overview 1.1.4TWS Rubric 2013).

For advanced programs, the four disposition assessments are all based on the validity and reliability-tested Niagara Disposition assessment (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 1.1.1 Advanced Ed. Candidate Disposition Inventory). The Midpoint Survey, Research Project rubric and all final portfolio rubrics are based directly on MoSPE standards in an effort to increase validity (see addendum exhibits 2.5.15 Research Project Rubric and Ad. Ex. 2.5.16 Midpoint Surveys). In addition, these portfolios are generally scored by two scorers in an effort to reduce bias and increase accuracy. Finally, many advanced programs use comprehensive exams as a final assessment, which generally act as unbiased evaluations of student achievement. This unit-level data has been shared with the professional members of the COTE and ASET committees.

<u>Standard 3</u>: Field Experiences and clinical Practice

Off-Site Report Page 16: Tracking diverse experiences of candidates

A discussion of the types of diversity experiences available to our candidates as well as a method for tracking each candidates experiences is outlined in this Addendum under Standard 4. Please see that section for an overview of this topic.

Off-Site Report Page 16: Qualification for supervisors in Advanced Programs

The qualifications and responsibilities for site supervisors working with advanced candidates is outlined in the Graduate Internship Handbook, page 9 (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 3.1.1 Graduate Internship Handbook).

<u>3.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate</u>:

1. Who are the current members of the Assessment System and unit Evaluation Team (ASET)?

   The current members of Assessment System and unit Evaluation Team (ASET) are: Barr,Rod; Benson,Christine; Crossland,Barbara; Detrixhe, Karen; Dimmitt, Travis; Galbreath, Leslie; Haddock,Gregory; Haughey, Joseph; Heidendal,Egon; Hullinger,Kim; Ingraham,Nissa F; Peters, Joshua; Kreizinger,Joe; Lanier,Brian; Malm,Cheryl; McBride,Michael A; Penniston,Mary Ann; Piveral,Joyce; Rich, Greg; Scarbrough,Shelby B; Steffens,Shirley; Steiner,Michael; Symonds,Matthew; Thompson,Patricia; Veasey,Michele R; Wilson,Amy

2. What are the expectations and selection process for cooperating teachers during the practicum? How is it determined that a teacher is “high quality”?

   The expectations and selection process for cooperating teachers can be located on page 6 of the Student Teaching Handbook (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 3.5.1 Student Teaching Handbook). The expectations are as follows:

The district shall appoint a cooperating teacher for each teacher candidate placed in student teaching. Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and Northwest Missouri State University regulations require that cooperating teachers meet the following criteria:

- The cooperating teacher shall be a full-time member of the district's faculty.
- The cooperating teacher must have taught for a minimum of three years and have been employed by the district for at least one year.
- The cooperating teacher must be fully certified by the State in which they teach and teach in an area in which they hold current certification.
- The cooperating teacher shall have achieved evaluation ratings of proficient (or its equivalency) or higher through the district's evaluation system. The cooperating teacher shall be an exemplary professional educator.
- The cooperating teacher must approve of having a teacher candidate assigned to them.

3. What specific assessments and criteria are used to demonstrate mastery of content knowledge in the field experience and internships for initial and advanced candidates?

The specific assessments and criteria used to demonstrate mastery of content knowledge in the field experience and internships for initial and advanced candidates include:

Undergraduate

- GPA in content area
- TWS (soon to be MoPTA)
- Praxis scores
- Criteria on Student Teaching Evaluation
- Secondary content teachers also do a formal observation assessment

Graduate

- GPA in content area
- Evaluation of videos of teaching
- Pre/Post tutoring Reports (Reading Program)
- Portfolios/Comprehensive Exams

4. What changes or recommendations have been made about clinical practice based on the findings of the Assessment System and Unit Evaluation Team (ASET)?

Data from various surveys completed by student teachers are evaluated each trimester. Data from the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program and the Content Methods Course Evaluation surveys are shared with program coordinators and methods instructors so they can determine how students can be better prepared for field experiences. Data are also collected from the evaluations that student teachers complete on their cooperating teachers and university supervisors. From these data, the Director of Field Services determines if additional professional development is necessary for cooperating teachers and/or university supervisors or determines if they will not be recommended to continue supervision of student teachers. As a result of the Tk20 survey completed by student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors, changes have been made to the Tk20 site to make its utilization more user friendly.

5. What is the training and support for cooperating teachers that serve in a co-teaching capacity

Training sessions for cooperating teachers who serve in a co-teaching capacity are held each trimester. Please refer to Addendum exhibit 3.5.2 Power Point: NW Co-Teaching Training Workshop and Addendum exhibit 3.5.3 Co-Teaching Handbook.

6. How do advanced program faculty ensure that candidates have diverse field experiences?

   Please see discussion of process to track diverse field experiences in Standard 4.

<u>Standard 4</u>: Diversity

<u>4.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate</u>:

1. What good faith efforts have been made to recruit diverse faculty?
2. What opportunities do all initial and advanced candidates have to interact with the five diverse unit faculty members?

   All faculty recruitment is funneled through our Human Resources Office. They provide full services to help us to meet the diversity expectations of our faculty who work with our future teachers. First, we advertise faculty positions on the Chronicle of Higher Education website, as it is an international platform that can reach beyond our local, state, and regional area to recruit faculty. Second, we maintain an equal opportunity employment statement in all of our faculty postings, identifying that we do not discriminate based on race, age, ethnicity, etc. (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 4.5.1 Equal Opportunity Employer). Additionally, the Human Resources Office will allow our departments to place position postings in other venues, based on our department recommendations. We have posted positions in the past at other universities who have the degree we are seeking for our potential faculty candidates, again with our EOE statement included.

   Through these types of efforts we have five racial/ethnically diverse faculty. Most of our elementary students have regular contact with our elementary coordinator who is of Native American heritage, due to her coordinating the program and teaching the core reading courses. Additionally, one of our faculty, from South Korea, works with our early childhood minors. These students have regular contact with two of our culturally diverse faculty, as both of the faculty are from various ethnic backgrounds, one being from South Korea and the other hailing from India. Many of our secondary, middle school, and elementary students opt to take a foreign language to meet their institutional requirement of diversity. If they choose to take Spanish, many of them either have as their professor, or interact with outside of the classroom, our Argentinian Spanish education professor. Additionally, on campus we have many faculty who come to us from various geographical locations, some being from other countries and of various races. All of our education students are required to take a 42 credit hour package of general education course. Within these courses our education students have opportunities to work with diverse faculty, such as Oral Communication, taught by a faculty from Nigeria who is African. Additionally, within the content areas of the secondary initial certification programs, many departments have diverse racial faculty.

4. What good faith efforts have been made to recruit diverse initial and advanced candidates?

   Through our undergraduate admissions office, we have developed and implemented a multitude of diverse student recruitment (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 4.5.2 Multicultural Recruitment and Retention). Some of the efforts include: having a university multicultural recruiter employed to go to identified schools; making cultural enrichment scholarships available; hosting bus tours of campus targeting multicultural groups of prospective students; hosting Green & White visit day; hosting

Major Area Visit Day. Due to these newer recruitment efforts, we have seen an increase in the diversity of our student population.

Within the advanced programs, program recruitment is conducted by the Outreach office and by program coordinators. As this is orchestrated predominantly by the program coordinators, there is a wide variety of recruitment efforts initiated. Some of the Outreach efforts include sending a MSEd program recruiter to diverse school districts to recruit potential advanced program students. Some of the program specific recruitment efforts include: advisory councils including members of diverse schools, online blog sites/Facebook pages that reach internationally, program highlights put on international organization websites.

3. Which candidates attend the Distinguished Lecture Series and Ploghoft Lecture series? Is attendance/participation optional or required for all candidates? If required, what measures are taken to ensure participation?
6. Is it required for all initial and advanced candidates to "log and reflect on 30 hours of working with diverse populations" as stated in the 2012 PEDS report? What are the criteria for diverse populations?
7. Is it required for all initial and advanced candidates to complete a form with demographic information on each setting for clinical practice as noted in the 2010 PEDS report? What is the form collection process? How are demographics and other diversity data accessed for reporting and utilized?
9. Describe the sponsored trips to institutions with greater diversity-PEDS 2012.

All initial candidates must complete 30 hours of diversity experiences. These 30 hours can be done involving each of our diversity definition qualifiers (directly associated with the NCATE definition) (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 4.5.3 Diversity Hour Credit Event Form). Of the 30 hours, 15 are done while students are taking the Introduction to Special Education course. This is tracked by our faculty who teach those courses. Prior to being allowed to take part in the 15 hours of diversity which are correlated with that course, each student (initial candidates in secondary, middle school, and elementary) must attend a diversity training, which allows students to better understand how to interact with people from diverse backgrounds and within organizations which they will conduct their diversity hours.

Although 15 hours of the total 30 are correlated with a course, the other 15 hours are facilitated by the students. The Diversity Committee reviews potential diversity experiences offered on campus or in the community through a diversity proposal form, determines if it meets the definition of diversity and the diversity proficiencies set forth by COTE (see addendum exhibit Ad. Ex. 4.5.4 Diversity Event Proposal Form). The committee also determines how many hours would be allotted per activity. This is then sent to the TESS office where it is posted on the TESS office diversity web page for students to review. If students opt to do other diversity opportunities, their diversity form is sent to the Diversity Committee for review and approval. All opportunities are reported via the currently paper form that can be accessed and download by students via the TESS office web page, but will soon be submitted electronically through the Tk20 system, only submitting in hard copy the signature portion to the TESS office for monitoring purposes.

All of these policies are the same for our advanced degree candidates, however, the hour requirement is only 6 hours. If the students take the Issues in Education course, these hours are facilitated in much the same way as in the Introduction to Special Education course.

Some of our approved diversity opportunities include: Operation Breakthrough (a trip taking education candidates to the urban core of Kansas City to work within a pre-K-8th grade school/afterschool care facility), Ploghoft Lecture series (we bring speakers to campus to present on diversity/multicultural issues in education), Intercultural Competence seminar (provided by a few of our faculty annually where students explore their own ideas of culture and who they are in relation to others), Distinguished Lecture series (this is different from the Ploghoft Lecture series, because it offers more frequent presentations, but they are not always about diversity and therefore only certain presentations are selected to meet the diversity hour requirement), and many other on-campus activities that are and have been hosted over time.

5. How does the International Student NWMSU Experience ensure/provide opportunities for initial and advanced candidates to interact with diverse students and English language learners?
8. How do the three week residential internships at Liberty School District, St. Joseph School District work-PEDS 2012?
10. How is this different/similar to the 2008-2011 residential internships in Kansas City Schools and St Joseph Schools?
11. How many study abroad teaching opportunities are there for initial and advanced candidates? How does the placement meet state licensure/certification requirements?

We are an institution which exists primarily in a rural, Caucasian community, but through the course of the last decade, our university and more specifically our Professional Education Unit, have embraced the idea of diversifying our students'experiences so that they are ready to teach their future students, whether they are in the rural area surrounding the university community or in a community in another state which has high ELL populations, various races and ethnicities, and of various other backgrounds.

Some historically offered field experience diversity opportunities we have provided to our students include: the urban experience where we took students to the urban Kansas City School District to do practicum work with various teachers who worked with highly diverse (race, ethnicity, ELL) students; the secondary education week-out experience in various suburban and urban districts, including St. Joseph, North Kansas City, Park Hill, and Kansas City.

<u>AFI #5:</u> There is little information concerning candidate instruction and opportunities to work with English Language Learners.

During the sponsored residential internships elementary education candidates have the opportunity to work in highly diverse buildings within the North Kansas City school district (race, ethnicity, ELL), Liberty, St. Joseph, and Kansas City School.

Additionally, we offer, through our partnership with University of Northern Iowa, student teaching abroad experiences for our undergraduates and graduate students. Through this arrangement, UNI facilitates the overseas school arrangements, as they have been working in this arena since the 1970s they have a good network to establish placements of our students in American Schools abroad. This experience is offered for half of the student's student teaching, the other half of the student teaching is done here. This is also offered to our Advanced Program practicum students, through the same arrangement.

Through the opportunities that the Tk20 system have granted us, we are now working towards establishing a four tiered field experience understanding, wherein all initial certification students would have to do at least one portion of their field experience within a highly diverse (race, ethnicity, ELL) school district (see addendum exhibits Ad. Ex. 4.5.5 Diversity Field Experience and Hours Initial Prgrms and Ad. Ex. 4.5.6 Diversity Field Experience and Hours Advanced Prgms). We are establishing three levels of diversity, utilizing our state gathered demographic data and ELL data, thereby creating three levels of diversity criteria which will be tracked within the Tk20 system. The professors teaching the initial tier field experience courses will explain this field experience requirement. The field experience placement office will review the candidate's previous field experience placements (as it will be tracked within the Tk20 system), and if the candidate has not had at least a level 2 diversity experience, will only allow the candidate to student teach within a level 2 diversity district. We will also be tracking all student field experiences to see how many of our students do field experience in level 3 (highly diverse) districts.

While this tracking/monitoring system will be utilized within our initial candidates' experience, our advanced candidates will utilize the same system (Tk20, three levels of diversity). The advanced programs will track/monitor the embedded field experiences within the courses, and if the student has not done an embedded field experience in a level 2 of higher school, the advanced candidate will need to do their practicum within a level 2 or higher school. While the final tracking/monitoring person will be the field experience coordinator for the initial candidates, for the advanced candidates, the final tracking/monitoring person will be the practicum professor.

<u>Standard 5</u>: Faculty qualifications, Performance, and Development

Off-Site Report Page 24: "Representative documentation of faculty scholarship and service activities should be provided."

Links to a few examples of actual products are in Ad. Ex. 5.1.1 Scholarly Products and Presentations. Several are linked to the NW library which requires log-in. Log-in passwords will be provided to the team upon arrival on campus.

Off-Site Report Page 24: "The team will want to examine samples of the faculty evaluations."

Individual faculty evaluations will be available in the office of the Dean of the College of Education and Human Services.

Off-Site Report Page 24: "The team will want to examine samples of the faculty evaluations."

Lists of activities highlighting involvement and collaboration of faculty with P-12 school personnel can be found in Ad. Ex. 5.1.2 Direct and Periodic Involvement.

Off-Site Report Page 25: "The IR does not report if there were actions based on the survey results."

The results of the survey identified the following: a need to improve ITV/distance learning delivery and course management systems and learn about Quality Matters, a review process of online instructional components and online courses. Based primarily on the survey results the following Best Practice Seminars were presented during 2010-11:

- Peg Tyre, author – *The Trouble with Boys*
- Online Teaching – Darla Runyon, CITE Office
- Smart Board Teaser (Marilyn Wehrli – NWRPDC)
- Parallel Lesson Planning – Nancy Foley

<u>5.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate</u>:

1. Is there a rubric or set of criteria to be used with the new faculty evaluation forms that describe the various levels of performance to assume quality and equity?

The new faculty evaluation form is a performance evaluation that, depending on the individual faculty member's preference or need, allows for faculty and department chairs to emphasize specific areas (Teaching; Creative/Research/Scholarship/Accomplishment; Service and Student Support)

2. The team will expect to review completed faculty evaluation forms.

   Individual faculty evaluations will be available in the office of the Dean of the College of Education and Human Services.

3. How does the new faculty evaluation system support the goals of the conceptual framework, "Learning to Teach – Teaching to Learn?"

   The faculty performance evaluation incorporates information from the faculty member's self-evaluation, which includes outcomes of professional development activities/peer observation; the Chair's written evaluation; and a summary of student course evaluations, all of which are attached to this document.

4. In what ways have new faculty evaluations been used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service?

   Within specified ranges faculty can focus on a specific area of preference or need based on the developmental level of the faculty member.

   Additionally, the Teaching & Learning Center, which opened in Fall 2013, was established to provide programs and services across the university to enhance professional development for faculty and promote student success and retention. The Department of Professional Education chair and faculty representatives were involved in planning.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

1. The team will expect information on advisement loads (i.e.,What are load numbers for faculty and staff advisors? How advisees are assigned?) as well as candidate perceptions of advisement.

   Advisors are assigned advisees within the departments by the Department Chair. Selection of advisors are determined by expertise and advisee load.

   - Ad. Ex. 6.5.1 Advisees and Advisor Load by College
   - Ad. Ex. 6.5.2 Analysis of Advisor Loads – Spring 2014.

   Students who declare they are undecided about their major and transfer students are assigned to professional advisement staff in the Advisement Office. Each department submits a list of advisors to the Advisement Office who are willing to advise these special groups of students. The advisors chosen by the department have special expertise (often long tenure at Northwest) and are focused on "student success."

   Informal information from four department chairs (Natural Sciences, Humanities and Social Science, Health and Human Services and Professional Education) via email about how they assign advisees is described below. These departments were chosen because they either have a large number of education advisees or they have a unique advising situation. A summary of the responses found that all four consider expertise and a balance of the number of advisees to share the load as fairly as possible. The Natural Sciences has a professional advisor who has approximately 400 advisees. The Professional Education Department has a half-time load for an advisor who advises students early in their education program prior to entry into the Professional Education Program and she advises approximately 120 students. From the above information and other discussions, the process for assigning advisees to faculty is comparable across the university.

Advisee Perceptions of Advisors

Advisee perceptions about advisors are gathered annually across the University in a consistent manner. An online survey is sent to all students after advising is finished each fall trimester. Data are shared by analyzing overall as well as by department, discipline and by advisor candidate feedback. The survey tool, Northwest overall data and data from Elementary Education advisees are contained in the addendum exhibits:

- Ad. Ex. 6.5.3 Analysis 2012 Northwest Academic Advisor Survey
- Ad. Ex. 6.5.4 Analysis 2013 Northwest Academic Advisor Survey;
- Ad. Ex. 6.5.5 Analysis 2012 Academic Advisor Survey by Major – Elementary Education
- Ad. Ex. 6.5.6 FA2013 Northwest Academic Advisor Survey Tool.

The data are shared across all colleges and administrative offices for improving advisement through training and knowledge sharing. Data reports are used by the Dean of Enrollment Management, by the University Dean's Council, by the University Chairs Council, and by Department Chairs who discuss this as a part of the faculty member's contract. These data are also included as one data point in the Annual Evaluation of a faculty member and are included as a part of advisement under service and student support.

2. Clarification on the roles and responsibilities of the Dean of the College of Education and Human Services and the Director of Teacher Education will be sought. How do they work together to lead the unit? What are the roles and responsibilities of each?

   Attached Job descriptions to include roles and responsibilities for the Dean/Director of Teacher Education and the Assistant Director of the Professional Education Unit.

   - Ad. Ex. 6.5.7 Dean College of Education Human Services
   - Ad. Ex. 6.5.8 Position – Job Description – Assistant Director of Teacher Education.

3. A specific budget breakdown is needed in order to ensure that the College of Education and Human Services receives adequate resources. Data for all three colleges should include the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty, total number of majors, student credit hours generated, and number of part-time faculty. Additionally, the team will want similar information by department for each of the departments housed in the unit, as well as information related to how budgets are allocated to the departments.

   Data for all three colleges including the number of tenured, tenured-track and part-time faculty are included in the addendum exhibits:

   - Ad. Ex. 6.5.9 Tenure and Tenure Track Faculty 2013-14.

   The salaries and benefits by tenure status for all three colleges are included in the spreadsheet contained in addendum exhibits:

   - Ad. Ex. 6.5.10 Salary and Benefits by Tenure Status.

   Data for all three colleges including the total number of majors and student credit hours generated are included in the addendum exhibits:

- Ad. Ex. 6.5.11 Number of Majors and Student credit Hours 2013.

Each department has a budget for operations. These budgets have been examined in the past three year budget cycles to gain efficiencies and to assist in fiscal responsibility. The department chair along with faculty input identified what was essential, important and elective as far as expenditures. The chair was then able to provide the amount of the operating budget that would go back to general operations. The budgets are adjusted yearly based upon department budget planning. For example, two years ago the Health and Human Services (HHS) Department budget exceeded by a large amount the other department budgets in the College of Education and Human Services. Their budget was adjusted to be more in line with other budgets in all three colleges. After operations were reviewed over a year, the chair advocated for raising the HHS budget to align more with spending needs. As a result, funds were added back to the HHS budget for 2013-2014.

Since secondary education resides in the content departments in the College of Arts and Sciences and Booth College of Business and Professional Studies, the Dean of the College of Education and Human Services provides funds for the Professional Education Unit operations. Additional education expenses are funded by the assessment account levied through student fees.

The office of Field Experiences is funded as a budget line item. The costs of supervising students in field placements, travel and other related expenses are charged to this account. Over the past three years, this budget and investment in field experiences has increased. It is projected for next year's budget this account will require a substantial increase.

Department classroom needs for equipment and materials are requested each year. Instructional equipment needs are funded through per-credit-hour student fees and requests submitted from the departments to the college deans who establish the priorities and budget. Needed equipment and materials are ordered and filled during the school year.

Other department funding needs are met through various other accounts. Capital equipment and facilities funds classroom furniture, blinds, teacher technology stations, ITV and fixed assets. Building and classroom improvements are drawn from these accounts. The new LEET Center renovation and Horace Mann Lab School lunch room were funded by a foundation gift and some university investment. In spring 2014 Northwest received a grant from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, to staff and equip an additional early childhood classroom. Northwest now has three early childhood classrooms as educational labs for our early childhood teacher candidates.

Research funds are given to all three colleges to be used for undergraduate and graduate student research. These funds are allocated across departments as research proposals which are received in the dean’s office for funding. Observations of use of funds over the last three budget years are that the funds have adequately met or been greater than the requests.

4. What sources of funding are available for faculty travel?

Funding sources available for faculty travel come from multiple sources. Faculty travel (Supplemental Travel) funds are provided to the colleges from the Provost Office. The Provost put additional funds into this account two years ago even though other budgets were decreased. These funds are allocated per number of faculty in the college. In the College of Education and Human

Services, the chairs have recommended that each faculty member can access their fair share from this budget.

The Dean's awards are given each year to faculty members who are recognized for outstanding achievement or service. Each college gives these awards and the amount per faculty member can range from $800-$1000. The faculty member can use the funds for classroom equipment, supplies and materials or it can be used to fund travel.

Grants are another source of funding for faculty travel. Internal grants are available through the Faculty Senate's Faculty Research Fund which provides funding for faculty, professional and support staff for research projects.   The nature of grant funding often requires travel and therefore, contributes to faculty development.

Additional funds to support faculty travel, student extended classroom opportunities and faculty and student development are available to departments from the Dean's offices. These funds are known as Academic Initiatives and a proposal for use of these funds must be submitted to the Dean's office. These funds have been used to supplement faculty travel to conferences which are rich with professional development opportunities. They also are used for student and faculty travel to diverse learning sites. Faculty can also access these funds to develop and/or implement instructional strategies or innovative delivery modes. Student and faculty support for extended learning opportunities are eligible for funding.

Some departments have auxiliary funds as a result of partnership work that are available to supplement department and supplemental travel funds. One example would be the agreement with Heartland to do data analysis for a contracted fee. There are only a few of these funds but they still are used and focused on faculty development.

Many departments also support faculty development through Outreach funds that are provided by revenue-sharing from Dual Enrollment programs hosted by those departments.

Faculty travel expense reports for 2007-2010 are available in the addendum exhibits listed below. These reports are not all exhaustive of all travel funds expended but provide an understanding of faculty travel support. The faculty travel expense report for 2012-2013 will be available for on campus review.

- Ad. Ex. 6.5.12 Travel Expenditures Report 2007-08
- Ad. Ex. 6.5.13 Travel Expenditures Report 2008-09
- Ad. Ex. 6.5.14 Travel Expenditures Report 2009-10
- Ad. Ex. 6.5.15 Travel Expenditures Report Fall 2013

5. What sources of support are available for grant writing?

A full-time grants person, Tye Parsons, has been hired to facilitate grant acquisition. Collaborative groups work together to secure grants. The Finance Office has a person dedicated to assisting with the budget part of the grant and other offices such as Institutional Research help in gathering information to assist with grant writing.

Internal grants are available through the Faculty Senate's Faculty Research Fund which provides funding for faculty, professional and support staff for research projects.

6. The team will want to verify that the facilities (e.g., library, laboratory schools, classrooms where candidates take course) and resources (e.g., technology, professional development) on the main campus and at the outreach centers are adequate to support candidate success and that they are as described in the IR.

7. The team was able to examine the library holding by looking at the Owens Library web site. The team will need verification of the education-related library holdings.

   A listing of the library holdings will be available for inspection upon the team's arrival. In addition, information on the education-related library holdings can be found in the exhibits listed below.

   - Ad. Ex. 6.5.16 Libraries NCATE
   - Ad. Ex. 6.5.17 Edu and Juv Orders 2011-2012
   - Ad. Ex. 6.5.18 Edu and Juv Orders 2012-2014

8. The team will verify the supports that are in place to support on-line and hybrid learning (i.e., professional development, handbooks and web sites, support personnel).

   Supports are in place to support on-line and hybrid learning. You will find information and resources at: http://www.nwmissouri.edu/cite/