

BOARD OF EXAMINERS REPORT N C A T E

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

ACCREDITATION VISIT TO:

University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky
November 10 – 14, 2007

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:

Linda Cornelious
Leah Engelhardt, Co-Chair
Deborah Hartz
Yuhong Rong
Thomas White
Lynn Wicker

State Board of Examiners Team:

Valeria Amburgey
Renee Campoy, Co-Chair
Cindy Gnadinger
Cathy Gunn
Matthew Pinder

KEA Representative:

Sandy Duvall

State Consultants:

Allison Bell
Marilyn Troupe

Type of Visit

First _____
Continuing X
Combination _____
Probation _____
Focused _____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	4
II. Conceptual Framework.....	11
III. Findings for Each Standard	
Standard 1	14
Standard 2	24
Standard 3	28
Standard 4	32
Standard 5	39
Standard 6	45
IV. Sources of Evidence.....	51
V. Corrections to the Institutional Report.....	68

**SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education**

Institution: University of Kentucky

Standards		Team Findings	
		Initial	Advanced
1	Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions	M	M
2	Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	M	M
3	Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	M	M
4	Diversity	M	M
5	Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	M	M
6	Unit Governance and Resources	M	M

M = Standard Met
NM = Standard Not Met

INTRODUCTION

A. The institution

The University of Kentucky is a land grant institution founded in 1865 as part of the Morrill Land Grant College Act as the Agricultural and Mechanical (A&M) College of Kentucky. The university awarded its first bachelor's degree in 1869; master's degrees were granted in 1876. After several name changes, it became the University of Kentucky in 1916 and awarded the first doctorate in 1925. Sixteen colleges and the Graduate School awarded more than 5000 degrees during the 2005-2006 academic year. Preparation of educators began in a normal school in 1880; the College of Education was created in 1923 with a four-year preparation program.

The university is one of 90 public research extensive universities and one of only seven universities in the United States with a teaching and research campus and medical campus in one central location. It ranks 24th among public research universities in funded research. More than 27,000 students were enrolled in fall 2006, with 71 percent in undergraduate programs. Females make up 51.2 percent of the undergraduate enrollment and 58.7 percent of the graduate enrollment. Eighty-three percent of the students attend full-time and Kentucky residents account for 77 percent of the enrollment.

The Kentucky General Assembly passed House Bill 1 in 1997, establishing a goal for the university to become one of the nation's top 20 public research institutions by 2020. The university submitted a Top 20 Business Plan to the General Assembly at its last session and received \$20.9 million in additional state funding. Increasing student enrollment, adding new faculty lines and increasing the number of advisors and support staff to improve student retention are among recent achievements toward meeting goals of this initiative.

The university is located in Lexington, the county seat of Fayette County, in the Bluegrass Region of the state. The county's 270,000 residents represent more than half of the immediate metropolitan population of more than half a million. Approximately 88 percent of state residents are white and not Hispanic. Persons of color make up about 10% of the population and a language other than English is spoken in 4 percent of the households.

The state's population of 4.2 million ranks 26th in the United States and grew at a slower pace than the rest of the nation during the last six years. Its median income ranks 45th with more than 16 percent of the residents living in poverty. Rural areas are experiencing a net loss of population while urban areas have recorded slight gains. The Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 resulted in substantial progress in P-12 schools. However, the state still lags behind much of the country on measures of educational success. High school graduates make up less than 75 percent of the population; fewer than 17 percent of those 25 and older have bachelor's degrees or higher.

B. The unit

The unit at the University of Kentucky is defined as the College of Education and the educator preparation programs located in the Colleges of Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Communication and Library Sciences, Fine Arts, Health Sciences and Social Work. Educator preparation is an institution-wide activity, with the dean of the College of Education designated as the unit head.

Individual program faculties, which are collaborative groups comprised of education faculty, university faculty from content areas, practitioners from schools and agencies, and undergraduate and graduate candidates govern their respective programs. Their responsibilities extend to developing and revising courses and programs, implementing unit policies, conducting unit assessments and using data to revise programs. There is no teacher education council. The director of the Office of Academic Services and Teacher Certification convenes the chairs of the program faculties monthly.

The unit offers 24 initial programs at the bachelor's and master's levels, 12 programs for the continuing preparation of teachers, 11 programs for other school personnel and two graduate programs leading to endorsements. Enrollment in the College of Education in fall 2006 included 1528 fulltime and 129 part time undergraduates and 348 fulltime and 451 part time graduate students. Those preparing to teach at the secondary level enroll in the Master's Initial Certification (MIC) program after completing bachelor's degrees in content areas of English, mathematics, science, or social studies. Enrollments in educator preparation programs in the other six colleges were reported as 230 at the initial bachelor's level, 10 at the initial master's level, 49 in advanced teacher preparation, and 152 in other school personnel programs.

The unit employed 120 professional education faculty in fall 2007 across the seven colleges, including 76 with tenure, 41 in tenure track positions, and three not on tenure track. Ninety-one were faculty in the College of Education and 29 were professors and lecturers in the other six colleges. Thirty-eight part time instructors and 41 graduate teaching assistants were employed to teach courses and/or supervise candidates in field experiences and clinical practice. Nine administrators direct the work of the unit.

The corrected chart below lists programs offered by the unit. All are within the College of Education except the following: College of Agriculture (Agriculture Education and Family and Consumer Sciences Education), Arts and Sciences (Master of Arts in Teaching World Languages and Advanced Study in Content Areas), Communication and Library Sciences (School Media Librarian Preparation), Fine Arts (Art Education and Music Education), Health Sciences (Communication Disorders) and Social Work (School Social Work Preparation). The School Psychology program is accredited by the National Association of School Psychologists through 2009, the communication disorders program is accredited by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association through 2013, and the music program received continuing accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Music in 2006

The master's degree program in moderate and severe disabilities can be completed via distance learning technologies. During 2006-2007, 24 candidates enrolled via distance learning and 16 selected the on campus option for courses. All assignments are identical for both groups, with the same instructor grading all assignments using the same guidelines. Disaggregated data were provided by the institution. Team members interviewed four candidates and read sample portfolios that documented the progress for three distance learning candidates on continuous assessment standards.

The most recent NCATE visit occurred in 2000. Since the visit, the unit extensively revised the conceptual framework, adding components on research, learning and leadership. The Center for Educator Preparation Information Systems (CEPIS) was established in 2003 to promote the development of a web-based information system. The increased expectations for research due to the institutional Top 20 initiative led to a reduction in faculty work load. New faculty and

advisors have been employed to meet other goals of the Top 20 program. Technology has been added to classrooms and laboratories and computers have been upgraded for faculty, staff and candidates.

The unit dropped the English as Second Language endorsement since the last visit and resubmitted the school social work program which was approved by the Education Professional Standards Board in April 2003.

Program Name	Award Level (e.g., Bachelor's or Master's)	Program Level (ITP or ADV)*	Number of Candidate s Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State or NAEYC)	Program Report Submitted for Review (Yes/No)	State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)	National Recognition Status by NCATE**
Agriculture Education (5-12)	Bachelor's	ITP	30	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Agriculture Education (5-12)	Master's	ITP	2	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Art Education (P-12)	Bachelor's	ITP	58	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Business and Marketing Education (5-12)	Master's	ITP	6	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Dance Education (P-12)	Bachelor's	ITP	2	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Elementary Education (P-5)	Bachelor's	ITP	567	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Elementary Education (P-5)	Post-Bachelor's	ITP	9	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
English Education (8-12)	Master's	ITP	18	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Family and Consumer Sciences Education (5-12)	Bachelor's	ITP	23	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Family and Consumer Sciences Education (5-12)	Master's	ITP	3	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Foreign Language Education (French, German, Latin, Russian, Spanish) (P-12)	Master's	ITP	5	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Health Education (P-12)	Bachelor's	ITP	10	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Integrated Music Education (P- 12)	Bachelor's	ITP	119	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education (B-P)	Bachelor's	ITP	59	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education (B-P)	Post-Bachelor's	ITP	7	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Mathematics Education (8-12)	Master's	ITP	11	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Middle School Education (5-9)	Bachelor's, Post- Bachelor's	ITP	109	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Physical Education (P-12)	Bachelor's	ITP	140	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Science Education (Biological Science, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics) (8-12)	Master's	ITP	9	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Social Studies Education (8-12)	Master's	ITP	16	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Special Education, LBD (P-12)	Bachelor's	ITP	72	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Special Education, LBD (P-12)	Post-Bachelor's	ITP	9	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable

Special Education, MSD (P-12)	Bachelor's	ITP	43	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Special Education, MSD (P-12)	Master's and Alt. Certification	ITP	17	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Program Name	Award Level (e.g., Bachelor's or Master's)	Program Level (ITP or ADV)*	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State or NAEYC)	Program Report Submitted for Review (Yes/No)	State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)	National Recognition Status by NCATE**
Advanced Teacher Preparation							
Agriculture Education (5-12)	Master's, Rank I	ADV	32	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Art Education (P-12)	Fifth-Year, Master's, Rank I	ADV	2	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Arts and Sciences	Master's, Rank I	ADV	0	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Elementary Education (P-5)	Fifth-Year, Master's, Rank I	ADV	23	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Family and Consumer Sciences Education (5-12)	Master's, Rank I	ADV	6	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education (B-P)	Fifth-Year, Master's, Rank I	ADV	10	State	Yes	Approved May 2007	Not applicable
Middle School Education (5-9)	Fifth-Year, Master's, Rank I	ADV	1	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Music Education (P-12)	Master's, Rank I	ADV	9	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Physical Education and Health Education (P-12)	Fifth-Year, Master's, Rank I	ADV	5	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Secondary Education (8-12)	Fifth-Year, Master's, Rank I	ADV	3	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Special Education, LBD/MSD (P-12)	Fifth-Year, Master's, Rank I	ADV	56	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Special Education, Director (P-12)	Post-Master's	ADV	6	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Other School Personnel Preparation							
Career and Technical Education Principal	Master's	ADV	0	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Career and Technical Education Supervisor	Master's	ADV	2	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Communication Disorders (P-12)	Post-Master's at Rank I	ADV	43	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable

Instructional Systems Design (P-12)	Master's, Rank I	ADV	12	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
School Media Librarian Certification (P-12)	Master's	ADV	72	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
School Media Librarian Rank Change (P-12)	Post-Master's, Rank I	ADV	2	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
School Principal (P-12)	Master's, Rank I	ADV	30	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
School Psychology (P-12)	Specialist	ADV	50	State	Yes	In compliance	Nationally Recognized by NASP
School Social Worker	Post-Master's	ADV	35	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
School Superintendent	Post-Master's	ADV	16	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Supervisor of Instruction	Post-Master's	ADV	5	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Graduate Programs Leading to Endorsement							
Instructional Computer Technology (P-12)	Post-Master's	ADV	2	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable
Reading and Writing (P-12)	Master's	ADV	11	State	Yes	In compliance	Not applicable

C. The visit

The visit was conducted under conditions in the NCATE/Kentucky protocol. The Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) reviewed and approved all programs prior to the visit. A team of six NCATE and five state BOE members was assisted by two representatives from the EPSB. An observer from the Kentucky Education Association attended all team meetings and assisted with interviews.

References to the unit in the institutional report and supporting information were sometimes limited to the College of Education. Documents in the exhibits provided data on programs, faculty, candidates, and graduates from programs in all seven colleges; team members interviewed representatives from all colleges.

No unusual circumstances occurred during the visit.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The Unit and University Mission Statements

The unit's conceptual framework describes the vision of University of Kentucky to be, "one of the nation's 20 best public research universities." The unit has translated that mission to the unit level and the conceptual framework mirrors the institution's emphasis of research, teaching and learning. The unit's stated mission is to "expand the knowledge of teaching and learning...to prepare college professionals for a variety of roles in educational settings and community agencies." The four elements described in the unit's philosophy: research, reflection, learning, and leading further reveal the values of the unit. These elements serve as themes to focus program faculty effort to accomplish the stated institutional goals.

Knowledge Bases

The knowledge bases apply to all unit educator preparation programs and explain the unit's perspective on research as it applies to teacher candidate and education faculty at a research extensive university. The No Child Left Behind Act and National Research Council (NRC) publications led to discussions that resulted in a definition of what the unit faculty consider rigorous and scientific research appropriate for recognition and reward; it embraces a range of research methodologies appropriate for the unit's disciplines. Reflection remains a theme from the previous version of the conceptual framework, as does practitioner inquiry. Learning and leading were selected as new themes to the conceptual framework, with learning an obvious theme for a college of education, but reiterated to show the faculty's efforts to balance teaching with the theme of research and so to maintain an appropriate focus on instruction and pedagogy within a teaching college. While the faculty do not share a single theoretical view of instruction, "learning was selected as one of the four major components of our conceptual framework to underscore our commitment to the many facets of learning." Leading is described as a commitment to produce candidates who will provide leaders for the professions produced in the unit as well as citizen leaders for the good of the greater community.

Alignment with Standards and Dispositions

The Kentucky New and Experienced Teacher Standards, the Interdisciplinary Early Childhood New and Experienced Teacher Standards, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards and Technology Standards for School Administrators are the stated proficiencies selected to determine program outcomes and are clearly aligned to course objectives in syllabi and in the evaluations of programs and candidates. Programs are also aligned to the respective specialized professional associations (SPAs) and agencies that accredit programs in music, communication disorders, and school psychology. In addition to external standards, the unit has selected five functional skills and dispositions to evaluate the unit's progress in meeting unit and institutional goals, including *effective communication*, operationally defined as effective and appropriate communication; *constructive attitudes*, described as a philosophy of teaching and learning; *knowledge and understanding of subject matter*; *appropriate and effective interactions with diverse groups of colleagues, administrators, students, and parents in educational settings*; and *commitment to ethical behavior*.

The NCATE themes of commitment to diversity and technology are also evident in the conceptual framework. The university and the unit share diversity as a central theme with organizational structures and resources provided to meet the goal of a diverse campus. Since the last visit, the unit created the Office of Equity and Diversity staffed by a full-time director. Working with a consultant, the unit also added diversity signature assignments in teacher

preparation programs. The university added two full time advisors to work with diverse candidates and increased scholarship dollars for the same. A commitment to technology is demonstrated by resources and many activities, but since the last visit the unit has funded smart classroom technology in all classroom and conference rooms in the college. The unit also staffs an Instructional Technology Center, which is responsible for technology in offices, computer labs, and classrooms.

The System for Assessment

Candidate performance is assessed using a variety of course embedded assignments, including traditional assessments such as ACTE, SAT, Praxis I or GRE for admission and Praxis II for completion. Additional data measuring teacher standards and unit dispositions are collected at three transition points in each program: admission, retention, and completion. The data from these assessments are stored in a technology system and are aggregated and used to make candidate, program, and unit decisions. The appropriate governing bodies review the data at each level and use it to make decisions to monitor progress in attaining the mission of unit and institution.

Development of and Revisions to the Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework began in 1992 with the adoption of the theme “The Teacher as Reflective Decision Maker” approved by the Faculty Council, Administrative Council, Program Faculty Chairs Group, and unit faculty. Between 1992 and 2003, the conceptual framework was reviewed and approved by faculty at annual unit-wide retreats. In 2003, the functional skills and dispositions were added at the same time that program faculty revised admissions, retention, and completion policy. With a new institutional mission announced in 2005, the unit’s mission statement was revised to better align with the institution’s increased emphasis on research. At the same time, the unit’s theme was broadened to “Preparing Professional Educators as Reflective Decision Makers.” As a final and major step in 2006, the theme of “Research and Reflection for Learning and Leading” was developed and approved, again emphasizing and aligning with the institution focus on research and becoming a top national public research institution. During each review and revision of the conceptual framework, members of the professional community and university faculty were consulted for contribution and provided feedback to the process. The unit’s standing governance structure provided approval of the conceptual framework each time the conceptual framework was revised. School-based educators are standing members of the Program Faculty committees and so were an integral part of the approval process.

Coherence of the Conceptual Framework

During the BOE visit the unit was in transition with the new theme of “Research and Reflection for Learning and Leading,” adopted in 2006, at various stages of implementation in its programs. The unit faculty were well aware of the changed conceptual framework and were able to articulate its beliefs during both interviews and in unit documents. Program submissions included an alignment statement and the conceptual framework was included as a part of all observed syllabi. Arts and Sciences faculty also expressed an understanding of the unit’s conceptual framework as they described their collaborative activities with unit faculty in areas such as grants and projects which provided occasion for faculty members to share beliefs and efforts to improve education at the PK-12 levels. During interviews, candidates expressed their direct knowledge of the themes of the conceptual framework and were able to describe how they created projects and assignments demonstrating the themes in the development of lessons, portfolio items, philosophies and projects at the initial level, and at the advanced level in school-

based projects, research projects, and as demonstrated in standards-based portfolios. The school-based educators who worked with the unit faculty to supervise student teachers and practicum candidates and those who served on the Program Faculty committees also expressed knowledge and understanding of the conceptual framework during interviews. Cooperating teachers were aware of the conceptual framework and reported that it was included in the student teaching information packet.

Assessment of the Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework is aligned to unit functional skills and dispositions, unit technology standards and performance standards of the programs. The standards required by Education Professional Standards Board (The Kentucky New and Experienced Teacher Standards, the Interdisciplinary Early Childhood New and Experienced Teacher Standards, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards, and Technology Standards for School Administrators) are aligned to program curricula as documented by approved Program Submissions. The assessment of the unit's skills and functional dispositions at admission, retention and exit programs are documented for each program and are posted on the unit's electronic exhibit webpage. A narrative is also posted for each program describing how each uses aggregated data for program improvement. The themes of the conceptual framework (Research and Reflection for Learning and Leading) are evident in initial program fieldwork with the evaluation of the candidate's quality of reflection and leadership. In initial programs, candidates are described as consumers of research. In advanced programs, research is the focus of course-embedded projects and exit assessments. Each year there is an opportunity for advanced candidates to present their research at a research conference with two other research universities.

STANDARD 1: CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Content knowledge for teacher candidates

Teacher candidates know the subject matter that they plan to teach and are able to explain important principles and concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Candidate presentations at the Sunday evening poster session and faculty, candidate, university supervisor, cooperating teacher and area school personnel interviews during the site visit documented data in the institutional report and exhibits. Knowledge of content and the unit's conceptual framework was especially evident in the candidate presentations.

Initial Programs:

The unit has established clear standards for admission into the initial teacher preparation programs. Candidates must have an overall minimum grade point average of 2.50. Candidates must also have a minimum score of 21 on the ACTE or passing scores on SAT or Praxis I to be eligible to apply for admission. The mean ACTE score and the high school GPA for COE entering freshman classes over a five-year period are above the minimums. Candidates applying for admission are also interviewed. Some programs cap enrollments; therefore, some students who have the minimum GPA and ACTE scores may still be denied admission to the teacher education program. Comparison data for the mean ACTE scores for candidates who were admitted versus those who were not admitted over a five-year period indicate the former attained higher mean scores; however, those denied admission each year had mean ACTE scores above the required minimum of 21 because the minimum test scores are required prior to making application.

Additional assessments utilized for proficiency of initial teacher candidates in content knowledge include grade point averages (GPAs), New Teacher Survey (NTS) data and ratings on appropriate state teacher standards, unit functional skills and dispositions (FSD) and technology standards from the Continuous Assessment Review (CAR) at three transition points within the program: admission, retention and completion. Program faculty rate candidate proficiency on the NTS, FSD, and unit technology standards using the CAR form. Candidates do not move beyond the transition points until they have met all the requirements. Aggregated data from the CAR related to the specific NTS and FSD related to content knowledge show there is improvement of candidates' proficiencies in content knowledge as they progress through the transition points. Summaries of specific program CAR data on the website for each program under the data table links also show growth in content knowledge.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky requires teacher candidates to successfully pass the specified Praxis II examinations in their content area in order to receive certification. The Institutional Report summary of aggregated institutional pass rates on Praxis II exams for initial programs and electronic links to summary aggregated data of Praxis pass rates for the individual programs verify that all programs have pass rates that are above the 80% minimum requirement.

The unit submitted all programs to the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) in the previous year for program approval. All programs were reviewed by the Content Area Specialists, the Continuous Assessment Review Committee (CARC) and the Reading Committee. The Program Review noted that all programs are in compliance with the EPSB Program Guidelines. Courses are aligned with state, national and SPA standards. Additionally, the unit verified in electronic exhibits specific program accreditation approvals from the following groups: American Psychological Association, American Speech-Language- Hearing Association, and National Association of Schools of Music.

All first-year teachers in the commonwealth must successfully complete the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP) in order to be fully certified in their areas. Assessments within the KTIP program include content knowledge of beginning teachers. The unit provided information on the pass rates for its interns over a four year period, verified at the EPSB website and in other published documents. The unit's candidates successfully and consistently complete their internship (first year experience) at or above the state pass rate.

The New Teacher Survey is completed by student teachers, cooperating teachers, interns and resource teachers and provides perception data regarding the preparation of the unit's candidates in all areas of the New Teacher Standards (NTS). Cooperating teachers are the P-12 classroom teachers who are mentoring student teachers in their classrooms. Resource teachers are P-12 teachers who are mentoring interns (first-year teachers) in their schools. The resource teachers must spend time in and outside the classroom with the intern. Cooperating and resource teachers are familiar with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required of beginning teachers. Perception data reported for four key items from the New Teacher Survey related to content knowledge and the mean scores for a four year period and interviews with candidates, cooperating and resource teachers validate that beginning teachers are adequately prepared in content knowledge in their subject area(s).

Advanced Programs:

The unit requires candidates in advanced programs for teachers to complete additional content courses in their subject areas offered by colleges and academic programs outside the College of Education. The unit also requires candidates to document content proficiency in a teacher performance assessment that is aligned with the state's Experienced Teacher Standards (ETS).

A newly designed web-based portal provides the unit with aggregated performance data related to content knowledge of advanced teacher candidates, aligned with the state's ETS # 2 and Unit Functional Skill and Disposition # 3 and the Technology Standards. A review of the Continuous Assessment Review (CAR) data indicates that candidates have gained considerable knowledge from the admission point through mid-point to completion from approximately at No or Low Knowledge level to High Proficiency.

All advanced teacher preparation programs are reviewed and approved by the EPSB. All programs are currently in compliance; the Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education, B-P, was recently approved in May 2007. The Music Education program is nationally accredited.

The unit does not have its own follow-up surveys of graduates and employers. Rather, it uses the University's alumni surveys and the EPSB First-Year Teacher Surveys to collect data from

graduates and employers. While the University's alumni surveys have had a low 15% average return rate, the responses are positive. The unit uses the EPSB First-Year Teacher Surveys, which have high response rates, to collect data from student teachers and their cooperating teachers in the schools and from intern teachers (graduates) and their resource teachers in the schools. It relies upon the University's alumni surveys.

Interviews with the faculty program chairs and the advanced program faculty confirmed that the programs have relied upon program faculty discussions, candidate assignments and portfolios, and data from exit interviews to gauge teacher candidates' content knowledge gains. The Graduate School also conducts an annual graduate student review to gauge each student's academic progress. Although the unit assessment portal has been built and is generating data and reports, the faculty in the advanced programs acknowledged that they have not used the system to track and advise students, as the portal is only in its pilot stage. Advanced program faculty members have used the actual paper form up to this point.

During interviews with the advanced program faculty members and the program chairs, participants indicated that they had used data from the commonwealth's standards to make changes in the methods courses with an emphasis on differentiated instruction. The Agriculture Education faculty members have used CAR data and program trend data to gauge candidates' knowledge gains. The advanced program chairs state that latest research has been incorporated into courses and students also learn how to evaluate research. The advanced program chairs also reaffirmed the concept that "educators as leaders" is firmly embedded in the programs. Interviews with past program graduates confirmed the above statements and they appreciate the fact the program faculty members have up-to-date knowledge and are nationally recognized scholars in their fields. Further, interview with the faculty members from the Music Education program indicated that the program assesses candidates' content proficiency upon admission by using an in-house instrument. Program faculty members have on-going conversations and use course embedded assessments to gauge candidates' progress throughout the program.

B. Content knowledge of other school personnel

Candidates in the 11 advanced programs for other professional school roles know their fields and can explain principles and concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Candidates in educational leadership are required to take two state certification tests: the Principal Test and the School Leadership Licensure Assessment. Candidates in communication disorders, school media, and school psychology are required to pass appropriate Praxis II examinations. The unit demonstrated that all program candidate pass rates are above 90 percent with some at 100 percent.

Further, the unit uses additional measures such as grade point average, Graduate Record Exam scores, and ratings on the unit's CAR. The unit relies upon the faculty ratings based on the appropriate standards of the commonwealth. The unit uses three transition points to assess its candidates in the advanced programs: program admission, retention, and completion. The unit presented data sets to document candidates' content knowledge base in their respective programs. Most data indicate a gradual gain of knowledge level from admission through the mid retention point to the completion point.

In 2005, the University administered a Graduate Alumni Survey, which generated 86 responses from three years of cohorts from the unit. Although the respondents reported a high rate of

satisfaction with their programs, only a small number of its graduates during that time period responded; the return rate was 15 percent.

All programs are currently in compliance according to EPSB. All issues raised by the EPSB appear to be minor technical matters. In addition, the School Psychology program is nationally recognized by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).

Interviews with advanced program faculty and past program graduates revealed that the Library Media Specialist program faculty members have incorporated data into courses. Interviews with past program graduates indicate that the program exposes candidates to new ideas and best practices. The experience outside of classroom is highly valued by the candidates. The combination of face-to-face and on-line instruction has helped candidates to practice the use of technology.

Interviews with faculty members in the Educational Leadership program and review of program documents reveal that the program requires field based portfolios from candidates with reflective assignments. The program relies upon national standards and the commonwealth's standards to develop candidates' self-assessments, and uses such self-assessments to write candidates' individual growth plans. Reflection is then applied when the candidates re-examine the self-assessments and the initial growth plan.

C. Pedagogical content knowledge for teachers

Teacher candidates have a broad knowledge of instructional strategies that draws upon content and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state and institutional standards to help all students learn. They facilitate student learning of the subject matter through presentation of the content in clear and meaningful ways and through the integration of technology.

Initial Programs:

Support for these findings occurred in interviews, candidate presentations, samples of lesson and/or unit plans, course-embedded assignments found in the exhibit room and/or web-based exhibit room and electronic portfolios, including the Open Portfolio system. All programs provide appropriate pedagogical content knowledge for candidates in the initial preparation programs; a review of course syllabi, sample candidate work and observation of classes verified this finding.

In the initial programs, pedagogical content knowledge is assessed through course-embedded assignments such as lesson and unit plans, classroom management plans, performance assessments, etc. Samples of these course-embedded assessments were included in the exhibit room and in candidate portfolios.

Candidates are rated on the New Teacher Standards in areas related to pedagogical content knowledge by using the CAR form. Two years of aggregated data indicate improvement of the pedagogical content knowledge by candidates in all programs through the three transition points.

Technology requirements are listed by courses in each program. The data on the CAR forms also include ratings for candidate technology standards. These ratings occur at the three

transition points and indicate improvement through program experiences on the use of technology to support instruction. By program exit, all candidates meet or exceed the required rating of 3. Examples of technology proficiencies of candidates were reflected in the sample portfolios and course assignments provided in exhibits.

Information obtained from the interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers, and other field based personnel provided mixed reviews regarding the preparation of new teachers in pedagogical content knowledge. Candidates in some programs, such as elementary education, expressed concerns regarding their preparation in designing and implementing instruction for students with special needs. This was reflected in CAR data and New Teacher Survey data as well. Program changes have been approved for a new course within the elementary education program focused on special needs populations. Current candidates and program faculty are aware of the approved program changes and anticipate improvement in this program when the new changes are implemented. Interviews with candidates, cooperating teachers and resource teachers indicate that candidates are well prepared overall for teaching careers.

Data from items on the New Teacher Survey related to pedagogical content knowledge were reviewed. Specific areas for improvement identified from these data are designing instruction and assessments for students with special needs, designing strategies to address the behavioral issues of students with special needs and using information about the community and backgrounds of students to design learning tasks. Modifications to programs have been based upon these data as well as data from CAR and other sources.

Advanced Programs:

The unit assesses candidate proficiency related to pedagogical content knowledge in advanced teacher programs by using the CAR process at admissions, retention, and completion. The program review reports presented a relatively coherent and consistent picture of how advanced programs are addressing the attainment of pedagogical content knowledge for teachers. The on-line electronic data as well as interviews with faculty members, candidates, and school personnel confirmed that candidates have attained these skills.

The unit relies upon the ratings in the CAR form in the appropriate subject areas to measure candidates' pedagogical content knowledge. Further, the candidate mid point assessments and completion data are also used to gauge candidate knowledge. The data presented demonstrated an overall gain of such knowledge by all candidates. In the areas of technology, most indicators demonstrated gains by candidates, although a few items showed a slight level of regression. There are no statistical or trend data to show if such regression is in any way significant.

Interviews with the advanced program faculty members indicate that the Early Childhood Education program found that the candidates report low proficiency ratings on the Technology Standards scale; the program has since strengthened the technology component of its programs. The Early Childhood Education program also uses case studies and portfolios to assess candidates pedagogical knowledge and skills. The Secondary English program addresses student family literacy, such as English as a second language, dialects, etc. as examples of "opportunity gap." The faculty members emphasize the importance of teaching candidates how to use data. Interviews with past advanced program graduates further confirmed that the self-regulated learning technique has helped them to adapt to a student centered learning model when they are in real classrooms.

D. Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teachers

Initial Programs:

Teacher candidates are able to apply professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state and institutional standards to facilitate learning. Evidence that they consider the school, family and community contexts in which they work and the prior experience of students to develop meaningful learning experiences was found in sample lesson/unit plans, research reviews, student presentations and observations of classes.

The scores for the Principles of Teaching and Learning (PLT) examinations indicate that the institutional pass rate for professional knowledge has remained consistent at 98 percent and 99 percent over the three years the exam has been administered. Pass rates for teaching special populations were 91 percent in 2002-2003 and 98 percent in 2003-2004.

Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are also assessed through course-embedded assignments, such as reflective narratives focused on teaching and learning and personal growth plans (PGP). Program faculties also rate candidate proficiency on the Kentucky New Teacher Standards (NTS) related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills using the CAR form. Aggregated data from the CAR form related to NTS V (Reflects upon teaching and learning), VI (Engages in professional development) and VII (Collaborates with colleagues, parents, and others) indicate improvement of candidates' reflection, collaboration and professional development knowledge and skills through the program experiences. Specific program data, which are found on each program website, indicates similar trends across all programs. Samples of course embedded assignments, such as reflective narratives and PGP, also verified this growth.

Candidates in all programs (initial and advanced) are required to abide by the Code of Professional Ethics for educators. They must read and sign a copy of the Code of Ethics. They are also required to complete a character and fitness review and sign a second copy of the code prior to admission to student teaching.

Advanced Programs:

The unit assesses candidate proficiency related to professional pedagogical knowledge and skills in advanced teacher programs by using the CAR process, at the aforementioned three transition points. The program review reports presented a coherent and consistent picture of how advanced programs are addressing the attainment of professional pedagogical knowledge and skills for teachers.

The unit relies upon the ratings in the CAR form in the appropriate subject areas to measure candidates' pedagogical content knowledge. The retention and completion evaluation data are used to gauge candidates' progress through their respective programs. These data, including candidates' performance in courses, field experiences, and the final projects or examinations in these transition points specifically address the following areas: foundations of education; the ways children and adolescents develop and the relationship to learning; professional ethics, laws, and policies; the use of research in teaching; the roles and responsibilities of the professional

communities; diversity of student populations, families and communities; and the consideration of school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students.

Interviews with faculty members revealed that programs conduct their assessments in a variety of ways by using unique data sources, such as portfolios, course embedded assignments, and information generated through student advising sessions. The new electronic portal will begin to document intervention with candidates by faculty and staff. However, it is only in the pilot stage and has had limited use.

E. Professional knowledge and skills for other school personnel

Advanced Programs:

Candidates for other professional school roles have an adequate understanding of the professional knowledge expected in their fields and delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They know their students, families, and communities; use current research to inform their practices; use technology in their practices; and support student learning through their professional services. Interviews with candidates and program faculty confirm that performance expectations in these areas are met.

The unit uses the same instruments, such as CAR, to gauge the candidates' professional knowledge and skills in other school personnel programs. Course embedded assignments, such as case analysis to highlight legal and ethical issues, in the numerous courses addressing the state's Code of Ethics and school safety and security provide data to document candidate learning in this area.

The unit relies upon the ratings in the CAR form in the appropriate subject areas to measure candidates' pedagogical content knowledge. The retention and completion evaluation data are used to measure candidates' progress through their respective programs. These data, including candidates' performance in courses, field experiences, and the final projects or examinations in the transition points, specifically address the areas of knowing their students, families, and communities, using current research to inform practice, and using technology in their practice. The data presented by the unit demonstrated an overall gain of such knowledge by all candidates.

F. Dispositions

Initial and Advanced Programs

Based upon information found in the unit's institutional report and verified by on-site exhibits, electronic exhibits and interviews with candidates, cooperating teachers, resource teachers, program faculty and other school personnel, candidates are familiar with the dispositions expected of professionals. Their work with students, families, and communities reflects the dispositions delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.

The unit has articulated a conceptual framework based on the four elements of research, reflection, learning and leading. It has further established five functional skills and dispositions indicators to assess candidate performance. The examiners asked the unit to demonstrate the coherence between the four elements identified by the conceptual framework and the five

functional skills and dispositions indicators. The unit submitted a matrix clearly aligning the themes in the conceptual framework with the unit functional skills and dispositions standards.

All candidates must demonstrate proficiency on the unit FSD, which were developed by program faculty chairs and endorsed by unit faculty. Its use was verified in interviews with program faculty and candidates.

Aggregated candidate data for each of the functional skills and dispositions collected from faculty ratings of candidates via the CAR form and specific program data from the CAR were available for each program. All data indicate that required experiences are increasing candidates' Functional Skills and Dispositions throughout the program. When program faculty members have concerns about candidate dispositions, they meet with the candidate to discuss the concerns and develop a plan for remediation.

Items on the New Teacher Survey related to the Unit FSD are also analyzed and aggregated. This information is also posted on the unit program web pages.

One element consistent across all programs and across all constituents is the requirement of experiences dealing with rural poverty. Communications Disorders and School Social Work are two programs which emphasize the many issues facing rural communities.

Review of course materials and interviews with faculty members indicate that the Educational Leadership program, especially the superintendent training program, includes an "equity audit" on schools and districts. It discusses the issues of access to curriculum, student course taking pattern, teacher expectation, community analysis, school finance data, and policy analysis so that the candidates gain a localized perspective of diversity.

The literacy program in elementary education addresses various aspects of student backgrounds, English as a second language, and socio-economic status to demonstrate the existing "opportunity gap" in the educational system. The Special Education program ensures that all students are placed in urban, rural, and various grade-level diverse learning environments.

G. Student learning for teacher candidates

Teacher candidates focus on student learning as shown in their assessment of student learning, use of assessments in instruction, and development of meaningful learning experiences for students based on their developmental levels and prior experience.

Initial Programs:

Interviews with candidates, program faculty, sample candidate work (portfolios, lesson/unit plans, etc.) verify that national and state standards are incorporated into the program experiences for beginning teachers and provide them the knowledge and skills related to student learning.

Teacher candidates are assessed on student learning throughout their programs with course-embedded assignments. Examples include a multifaceted assessment project on a student in the field placement associated with the course EDC 339 *Designing a Reading and Language Arts Program in the Elementary Schools*. Candidates administer and interpret an interest inventory, a reading attitude survey, an initial word recognition and comprehension screening (an IRI or

running record) and two appropriate follow-up assessments. Based on results and analysis, candidates must design and implement two appropriate lessons for the student. Additional evidence was provided during on-site interviews and observations as well as sample candidate projects and portfolios in the on-site exhibits.

Examples of the Diversity Signature Assignments which are incorporated into the program experiences include article reviews, case studies, emergent readers, lesson/unit plans, and classroom management plans. The diversity reflected in these signature assignments included populations of students with special needs and/or diverse cultural groups.

Candidates are assessed at three transition points throughout the program: program admission, retention, and completion. Program faculties rate candidate proficiency on the New Teacher Standards, Functional Skills and Dispositions, and unit technology standards using the Continuous Assessment Review (CAR) form. Aggregated data from the CAR aligned to the specific NTS and FSD related to student learning show there is improvement of candidates' performance as they progress through the transition points.

The New Teacher Survey is completed by student teachers, cooperating teachers, interns and resource teachers and provides perception data regarding the preparation of the unit's candidates in all areas of the NTS. Data for a four-year period for the key items from the NTS related to student learning and interviews with candidates, cooperating and resource teachers validate that beginning teachers are perceived as being able to improve student learning.

Advanced Programs:

Teacher candidates in advanced programs are required to complete a portfolio or a capstone project, which includes work samples and teacher assessments aimed at measuring student learning. They are required to document intervention and instructional strategies. The unit has begun to use the CAR assessment process for advanced programs for teacher candidates. The state's Experienced Teacher Standards, the unit's functional skills and disposition indicators, and the technology standards are incorporated in the measures. It appears that the Elementary Education program is moving ahead with this assessment tool while the other programs have begun the process of using data entered and reports generated through the CAR process. Interviews with department chairs, program faculties, candidates, and graduates confirmed that assessment of student learning had been an area of concern. During the recent redesign of the Elementary Education program, the elements of assessment have been expanded in courses and clinical experiences.

H. Student learning for other school personnel

Candidates for other professional school roles are able to create positive environments for student learning. They understand and build upon the developmental levels of students with whom they work; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work.

Advanced Programs:

A review of program documents as well as interviews with program faculty members indicate that other school personnel programs require candidates to demonstrate proficiency in assessing

student learning through research and reflection in course embedded assignments. The principal and superintendent training programs include materials of the commonwealth's standardized test and the analysis of the results of such tests. All programs use data to examine candidate progress. The unit has made program modifications on the basis of the review of such data. The meeting minutes of the Course and Curricular Committees and the interview with the members of this committee indicated the unit's history of addressing such changes.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Initial and Advanced Programs:

The unit presented convincing evidence that its initial and advanced programs are aligned with professional, state, and unit standards governing educator preparation. The standards are aligned with the four elements of the unit's conceptual framework: research, reflection, learning and leading. Candidates and graduates state that the unit has more than adequately prepared them for their subject area or for professional roles that they plan to assume. The candidates and program graduates believe that the instructional and professional knowledge that they gained from their learning experiences at the unit will facilitate their classroom instructions or prepare them for the roles as other school personnel. The program documents, observations of classroom instructions, and interviews with the constituents support the notion that candidates from both initial and advanced programs are capable of creating positive environments conducive to student learning. The unit has demonstrated that key assessment measures are in place for the faculty to gauge candidate progress from admissions through to completion.

Recommendation: Met

Areas for Improvement:

Corrected: Evidence does not show that candidates in school social work are competent in their field. (Advanced)

Rationale: Since the last accreditation visit, the program was submitted and approved by the commonwealth's Education Professional Standards Board in 2003. Evidence was provided within the institutional report, on-site interviews, and exhibits (both physical and electronic) to support the fact that this weakness has been corrected.

STANDARD 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

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

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Assessment system

The University of Kentucky professional education unit began transforming its technology infrastructure in 1994. The expansion of the use of Information Systems Technology was initiated to support the management of candidate progress through programs, to assess the effectiveness of programs and to facilitate systematic planning. The College of Education Instructional Technology Center (ITC) technical staff was increased as were resources to support a growing technical system including additional wiring, data servers and faculty support.

The first project on Databases and Information Systems began in 1996 to collect data associated with teacher education candidates. These data records were managed by the Office of Academic Services and Teacher Certification, which was also charged with the responsibility of maintaining candidate records and providing data and reports to program faculties. The unit's Center for Educator Preparation Information Systems (CEPIS) was established in 2003 and continues to develop. The function of the CEPIS Web Portal is to allow unit database accessibility to program faculties, staff, candidates and unit administrators for data analysis and reporting.

The unit's assessment system reflects state and professional standards and the candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework. Candidates are assessed throughout the program, both formally and informally, on New Teacher Standards and Experienced Teacher Standards. *Research* is an integral part of all methods coursework. Candidates are expected to do extensive *reflection* throughout the program as they develop their skills and practice them in the classroom. One candidate observed, "We do reflection, reflection and more reflection, and then we reflect on our reflection." As they compile portfolios through coursework and field work, candidates are expected to focus on student *learning*. In an introductory methods class observed during the visit, the professor explained that many of the lesson plans she had just reviewed needed improvement in connecting the assessment to the lesson objective. *Leading* is embedded within the four sets of standards, which are continuously measured by the assessment system.

Candidates are assessed in a variety of ways, including standardized tests, such as ACTE, Praxis and SAT. Candidate performance on New Teacher Standards, Technology Standards, and Functional Skills and Dispositions are assessed in candidate-assembled portfolios and faculty interviews and observations. Candidates are assessed at all three key transition points: program admission, program retention, and program completion. The education counseling and psychology department uses candidate portfolios, practicum ratings and internship ratings to assess its advanced candidates, using rubrics based on National Association of School Psychologist standards.

Unit faculty members inform those candidates who do not meet expectations for program

admission exactly why they were denied and what they need to do in order to be reconsidered. Unit faculty document candidates' progress toward and attainment of all standards as they move through the programs. Unit advisors monitor candidate progress and work personally, via email and phone calls, with those candidates who appear to not be making progress.

The unit employs several policies in order to ensure fairness, equity, consistency and a bias-free assessment program. First, they are very transparent and explicit in regards to the directions for preparation of and the expectation for candidates' portfolios. Secondly, the Continuous Research, Assessment, and Development (UK-RADS) regularly reviews all assessment policies and looks carefully at the data generated by the assessments to determine whether or not they are fair. The use of Kentucky New Teacher Standards enables the unit to take advantage of an instrument that was developed using a larger and more diverse population than would be available locally. In addition, all faculty interviews with candidates for the purposes of assessment are conducted by at least two faculty members, who then compare and reconcile their impressions.

A combination of formal and informal assessments occurs at each transition point. Interviews with faculty responsible for admission of candidates emphasized that the best predictors of candidate success were those assessments that included interviews with the candidates. Faculty stated that oral communication skills are integral to effective teaching, and in their experience, those candidates who do well in those types of admission assessments usually become strong teachers.

All assessment data for all initial and advanced programs are entered into the unit's data base. The data are used by all programs to manage individual candidates; the potential exists for the unit and its programs to use these data extensively to manage and improve its operations. This system is relatively new, and that potential has been realized in limited ways, mostly by initial programs.

B. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation

Data are collected for each candidate, initial and advanced, during each of the three points in the program. In addition, surveys are administered to student teachers, cooperating teachers and university supervisors. Follow-up data from teacher interns, resource teachers and alumni are also analyzed.

The data are summarized into three categories for each program: educator standards, Unit Functional Skills and Dispositions, and Unit Technology Standards. These data are reported in electronic tables, made available through the CEPIS web portal. Interviews with the Academic Services staff showed how these tables are easily converted into graphs and charts. The data can then be analyzed at the program and unit level.

Candidates who are denied admission to an educator certification program, not retained in the program, or denied completion of the program, may appeal the decision of the program faculty. The steps of this process are outlined entirely in the University Bulletin. Records of all candidate complaints and resolutions are maintained on the CEPIS system.

C. Use of data for program improvement

The unit regularly and systematically uses data, including candidate and graduate performance information, to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs, and field and clinical experiences. The unit uses a model of *Continuous Research, Assessment, and Development* (UK-RADS) to support its assessment system. The unit has also identified unit data that are collected, analyzed, and reported on a regular basis for the purpose of making improvements to programs and the unit. Interviews with program faculty chairs confirm that both initial and advanced programs collect and analyze data from the Continuous Assessment Reviews (CARS) which includes data on educator standards, Unit Functional Skills and Dispositions, and Unit Technology Standards.

The data are used by faculty and candidates to improve performance in a variety of ways. Faculty members provide formative feedback to candidates as they progress through the program. For example, the candidates in the Educational Leadership program are provided feedback on the assessment of the portfolio at the midpoint and completion stage of the program. Candidates also receive feedback from each course on assignments and projects. Interviews with candidates and faculty and examples of student work in the exhibit room substantiate the finding that extensive formative feedback is provided as candidates progress through the program.

The unit analyzes program evaluation and performance assessment data for the purpose of initiating changes where needed. Numerous changes have been implemented as a result of data analysis.

Unit level use of data for program improvement at the advanced level was referenced in the institutional report and verified in interviews. Program level examples of data use for improvement were verified through interviews and minutes. A number of significant programmatic improvements are being initiated based on the initial results of data collection at the program level and were confirmed through program faculty interviews and document reviews. The improvements are illustrated in the following examples:

1. Focus group data collected from elementary graduates, feedback from the New Teacher Survey, and exit interviews with student teachers were used to convene an Elementary Revision Committee to review the curriculum and experiences in the undergraduate elementary education program. Numerous data-driven changes that were made to the program include a new course focused on working with students with special needs, elimination of duplicative coursework in art and music courses, replacement of the specialization areas with additional course requirements in mathematics and literacy, and identification of major strands to be integrated throughout the program. The University Senate approved the revised program for implementation in fall 2007.
2. The Agricultural Education program was redesigned based on trend data from the CARS reports and Praxis II results to increase rigor and candidate expectations in the program and to ensure candidates have the opportunity to complete the program in four years. These intended outcomes were accomplished at many levels and led to a strengthened curriculum in the professional teacher education core, educational support classes, and agriculture content.

Assessment data are shared with candidates through feedback sessions on their progress through the transition points of the programs, particularly at the midpoint and completion stage. An example of this is the feedback provided to the candidates in the Educational Leadership program. Candidates receive feedback from each course on assignments and projects as well as on the assessment of their portfolio at the midpoint and completion stage of the program.

The department also receives feedback from the Educational Testing System at the end of each academic year on the three administrations of the School Leadership Licensure Assessment. Results from the three tests are reported to the Certification Office in the College of Education, which distributes them to the department. Faculty then review the results and identify instructional and curriculum changes.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has an assessment system to manage candidate performance and unit operations for initial and advanced programs. Sufficient evidence was presented that this system enables the unit to collect, analyze, summarize, and use data to monitor candidate performance and to make program and unit improvements at the initial and advanced levels. Evidence was provided showing that databases are used for initial and advanced programs and that program improvements are data-informed.

Recommendation: Met

Areas for Improvement: None

STANDARD 3: FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Collaboration between unit and school partners

Initial and Advanced:

Councils known as Program Faculties consist of program specific unit faculty, university faculty outside of the unit, school personnel relevant to the program (i.e., teachers, administrators, or other school personnel) and candidate representatives. They are the governing bodies for each of the unit's programs. These councils make decisions about policies, curricular changes, the scope and sequence of the field experiences, the retention of field supervisors, and other key issues related to field experiences. These collaborative Program Faculties govern nearly all programs at the initial and advanced levels. The educational leadership programs, however, are governed by the Educational Leadership Advisory Committee in policy and procedural matters. This structure actively supports and promotes the collaboration between the university and school-based partners. Members of Program Faculties interviewed believed their viewpoints and ideas were listened to and acted upon by the council. Program Faculties for each program meet regularly, at least two times each semester and the Program Faculty Chairs meet monthly during the academic year to create uniformity across all programs. Minutes from the Program Faculty Chairs indicate that they review assessment data as a unit.

Partners contribute to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the field and clinical experiences primarily through the interaction of the various Program Faculties, which contribute significantly to decisions regarding all aspects of their individual programs. Issues related to the field and clinical experiences are frequently debated as evidenced by the minutes of these councils and interviews of members of the councils. Discussions focus on selecting placements sites, tasks to be completed during field experiences, placement for clinical experience for candidates experiencing difficulty, and analysis of program evaluation data. Suggestions for modification of assessment instruments and methods for evaluating the candidates during their field experience are documented in the minutes and through interviews of members.

As revealed through interviews and printed departmental procedures, candidates are placed in schools and educational agencies that have been designated as partner sites described as the Field Network. Member institutions within the Field Network must indicate a strong interest in collaboration with the unit. The placement coordinator of each Program Faculty is charged with maintaining familiarity with the demographic data of the partner sites, and with ensuring dissimilarity for a candidate's experience. The unit strives to place candidates in a variety of grade level settings and with diverse populations. While this goal is met with varying degrees of success, evidence found in the various databases documents the consistency of this effort. Particular strength was found in the placement models at the middle and high school levels, at both initial and advanced levels.

The unit allows districts used in elementary field experience to arrange the first placements for all candidates. All other placements are arranged by the unit via the individual Program Faculties. Progress of candidates is jointly monitored throughout each placement.

Interviews with building principals indicate that they assist in the placement of candidates. The placement coordinator for each of the Program Faculties contacts the network of principal and clinical faculty indicating the number of candidates requiring placement. Assignments are then made based on the availability of qualified cooperating teachers at requisite grade levels and subject area specializations.

The Program Faculties also have the ability to arrange for candidates to complete the requirements for student teaching with partner institutions through the Consortium for Overseas Student Teaching (COST). The Consortium conducts all placement arrangements based upon student application data. The candidate makes application for the overseas student teaching and is then screened to determine the suitability in relation to academic accomplishments, adaptability and maturity. Candidates wishing to conduct their student teaching through the COST program must take an intensive orientation course (*EDC 554: Culture, Education and Teaching Abroad*) in the fall semester immediately preceding their departure.

B. Design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice

Initial and Advanced:

The field experiences and clinical practices are embedded in the required course work for each initial and advanced certification program, programs for the continuous preparation of teachers, and other school personnel (e.g. school psychology, social worker). The specific requirements for initial programs and for advanced programs, outlined in the institutional report, were verified by documents and in interviews.

Assignments and assessment measures, represented by artifacts in the exhibit room, are tied to the unit's conceptual framework, state standards and national standards for each program. Candidates at the initial level design units of study that are congruent to the standards of the state. They must show multiple forms of assessment to evaluate the effectiveness of lessons taught, and they analyze assessment data to determine the effectiveness of lessons taught. Evidence of this process was clearly demonstrated in the poster sessions and described by candidates. The candidates address classroom diversity through differentiated instruction and other strategies to meet the needs of individual students.

All candidates reflect on their work in order to learn how to improve and modify their lessons. Instruments for guiding candidate reflection, as well as completed examples, demonstrated a clear avenue for appropriate reflection, in accordance with the unit's conceptual framework.

Research plays a major role in the field and clinical experience in the advanced programs. Many candidates conduct action research projects in their classrooms. University supervisors and clinical faculty assist the candidates in activities focused on the analysis of data collected. Guided reflective activities accompany and follow these candidate research efforts.

At the advanced level the assessment tools reflect the state and national standards for each program. Candidates are assessed by the university and resource teachers using these criteria.

The use of technology as an instructional tool is systematic. As evidenced in classroom observations, the unit faculty model the use of technology in their classrooms with candidates. Candidates are exposed to these technologies and required to demonstrate their proficiency as they progress through their studies. University faculty demonstrated the use of email, Blackboard, PowerPoint, SMART boards, websites, overhead projectors, and video streaming, to enhance their lessons. Some candidates are required to produce lessons using a variety of these technologies as shown in course requirements. Portfolios are now electronically produced by some candidates, and were reviewed for content, depth, and quality. Candidates record and analyze data to track their own growth through data-based computer systems. Candidates are also required to video tape themselves teaching during their practicum and student teaching and to use the video to reflect on their teaching.

At both the initial and advanced levels candidates use technology in their placements. Based on the availability of technology in their schools or agencies, the expectation is that candidates will use the technology to enhance their lessons.

Those who serve as clinical school-based teachers (Clinical Faculty) for student teachers in initial teacher certification program are referred to as cooperating teachers. They are selected using several data sources, including their expressed interest, recommendations by university faculty and school administrators, interviews and classroom observations, and documentation that they meet state and national accreditation requirements. These requirements include having: (a) a valid Kentucky teaching certificate for the grade and subject taught, (b) a Rank II certification or a minimum of fifteen hours of approved credit toward a Rank II within a minimum period of five years, (c) three years' experience teaching with a Professional Certificate, and (d) one year of experience teaching in the current school system. A waiver for potential school-based faculty who possess exceptional experience, but who do not meet one or more of the state mandated criteria, can be submitted by the unit head to the EPSB for state level approval. Examples of approved waivers demonstrated a multi-tiered examination process.

Clinical faculty are offered the opportunity to participate in an initial training seminar prior to their first clinical practice placement. Interviews indicated the while many of the clinical faculty participate in the training session, many do not. Ongoing training is conducted by individual program faculties in a non-uniform, but program specific manner. The initial certification program in mathematics, for example, manages a widely utilized website to provide a continuous stream of developmental training information for clinical faculty, candidates in clinical practice, and university supervisors.

The clinical faculty provide regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing advanced-level programs and other interns through a prescribed method of assessment. The unit provides the *Field Guide for Professional Partners* containing the requirements and evaluation forms to be used by the cooperating teacher. The evaluation forms are returned to the individual Program Faculties at prescribed intervals throughout the placement. The cooperating teacher is made aware of the supervisory expectations, as well as the support system provided by the unit and the individual program.

C. Candidates' development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn

Initial and Advanced:

Candidate eligibility and success rates were provided, aggregated by year (fall and spring semesters). The tables track the number of candidates in twenty-one programs, covering four academic years (2003-2004 to 2006-2007), that were admitted to the program, as well as those who either completed or did not complete each program. Specific descriptions of why each of the 14 candidates who did not complete their individual programs was also provided.

Individual program faculties provide for an ongoing series of formative (reflection assignments, case studies, and abstract designs) and summative assessments (portfolio submissions, oral examinations, standardized test scores) through each of the required field experiences and clinical practice. Formal assessment instruments, constructed with professional standards and gauged with embedded performance indicators, are used unit-wide. Both initial and advanced program levels employ assessments that involve the candidates, school-based personnel (midterm/final conferences with university supervisors, anecdotal conversations, post observation conferences), and university personnel (course grades, field observations, field reflection documents). At the earliest stages of the various programs, students submit portfolios that document core knowledge related to the specific certification requirements and areas related to specialty area studies. Emphasis is on development of knowledge, skills and dispositions to help all students learn. Portfolio submissions continue throughout several of the candidates' programs. Elementary candidates, in particular, are required to continue the submission of portfolios at appointed stages.

The conceptual framework of the unit guides candidate reflection throughout all field and clinical placements at the initial and advanced levels. Candidates engage in reflection assignments in a systematic and deliberate manner throughout each of the various field experience and clinical practice placements. Expectations for appropriate reflection responses are well known among school-based faculty, and candidate performance is monitored by both school-based faculty and university supervisors. Feedback related to candidate performance is an ongoing process that involves informal (post-observation conferences, daily exchange of information via email and Internet) and formal structures (post-observation review instruments, midterm, and final conferences).

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit, in collaboration with its school partners, designs, implements, and evaluates field experiences and clinical practices to ensure that the candidates' experiences provide the opportunities to develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions mandated by the conceptual framework, with a focus on student learning. The various field experiences take place in a variety of settings and are monitored to ensure compliance with institutional, state, and national standards. Supervision is conducted by a wide range of university supervisors and clinical faculty.

Recommendation: Met

Areas for Improvement: None

STANDARD 4: DIVERSITY

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

Level: Initial and Advanced

The professional education unit emphasizes the importance of diversity in its mission statement and the unit's strategic plan embraces diversity across all dimensions. The plan also identifies the unit's policy on diversity, with conviction that it must strengthen the diversity of its communities; support free expression, reasoned discourse, and diversity of ideas; and take into account a wide range of considerations including, but not limited to, ethnicity, race, disability and sex, when making personnel and policy decisions. The unit has established specific objectives in its strategic plan that relate to increasing faculty, candidate, and curricular diversity. There are multiple offices and committees to ensure that these objectives are met, including the Office of Equity and Diversity, the International Committee, and the Inclusiveness Task Force.

A. Design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences

Candidates in initial, advanced and other school personnel programs are required to develop and demonstrate proficiencies related to diversity that are specified in the unit's conceptual framework and in national, state, and institutional standards. Two of the five Unit Functional Skills and Dispositions described in the conceptual framework emphasize the importance of diverse perspectives in the development of professional educators. Throughout their preparation programs, candidates must demonstrate proficiency with the skills and dispositions related to diversity. Data related to candidate proficiency on these skills and dispositions are discussed in Standard 1 of this report.

Initial Programs:

Candidates in initial teacher preparation programs must demonstrate proficiency on standards and performance criteria related to diversity in the state's New Teacher Standard 2: Creates/Maintains Learning Climates. Candidate performance data aligned with these indicators, reported in Standard 1 of the institutional report, were verified in exhibits and interviews. Academic programs across the unit have mapped their courses with the topics and issues of diversity and the assignments covered by courses within the programs. Candidates in early childhood education programs must also demonstrate proficiencies related to diversity identified in the state's Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education Birth to Primary Standards.

Advanced, Other School Personnel Programs:

Candidates in advanced and other school personnel programs must demonstrate proficiencies related to diversity in the state's Experienced Teacher Standards. Course maps for diversity provide evidence of a systematic inclusion of diversity topics, discussions, and assignments across most programs. For example, in EDC 730 (Social Studies), diversity is considered from multiple perspectives. Advanced candidates examine their own practice and experiences along multiple dimensions of diversity, using course readings. In the advanced Interdisciplinary Early

Childhood Education (IECE) program, the inclusion of children with disabilities in each of the field sites strengthens the candidates' understandings of diversity as well as their ability to meet the diverse learning and behavioral needs of young children. Program faculty provide assistance to IECE candidates in field experiences to discuss methods to meet the individual learning needs of students with identified disabilities and instruction specific to the study of racial and cultural diversity within university and college requirements.

The unit recognizes, through analysis of the state's New Teacher Survey data, that student teachers and their cooperating teachers as well as intern teachers and their resource teachers rate student teacher and intern teacher level of preparation as less than "good" on the survey in areas related to working with students with special needs. The unit has identified strategies to address these concerns. For example, at a supervisor's meeting, a workshop for supervisors and program faculty members focused on how programs help teacher candidates address the needs of children with disabilities in the classroom. In addition, a new course that focuses on working with students with special needs was added to the elementary program in response to feedback from these multiple sources that candidates are less than well prepared in this area.

The unit contracted with a consultant for the purpose of reviewing the extent to which diversity is infused in program curricula and experiences and to develop signature diversity assignments. Initial and advanced programs have or are in the process of developing these signature assignments that candidates must complete during their programs. Evidence of these assignments was available in the exhibit room and in electronic portfolios.

Initial, advanced, other school personnel programs, and the one distance education program require coursework that is aligned to professional standards (i.e., the state's New Teacher Standards and Experienced Teacher Standards, ISLLC Standards) and most programs use diversity course maps or matrices to document which standards are met in what courses within a program. For example, programs in agricultural education map courses by diversity topics (i.e., learning styles, multiple intelligences, personality type, gender, race/ethnicity, and socio-economic) while the Department of Educational Leadership Studies maps courses by knowledge, disposition, and performance indicators. Candidates in initial preparation programs in art, music, elementary, middle, health education, physical education, and special education (LBD) are required to take EPE 301 *Education in American Culture*. This course explores the context of teaching and learning in American society, examines different perspectives on education and culture, and explores the effects of race, class, gender, ethnicity, religion, language, and regional dynamics on teaching and learning.

Assessments in required courses provide evidence about candidates' proficiencies related to diversity. Assessments include observations, portfolios, and performance on signature assignments. Candidates complete and defend portfolios aligned with various state and national professional standards (i.e., ISLLC, International Reading Association standards, Experienced Teacher Standards). Using the Continuous Assessment Review (CAR) form, program faculties rate candidate proficiency on diversity standards at critical transition points and data show that candidates progress in their proficiencies from admission to retention to completion. Evidence of student proficiency was found in reflection assignments, case studies, abstract designs, lesson plans, and portfolios (both paper based and electronic).

The unit analyzes and uses data from the New Teacher Survey and the Graduating Senior Survey to assess its effectiveness in preparing candidates to meet diversity standards. A review of data

from these surveys from 2002 to 2006 indicates that in general, graduating seniors indicated that their knowledge and skills related to understanding the world from a variety of viewpoints and valuing cultural diversity were stronger or much stronger than when they entered the unit. Responses from candidates interviewed were generally mixed regarding their confidence in working with students with special needs and students from diverse backgrounds. A review of candidate products provided evidence that they were able to consider accommodations for students with special needs. Less evident were specific references in some candidate artifacts, such as lesson plans completed for course assignments, to the needs of students from diverse backgrounds and cultures. While it is less evident in student products, interviews with professors, principals, supervisors, and candidates provide evidence that attention to the need of students from diverse backgrounds or to provide a classroom climate that values diversity is a priority with candidates.

B. Experiences working with diverse faculty

Candidates at all levels have opportunities to interact with diverse faculty throughout the university and in their professional education classes. The unit has identified recruitment and retention of diverse faculty as a high priority and that priority is evidenced throughout the leadership of the unit. Most college deans who collaborate with the unit have identified strategies to support the priority, with one College (Communications and Information Studies) reporting a forty percent minority faculty. There is evidence that the number of minority faculty members in the College of Education has been consistent over the last six years. The college has lost some minority faculty members over the time period; however, it has hired new minority faculty as well. The unit lost one African-American faculty member in 2004 when she assumed a deanship at another institution; however, two additional minority faculty members were hired from 2003 to 2006. The female to male ratio of faculty in the unit has increased slightly from 2001 to 2006. In 2001, 51 percent of the faculty members were female as compared to 52.7 percent in 2006. Of 120 full-time faculty members in the professional education unit for the fall 2007 semester, two are Asian or Pacific Islander (1.7%); 13 are Black, non-Hispanic (10.8%); and 105 are White, non-Hispanic (87.5%). When considering all faculty at the university, the percentage of diverse faculty has increased from 11.7 percent in 2001 to 14.2 percent in 2005. Over the same five-year period, the percentage of female faculty increased from 27.8 to 28.8 percent. The university president pays the first year salary for new and diverse faculty hired as an incentive to recruit and hire diverse faculty and the provost will provide funding to hire a minority faculty member in cases when a highly qualified professional is identified and a faculty line is not available. Candidates indicate that their professors bring many backgrounds and diversity of place and ideas to their classrooms and an audit of faculty vitae indicate that many faculty members have had diverse experiences that should contribute to cultural competency. A wide variety of experiences and backgrounds indicate a faculty able to represent a variety of views appropriate for a culturally rich education experience. Tables below, from the institutional report, provide trend data on minority and gender distribution for the College of Education over a six year period, unit diversity for faculty in fall semester 2007 and five-year trend data on minority and gender distribution for university tenure and tenure-track faculty.

**Table 4.9: Minority and Gender Distribution of Tenured and Tenure-Track College of Education Faculty
Fall Semesters, 2001-2006**

	2001 N (%)	2002 N (%)	2003 N (%)	2004 N (%)	2005 N (%)	2006 N (%)
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Asian or Pacific Islander	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.1%)
Black, non-Hispanic	10 (10.4%)	9 (9.9%)	9 (9.3%)	10 (10.3%)	11 (11.6%)	11 (11.9%)
Hispanic	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
White, non-Hispanic	84 (87.6%)	80 (87.9%)	86 (88.7%)	86 (88.7%)	83 (87.4%)	81 (87.0%)
Total	96 (100.0%)	91 (100.0%)	97 (100.0%)	97 (100.0%)	95 (100.0%)	93 (100.0%)
Female	49 (51.0%)	44 (48.3%)	50 (51.5%)	50 (51.5%)	50 (52.6%)	49 (52.7%)
Male	47 (49.0%)	47 (51.7%)	47 (48.5%)	47 (48.5%)	45 (47.4%)	44 (47.3%)
Total	96 (100.0%)	91 (100.0%)	97 (100.0%)	97 (100.0%)	95 (100.0%)	93 (100.0%)

Displayed in Table 4.10 are demographic data for the 120 full-time faculty members in the professional education unit for the fall 2007 semester.

Table 4.10: Diversity of Unit Faculty, Fall 2007

American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black, non-Hispanic	Hispanic	White, non-Hispanic	Female	Male	Total
0 (0.0%)	2 (1.7%)	13 (10.8%)	0 (0.0%)	105 (87.5%)	65 (54.2%)	55 (45.8%)	120 (100%)

Table 4.11 reports the racial/ethnic and gender distribution of tenured and tenure-track faculty throughout the university.

**Table 4.11: Minority and Gender Distribution of Tenured and Tenure-Track UK Faculty
Fall Semesters, 2001-2005**

	2001 N (%)	2002 N (%)	2003 N (%)	2004 N (%)	2005 N (%)
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3 (0.2%)	2 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)
Asian or Pacific Islander	116 (7.2%)	127 (7.8%)	139 (8.6%)	149 (9.3%)	150 (9.5%)
Black, non-Hispanic	54 (3.4%)	58 (3.6%)	58 (3.6%)	61 (3.8%)	59 (3.7%)
Hispanic	14 (0.9%)	19 (1.1%)	19 (1.2%)	15 (0.9%)	15 (0.9%)
White, non-Hispanic	1,423 (88.3%)	1,427 (87.4%)	1,389 (86.5%)	1,371 (85.9%)	1,356 (85.8%)
Total	1,610 (100%)	1,633 (100%)	1,606 (100%)	1,597 (100%)	1,581 (100%)
Female	447 (27.8%)	461 (28.2%)	456 (28.4%)	453 (28.4%)	455 (28.8%)
Male	1,163 (72.2%)	1,172 (71.8%)	1,150 (71.6%)	1,144 (71.6%)	1,126 (71.2%)
Total	1,610 (100%)	1,633 (100%)	1,606 (100%)	1,597 (100%)	1,581 (100%)

While the professional education unit employs faculty that represent racial and gender diversity, it is committed to continue to increase the number of faculty from diverse racial and ethnic groups. The *College of Education Strategic Plan* identifies a unit goal of hiring two additional faculty of color by 2009. In upcoming searches, each department will be asked to continue making a full-faith effort to comply with the unit's *Guidelines for Search Committees on Promoting Diversity*. These guidelines, developed in 2006-2007 in consultation with the Task Force on Inclusiveness, focus on eight key responsibilities of search committees such as having a diverse membership, using appropriate advertising and recruitment procedures, selecting a list of finalists which is diverse, making an appropriate hiring recommendation, evaluating the search process and developing a long-term strategy for cultivating potential applicants. Additionally, the university is systematically looking at the department level for accountability in recruiting a diverse faculty.

In addition to applying these guidelines to all faculty searches, the College of Education continues to advertise all positions nationally in relevant national professional associations and organizations. Departments also distribute position announcements to education units at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and to Holmes Scholars.

C. Experiences working with diverse candidates

Candidate data on ethnicity of candidates across the unit reflect the ethnicity data for the state, based on the 2000 Census. Demographic information from 2001 to 2006 on undergraduate candidates ranges from 8 to 9.4 percent minority and from 12 to 15 percent minority graduate and other school personnel candidates. Minority and international students made up at least 13.6 percent of the overall headcount enrollment at the university, which is somewhat higher than that of the College of Education. Based on a review of enrollment data provided by the Office of Institutional Research, minority candidate percentages from programs outside of the College of Education range between 3.3 and 13.6 percent. The College of Education enrolled substantially more women (70.2% undergraduate /71.8% graduate) than the university (51.2% undergraduate/58.7 graduate) in fall 2006. See Tables 4.12 Racial/Ethnic and Gender Diversity of COE Undergraduate Students, 4.13 Racial/Ethnic and Gender Diversity of COE Graduate Students, and 4.14 Racial/Ethnic and Gender Diversity of UK Undergraduate and Graduate Students in the Institutional Report for trend data.

The professional unit is aggressively recruiting more minority candidates into its programs and has been successful in raising scholarship money to be used for minority scholarships. The College of Education's Office of Equity and Diversity, which was created in 2004, focuses on the early identification and preparation of potential candidates from diverse backgrounds. The office works with students eligible for application to a Teacher Education Program upon applying for admission to the university. Students declaring a major in the college are provided links to individuals, services, programs, resources, and activities to ease their transition into the college and to increase the likelihood of their retention.

D. Experiences working with diverse students in P-12 schools

Candidates in initial, advanced, and other school personnel have opportunities within their respective programs to work with diverse students in P-12 schools, and the unit is committed to

ensuring that candidates experience diversity in their placements. Most elementary program candidates are placed for their student teaching experiences in the county surrounding the university. It is important to note that cooperating teacher demographics are much different, with 12 out of 18 programs placing candidates with 100 percent white cooperating teachers; the unit relies on the county school's field placement coordinator to make all initial field placements. Table 4.15 in the Institutional Report illustrates the diversity in the central Kentucky region served by the university. Demographic data for P-12 placement sites are provided in Table 4.16.

Initial Programs:

To ensure that all initial candidates have diverse field experiences, the placement of candidates in multiple and diverse environments is systematized at the program level. Candidates are informed of this policy when they apply to the program. Program faculties base placement decisions on careful examination of previous placements and programs use a placement database and demographic reports maintained by the Office of Field Experiences (OFE). The placement database tracks each candidate's placements throughout the program and can be viewed online by program faculty. The school demographic reports provide information about populations served by partner schools in what the unit calls the "Field Network" and include the racial and ethnic diversity and socioeconomic diversity based on students receiving free and reduced lunch in the placement sites. The unit reports that this placement procedure usually ensures that candidates complete field assignments in several different settings working with populations that represent different kinds of diversity such as cultural, economic, ethnic, and linguistic as well as students with special needs.

Advanced Programs, Other School Personnel, and Distance Education Programs:

Candidates in advanced, other school personnel programs, and the unit's distance education program can complete assignments and clinical experiences in their own classrooms as long as they have diverse experiences woven into their programs. Advanced and other school personnel program faculties find it challenging to provide rich and extended diverse experiences in environments outside of a candidate's home school or agency because the candidates are typically employed in full time jobs and are unable to take time off for extended periods. In the case of the social work program, candidates also need to be placed with certified social workers which limits their placement options even further. One way that several programs are addressing this limitation in a creative manner is to pair candidates within a cohort (i.e., urban with rural; less diverse with more diverse school setting). Several program faculties indicated that they encourage candidates to visit their partner's school or clinical setting. Other faculty reported using technology to enhance candidates' experiences, by creating web-enhanced learning communities where candidates address their environmental context and settings through online discussions and reflections. One program uses the web-based YouTube (www.youtube.com) environment, where candidates and the university professors upload videos of themselves periodically as a way to communicate between face-to-face sessions.

Based on interviews with candidates at all levels and with program faculty, and based on a review of candidate products, it is evident that candidates work collaboratively with their peers and receive constructive feedback from their professors in courses throughout their program and during their practicum placements, student teaching, and internships.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has a clear and broad base of diversity priorities in its mission a practice of recruiting and retaining diverse faculty and candidates, and makes efforts to provide a diverse range of experiences for its candidates at all levels. The diversity of candidates in unit programs roughly mirrors that of the university and service area as a whole. Candidate dispositions and standards related to diversity are assessed throughout required coursework at all program levels. Within the racial and ethnic diversity in the university's service area, initial, advanced and other school personnel candidates have adequate experience with a diverse population of P-12 students.

Recommendation: Met

Areas for Improvement: None

STANDARD 5: FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT

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

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Qualified faculty

The University of Kentucky defines the professional education faculty as those who are full time in the COE as well as full time faculty members from schools and colleges other than the COE who contribute significantly to the educator preparation programs. In the *UK Administrative Regulations*, individuals are designated as either *regular title* or *special title*. The majority of faculty in the COE are regular title and are expected to accomplish teaching, research, and service. The few faculty members who hold special title faculty positions are typically teaching intensive with a modest research expectation, or special title faculty who have a primary focus on supervision of field experiences.

There are 120 full time professional education faculty of which, 111 have an earned doctorate (93%). The nine faculty members who do not hold a terminal degree have exceptional expertise in their teaching or specialization areas. The COE requires the same criteria for “exceptional expertise” as outlined by the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges (SACS). This documentation is included on faculty members’ vitae and maintained in the office of the dean. Part-time faculty teach courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels and supervise students in the field. Thirty-eight part time faculty members contributed to the professional education programs during fall 2007. Of the full time faculty, 76 are tenured with 26 of those holding the rank of Professor. Fifty are at the rank of Associate Professor, and 41 are Assistant Professors on a tenure track. The unit has three full time faculty members who are non tenured and not on a tenure track. Unit faculty are comprised of 65 females and 55 males. Eighty-seven percent of the faculty are White and 10.8 percent are African American. Asian or Pacific Islander faculty members represent 1.7 percent of the COE faculty.

According to the Institutional Report, 83 percent of the COE faculty have contemporary educational experiences. Contemporary professional experiences are defined by the unit as occurring within the past five years and include professional experiences such as having been a certified employee, conducting observations, conducting action research, or collaborating with P-12 partners. Collaboration examples include consulting, delivering professional development, or working on funded projects. Faculty vitae provide documentation of the professional licensures held and the contemporary school experiences. Faculty members who do not report contemporary experiences are those who typically teach courses that do not focus on P-12 education such as higher education, health promotion, and rehabilitation counseling.

The university and the unit award graduate assistantships in the form of teaching and research assistants. The unit is responsible for providing written policies concerning the appointment and reappointment of teaching and research assistants. Teaching assistants (TAs) are employed and evaluated by the academic departments and report to the department chair. Research assistants

(RAs) are also employed by the academic departments and may be assigned by the department chair, director, or may be assigned by an individual faculty member.

B. Modeling best professional practices in teaching

The unit's conceptual framework is integrated into the education courses and instruction. Course syllabi provide examples of a variety of learning strategies and assessments based on the unit's theme, *Research and Reflection for Leading and Learning*, and also provide evidence of program alignment to the pertinent state and professional standards. Course syllabi indicate that faculty members incorporate current research related to best practice in their courses such as EDC 339: Designing A Reading and Language Arts Program for the Elementary School, EDC 620: Design and Implementation of a Reading Program, and EDL 701: Leadership in Educational Organizations. Classroom observations indicate that some faculty members employ traditional methods of lecture instruction; however other faculty utilize exemplary methods of instruction such as small group instruction, student engagement with candidate presentations, and team teaching. Candidate interviews confirm that faculty in the unit infuse the conceptual framework theme of reflection and encourage students to be reflective practitioners in coursework and through field experiences. Interviews with candidates and faculty confirm that critical reflection is required of candidates not only on their pedagogical skills, but also on the impact of their teaching in relation to student learning.

A review of faculty publications and interviews provided evidence of faculty knowledge and experience in diversity. Some unit faculty are highly specialized and are noted experts in their chosen fields in teaching and working with diverse populations of students. Courses in the COE assist candidates to meet the needs of diverse learners. For example, EPE 301 Education in American Culture is offered in the Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation department. Recently an art education course was added to the curriculum to provide candidates more exposure to diversity topics in art education. Candidate work samples, from the electronic exhibits and the hard copy exhibits, include assignments that directly address diversity as well as lesson plans including adaptations for addressing student learning differences.

Classrooms in the COE have been recently renovated to include teaching stations with computers, Internet connections, and projectors; some classrooms feature smart boards and digital document cameras. Candidate interviews and student presentations noted the use of technology in many of their courses. Faculty members incorporate the use of technology into their classroom instruction through PowerPoint presentations. More advanced technologies can be found in the Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotions where candidates have the opportunity to learn with state of the art exercise equipment including a pediatric physiology lab and other tools for measuring bone density and body composition. Faculty members model and teach candidates to use current technology to enhance classroom instruction. Faculty members in the Communication Disorders program use a wide variety of adaptive technology to train candidates. Assistive technology is taught in special education courses and interviews with advanced candidates in this program confirm that using this technology has enhanced P-12 student learning in their own classrooms, according to the latest state assessment.

Evidence of professional education faculty effectiveness includes course evaluations and faculty awards. Faculty members in the unit receive higher ratings on their course evaluations than their colleagues throughout the university. A review of course evaluations from 2000-2007 indicates that faculty in the COE received an average rating of 3.55 out of a 4 point rating scale, compared

to the university average of 3.35. Unit faculty have been recognized for their teaching excellence through the receipt of various awards. Examples of teaching awards include:

- Art Educator of the Year, National Society of Arts and Letters
- President's Award, Association of Teacher Educators
- Art Educator of the year, Kentucky Art Education Association
- Sylvia Walker Educator of the Year, National Association of Multicultural Rehabilitation Concerns
- Lifetime Achievement Award, Kentucky Council of Teachers of Mathematics
- Great Teacher Award, UK Alumni Association

Unit faculty have several opportunities to engage in self assessment of their teaching. The annual evaluation for non-tenured faculty members and the biannual evaluation of tenured faculty provide opportunities to engage in a self evaluation process. The tenure and promotion process provides an opportunity for in depth reflection and analysis of one's teaching performance. Faculty submit materials to the department chair for review. The faculty member is provided a written evaluation of the review and has another opportunity to reflect and respond to the evaluation.

C. Modeling best professional practices in scholarship

The institutional mission, approved on October 10, 2006, includes a goal of expanding knowledge "through research, scholarship, and creative activity." The unit upholds this aspect of the institute's mission through excellent scholarly work. The mission of the unit is to expand the knowledge of teaching and learning processes across a broad educational spectrum. All faculty members in the COE uphold the unit's theme of *Research and Reflection for Learning and Leading*. Faculty members receive support for their scholarly activities in a variety of ways. Faculty members are allotted a specified amount of time to devote to research through the Distribution of Effort (DOE) system. In recent years, the standard load of two-three (or five courses per academic year) has been reduced to two-two, or four courses per academic year. This reduction in teaching load allows faculty members the opportunity to attend to research and publication. The Institute for Educational Research (IER) was established to enhance grant writing and productivity of the COE faculty. The institute provides faculty support at all phases of the grant submission process from locating appropriate grants to post- award support with budgets and reporting. Journal articles, books, book chapters, technical reports, state, national, and international conference presentations, awards and grants documented faculty scholarship in the unit. Since 2000, professional education faculty members at UK were awarded \$ 39.7 million in grants, published a total of 950 journal articles, and conducted 2,348 conference presentations. While scholarship expectations may differ between regular title faculty and special title faculty, all faculty members have some level of expected scholarship. Some unit faculty have received awards for their scholarly contributions. Examples include:

- Prove It Works Research Award, Kentucky Association for Education Communications and Technology
- Relating Research to Practice Award, American Educational Research Association
- Exemplary Researcher Award, American Educational Research Association

A review of faculty vitae, dossiers, and interviews with unit faculty and administration suggests that faculty members in the unit model best professional practices in scholarship.

D. Modeling best professional practices in service

Faculty in the professional education unit engage in service in a variety of ways. Through the Distribution of Effort model, faculty members are allocated time for service to the university, the profession, and the community. Unit faculty serve on committees within the unit and also contribute membership on university wide committees such as the University Senate. Unit faculty serve as members of the Research Committee and University Studies Program Committee. Unit faculty serve the professional community by holding offices in state and national organizations, serving on editorial boards, and holding editorships for professional journals. From 2000-2007, the unit reports 235 occurrences of offices held in state professional organizations by unit faculty and notes 218 occasions of offices held in national or international organizations. There are 1,193 records of service to professional journals through editorships and editorial boards.

Faculty provide service to P-12 schools in a variety of ways through different initiatives such as the Appalachian Mathematics and Science Partnerships. Through this project, unit faculty develop and teach courses for pre-service teachers and provide professional development for in-service teachers in rural school districts. Through the Fayette County Great Schools Initiative, faculty members partner with local schools to raise student achievement. The Collaborative Center for Literacy Development (CCLD) is engaged in several initiatives such as the New Adult Literacy Initiative which provides oversight of four pilot projects which serve adults reading at below basic and basic levels. These pilot projects embed new strategies for teaching reading, highlighting the use of technology software designed for enhancing reading proficiency for adult learners.

Unit faculty have been recognized for their outstanding service contributions with the following awards:

- Volunteer Award, Fayette County Schools
- Distinguished Service Award, Kentucky Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
- National Distinguished Service Award, Family, Career and Community Leaders of America

E. Collaboration

Unit faculty collaborate with Arts and Sciences colleagues in a variety of ways, which include serving on committees and through initiatives such as the Appalachian Mathematics and Science partnership. In this initiative, unit faculty work with faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences to provide teacher development and training. Several other projects are in place through CCLD which provide opportunities for unit faculty to collaborate with other agencies and faculty partners. The Adolescent Literacy Coaching Project, through CCLD, is a partnership with the Kentucky Department of Education and provides training of literacy and mathematics coaches for teachers in grades 4-12. The teachers are provided training through summer academies and monthly professional development meetings. Unit faculty collaborate with other university partners and local agencies to address safety issues in P-12 schools.

F. Unit evaluation of professional education faculty performance

The unit dean expressed his philosophy of hiring the best candidates and providing them the necessary support toward tenure. Faculty performance evaluations take place annually for all non-tenured faculty members and biannually for tenured faculty members. The procedures for performance evaluations are outlined in the university and the COE handbooks. These processes were designed within the faculty governance structure of the university which included faculty input and approval. Unit faculty complete the *Faculty Performance Review* form and the *Faculty Activities Report* form and submit to the program chairperson. Some departments in the unit require a teaching portfolio. The faculty member also includes a Distribution of Effort form in the review packet. A narrative is optional if the faculty member wishes to expand or comment on the information provided on the forms. The chairperson provides a written evaluation to the faculty member through a conference meeting. The faculty member's evaluation is forwarded to the dean and a copy of the evaluation is filed in the dean's office. Below average performance evaluations may result in an adjustment in the faculty member's DOE and professional development support is provided. Progress toward tenure reviews occurs at the end of Year 1 (optional), 2, and 4. Reviews for promotion and tenure are required for assistant professors and, as appropriate, for associate professors. Part-time faculty members and teaching assistants (TAs) are evaluated each semester through student course evaluations. Interviews with part-time faculty and TAs confirm that student course evaluations are provided to them at the end of each semester. Student course evaluations are used to determine future course assignments and rehiring of part-time faculty and teaching assistants.

G. Unit facilitation of professional development

New faculty in the unit are provided mentors to assist them in their transition to the COE. Faculty support for teaching is available for all faculty members at the university through the Teaching and Academic Support Center (TASC), although faculty who receive below average performance evaluations may be encouraged to utilize the resources of the TASC. The Center's mission is to improve teaching and student learning throughout the university. TASC encourages and promotes pedagogical innovation, effective applications of teaching technology, and development of alternative instructional modes. TASC provides a wide variety of educational support services which include:

- Seminars, workshops and individual consultation to improve instructional skills
- Audio-visual and classroom support services
- Web-based resource materials
- Instructional technology support
- University's digital library
- Educational art, graphics and media production

The unit encourages continued professional growth for faculty. For example, all full time faculty members receive \$1,100 in support of travel to professional conferences. Additional funds are available upon request to support travel and presentations at additional conferences. Support for faculty research is available through the Institute for Educational Research. The Institute includes a director and several support staff to assist unit faculty in all aspects of the grant

process including locating appropriate grants, writing the proposal, acquiring permissions for application, and implementing the grant. Faculty members also receive incentives such as the opportunity to receive the annual Wethington Award for successfully acquiring grant funds.

Another important professional development opportunity for unit faculty is the sabbatical. Interviews with the dean suggest that on average, four to five professors are granted sabbaticals each year in the COE. Sabbatical leaves may be granted for one semester or one academic year for the purpose of allowing faculty members extended time to concentrate on research, teaching innovations, study, or creative endeavors. Sabbaticals support the unit's conceptual framework and theme of *Research and Reflection for Learning and Leading*. The sabbatical policy and application is found in the COE handbook and the university's handbook.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Members of the professional education faculty are dedicated to the advancement of learning for the candidates. The faculty incorporate best practices for teaching in their classroom instruction and model appropriate practices for the education candidates. The unit faculty are scholars who carry out the mission of the institution to become one of the top 20 research institutions nationally, and maintain an impressive scholarly record of research and publication. They provide service to their community and their profession. Unit faculty collaborate with colleagues on campus, and other local and state agencies as well as maintain a collaborative partnership with P-12 schools. Faculty are systematically evaluated for performance and have policies and resources available for professional development.

Recommendation: Met

Areas for Improvement: None

STANDARD 6: UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

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

Level: Initial and Advanced

A. Unit leadership and authority

The professional education unit is defined as the College of Education and the educator preparation programs located in the six additional colleges. The college is administered by a dean, with an associate dean for academic and student services, an associate dean for research and graduate studies, and six department heads. The dean reports directly to the provost. The unit has the authority to develop, implement, and evaluate certification programs for teachers, administrators, and school service personnel. The dean oversees educator preparation programs at both initial and advanced levels, has responsibility to provide leadership in the development of these programs, and has the authority to implement the policies of the education unit. The dean also provides academic leadership, hires faculty and staff, encourages and evaluates faculty and staff, oversees unit assessment, establishes and maintains contact with P-12 school districts and agencies, and promotes grant and other scholarly activities in the unit. Interviews with unit faculty and the dean reveal that P-12 partners support the efforts of the unit and are engaged as community representatives in the design, implementation, and assessment of programs for school personnel. Interviews with faculty and department program chairs indicate sufficient management and coordination of all initial and advanced programs. In group interviews faculty, candidates, alumni, principals and superintendents describe the unit's commitment and dedication to the candidates and to the education programs.

The dean is the chair of the Council of Chairs, which is one of three key committees that provide advice and guidance. The Council of Chairs consists of the associate deans, department chairs, and chair of the Faculty Council. Interviews with faculty and the dean in the unit indicate that the Council of Chairs meets monthly. In addition to the Council of Chairs, the dean meets with the Faculty Council on issues relating to activities within the unit. The Staff Council meets on a regular basis, advises the dean and sponsors activities for personnel in the education unit. Membership consists of representatives from each academic department and support unit.

The dean of the unit has the authority over all programs which result in Kentucky certification, including the school social work program. This program was cited in the 2000 NCATE BOE/EPBSB report. Since the last accreditation visit, the social work program was submitted and approved by the Education Professional Standards Board in 2003. Interviews with the dean of the unit and department program chairs indicate that programs are governed by individual program faculties, which are collaborative groups comprised of a broad representation of professionals, including education faculty, university faculty from content areas, practitioners from schools and agencies, and undergraduate and graduate candidates. Multi-disciplinary faculty committees are responsible for initiating and revising programs and courses and for selecting and retaining students in their respective programs.

Interviews with unit faculty indicate that they actively participate in the decision-making processes of the unit and university through their involvement with various standing committees and ad-hoc committees appointed by the dean. In addition, unit faculty reported that they have multiple opportunities to serve on university-wide committees. For example, unit faculty members serve in leadership roles on the Institutional Review Board, the President's Commission on Diversity, and Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

Changes in curricula, such as the design of new courses, the content of field experiences, and course revisions originate within the appropriate program. According to members of the Council of Chairs, typically faculty in a program area will develop proposals to change courses and/or degree requirements. Interviews with program faculty indicate that they initiate course and curriculum revisions for their respective programs and then forward the proposed revisions and changes through the appropriate channels to the college-wide Courses and Curricula Committee. Proposals approved at the unit level are then forwarded to the appropriate university undergraduate or graduate council for review and approval. Interviews with members of the Courses and Curricula Committee indicate that once changes are considered, the proposals are sent forward for action by the University Senate. Each college has at least one representative on the senate. A review of standing committee minutes, faculty meeting minutes, program and departmental minutes, annual program data reviews, and formal evaluations in programs reflects the faculty's involvement in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs.

Initial and advanced admissions requirements are clearly delineated in the *University 2007-2008 Bulletin*. The university has developed a webpage, which includes information about procedures and policies for candidates. Academic calendars, catalogues, bulletins, and publications found in the unit appear to be current and accurate. Information about the unit's programs is published in the *University 2007-2008 Bulletin* and on the College of Education's website. Policies for admission to teacher education programs are disseminated through print and electronic media, as well as through communications in orientation meetings, introductory teacher preparation courses, and individual advising sessions. Information on admissions for the advanced programs is also presented in the *2007-2008 Bulletin* and is provided in the application materials. Interviews with support staff indicate that they also provide information to candidates in the initial and advanced programs as they meet with them on a formal or an informal basis. Initial and advanced admissions requirements to the university and to the unit are clearly provided in multiple documents found as evidence in the unit.

A variety of programs and services are available to candidates in the unit. There are numerous programs, services and events that help candidates with campus life, as well as promote their personal and professional development. The unit provides advising and counseling services to candidates including specialized services for diverse and first generation candidates. In the initial preparation programs, professional advisors in the Office of Academic Services and Certification indicate that they advise candidates prior to program admission. The advising center provides candidates with advisement manuals, testing requirements, career information, and other materials as needed. Additional advisors have been hired as part of the university Top 20 initiative to promote student retention.

After candidates are admitted to advanced programs, they are assigned faculty advisors. Interviews with academic and faculty advisors reveal that they assist candidates in program planning and course selection. Additionally, as shown on the university website, the university

provides other services for candidates. Support services for candidates include the Counseling and Testing Center and the Writing Center. Information regarding financial support and assistance is available to candidates through the Office of Academic Services and Teacher Certification. Other offices in the unit that support the work of candidates and faculty include the Office of Field Experiences and School Collaboration, the Office of Equity and Diversity, the Instructional Technology Center, the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, and the Office of Alumni and Student Affairs.

B. Unit Budget

The education unit includes the College of Education and programs in six other colleges across campus. Candidates in the College of Education represent more than 85% of educator preparation programs. Therefore, the College of Education's budget is shown to reflect this enrollment. According to data provided by the unit and data shown in the *2007-2008 Operating and Capital Budget*, the College of Education's state-appropriated funds are comparable to other colleges in the university. The total revised operating budget for the College of Education has increased steadily over the past five years. Table 6.3 in the institutional report shows the unit's revised budget summary for 2002-2003 through 2006-2007. Table 6.4 in the institutional report reveals the budget of the unit as compared to six other colleges in the university for FY 2005-2006. Based on numbers of students and faculty, the level of funding for the College of Education is equitable to, and even exceeds, levels of funding for similar colleges on campus (see Tables 6.4 and 6.5 in the institutional report). Interviews with the dean and other university administrators indicate that the unit's funding is sufficient to prepare candidates in initial and advanced programs, and adequately covers both on-campus and clinical work necessary to prepare teacher educator candidates and other school personnel to meet professional standards. For example, the unit's budget for FY 06-07 includes \$57,578 allocated for cooperating teachers. In addition to budgetary support from the university, the unit receives funding from external sources to enhance its work and to further its mission. External funding has permitted faculty to engage in additional research and service activities. A summary document entitled, *Grants and Research Award History* indicates that the College of Education has an established record of securing extramural funding. For example, during 2002, faculty in the unit were awarded over \$2 million in grants awards increasing to over \$5 million in 2004. In addition to individual awards, multidisciplinary collaborative efforts increased from \$7 million to \$16 million during the same period.

Faculty professional development funds for travel are available through the department, associate dean's office and the dean's office. According to the dean, in the case of assistant professors, all reasonable professional travel requests are met. Documents in the unit show that in 2006-2007, new faculty received start-up funds of \$8,000. If a faculty member conducts laboratory research, the start up package is greater. For example, a new faculty member received \$178,280 to purchase equipment for his lab. Additional start-up funds are provided for endowed chairs. All new faculty in the unit receive a new computer and printer; some new faculty are also given a laptop. According to staff in the Instructional Technology Center, it is recommended that the unit replace faculty, staff and computer classroom/lab computers on a 3 year rotation cycle. Technology support and technology instruction (training) are provided in the Instructional Technology Center for faculty and candidates. Interviews with staff in the center indicate that faculty and candidates are able to check out equipment, as well as request support for the creation of presentations. If requested, faculty members are also able to get training in the use of educational technology including, but not limited to: Smart Boards, PowerPoint presentations,

assistive technologies, creation of websites, online pedagogy, and other interactive technologies to enhance candidate learning. The unit also provides professional development workshops for part-time faculty to help ensure that they contribute to the integrity, coherence, and quality of programs in the unit. Opportunities such as these reflect the unit's commitment to the professional development of its faculty and candidates.

Interviews with faculty and administrators indicate that professional development activities relate to the mission of the university and the unit and that the university supports faculty to pursue research, service and other faculty development activities. Faculty vitae detail such activities as publications in professional journals, presentations at national and international conferences, and grant writing activities. Faculty in the unit may also apply for sabbaticals to engage in research, creative effort, improvement of teaching capabilities and methods, and other related travel. Documents in the unit show that seven faculty members in the unit applied for and were awarded sabbaticals in 2007, eight faculty members were granted a sabbatical in 2006, and four faculty members were awarded sabbaticals in 2005.

C. Personnel

The unit includes faculty from the Colleges of Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Communications and Information Studies, Fine Arts, Health Sciences, and Social Work who prepare educators. The unit engages full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and graduate assistants to teach courses. During the fall 2007 semester, 120 faculty were employed in tenured or tenure-track positions in the unit; 38 part-time instructors and 41 graduate teaching assistants also taught and/or supervised candidates in educator preparation programs. Teaching effectiveness is measured in part through a student evaluation of the faculty's teaching. Departments orient part-time faculty and graduate teaching assistants to departmental policies and procedures and evaluate their performance. Interviews with department program chairs indicate that they communicate with part-time faculty and graduate teaching assistants to ensure that they stay informed about issues necessary for effective performance of their duties. Workload policies for unit faculty are clearly delineated in the *University Faculty Handbook*, the *College of Education Faculty Handbook*, and the *College of Education Policy on Teaching Loads and Distribution of Effort (DOE)*. The policy specifies a four-course teaching load each year for tenure track faculty. However, it was learned through the interview process that department chairs, in consultation with the dean, retain flexibility to establish teaching loads appropriate to the needs of respective departments and individual faculty. The policy also provides guidelines for typical DOE percentages for research, teaching, and service to assist department chairs and faculty as they work together to negotiate DOE agreements each year. Interviews with department chairs and faculty indicate that the workload policy allows them to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Other personnel who contribute to the work of the unit include 51 full-time staff members who provide clerical and technical support to help administrators and faculty accomplish the goals and mission of the unit. Fifteen of these positions are designated as professional staff members who are employed as the business manager, budget officer, public information officer, professional advisors, and directors of support units, such as the Instructional Technology Center, the Office of Academic Services and Teacher Certification, and the Office of Enhancement. Thirty-six of the staff positions are designated as clerical and technical support positions in departmental and unit offices. Each department in the unit has an office manager and one or more full-time support staff. The job description for each support position is found in the unit and provides the guidelines for the work of the individuals who serve in these positions.

D. Unit facilities

The unit's programs are located in three buildings on campus: Dickey Hall, Taylor Education Building, and the Seaton Center. All unit classrooms in Taylor Education Building and Dickey Hall, have been converted from traditional classrooms to "smart" classrooms. Classes, labs, and offices are also located in Barker Hall, Erickson Hall, Maxwellton Court, and Wenner-Green Research Lab buildings. The unit recently renovated several rooms and areas to provide an attractive meeting area for student organizations and to provide improved space for classes, seminars, workshops, and meetings. The unit facilities are equipped with faculty offices, staff work areas, classrooms, and laboratories that enable faculty and candidates to access the teaching and learning environments essential for the preparation of school personnel. Individual faculty offices in the unit have full technology support. Classrooms vary and can accommodate different class sizes, distance learning, and electronic instructional needs. A detailed description of unit facilities is found in the IR; other classroom facilities utilized by candidates in the unit are shown on the university website.

The unit has endeavored to improve areas of concern regarding weaknesses with "Unit Facilities" described in the *2000 NCATE BOE Report*. Updated communication infrastructures have been installed for numerous offices and departments. The university and the College of Education have worked with the Ayers Saint Gross architectural firm to plan for possible renovations and improved functionality of existing space in the Taylor Education Building. Interviews with the dean and a tour of the unit facilities indicate that since the last accreditation site visit, much effort has been made to improve space functionality and technology utilization in the unit.

E. Unit resources including technology

The unit is committed to the utilization of technology. Opportunities for instruction and support in the use of electronic resources are available to faculty and candidates. The unit maintains 22 technology rich "smart" classrooms, three computer classrooms, three technology rich conference rooms, an auditorium with computing and projection equipment, and a multimedia classroom. The university web page, as well as the Internet, offers faculty and candidates access to resources and research in their educational endeavors. The Instructional Technology Center (ITC) provides technology support within the unit. Interviews with the ITC staff indicate that they provide computer support to over 350 desktop and laptop computers and maintain the three computer classrooms, the multimedia classroom, and two computer labs -- one each in Taylor Education Building and Seaton Center. The ITC administers web servers for departments, the college, and college affiliates.

Faculty and candidates also have complete access to 15 libraries within the university library system. An interview with the Associate Dean for Research and Education reveals that state funds for the education collection totals \$94,461. The Library collection exceeds three million volumes and includes over 27,000 journals. Of that number, 1.2 million books are found in the main building, while another 1.5 million volumes are located around the campus in branch and associate libraries. A description of the Education Library, a subject library within the university, is found in the intuitional report.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has the leadership and authority for the operation of the educator preparation program with adequate budget, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of all candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. All of the unit's policies and procedures are clearly described and accessible in multiple sites and documents. The governance structure that guides this unit fosters an environment that promotes faculty and candidate professional growth and development. The unit plans, delivers, and operates programs at both the initial and advanced levels that enable candidates to meet standards. The unit has adequate resources (financial, faculty positions, support personnel, technology, and professional development opportunities) to ensure that its candidates are successful. Unit faculty members participate on governance committees, both at the unit and at the university levels. The unit facilities, technology support and library resources are adequate and provide access for all candidates.

Recommendation: Met

Areas for Improvement:

Corrected

1. The unit's authority over the school social work program is not well defined. (Advanced)

Rationale: The dean of the unit has authority over all programs which result in Kentucky certification, including the school social work program. Since the last accreditation visit, the program was submitted and approved by the Education Professional Standards Board in 2003.

2. The unit has limited and outdated physical space to ensure high quality instruction.

Rationale: The unit has adequate campus and partner facilities to support candidates in meeting professional standards. Since 2000, the unit has converted several classrooms from traditional classrooms to smart classrooms. In addition to substantial renovations in the education building, the unit has access to other state-of-art resources to support candidates.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

List of Exhibits

General Information (Electronic Exhibit Room)

Academic Services and Teacher Certification Office Website
Accreditation Verification: American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences
Accreditation Verification: American Library Association
Accreditation Verification: American Psychological Association (1986)
Accreditation Verification: American Speech-Language-Hearing Association
Accreditation Verification: Council on Rehabilitation Education
Accreditation Verification: Council on Social Work Education
Accreditation Verification: National Association of Schools of Music (2006)
Accreditation Verification: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
Accreditation Verification: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (Through 2013)
Alumni and Development Office Website
Blackboard Academic Suite – e-Education platform
Certificate Application Process (includes self-assessment)
College Community Outreach
College Departments Websites
College Mission, 1999
College Mission, 2003-2004
College Mission, 2005
College Technology Mission
College of Education Technology (CoET) Standards
Courses and Curricula Committee Minutes
Distance Learning Website
Education Professional Standards Board Website
Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes
Faculty Retreats, 2000-2007
Faculty Sponsored Projects, 2000-2007
Functional Skills and Dispositions
Graduate Program Admissions
Graduate School Bulletin
Graduate School Statistical Reports, 1990-2006
Institutional Research Surveys Website
Intent to Continue NCATE Accreditation
ISLLC Standards
Kentucky Education Reform Act
Kentucky Educator Preparation Report Card: University of Kentucky
Kentucky Experienced Teacher Standards
Kentucky Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education Standards
Kentucky New Teacher Standards
Kentucky-NCATE Joint Protocol
Kentucky Quality Performance Index Reports, 2002-2006
National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) Program Approval 2005
NCATE Accreditation Action Report, April 2001
NCATE Annual Reports, 1999-2006
NCATE/EPSTB Institutional Report 2000

NCATE/EPSB Rejoinder 2001
NCATE/State Board of Examiners Report, 2000
Program Approval: Education Professional Standards Board
Schedule of Classes
State and Local Demographics
Student Degrees Awarded, 1998-2007
Student Headcount Enrollment, 1997-2007
Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook
Technology Standards for School Administrators
Third-Party Comment
University Bulletin
University Fact Books, 2000-2007
University Mission and Vision

General Information (Hard-Copy Exhibit Room)

AACTE Professional Education Data System (PEDS) Reports, 2002-2006
Display and Materials from Office of Equity and Diversity
Display and Materials from Office of Academic and Student Services
Display and Materials on International Initiatives
EPSB Program Review Update, Revised November 2007
Field Supervisors Meeting Agendas and Materials, 2004-2007
Program Faculty Chairs Meeting Agendas and Materials, 2001-2007
College of Education Research Briefs, 2007, 2006
College of Education Newsletter, *Network*, Summer 2007
Collaborative Center on Literacy Development Annual Report 2007
Recruitment Brochures for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs
Campus Map and Visitor's Guide
Campus Parking Map
Dean's Power Point Presentation to BOE, November 10, 2007
Field Notes, Newsletter from the Office of Field Experiences
Directory, College of Education
Director, Professional Education Unit
Program Faculty Minutes

Conceptual Framework (Electronic Exhibit Room)

College of Education Technology (CoET) Standards
Functional Skills and Dispositions
ISLLC Standards
Kentucky Experienced Teacher Standards
Kentucky Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Standards
Kentucky New Teacher Standards
Program Conceptual Frameworks for Initial, Advanced, and Other Personnel Programs
Revisiting the Conceptual Framework: Fall 2005 Faculty Retreat
Teacher as a Reflective Decision Maker Document, 1992
Technology Standards for School Administrators
Unit Conceptual Framework 1999
Unit Conceptual Framework 2007

Conceptual Framework (Hard-Copy Exhibit Room)

Alignment of Conceptual Framework Themes with Core Standards Sets

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions (Electronic Exhibit Room)

Continuous Assessment Record Aggregated Data, Advanced, Experienced Teacher Standards
Continuous Assessment Record Aggregated Data, Advanced, ISLLC Standards
Continuous Assessment Record Aggregated Data, Advanced, Functional Skills and Dispositions
Continuous Assessment Record Aggregated Data, Advanced, Technology Standards
Continuous Assessment Record Aggregated Data, Initial, New Teacher Standards
Continuous Assessment Record Aggregated Data, Initial, IECE Standards
Continuous Assessment Record Aggregated Data, Initial, Functional Skills and Dispositions
Continuous Assessment Record Aggregated Data, Initial, Technology Standards
Character and Fitness Review
Code of Ethics
Course Syllabi
Curriculum Contracts on Unit Programs Web Pages
Exam Pass Rates: PLT Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation
Exam Pass Rates: Praxis II Content Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation
Exam Pass Rates: Tests for Other School Personnel Preparation
Follow-Up Data: Employers
Follow-Up Data: Graduates
Kentucky Quality Performance Index Reports, 2002-2006
Kentucky Teacher Education Admission Regulation
New Teacher Survey Unit Data Tables Overall and by Respondent Group, 2002-2006
New Teacher Surveys, EPSB Website, 2002-2007
Program Data Tables: Disaggregated Data by Program Area
 Praxis II Content Exam Scores
 PLT Exam Scores
 New Teacher Survey Results by Respondent Group and Year, 2002-2006
 Student Teacher Evaluations
 Continuous Assessment Record Data at Admission, Retention, and Completion
 Appropriate Educator Standards
 Functional Skills and Dispositions
 Unit Technology Standards
 Focus Group Results
 Exit Interviews
 Follow-Up Surveys
Program Descriptions
Program Review Documents
Student and Alumni Survey Results, 2002-2007 (UK Institutional Research)
Student Degrees Awarded, 1997-2006
Student Headcount Enrollment, 1997-2006
Kentucky Teacher Internship Program Pass Rates, 2002-2006

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions, (Hard Copy Exhibit Room)

Displays for Each Program Highlighting Sample Candidate Portfolios, Action Research Projects, Diversity Assignments, Technology Assignments, and Scoring Rubrics
School Social Work Learning Agreement and Standards

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidate Electronic Presentations on Sunday Evening

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation (Electronic Exhibit Room)

Admission/Retention/Exit Policy
Assessment System for Advanced Programs
Assessment System for Initial Programs
Assessment System for Unit Operations
Center for Educator Preparation Information Systems (CEPIS) Website
Continuous Assessment Review Form
Course Evaluation Process and Results
Electronic System for Tracking Field Placements
Faculty Performance Evaluation
Faculty Vita Generator
Program Continuous Assessment Plans on Unit Program Web Pages
Scoring Rubrics for Student Teaching Experience (Field Experiences Website)
Unit Continuous Assessment Plan 2000
Unit Continuous Assessment Plan 2007
Unit Data Management System
Use of Data for Program Improvement Entries on Unit Program Web Pages

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation (Hard Copy Exhibit Room)

Program Faculty Chairs Agendas and Materials

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice (Electronic Exhibit Room)

Central Kentucky Educational Cooperative Website
Central Kentucky Special Education Cooperative Website
Consortium for Overseas Student Teaching
Cooperating Teacher Qualifications: State Regulation
Field Experience Requirements by Course
Field Experiences Website
Field Experience Newsletters: Field Notes
Field Guide for Professional Partners
Field Placement Sites and Demographics
Holmes Partnership Involvement
Kentucky Teacher Internship Program
Office of Field Experiences and School Collaboration Website
Online Placement Tracking System
Resources for School Partners
Student Teaching Website
Student Teaching Field Placement Policy
Student Teaching Performance Evaluations
Supervising and Resource Teacher Tuition Waiver Program
Teacher Education Model Program (TEMP) Initiative
Tips for Mentoring Document
Unit Operations Data: Perceptions of Student Teaching Experience
Field and Clinical Placement Databases

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice (Hard Copy Exhibit Room)

Documentation of Waivers of Cooperating Teacher Requirements Granted by EPSB

Field Supervisors Meeting Agendas and Materials, 2004-2007
Sample Candidate Work from EDC 724, *Guiding and Analyzing Effective Teaching*
Teacher Education Model Program (TEMP) Partnership Materials
Cooperating Teacher Demographics Fall 2004-Spring 2007
Field Experiences Database Student Files

Standard 4: Diversity (Electronic Exhibit Room)

Affirmative Action Policies
Central Kentucky Special Education Cooperative
College Profile Reports, 1999-2005
Diversity Matters
Faculty Diversity Awards, 2005
Field Placement Sites and Demographics
Graduate School Statistical Reports, 1990-2006
Integration of Diversity in Curriculum and Experiences: Unit Program Websites
Office of Equity and Diversity Website
Task Force on Inclusiveness
State and Local Demographics, Census Data
Unit Degrees by Race/Ethnicity, 1998-2007
Unit Degrees by Race/Ethnicity and Program Area, 1998-2007
Unit Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 1997-2006
Unit Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity and Program Area, 1997-2006
Unit Operations Data: Faculty, Candidate, and Placement Diversity
University Affirmative Action Plan
University Degrees by Race/Ethnicity, 1998-2007
University Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 1997-2006

Standard 4: Diversity (Hard Copy Exhibit Room)

Displays and Scrapbooks from FEA Residential Summer Camp, 2004-2007
Recruitment and Retention Initiatives from Office of Equity and Diversity
Sample Diversity Signature Assignments
MSD Program Evidence binder
MSD Exit Point Portfolio example
MSD Master's Retention Portfolio example
Secondary Mathematics Education Diversity Information & Examples
Student Artifacts
 Final Science Student Teacher Evaluation Form & Scoring Rubric
 Final Portfolio – Business Education (2005)
 EDC 433 Elementary Student Teaching Portfolio – Spring 2007
 Practicum Portfolios
 Graduate Portfolios

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development (Electronic Exhibit Room)

Faculty Collaboration
Faculty Handbook – College of Education
Faculty Handbook – University of Kentucky
Faculty Performance Evaluation
Faculty Representation on University Committees
Faculty Sponsored Projects, 2000-2007

Faculty Vitae
Institute for Educational Research
Online Faculty Vitae Tool
Mentoring Program for New Faculty (Faculty Handbook)
Program Faculty Structure
Research Support for Faculty
Teaching/Course Evaluations, 1995-2007
Teaching and Academic Support Center
Unit Operations Data: Faculty Productivity, e.g., Publications, Presentations, Grants

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development (Hard Copy Exhibit Room)

Cooperating Teacher Demographics (Fall 2004 – Spring 2007)
Sample Promotion and Tenure Dossiers for Faculty across Education Unit
Selection of Faculty Publications (Books, Refereed Journal Articles, Grant Reports)

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources – Unit (Electronic Exhibit Room)

Administrative Council Agenda and Minutes
College Faculty Handbook, 2007
College Profile Reports, 1999-2006
College Review, 1999-2000
College Strategic Plan
Council of Chairs Agendas and Minutes
Courses and Curriculum Committee Minutes
Curriculum and Instruction Website
Departmental Reviews
Departmental Websites
Educational and Counseling Psychology Website
Educational Leadership Studies Website
Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation Website
Education Library Website
Facilities Renovation Plan
Faculty Council Minutes
Faculty Meeting Agendas and Minutes
Faculty Representation on University Committees
Faculty Sponsored Projects, 2000-2007
Financial Aid Information
Instructional Technology Center Website
Kinesiology and Health Promotion Website
LISTSERVs Supported by the College
NCATE/EPSC Accreditation Steering Committee Agendas and Minutes
Organizational Chart for the College of Education
Program Faculty Description
Program Faculty Membership across Unit Programs
Special Education and Rehabilitation Counseling Website
Standing Committees
Teaching Loads and Distribution of Effort Policy
Unit Operations Data: Advising, Library, and Technology Resources

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources – University (Electronic Exhibit Room)

Academic Ombud Services Website
Administrative Regulations
Affirmative Action Policies
Career Center
Departmental Unit Review School and Process
Disability Resource Center
Faculty and Staff Data (Office of Institutional Research)
Governing Regulations
Internal Program Reviews
Lucille Caudill Little Fine Arts Library and Learning Center
Teaching and Academic Support Center
University Budget
University Fact Books, 2000-2007
University Faculty Handbook
University Libraries Website
University Mission and Vision
University Profile Report of Colleges, 1999-2005 (Source of Budget Data for Comparisons)
University Senate Minutes
University Senate Rules
University Strategic Plan 2003-2006
University Strategic Plan 2006-2009
University Top 20 Business Plan
W. T. Young Library Website

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources – Unit (Hard Copy Exhibit Room)
Program Faculty Chairs Agendas and Materials

Persons Interviewed

Administration

Lee Todd, President
Kumble Subbaswamy, Provost
Stephen Barnett, Office of Admissions
Patricia Bond, Assistant Dean of Graduate School
Sandy Copher, Office of Admissions
Lynda George, Office of Admissions
Toni Greider, Associate Dean for Libraries
Jacquie Hager, Office of Admissions
Brian Jackson, Senior Associate Dean of Graduate School
Phillip Kraemer, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education
Angela Martin, Vice President for Budget, Planning, & Policy
Michelle Nordin, Office of Admissions
David Prater, Financial Aid Officer
Cleophus Price, Assistant Dean of Graduate School
Tonya Prince, Office of Admissions
Kaveh Tagavi, Chair, University Senate Council
Don Witt, University Registrar

Unit Administration and Faculty

Mark Abel
Janice Almasi
Richard Angelo
Gary Anglin
Margaret Bausch
Rayma Beal
Aaron Beighle
Rose Boulay
Kelly Bradley
Sharon Brennan
Tricia Browne-Ferrigno
Leslie Burns
William Calderhead
Susan Cantrell
James Cibulka
Jody Clasey
Steve Clements
Belva Collins
Ralph Crystal
Alan DeYoung
Ginny Ellington
Heather Erwin
Beth Goldstein
Jennifer Grisham-Brown
William Gustashaw
Karen Hager
Bryan Hains

John Hall
Debra Harley
Charles Hausman
Robin Peiter Horstmeier
Tim Jacobbe
Willis Johnson
Lee Ann Jung
Tracy Kitchel
Robert Knoeppel
Flo Lankster
Linda Levstik
Joyce Logan
Keisha Love
Xin Ma
Joan Mazur
Katherine McCormick
Nancye McCrary
Robert McKenzie
Rebecca McNall-Krall
Angela Miller
Kim Miller
Richard Millman
Cheryl Mimbs
Kristen Missall
Margaret Mohr
David Mullineaux
Nina Nilsson
Melody Noland
Judy Page
Steve Parker
Sonja Feist-Price
Tom Prout
Eric Reed
Jeff Reese
Rory Remer
Pam Remer
Richard Riggs
Jim Rinehart
Sharon Rostosky
Rosetta Sandidge
John Schuster
Mary Shake
Robert Shapiro
Deborah Slaton
Doug Smith
David Sogin
Don Stenhoff
Truman Stevens
Bill Stillwell

Jennifer Stringfellow
Kathy Swan
Gerry Swan
Lucian Taylor
John Thelin
Kim Townley
Kenneth Tyler
Ellen Usher
Mary Ann Vimont
Rosemary Waters
Andrew Weiner
Jackie White
Lynda Brown Wright
J.W. Yates
Sadia Zoubir-Shaw

Deans of Other Colleges with Ed Prep programs

Lori Gonzalez, Dean of Health Sciences
Steven Hoch, Dean of Arts and Sciences
Kay Hoffman, Dean of Social Work
J. David Johnson, Dean of Communications and Information Studies
Bob Shay, Dean of Fine Arts

Arts and Sciences/Content Faculty

Julie Cerel
John Christopher
Janet Eldred
Jane Kleinert
Lori Lazzari
Richard Millman
Jeffrey Osborne
Allan Richards
Randall Roorda
Joseph Straley
Jackie White
Sadia Zoubir-Shaw

Teaching Assistants and Part-Time Instructors

Kiluba Akulu
Russell Couch
Jennifer Eli
Connie Evans
Linda Gassaway
Leslie Gerrard
Brian Gustman
Pam Hammonds
Alexandra Henchy
Vicki Leet
Denis Lester

Shayla Mettelle
Stacie Meyer
Raven Piercy
April Pilcher
Sara Porter
Denise Probst
Margaret Rintamaa
Sandra Stults
Bennett Thornbury
Angela Tobar
Gretchen Wagner

University Diversity Recruitment

Joyce Beatty, Director, William C. Parker Scholarships
Buzz Burnam, Director, Office of Diversity Recruitment
Allan Richards, Chair, President's Commission on Diversity
Toni Thomas, Director, Center for Academic Resources & Enrichment Services

Unit Support

Phyllis Bates
Rose Boulay
Jill Caudill
Julie Cleary
Faith Cordray
Susan Daole
Patricia David
Terry Edin
Martha Geoghegan
Laura Harris
Linda Hensley
Jason Horger
Cindy Jennings
Stuart Reedy
Jennifer Richmond
Gary Schroeder
Ryana Severance
Clelia Smyth
Rita Stevenson
Bill Stilwell
Dan Vantreese
Sarah Vaughn
Phani Yaylagadda

Candidates in Initial Programs

Boushra Aghil
Andrew Ashford
Megan Aynes
Jamie Baker
Vera Beattie

Jessica Blackburn
Jeffrey Brewster
Ashley Coleman
Meredith Della-Giustina
Melissa DiGeronimo
Colleen Dille
Patrick Effgen
Sam Habeeb
Tiffany Hall
Sarah Hellems
Ben Herald
Bretta Hulcha
Jennifer Folck
Tonya Fox
Cindy Gatsos
Ashley George
Michelle Grant
Georgia Grayson
Casey Gregory
Jeffery Griffin
Amber Johnson
Caroline King
Jenna Klopfenstein
Kim Lacy
Nathan Lockhart
Ellen Lyon
Rachel Mesaris
Jessica Murray
Cara Neel
Mary Beth Ping
Kristina Plas
Melissa Sanders
Julie Schroering
Lillian Scott
Leslie Simpson
Brent Sizemore
Sara Stout
Kelly Svec
Brian Tarter
Adele Taylor
Heather Thompson-Abell
Kathleen Walker
Whitney Walter
Derek Waye
Cameron White
Jessica Wilkinson
Ashley Williams
Emily Wilson

Student Teachers

Lauren Addington
Katrina Alexander
Sara Bergheger
Melissa Brooks
Ross Brown
Benjamin Bruser
Thomas Clouse
Tess Collins
Magan Greer
Tiffany Hall
Christy Hill
Michele Holleran
Kendra Horn
Jessica Kreitzer
Taylor Marshall
Jeremy Miracle
Jade Morton
Tiffany Pangallo
Candace Simon
Lydia Stokes
Ashley Todd
Tai Tucker
Brittany Wilkinson

Cooperating and Resource Teachers

Victoria Aurelius
Jillian Baker
Shawna Baker
Barbara Barr
Mary Bazard
Colleen Call
Tanya Carlin
Valerie Cecil
Dawn Drummond
Donna Ebelhar
Afre Emerson
Kyle Fannin
Theresa Figueroa
Marian Fister
Scott Gill
Shemeka Gill
Stephanie Godby
Karen Guarnieri
Christi Hack
Cynthia Hawkins
Lisa Hicks
Kathy Howells
Susie Joliffe

Anushna Kankelanova
Jill Klinker
Tracy Lambert
Stephanie Lester
Mary Lou Long
Sheila McIntosh
Stacie Meyer
Brenda Nally
Patti Palmer
Michelle Parsons
Geoff Ritchie
Becky Russell
Craig Schroeder
Debra Simpson
Marsha Stocker
Ronni Tallent
Lydia Wainright

Candidates in Advanced Programs

Shirley Addo
Jane Arrington
Kristina Baker
Jessi Burke
Ashley Clements
Becky Combs
Lindsey Crowdus
Jennifer Darvis
Michelle Daugherty
Sarah Dobson
Abbie Dorton
Erin Dreyer
Nicole Etter
Tracy Fisher
Meribeth Gaines
Susan Gniot
Rebecca Gorden
Brian Gustman
Kristen Hahn
Emily Hall
Keysha Hammons
Alexandra Herren
Karen Hill
Lisa Hill
Jenny Jackson
Betsy Johnson
Enrika Johnson
Brandy Jones
Chris Kemker
Anne Lattin

Erin Lawrence
Brian Lightner
Stacey Lockett
Shamekia Mason
Allison Meding
Erin Montgomery
Jane Musson
Ashley Neitzel
Shasta Osborne
Laura Pierce
Erin Pryor
Kristen Roman
Christopher Salyers
Craig Schroeder
Cristin Schroering
Jessica Searight
Rachel Shires
Amanda Smith
Maria Vanover
Melissa Wheatley

University Supervisors

Rayma Beal
Leslie Burns
Harry Clarke
Lois Daniel
Heather Erwin
Connie Evans
Ann Katherine Griffen
William Gustashaw
Karen Hager
Phyllis Hamilton
Pam Hammonds
Sarah Hawkins
Marty Henton
Tim Jacobbe
Willis Johnson
Vicki Leet
Denis Lester
Keisha Love
Rebecca McNall Krall
Jason Meenach
Kristen Missal
Margaret Mohr
Steve Parker
Sandra Stultz
Kathy Swan
Lucian Taylor
Mary Ann Vimont

Sadia Zoubir-Shaw

Interns and Recent Graduates

Jillian Baker
Kay Castle
Audra Deli
Ashley Farmer
Abby Florence
Jerome Gallt
Kayla Godbey
Katie Grossman
Katie Lynch
Jacqueline McNaughton
Michael Price
Dorie Raybuck
Craig Schroeder
Kristen Tabor
Carolyn Troyer
Ashley Watkins
Gayla Webb

Student Organization Representatives

Jessica Blackburn
Jennifer Eli
Eamonn Fitzgerald
Jacqueline Haynes
Donald Hughes
Ellen Lyon
Natalie Moore
Lee Roher
Ashley Todd

Principals and Superintendents

Heather Bell
Andy Biggers
Janice Blackburn
Cecil Combs
Lana Fryman
Vivian Hammons
Dexter Knight
Edwina Smith
H.M. Snodgrass
Mike Stacy
Tina Stevenson
Sam Meaux
Deann Watts
Lu Young

Schools Visited

Clays Mill Elementary School
Maxwell Elementary School
Jessie Clark Middle School
Tates Creek High School

Classes Observed

EDP 680 Parent and Child Counseling
EDC 323 Classroom Management and Discipline
EDC 345 Teaching Mathematics in the Middle Grades
EDS 548 Curriculum Design for Students with Moderate and Severe Disabilities
EDC 329 Teaching Reading and Language Arts in the Elementary School
CD 378 Anatomy and Physiology of Speech

CORRECTIONS TO THE INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

The program list included in the Introduction section of the Institutional Report was revised to demonstrate the discontinuance of the ESL Endorsement program and a clarification of the advanced program in Special Education (LBD/MSD).

The name of the College of Communication and Library Sciences/Studies has been changed to the College of Communications and Information Studies.