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OVERVIEW

This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel.

A. Institution

A.1. What is the institution's historical context?

Niagara University was co-founded in 1856 by Father John L. Lynch and Bishop John J. Timon. In 1861 Niagara was chartered as a seminary, and on August 7, 1883 it was re-chartered as a university for “the instruction of youth in the learned languages and in the liberal and useful arts and sciences. In the years since its founding, Niagara has retained this tradition of emphasis on the liberal arts, sciences and professional studies as it has grown into a mid-sized Catholic university of over 3,800 students at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

As a Vincentian university, Niagara has consistently drawn inspiration from St. Vincent de Paul who organized his contemporaries in the 17th century to respond compassionately to people’s basic needs. Continuing this tradition, Niagara has focused on inspiring all of its students to serve all members of society, especially the poor and oppressed, in local communities and in the larger world.

Niagara University celebrated its sesquicentennial anniversary (150 years) in 2006-07! During this time, the University began its capital campaign (the Promise of Niagara: The next 150 years) and currently has commitments that are 72% of the $85M campaign goal. A campus master planning process is underway to establish priorities and plans for additional campus enhancements.

Niagara University has been a member of the Middle States Association-Commission on Higher Education since 1922. The last accreditation visit was in 2007 and resulted in another re-certification of “Compliance with Middle States Commission on Higher Education Eligibility Requirements & Federal Title IV Requirements”. The University has continued its focus on excellence by expanding accreditations across programs and colleges. The list of accreditations held by Niagara University is included in Attachment 1.

A.2. What is the institution's mission?

The Niagara University mission statement and enabling goals are clearly defined and used to develop and shape programs and practices, including the conceptual framework of the Unit (the College of Education). The mission of Niagara University is to educate its students and enriches their lives through programs in the liberal arts and through career preparation, informed by the Catholic and Vincentian traditions. This mission is further articulated through the enabling goals:

1. As a university, Niagara prepares its students for positions of responsibility in the professions and in the broader society. Through teaching, research and service in programs of study at the baccalaureate and graduate levels, Niagara seeks to develop within its students a passion for learning.
2. The university’s commitment to the Catholic faith provides perspective in the search dignity of every person and all faith traditions. Students experience the vision and reality of a gospel-based, value-centered education.

3. Niagara draws inspiration from St. Vincent de Paul, who organized his contemporaries to respond compassionately to people’s basic needs. Continuing this tradition, Niagara seeks to inspire its students to serve all members of society, especially the poor and oppressed, in local communities and in the larger world.

4. Niagara University seeks to develop the whole person, mind, body, heart, and soul, for the benefit of one’s personal and professional life.

A.3. What are the institution's characteristics [e.g., control (e.g., public or private) and type of institution such as private, land grant, or HBI; location (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban area)]?

Niagara University is a four-year Masters I independent, non-profit liberal arts university with four colleges: College of Arts and Sciences; College of Business Administration; College of Education; and College of Hospitality and Tourism Management. The University offers a wide variety of bachelor’s degrees, master’s degrees, and certificates of advanced study (post-master’s degree programs). In addition, the University has currently completed an external readiness study and is in the final review phase for a doctoral program.

Enrollment at the University has grown to slightly over 3,000 undergraduate students and 929 graduate students (2008-09). The University’s mission is carried out by 150 full-time faculty, of whom 94% have the highest degree in their fields. The residential student population is approximately 1,500 students on campus; with students living in several halls, an apartment complex, and a grouping of five small cottages on campus.

The 160 acre campus overlooks the Niagara River gorge. The proximity of the University, “just across the river” from Canada has provided Niagara University with numerous international students and has given the University unique opportunities to provide both undergraduate and graduate programs as well as education and community services to significant populations on both sides of the international border for well over a century.

A.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the institutional context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Attachment 1 - Current Accreditations at Niagara University Fall 2009

See Attachments panel below.

B. The unit

B.1. What is the professional education unit at your institution and what is its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators?

The professional education Unit is the College of Education, one of the four Colleges of the University. The College has two academic departments, each of which is led by an elected chairperson: the Department of Teacher Education and the Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling. The Unit also supports the Offices of Student Teaching, Graduate Education, Assistant to the Dean, and two Centers: the Institute of Applied Learning (professional development and partnerships) and the Center for Excellence in Catholic Education. An organizational chart of the Unit is included in Standard 6.
The Dean of the Unit works with the other University Deans through the Council of Deans (chaired by the Vice President of Academic Affairs). The Chair of the Department of Teacher Education works with the chairs of all academic departments in the Colleges of Arts and Science and Business that are involved in the preparation of educators as the teacher education programs include content area concentrations (commensurate with a major) and all undergraduate candidates have two advisors (education and arts and sciences). Furthering this collaboration, the Institute of Applied Learning draws upon the tripartite of Education, Arts and Sciences and school faculty in all professional development and partnership activities in the P-12 schools.

B.2. How many professional education faculty members support the professional education unit? Please complete Table 1 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Education Faculty</th>
<th>Full-time in the Unit</th>
<th>Full-time in the Institution, but Part-time in the Unit</th>
<th>Part-time at the Institution &amp; the Unit (e.g., adjunct faculty)</th>
<th>Graduate Teaching Assistants Teaching or Supervising Clinical Practice</th>
<th>Total # of Professional Education Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.3. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare candidates for their first license to teach? Please complete Table 2 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Award Level (e.g., Bachelor's or Master's)</th>
<th>Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted</th>
<th>Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)</th>
<th>Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)</th>
<th>State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)</th>
<th>Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.4. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals? Please complete Table 3 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Award Level (e.g., Master's or Doctorate)</th>
<th>Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted</th>
<th>Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)</th>
<th>Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)</th>
<th>State Approval Status (e.g., approved or provisional)</th>
<th>Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.5. Which of the above initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are offered? [In addition to this response, please review the "Institutional Information" in AIMS and, if updating is needed, contact NCATE with details about these programs.]

Niagara University does not offer any of the programs in a distance education format at this time. The faculty in educational leadership have recently received approval from the New York State Education Department to offer the existing educational leadership programs in a distance format (September, 2009), however, approval from the Middle States Commission is pending (substantive change submitted, October 2009). The School District Leadership program is approved for a Transitional D certificate; however, there are no candidates enrolled in this pathway.

Niagara University does offer courses and programs (under Consent of the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities) at approved sites in the Province of Ontario, Canada. The Unit received confirmation from NCATE (e-mail of 12/5/07) that “off campus programs out of the county do not have to be included in the review.” The Unit confirmed that it does not plan to include the Ontario programs in the NCATE review.

B.6. (Continuing Visit Only) What substantive changes have taken place in the unit since the last visit (e.g., added/dropped programs/degrees; significant increase/decrease in enrollment; major reorganization of the unit, etc.)? [These changes could be compiled from those reported in Part C of the AACTE/NCATE annual reports since the last visit.]

Substantive changes include the following:

1. Significant changes in physical facilities were realized. The $18,6M Academic Complex opened in the fall 2007 semester (a state-of-the art, building for the Unit) and the Teaching Studio (hands-on curriculum and resource center) opened in the Main Library in the fall 2009.
2. The Institute of Applied Learning was created as a center of the Unit with a focus on P-16 partnerships and professional development. Through the Institute, new revenues for the Unit have been generated and extended partnerships with the P-12 have been documented (research-based). The literacy and counseling centers (in the new Academic Complex) have been instrumental in bringing high-needs members of the community to campus (literacy; young adults with disabilities; Science, Technology, Engineering and Math camps).
3. Ministerial consent in Ontario (2004, 2005) was renewed to reflect changed governance and regulation in this jurisdiction (M.S. Ed. in Administration and Supervision; and B.P.S. in Teacher Education).
4. A new degree (Bachelor of Professional Studies – B.P.S.) was added and received consent in Ontario. The program has received full accreditation through the Ontario College of Teachers (seven years, with no conditions). This program operates in two schools –Senhor Santo Cristo for the primary/junior concentration and Jean Vanier for the intermediate-senior concentration. A substantive change request was approved (August 2006) with the Middle States Commission.
5. The Unit revised its committee structure with a new standing Committee – the Advanced Research Committee (ARC).
6. Faculty in the Unit developed curriculum for a Ph.D. program in Leadership and Policy and conducted the feasibility study to offer a degree at this new level and external program review of the specific curriculum.
7. All educational leadership programs (building, district, business) were revised and registered in New York State, 2004.
8. New program offerings: B.A. degree in TESOL (2006), literacy minor, STEM concentration for the M.S. Ed. program in Foundations (replaces former content sequence), liberal arts concentration for early childhood and childhood undergraduate programs.
9. The first joint degree with a community college was approved: TESOL was approved as a jointly registered program with Niagara Community College (2009).

10. Undergraduate and graduate enrollment has remained constant (increase of 1.5% since 2004); while the number of full-time, tenure-track faculty over the same period of time (2004-05 through 2008-09) increased by 27% (does not include full-time clinical faculty who supervise practica).

11. Course-embedded assessments were designed, approved, and implemented by faculty (2005), using national program standards and faculty-approved rubrics (outcomes assessment methodologies).

12. A new NCATE coordinator was appointed in August 2007 – Dr. James Mills.

B.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

| Table 1 - Professional Education Faculty |
| Table 2 - Initial Program Information |
| Table 3 - Advanced Program Information |

See Attachments panel below.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This section provides an overview of the unit's conceptual framework(s). The overview should include a brief description of the framework(s) and its development.

C.1. How does the unit's conceptual framework address the following structural elements? [Please provide a summary here. A more complete description of the conceptual framework should be available as an electronic exhibit.]

- the vision and mission of the unit
- philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit
- knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit
- candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards
- summarized description of the unit's assessment system

The conceptual framework of the College of Education is grounded in the Catholic and Vincentian tradition upheld by the founding fathers of Niagara University. The shared vision of the College of Education focuses on excellence (high quality), transforming the community through education (cutting edge), opportunity that is global and diverse, reciprocal and collaborative partnerships, and learner and community-focused instruction (student/family). This vision provides guiding principles for the mission, goals, and standards for the Unit and its programs.

It is the mission of the College of Education to prepare educational leaders, who demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to serve others and who further the values and practices of their respective professions. We seek to inspire our candidates in the Vincentian tradition; and to foster
core dispositions of professional commitment and responsibility (includes fairness), professional relationships (includes the belief that all children can learn), and critical thinking and reflective practice.

As a faculty, we have developed programs with courses, clinical experiences, and assessments based on three complimentary dimensions: constructivism, process-product framework, and reflective practice. The knowledge base underpinning these dimensions includes current research, theory and practice in the profession, as well as on-going scholarship by members of the faculty of education. The dimensions are represented through the visual of a garden. This visual representation was created by the members of the faculty of education as the logo depicting the conceptual framework.

Student-Centering Through Constructivist Practice. Grounded in Dewey’s progressive educational philosophy, predicated on the learning theories of Piaget and Vygotsky, and furthered through the research of such modern leaders as Darling-Hammond (2001), Shulman (2005), Gardner (2006), Perkins (2009), and Danielson (2007), this dimension is based on the belief that knowledge is created and developed by learners and is influenced by the experiences, values, and multiple identities (e.g., race, class, culture, gender, nationality, exceptionality, language of individuals). This perspective drives us to place the prior knowledge and experiences of students at the core of our instructional practice and facilitate their development through meaningful exploration. Constructivist practice invites candidates to be active participants in their own development and to view knowledge—in theory and in practice—as fluid social constructions that are made and re-made through reflective interactions with social, cultural, and natural phenomena (Dansforth & Smith, 2005; Foote, Vermette, & Battaglia, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Marlowe & Page, 1998; Vermette, 2009).

A Process-Product Framework. Throughout our programs, we emphasize that education and counseling are most effective when they acknowledge the interdependence of process and product. With this individualized framework for growth, there are multiple paths to effective practice and we encourage educators, educational leaders and counselors to continuously examine and implement a wide range of research-based best practices. This dimension toward examining the interplay of practice and outcome transforms earlier behaviorist methodology and has been advocated by Good and Brophy (2003, 2008) in the many editions of their text Looking in Classrooms, as well as by Darling-Hammond (2001) in her work on teacher-testing and performance-based assessment.

Reflective Practice. Self-assessment, peer-assessment, and critical examination of the efficacy of one's own practice are essential dispositions for all professionals (Feimann-Nemser, 1990). We believe that reflective practice can be taught in the context of courses that view students as knowledge producers in search of meaning (Palmer, 1983). Pedagogy that poses problems rather than transmits content encourages reflective thinking and doing (Miller, 1993). Educational professionals must be reflective and metacognitive themselves in order to encourage these practices in those they serve (Eby, Herrell, & Hicks, 2002; Egan, 2007; Henderson, 1996; Zemelman, Daniels, & Hyde, 1998). We also believe that interaction with current and future practitioners both extends and promotes such reflection.

Faculty members in the Unit seek to extend and promote these dimensions through modeling related pedagogical practices and instilling in our candidates a desire to promote such practices in their professional lives.

Goals of the Unit. Extending from the mission of the University and the theoretical orientation described above, the goals provide direction for the Unit, its faculty, programs, and candidates. The five strategic goals of the College of Education include the Unit’s commitment to diversity, strong partnerships with the educational community, the preparation of teachers, counselors and leaders who help all children learn, the review and development of programs that meet high national standards, the integration of technology, and the extension of faculty contributions. These goals are continually assessed and translate
Candidate Proficiencies. The conceptual framework provides the context for developing and assessing candidate proficiencies based on professional, state, and institutional standards. Candidates are also expected to demonstrate the core dispositions of professional commitment and responsibility, professional relationships, and critical thinking and reflective practice. Candidate proficiencies are aligned with national standards as follows:

Graduates of the educational leadership programs are expected to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions recognized by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC).

Graduates of the counselor preparation programs and the school psychology program in the College of Education are expected to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and ethical standards as set forth by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) for counseling and those of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) for school psychology respectively.

Candidates in teacher education programs leading to initial certification are expected to demonstrate competency in each of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards. Candidates in programs leading to professional certification are expected to demonstrate competency in the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). In addition, candidates in all teacher education programs must demonstrate competency in each of the standards associated with the nationally recognized associations aligned with the areas of certification they seek. These associations include:

• Birth to grade 2 – National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)
• Grades 1-6 - Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI)
• Science Grades 5-12 (biology or chemistry) - National Science Teachers Association (NSTA)
• Social Studies Grades 5-12 - National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS)
• English Grades 5-12 - National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)
• Foreign Language Grades 5-12 - American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)
• Mathematics Grades 5-12 - National Council for Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)
• TESOL Birth – Grade 12 - Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
• Special Education Grades 1-6 or 7-12 - Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)
• Literacy Instruction Birth – Grade 6 or Grades 5-12 - International Reading Association (IRA)

Commitment to Diversity. The conceptual framework reflects the Unit’s commitment to preparing candidates to support learning for all students and provides a conceptual understanding of how knowledge, dispositions, and skills related to diversity are integrated across the curriculum, instruction, field experience, clinical practice, assessment, and evaluation.

The first goal of the College of Education states that “the commitment of the College to a diverse, inclusive, multicultural, and international society will be demonstrated through its personnel, candidates, curriculum and clinical experiences.” This goal is also reflected in the University’s strategic plan which states that “Niagara University will become a more diverse institution, and prepare students to succeed in an increasingly diverse global society”. Indicators of performance are measured at the Unit level and reported/discussed annually. In 2005 and revisited annually as part of the Assessment System, faculty in the College of Education adopted the Framework for Standards and Assessment of Diversity to set forth the knowledge base and indicators of candidate performance related to diversity as informed by culturally relevant pedagogy (Irvine & Armento, 2001). Assessment measures were delineated for each program area based on the indicators of culturally relevant pedagogy that align with national standards.
Commitment to Technology. The conceptual framework reflects the Unit's commitment to preparing candidates who use instructional technology to help all students learn. The commitment to technology is noted across the goals of the College – from facilities (state-of-the-art technology in the Academic Complex and teaching studio) to professional development priorities related to instructional technology for faculty, to the assessment of candidate proficiencies in technology within each program area (based upon the ISTE standards).

Assessment System. The Assessment System of the College of Education is a carefully designed and functional system for collecting, organizing, maintaining, analyzing and using meaningful information for decision-making, planning, and continuous improvement. The College of Education’s Assessment System is aligned with the conceptual framework and provides the continuous process for reporting, discussing, and using data to make decisions about programs and candidates.

The Assessment System is aligned with the conceptual framework of the Unit, includes data related to multiple points of assessment, reflects the involvement of the professional community, and ensures the integration of assessment information and data with other University assessments. Items from Unit-wide assessment instruments have been aligned with indicators of the University mission, Unit goals and the theoretical dimensions of the conceptual framework. Program-level knowledge, skills, and dispositions are aligned with the approved professional standards and have been developed and confirmed by faculty for each program area (teacher education, counseling and school psychology, educational leadership). Each program area has clear transition points that serve as a roadmap for success for candidates and an accountability framework for the Unit.

Data on Unit operations and candidate performance are analyzed by faculty annually to improve the operation of the Unit, its programs and the performance of its graduates. The assessment system focuses on the use of data for continuous improvement with an organizational structure and annual timelines for the promulgation of data and discussion of performance (Unit Assessment System). Specific steps are taken to establish fairness, accuracy, consistency and the avoidance of bias in these assessment procedures.

C.2. (Continuing Visits Only) What changes have been made to the conceptual framework since the last visit?

The conceptual framework continues to be reviewed and updated. Since the last visit, the following changes have been made:

1. A new strategic plan for the Unit was approved by the faculty (2004). The 2004-2010 strategic plan includes the revised dispositions, goals, and new objectives/measures. The strategic goals were amended, most notably goal #5, to add focus on service (underserved communities), partnerships that improve student learning, and technology.

2. A significant revision was made to candidate dispositions, with the delineation of observable indicators for each program, and the establishment of a reliable evaluation methodology. The faculty adopted three core dispositions and voted to adopt the instrumentation and procedural methodology that had been researched by the faculty (Rinaldo et.al). The assessment of dispositions has subsequently been threaded throughout programs in coursework, assessments, and field experiences.

3. Programs were further aligned to the national standards of the specialized professional associations (SPA). While programs in the Unit were framed on the INTASC and NPBTS standards, further
alignment to the specific professional standards took place across programs.

4. Updated research-based references were added to the framework and additional members of the faculty added to this knowledge-base through their scholarship. In addition, in both Departments of the Unit approved a revised classroom visitation (observation) form to more closely align the assessment of teaching effectiveness to the conceptual framework.

5. The academic sector of the University, adopted an active, integrated vision for teaching and learning. This vision, grounded in the philosophical dimensions of the conceptual framework of the College of Education, extended the influence of the faculty of education across the campus, e.g., Committee on College Teaching and Learning.

C.3. (First Visits Only) How was the conceptual framework developed and who was involved in its development?

C.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the conceptual framework may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

STANDARDS

This section is the focus of the institutional report. A description of how the unit meets each standard element must be presented. Significant differences among programs should be described as the response is written for each element under subheadings of initial teacher preparation, advanced teacher preparation, and other school professionals. Significant differences among programs on the main campus, in off-campus programs, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs should be identified. Links to key exhibits to support the descriptions may be attached to the last prompt of each element.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

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

Directions When Programs Have Been Reviewed Nationally or by a Similar State Review

To reduce burden and duplication, units have fewer reporting requirements for Standard 1 when programs have been submitted for national review or similar state review. These review processes cover many of the elements in Standard 1. For programs that have been submitted for national review or similar state review, units are asked to report in the IR only the following information:

- State licensing test data for Element 1a (content knowledge for teacher candidates)
and Element 1e (knowledge and skills for other school professionals)
- Assessment Data for Element 1c (professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills)
- Assessment data for Element 1g (dispositions)
- Results of follow-up studies of graduates and employers (all standards elements)

Because program standards do not generally cover general professional knowledge and skills nor professional dispositions, the unit must respond to all of the prompts in Elements 1c (Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates) and 1g (Professional Dispositions for All Candidates) regardless of whether programs have been submitted for national or state review.

The prompts for each element in the IR include reminders of when data for these programs need not be included. The term "similar state review" refers to state review processes that require institutions to submit assessments and assessment data for evaluation and/or approval. For more information on "similar state review," click on the HELP button at the top right corner of your screen.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1a.1. What are the pass rates of teacher candidates in initial teacher preparation programs on state tests of content knowledge for each program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 4 or upload your own table at Prompt 1a.5 below. [This information could be compiled from Title II data submitted to the state or from program reports prepared for national review.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Name of Content Licensure Test</th>
<th># of Test Takers</th>
<th>% Passing State Licensure Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Pass Rate for the Unit (across all initial teacher preparation programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1a.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]
We have initial programs in Business Education Grades 5-12 at both the undergraduate and graduate levels that are not nationally reviewed. Since there is not an NCATE-accepted set of national standards for this program we have adapted the expectations for New York State Learning Standards in Business and Marketing (NYSB Standards) for our program standards in content knowledge and adapted the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards for content/pedagogy and professional knowledge standards.

These NYSB standards are as follows:
1. The candidate demonstrates an understanding of business, marketing, and multinational economic concepts.
2. The candidate performs business-related mathematical computations.
3. The candidate analyzes/interprets business-related numerical information.
4. The candidate selects, applies, and trouble shoots hardware and software used in processing of business transactions.
5. The candidate prepares, maintains, interprets/analyzes, and transmits/distributes information in a variety of formats while demonstrating the oral, nonverbal, and written communication skills essential for working in today’s international service-/information-/technological-based economy.
6. The candidate demonstrates an understanding of the interrelatedness of business, social, and economic systems/subsystems.
7. The candidate identifies, organizes, plans, and allocates resources (e.g. financial, materials/facilities, human, time) in demonstrating the ability to manage their lives as learners, contributing family members, globally competitive workers, and self-sufficient individuals.
8. The candidate exhibits interpersonal skills essential for success in the multinational business world, demonstrates basic leadership abilities/skills, and functions effectively as a member of a work group or team.

In addition to the New York State Content Specialty Test discussed above in 1a.1, we assess candidate content knowledge according to the NYSB standards by evaluating candidate Grade Point Average in the required content courses for our undergraduate program prior to student teaching. For candidates in the graduate program we assess candidate Grade Point Average in the 36 credit hours of required Business coursework upon admission into the program. Please see the attachment summarizing the data in 1a.5 for undergraduate GPA (Attachment 2) and graduate GPA (Attachment 3). In these attachments we have aligned each course or course topic to the NYSB standards and reflected upon the degree to which the data illustrates how well we meet these standards. We find that at the undergraduate level candidates move closer to our target expectations as they proceed through the program. All undergraduate program completers meet GPA target expectations prior to student teaching. We are challenged by the fact that there are very few candidates in the program overall, and in any given course in an academic year, and therefore one particularly weak candidate can significantly skew the data. At the graduate level our candidates have demonstrated consistently strong GPAs at program intake over multiple years.

**1a.3. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]

| Not Applicable |

**1a.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates'
preparation in the content area? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to content knowledge could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]

Our Office of Career Development conducts follow-up surveys with graduates on an annual basis. In addition, they offer employer surveys on a bi-annual basis. Respondents are requested to rate themselves or employees using a Likert scale of 1 (not well prepared) to 5 (very well prepared). Please see the table summarizing 2004-2007 alumni and employer follow-up assessments in Attachment 4 (in 1a.5) Graduate and Employer Surveys. Specific information about preparation in the content area is identified under “knowledge of subject matter.” Candidates consistently rated themselves as well prepared in content knowledge in each of the surveyed years. Employer responses have indicated an improvement in preparation in the area of “knowledge of subject matter.” In 2004 responses were slightly above average, whereas 2006 responses indicated that they were well prepared.

The response rates for graduates themselves range between 38 and 68% depending on the year and level of program of the respondents. Our process for employer follow-up involves surveying principals who may employ multiple candidates in a single school building. Therefore the response rates do not directly reflect employer feedback by the number of candidates.

1a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment 1 - 1a.5</th>
<th>Pass rate on content knowledge state test CST-business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 2 - 1a.5</td>
<td>Undergraduate GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 3 - 1a.5</td>
<td>Graduate GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 4 - 1a5</td>
<td>Graduate and Employer Follow-Up Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4 - Pass Rates on Content Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation and Advanced Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1b.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

In addition to the NYSB standards listed above which relate specifically to content knowledge, we have adopted the Interstate New Teacher Support Consortium Standards (INTASC) to infuse content pedagogy and pedagogy standards within the pre-service Business Education programs.

These standards include:
#1: The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he
or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

#2: The teacher understands how children learn and develop and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.

#3: The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

#4: The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

#5: The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

#6: The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

#7: The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

#8: The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

#9: The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

#10: The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

We implement a common course assignment entitled “Content Area Resource Packet” in the Methods of Teaching Business course at both the undergraduate and graduate levels (EDU 466 or 766). This assignment requires candidates to create a resource packet reflecting their examination of each of the content strands within the discipline of business. This packet includes a description of:

1. resources that could be used in teaching each of the various strands of the New York State Learning Standards or Ontario Expectations. Two of the resources are specifically designated as instructional technology and a text. All other resources may be individually identified by the candidate.

2. an activity that incorporates each resource and fosters active inquiry, critical thinking, and supportive interactions among the students.

3. an assessment of student knowledge and skill within each strand as a result of participating in the activities and utilizing the resources.

4. a common misconception or difficulty students typically have in each content strand and how the candidate might accommodate/support students who have this misconception or difficulty.

Please see the attachment describing the assessment, its alignment to the NYSB and INTASC standards, and summarizing the data on this assessment in Attachment 5, 466 Undergrad Content Pedagogy and Attachment 6, 766 Graduate Content Pedagogy in 1b.4 below. In sum, graduate and undergraduate candidates all met the minimum expectations for this assessment. Graduate candidates also met the additionally required condition of connecting the current research in the field regarding each of the resources and strategies they planned.

1b.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates know and apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, are able to use a range of instructional strategies and technologies, and can explain the choices they make in their practice. [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]
1b.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

We offer follow-up surveys to graduates on an annual basis and to employers on a biannual cycle. Please see the table summarizing alumni and employer follow-up assessments on “Knowledge of Subject Matter” and “Instructional Strategies” in Attachment 4 (in 1a.5) above. We include the “Knowledge of Subject Matter” assessment in the pedagogical content knowledge area because evidence of candidate content knowledge is based on the evaluation of the application of said knowledge in the classroom setting. Additional information about preparation in content pedagogy is identified under “variety of instructional strategies” because the strategies implemented by candidates are closely connected to their content area. Candidates consistently rated themselves as well prepared in each of the surveyed years. Employer responses have indicated an improvement in preparation in this area. In 2004 responses were slightly above average, whereas 2006 responses indicated that they were well prepared.

1b.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the pedagogical content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. (Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment 5 - 1b.4 466 Undergraduate Content Pedagogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 6 - 1b.4 766 Graduate Content Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1c.1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced teacher preparation programs demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

Based on correspondence with the NCATE office we understand that this condition applies only to programs that have not been nationally reviewed.

One key assessment for planning instruction to facilitate learning in the Business Education Grades 5-12 programs is administered in the General Methods of Secondary Education course (EDU 460 or 760). The common assignment required of all candidates taking this course is a “Consecutive Lesson Planning Project”. Within this assignment candidates plan two consecutive lessons for a secondary classroom that explore an important historical or foundational concept within the discipline of business using a standard format. The lessons must identify the intended student outcome(s); align to the NYS Standards or Ontario Expectations; indicate how the needs of various learners including at-risk, high-achieving, culturally diverse, and special needs students will be met by describing planned interventions that will

---
help learners complete the task; and describe how technology will be effectively integrated. The lessons must include evidence of on-going assessment indicating what proof will be gathered to determine if the learning outcomes have been met. Finally, the candidate must reflect on the planning process and include this with the assignment. A version of this assessment has been required in this course for a number of years; however, up until the fall semester of 2007 data was gathered using a more general portfolio submission model. The 2006-2007 data are provided according to the general portfolio program expectations of “Multiple Instructional Strategies,” “Planning,” and “Reflection and Evaluation.” The 2007-2008 data present results of the assignment using the current rubric. Please see the tables summarizing the data in Attachment 7, 460 Undergraduate Pedagogical Knowledge and Attachment 8, 760 Graduate Pedagogical Knowledge in 1c.5 below. Candidates in the graduate and undergraduate programs have been largely successful on all elements of this assignment.

The other key assessment of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills is the final student teaching report. At the conclusion of each student teaching placement, the cooperating teacher evaluates the candidate on each of the program expectations which are aligned to the NYSB and INTASC standards. Candidates are evaluated on a continuum from outstanding to unsatisfactory and are expected to achieve a minimum score of satisfactory on each program expectation. A final, holistic judgment is made on the competency of the candidate based on overall performance in each program expectation. Candidates may receive a grade of satisfactory or unsatisfactory in the student teaching placement based on this final recommendation. The form itself underwent a revision to clarify content area knowledge as it relates to NYSB and INTASC standards. This revised form was implemented for the first time in fall 2007 and is included as item 5(a) below. The prior form was focused on content knowledge more generally and the data for 2006-2007 illustrate this more general content area evaluation. Please see the table summarizing the data in Attachment 9, Undergraduate Student Teaching and Attachment 10, Graduate Student Teaching in 1c.5 below. Candidates in the undergraduate and graduate programs have been largely successful in student teaching over the last 3 years. In only one instance was one candidate (graduate) rated as unsatisfactory on any elements of the evaluation form.

1c.2. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs consider the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings? If a licensure test is required in this area, how are candidates performing on it? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

Based on correspondence with the NCATE office we understand that this condition applies only to programs that have not been nationally reviewed.

The final student teaching report highlighted as a key assessment of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in 1c.1 above provides a detailed evaluation of candidates. Items 7a, 10a and 10b evidence their consideration of the school, family and community contexts. Items 2a, 2b, and 7a evidence consideration of the prior experiences of students. Items 9a and 9b indicate the degree to which candidates reflect on their own practice and improve professionally. As indicated above, all but 1 candidate have been successful in their student teaching placements for the past 3 years. Please see the table summarizing the data in Attachment 9, Undergraduate Student Teaching and Attachment 10, Graduate Student Teaching in 1c.5 below.

Another key assessment in this area is the Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W). All candidates seeking initial teacher certification in New York State must successfully pass the ATS-W licensure test. According to the information presented in the Test Framework Guide, the ATS-W assesses the following:
The teacher understands how children learn and develop and can provide learning experiences that support all children’s intellectual, social, and personal growth, including children who have special needs and children for whom English is not their primary language. The teacher can use a variety of instructional and assessment strategies to foster students’ academic development and to encourage students’ active engagement in learning. The teacher recognizes the roles that family and community play in student learning and forges home-school partnerships to achieve common goals for children’s education. The teacher is a reflective practitioner who is able to work collaboratively with other members of the school community and can take advantage of opportunities for professional development. Most importantly, the teacher is able to create a cooperative and supportive classroom environment that addresses the needs of individual students and within which all students can grow and learn. Additional information may be found in the full test framework at http://www.nystce.nesinc.com/PDFs/NY_fld91_objs.pdf.

The test is comprised of approximately 80 multiple choice items with subscores reported in the following areas A) student development and learning, B) instruction and assessment, and C) the professional environment; as well as D) 1 constructed response item on instruction and assessment. The following website presents a preparation guide for the test: http://www.nystce.nesinc.com/PDFs/NY_fld091_prepguide.pdf. The following alignment between this test and INTASC Standards exists:

ATS-W Sub-Area INTASC Standard
I. Student Development and Learning 2, 3
II. Instruction and Assessment 4,6,7, and 8
III. The Professional Environment 5,9,and 10
IV. Instruction and Assessment-Constructed 4,6,7, and 8

Response
Please see the table summarizing the data in Attachment 11, ATS-W Pass Rates in 1c.5 below.

We have a 100% pass rate on this state assessment for the past 2 years for both undergraduate and graduate candidates. Furthermore, average scores on the subareas are well above the 220 target for each subarea.

1c.3. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates reflect on their practice; engage in professional activities; have a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work; collaborate with the professional community; are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices; and can analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their own practice and the profession? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

Not Applicable

1c.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

We offer follow-up surveys to graduates on an annual basis and to employers on a biannual cycle. Please see the table summarizing alumni and employer follow-up assessments on “Diverse Learners and Communities”, “Instructional Strategies, ” Motivating and Managing”, “Interactive Environments and
Technology”, “Professional Growth and Self Assessment”, and “Colleagues, Parents and Community” in 1a.5 above. Candidates consistently rated themselves as well prepared in each of the surveyed years. Employer responses have indicated an improvement in preparation in this area. In 2004 responses were slightly above average, whereas 2006 responses indicated that they were well prepared.

1c.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

| Attachment 7 - 1c.5 460 Undergraduate Pedagogical Knowledge |
| Attachment 8 - 1c.5 760 Graduate Pedagogical Knowledge |
| Attachment 9 - 1c.5 Undergraduate Student Teaching |
| Attachment 10 - 1c.5 Graduate Student Teaching |
| Attachment 11 - 1c.5 atsw pass rates |

See Attachments panel below.

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1d.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

The key assessment for measuring candidate impact on student learning in the Business Education Grades 5-12 programs is administered in the Assessment of Learning course (EDU 451 or 505, Attachments 12 and 13 respectively). The common assignment in this course is the “Measurement Project”. This project requires candidates to conduct pre- and post-instruction assessments and analyze their impact on student learning. For graduate candidates in EDU 505 three years of data are provided in Attachment 13, located in 1d.4 below. The 2006-2007 data for graduate candidates is provided based on a previous portfolio evaluation model wherein candidates were expected to demonstrate satisfactory the general program expectations of “Multiple Instructional Strategies” and “Assessment”.

At the undergraduate level, EDU 451 became a requirement for candidates entering the program in fall of 2006, and therefore it was fall of 2008 before the first group of candidates progressed to the pre-student teaching semester in which the course is offered.

Prior to the Measurement Project, one assessment used to measure candidate impact on student learning was the Teaching Assistantship Final Report. Candidates in the pre-student teaching assistantship are required to plan, implement, and assess at least two lessons in 5-12 Business classrooms. Field-based mentors review the plans, observe the lessons, review the assessment data, and provide feedback to the candidate. The final report evaluates the candidate’s performance on nine criteria, one of which is assessment of impact on student learning. We did not have any candidates in EDU 451 in the 2008-2009 academic year and therefore all data illustrated in Attachment 12 are based on the prior teaching
assistantship.

In sum, all candidates have demonstrated satisfactory levels of impact on student learning, and the processes for improving in this competency area have included the addition of an undergraduate course focused on this topic.

1d.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning; regularly apply them in their practice; analyze student, classroom, and school performance data; make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning; and are aware of and utilize school and community resources that support student learning? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

Not Applicable

1d.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to help all students learn? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to help all students learn could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

We offer follow-up surveys to graduates on an annual basis and to employers on a biannual cycle. Please see the table summarizing alumni and employer follow-up assessments on “Formal and Informal Assessment” in 1a.4 above. Candidates consistently rated themselves as well prepared in each of the surveyed years. Employer responses have indicated an improvement in preparation in this area. In 2004 responses were slightly above average, whereas 2006 responses indicated that candidates were approaching the level of well prepared. Follow-up studies from employer surveys also indicate graduates' ability to help all students learn. On a 5 point Likert scale, the mean rating among employers was 4.2 for professional relationships (includes belief that all children can learn) among candidates and 4.2 related to working with diverse learners and communities (class of 2006).

1d.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Table 5

Pass Rates on Licensure Tests for Other School Professionals

| Attachment 12 - 1d.4 451 Undergraduate Assessment of Learning |
| Attachment 13 - 1d.4 505 Graduate Assessment of Learning |

See Attachments panel below.

1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

1e.1. What are the pass rates of other school professionals on licensure tests by program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 5 or upload your own table at Prompt 1e.4 below.
1e.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that other school professionals demonstrate the knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for programs for other school professionals that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below.]

We have programs in School Counseling that are not nationally reviewed. Since there is not an NCATE-accepted set of national standards for this program we have adapted the expectations for school counselors established by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) to assess the knowledge and skills of our school counseling candidates. These standards include:

1. Professional Identity- an understanding of all aspects of professional functioning
2. Social and Cultural Diversity- an understanding of the cultural contexts of relationships, issues and trends in multicultural and diverse society
3. Human Growth and Development- an understanding of the nature and needs of individuals at all developmental levels
4. Career Development –an understanding of career development and related life factors
6. Group Work- an understanding of group purpose, development, dynamics, counseling theories, group counseling methods and skills
7. Assessment- an understanding of approaches to assessment and evaluation
8. Research and Program Evaluation- an understanding of research methods, statistical analysis, needs assessment and program evaluation. *

* Please consult CACREP for the unabbreviated standard language.

During the final internship candidates develop a portfolio in which they provide two artifacts demonstrating evidence of their competence and write a reflection paper on their personal and professional development in each of the 8 CACREP standard areas. Attachment 14 in 1e.4 below describes the portfolio elements, illustrates the grading rubric and summarizes the data for the past 2 years on this assessment. We find that all candidates have met expected targets on all CACREP standards, save 1 candidate who did not meet the expectations in Assessment.

A second key assessment of the CACREP standards is the final internship evaluation completed by the site supervisor in collaboration with the university-based internship supervisor. Attachment 1e.4 below presents the scoring form used for the internship evaluation, and summarizes the data for the past 2 years. We find that all candidates are meeting minimal expectations on all aspects of the assessment. One candidate demonstrated a need to improve competency in working with classroom teachers in implementing activities. The School Counseling faculty members are concerned that a number of elements have been rated as not observed or not essential. After deliberation they have concluded that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Name of Licensure Test</th>
<th># of Test Takers</th>
<th>% Passing State Licensure Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Pass Rate for the Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(across all programs for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparation of other school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professionals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
these elements may not be appropriate to the level of development of some candidates (ex. 3.3 Hire certified school counselors) or the level or type of program in which they were placed for the internship (ex. Elementary vs. secondary), the faculty wish to continue to include these elements to increase the knowledge and competency of candidates and their site-based supervisors.

1e.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about the knowledge and skills of other school professionals? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1e.4 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]

Within the category of “other school professionals”, we offer programs in educational leadership, counseling, and school psychology. Follow-up surveys to graduates of these programs are conducted on an annual basis. For the 2004-2007 academic years these evaluations were aggregated across all of these program areas. The Unit developed program-specific surveys for use with 2008 program completers. Preliminary data are presented on the graduate responses to these questions. Employer results are still being collected. Please see the table summarizing alumni and employer follow-up surveys on “knowledge of content” for the 2004 to 2007 versions and for the 2008 data view “Knowledge of Counseling” for School Counselors and “Develop, articulate, implement a school or district vision of learning” and “manage the organization, operations and resources in a way to promote the success of students” for examples of knowledge and skills of other professionals. Attachment 16, Graduate and Alumni Follow-up Surveys, is located in 1e.4 below. In sum, we find that our counseling and school psychology candidates rate themselves as well prepared or extremely knowledgeable and employers find them above average. Candidates completing the educational leadership programs rate themselves as knowledgeable and well prepared.

1e.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the knowledge and skills of other school professionals may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

| Attachment 14 - 1e.4 School Counseling Portfolio Final Evaluation |
| Attachment 15 - 1e.4 School Counseling Final Internship Site Supervisor Evaluation |
| Attachment 16 - 1e.4 Graduate and Employer Follow-Up Surveys |
| Table 5 - Pass Rates on Content Tests for Other School Professionals |

See Attachments panel below.

1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals

1f.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates can create positive environments for student learning, including building on the developmental levels of students; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work? [Data for programs for other school professionals that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]

The portfolio and internship evaluations described in 1e.2 above also address these areas of professional skill as follows:
CACREP Standards 5 Helping Relationships and 6 Group Work focus on creating positive environments.  
CACREP standard 3 Human Growth and Development focuses on building on the developmental levels of students.  
CACREP standard 2 Social and Cultural Diversity focuses on diversity of students, families, and communities.  

The scores on these elements of the portfolio and internship reveal that all candidates (save 1) have met expected targets. For the internship a few elements were not observed or deemed essential to the particular placement.  

In addition, the program implements a comprehensive evaluation in which candidates complete a “Case Conceptualization.” Within this assessment candidates must tape a counseling session with a student from the practicum site. Candidates type a script of the tape and complete a report indentifying the student, presenting the issues addressed in counseling, reflecting upon the relationship between his/her theoretical orientation and counseling techniques, and providing insights into the strengths and limitations in exploring issues with the client. This assessment requires candidates to identify ethnic and family background information, peer relationships, career development, and student goals.

Please see the attachment summarizing the data in Attachment 17, in 1f.3 below. Within this attachment is a detailed description of the assessment, the report scoring rubric, and a summary of the data. In sum, we find that candidate mean scores are above the target on all elements of the evaluation.

1f.2. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to create positive environments for student learning? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to create positive environments for student leaning could be attached at Prompt 1f.3 below.]

Please see the table summarizing 2004-2007 alumni and employer follow-up surveys on “Diverse Learners and Communities”, “Motivating and Managing”, “Interactive Environments”, and “Colleagues, Parents and Communities” and 2008 alumni responses to “Promote a positive school culture” for educational leaders and “Motivating and managing the counseling environment” and “Creating interactive counseling environments” for school counselors in Attachment 16, in 1e.4 above. Candidates rate themselves as well prepared or very knowledgeable, while employers rate candidates as average to slightly above average.

1f.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to other school professionals' creation of positive environments for student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Attachment 17 - 1f.3 School Counseling Comprehensive Evaluation

See Attachments panel below.

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates. [Indicate when the responses refer to the preparation of initial teacher candidates, advanced teacher candidates, and other school professionals, noting differences when they occur.]
1g.1. What professional dispositions are candidates expected to demonstrate by completion of programs?

Candidates throughout the unit are expected to demonstrate the dispositions of:

Professional Commitment and Responsibility
The candidate demonstrates a commitment to the profession and adheres to the legal and ethical standards set forth by it. (Includes disposition related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn. See section 1g.2)

Professional Relationships
The candidate develops, maintains, and models appropriate relationships within the workplace, community, and larger society.

Critical Thinking and Reflective Practice
The candidate demonstrates a commitment to continuous development within the profession.

These dispositions are articulated in the Conceptual Framework of the Unit and operationalized differently by department and program areas with a set of observable behaviors which are reviewed by faculty who have worked with candidates in each course throughout the program and by field supervisors who have observed candidates in their placements.

1g.2. How do candidates demonstrate that they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

The overarching dispositions each include a subset of specific affective qualities that are evaluated by faculty and field supervisors. Dispositions related to fairness are subsumed within the Unit disposition of Professional Commitment and Responsibility. Within this disposition candidates are assessed specifically on the degree to which they “act with ethical integrity” and “maintain confidentiality”. Dispositions related to the belief that all students can learn are subsumed under the Unit disposition of Professional Relationships. Within this disposition candidates are assessed specifically on the degree to which they “maintain high expectations for self and all others,” “exemplify respect for self and all others,” and “recognize and promote diversity.” Faculty teaching each course, in each semester evaluate candidates on the dispositions, and field supervisors in the final student teaching experience evaluation similarly assess all pre-service teaching candidates. Tables summarizing these data are included in Attachment 18 in 1g.5 below. More than 97% of candidates have met the minimum expectation.

1g.3. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions listed in 1g.1 as they work with students, families, colleagues, and communities? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

Candidate dispositions are evaluated by cooperating teachers and by campus-based supervisors as a component of field experiences and field-based course assignments. Candidate dispositions related to their work with students, families, colleagues, and communities is subsumed under the Unit disposition of Professional Relationships. Within this disposition candidates are assessed specifically on the degree to which they “maintain high expectations for self and all others,” “exemplify respect for self and all others,” “recognize and promote diversity,” “act compassionately towards all others,” “demonstrate patience and flexibility,” and “collaborate with peers and support their development.” A table summarizing these data is included in Attachment 19, in 1g.5 below. More than 97% of candidates have met the minimum expectation.

1g.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' demonstration of professional dispositions? If survey data have not already been reported, what
was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional dispositions could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

We offer follow-up surveys to undergraduates and graduates on an annual basis and to employers on a biannual cycle. Please see the table summarizing alumni and employer follow-up surveys on disposition in “Diverse Learners and Communities”, and “Professional Growth and Self-Assessment/Reflective Practice” in 1a.5 and 1.e.4 above. In sum, we find that our candidates consistently rated themselves as well prepared in each of the surveyed years. Employer responses have indicated an improvement in preparation in this area. In 2004 responses were slightly above average, whereas 2006 responses indicated that candidates were approaching the level of well prepared.

1g.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to professional dispositions may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

| Attachment 18 - 1g.5 Student Teaching Dispositions |
| Attachment 19 - 1g.5 Course Based Disposition Assessment for All Programs |

See Attachments panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 1?

The faculty adopted a consistent and deliberate assessment methodology leading to performance-based and standardized assessments for candidates. Using this evidence of candidate performance, 21 programs have been nationally recognized. The teacher preparation programs have instituted common course assessments with standardized rubrics aligned to state and national standards to insure that all candidates demonstrate competency in pedagogy and content pedagogy in a consistent fashion. Graduates have a very strong passing rate on New York State licensure examinations of professional knowledge (100% pass rate on Assessment of Teaching Skills), general content knowledge (100% pass rate on Liberal Arts and Sciences Test) and content knowledge (88-100% pass rates on all content specialty tests) as reported under Title II.

As a bi-national University, the policy, preparation, and assessment strategies (pre-service, advanced programs, and on-going professional learning) seamlessly transcend candidate performance and the contributions of graduates in both Ontario and the U.S.

A common set of professional dispositions are assessed in all courses and in clinical practice, using instrumentation that is being replicated in over 30 institutions of higher education across the country. The dispositions reflect the mission of the institution and the conceptual framework of the unit.

Curriculum is developed with the educational community (P-12 schools and arts and sciences) to reflect the needs within a P-16 continuum – recent examples include the development of a literacy minor (designed in partnership with area school leaders), the interdisciplinary content area core (designed with Arts and Sciences), and approval of a TESOL undergraduate program (one of a very few offered at the initial level) to address supply/demand needs within the region. A new area, identified strongly as a need by P-12 schools and included in recent grants, is teacher as leader.

2. What research related to Standard 1 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?
Assessment of dispositions (Rinaldo et al) – faculty has made numerous national presentations and published several articles in this area with over 35 institutions across the country replicating the assessment model and instrumentation.

Preparing current and aspiring superintendents to cope and succeed and the “professional victim syndrome” in educational leadership (Polka).

Transforming school counseling initiative of the Education Trust (Bogner).

Analysis of social studies textbooks regarding representation of non-Western societies (Zambon).

Cooperative learning in the mathematics classroom (Hernandez de Hahn).

What the pre-service candidate (novice teacher) brings to literacy instruction (Phillips, Rinaldo).

Peer mediation and the impact on student achievement (Bogner).

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.

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

2a. Assessment System

2a.1. How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit’s conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards?

The Unit ensures that information is collected on candidate proficiencies as outlined in the conceptual framework, state and professional standards through its alignment to the conceptual framework, the Assessment System by nature of its design, and the structure of collecting and reporting of findings.

The Assessment System of the College of Education (Ex. 2.1a) is a carefully designed and functional system for collecting, organizing, maintaining, analyzing and utilizing meaningful information that is readily available for the purpose of decision making, planning, and strengthening the Unit and programs. Specifically, the Assessment System has been developed for (a) measuring progress (Unit standards, strategic plan goals, federal and state standards) for accreditation and evaluation; (b) identifying strengths and issues; (c) internal planning, analysis and advocacy (planning for the Unit in general, program areas specifically); (d) measuring candidate performance; and (e) continuous improvement. The Unit’s Assessment System represents this continuous process with inputs at multiple levels of the organization and transparent processes for the analysis, discussion and dissemination of data for continuous improvement, planning, and quality assurance.

The Assessment System is aligned with the Conceptual Framework (Ex. Gen.3f) of the College and
professional and state standards; with further alignment to strategic planning and an implementation structure (Ex. 2.1f: Assessment Matrix). The Assessment System includes data related to multiple points of assessment, reflects the involvement of the professional community, and ensures the integration of assessment information and data with other University assessments.

The Unit Assessment Collection and Dissemination Plan (Ex. 2.1g) delineates core assessments that are used, the level of the analysis (Unit or program), and a timetable outlining when assessments are collected and data disseminated. Data are disseminated at the Unit level, with more detailed analyses of candidate performance provided at the program level.

Program-level knowledge, skills, and dispositions are aligned with the approved professional standards and have been developed and confirmed by faculty for each program area (teacher education, counseling and school psychology, educational leadership). Each program area has identified key assessments, as reported in the SPA reports, that provide multiple indicators of candidate performance on each of the approved program standards – these reflect and include the transition points (see Table 6) for each program.

The operating structure within the Unit is designed to support the assessment system in the collection, reporting and use of data for continuous improvement and planning. The Planning and Evaluation Committee of the Unit serves as the overall mechanism to review progress and recommend changes as indicated by the data. The charge of the Committee is to provide leadership for quality across the Unit through planning and assessment for the College of Education. Specific committees of the Unit have been charged to collect, analyze, and report on specific standards. These Committees are Program and Assessment; Field Experiences and Partnerships; Diversity; and Faculty Qualifications and Professional Development. Candidate, faculty, and Unit assessment data are regularly shared for the purpose of improvement based on the data. The work of these Unit-level standing committees is aligned with institutional, state, and professional standards (Ex. 2.1f).

2a.2. What are the key assessments used by the unit and its programs to monitor and make decisions about candidate performance at transition points such as those listed in Table 6? Please complete Table 6 or upload your own table at Prompt 2a.6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Entry to clinical practice</th>
<th>Exit from clinical practice</th>
<th>Program completion</th>
<th>After program completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2a.3. How is the unit assessment system evaluated? Who is involved and how?

The Unit’s Assessment System is evaluated and refined on an ongoing basis. The Assessment System consists of internal and external inputs which provide both formative and summative data.

The Assessment System (Ex. 2.1a) clearly depicts the process for the assessment of candidate performance and student learning and Unit operations, who is involved and the specific timelines (and feedback loops) for the system. All aspects of the University are included, creating a continual input and feedback mechanism for the continuous improvement process. On an annual basis (components D and E of the Assessment System), the reports of learning outcomes from the Department chairpersons, standing Committee chairs, and the Unit’s Planning and Evaluation Committee serve as the basis for (a)
the review of key assessments; (b) considering changes needed to make the data entry, evaluation, and analyses more appropriate for the analyses of outcomes and benchmarks, and (c) assessing whether the data suggest changes that would improve the professional education program. These annual reports are required (University and Unit policy). The Fall Assessment Retreat of the faculty, (Ex. 2.1m, n, o – Fall Assessment Retreat Documentation 2009, 2008, 2007) provides an annual and formal opportunity for faculty to evaluate and refine the assessment system. The Retreat results in the discussion of continuous improvement for the Unit and its programs, as well as the opportunity for faculty to evaluate the Assessment System.

The analysis of data related to key performance indicators in the Unit are discussed and disseminated in the Annual Planning and Evaluation Report Part A 2009, 2008, 2007 (Ex. 2.1x6, 2.1x5, 2.1x4) which is printed and disseminated annually.

Involvement in this process includes the University community, the faculty and professional staff in the Unit, and professional community. The Planning and Evaluation Committee of the Unit serves as the overall mechanism to review progress and recommend changes, with other standing committees of the College aligned with the assessment of College goals and standards (see Ex. 2.1h: Committee Charges). On an annual basis, through formal assessment retreats and disseminated reports, Unit operations and candidate performance are analyzed by faculty to improve the operation of the Unit, its programs and the performance of its graduates. Candidate, faculty, and Unit assessment data are regularly shared for the purpose of improvement based on the data. The professional community has been involved in the design, implementation and evaluation of the Assessment System. The Advisory Council reviews assessments and respective data for both Unit operations and candidate performance. The charge of the Advisory Council and its members is included in Attachment 1. The professional community is further involved in assessment at the implementation level as the assessment includes field based components and completion of employer follow-up surveys, which require practitioners to evaluate candidate proficiencies and program quality.

The Assessment System also demonstrates coherence with University assessment generally. To ensure this coherence, members of the Unit serve on the University Committees of Planning, Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness. The Assessment System of the Unit draws upon and contributes to University planning and assessment.

2a.4. How does the unit ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?

The Unit has taken steps to ensure fairness, accuracy, consistency and the avoidance of bias in measuring candidate proficiencies. Assessments (the instruments, rubrics, and procedures) are designed by faculty at the Departmental level and formally approved by the faculty as reflecting practices associated with the standards as well as the adoption of the instrument to be used for all required assessments (course-embedded and clinical practice). This approval process itself, is a foremost strategy to ensuring that all faculty support and use assessment measures that are aligned with standards and consistently implemented.

• In regard to fairness, faculty has taken steps to ensure that candidates understand what is expected of them. A standardized format for course syllabi is used. A review of the syllabi illustrates how course assessments, criteria, and expectations for grading are clearly delineated in syllabi. All candidates, initial and advanced, are informed of requirements for completion of their programs at the time of admission to the program when they meet with the Education advisor, through the undergraduate NUS symposium (Attachment 2: NUS Syllabus), in graduate orientation sessions, in curriculum cards, and in Handbooks.
• Faculty ensures consistency by using the rubrics and scoring procedures that have been approved at the Departmental level. Measures of reliability have been instituted on assessments – most notably the dispositional survey (Ex. 2.3g: Dispositions Research, Rinaldo, et al.). Reliability studies demonstrate the strength of the instrumentation for assessment of dispositions (r=98.7, p<.001). Additional small-scale measures of reliability are being undertaken by the faculty. Student teaching rubrics and childhood and foundational common course assessments were reviewed to strengthen inter-rater reliability, leading to further work among tenure-track and clinical faculty. Ninety (90%) of tenure-track faculty report being involved in the review of rubrics to improve the consistency of feedback.

• Required assessments (course-embedded and clinical practice) are aligned with standards and learning outcomes. As approved by the faculty, rubrics address, in part, a measure of validity. Faculty, in program clusters, meet to review their assessments and continuously strengthen the rubrics that align candidate performance to the standards.

• To avoid bias in assessment, due process procedures are in place at the University, Unit, and Program level. These include the Academic Integrity, grade appeal, and disability services and accommodations policies. Beginning with the admissions process (three levels of review) through the grading of culminating examinations, steps are taken to avoid biasness. These include blind reviews (educational leadership), multiple reviewers (teacher education), and comparing results to other internal assessments (counseling).

2a.5. What assessments and evaluation measures are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?

The Assessment System maintains data aligned with the conceptual framework and measures candidate progress and performance (Unit and program levels). The Unit Assessment Collection and Dissemination Plan (Ex. 2.1g) delineates core assessments that are used, the level of the analysis (Unit and program), and a timetable outlining when assessments are administered and data collected and disseminated. Data are disseminated at the Unit level, with more detailed analyses of candidate performance provided at the program level.

At the Institutional and Unit level, core assessments include NSSE data (Ex. 1.9a), data from Institutional Research, follow-up surveys (Ex. 1.7b), FQPD and technology survey (Ex. 2.1j), and faculty reviews. Additionally, a new P-16 data set for program completers in New York State is in the pilot stages (Teacher Quality Research Pilot: Tracking Program Completers). These data will augment information that is currently used for follow-up assessment.

The analysis of data related to key performance indicators in the Unit are discussed and disseminated in the Annual Planning and Evaluation Committee Report 2008-2009, 2007-2008, 2006-2007 (Ex. 2.1x6, 2.1x5, 2.1x4). This report of the Planning and Evaluation Committee is printed and disseminated annually. The assessment findings from the SPA reviews have also been integrated in the Unit’s assessment plan. The SPA Findings Assessment Plan (Ex. 2.9a) includes actions and timelines for common findings and program specific findings.

Data on the transition points is monitored and evaluated. Each program has established clear transition points (Table 6) that include admission, entry to clinical practice, exit from clinical practice, program completion, and follow-up. The Unit uses these transition points as benchmarks for candidates to move through the program. Transition points are monitored through the Office of the Assistant Dean, the Department Chairpersons, and Director of Student Teaching. University and Unit Policies are in place to address issues of candidates who are unable to meet the established criteria (e.g., exit from student
teaching, graduation requirements).

In addition, each program has identified additional assessments in order to have multiple indicators of candidate performance across the program standards (reported in SPA reports). These data are collected regularly and reported annual (Annual Reports of the Department Chairpersons) for discussion and decision-making at the annual Fall Assessment Retreat of the faculty.

2a.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's assessment system may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

| Table 6 - Transition Points |
| Attachment 1 - Advisory Council Charges |
| Attachment 2 - NUS 2009 syllabus |
| 2a.6 - Links to Exhibits |

See Attachments panel below.

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

2b.1. What are the processes and timelines used by the unit to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, unit operations, and program quality?

- How are the data collected?
- From whom (e.g., applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty) are data collected?
- How often are the data summarized and analyzed?
- Whose responsibility is it to summarize and analyze the data? (dean, assistant dean, data coordinator, etc.)
- In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? (reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)
- What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?

The process of and timelines used by the Unit for data collection and analysis are coordinated with University-wide assessment and data functions. The data are collected according to established timelines to integrate with existing data systems across campus (e.g., Institutional Research), to meet requirements for reporting, and to ensure annual, formal opportunities for faculty to evaluate, discuss, and use data.

The Assessment Secretary for the Unit coordinates timelines for collecting data for the Unit from Institutional Research, Career Development, Academic Departments, the Dean’s office, and the Office of Student Teaching. The Assessment System Data Checklist (Ex. 2.1k) is used by the Assessment Secretary to track data sources and timelines for specific data sets. Data are collected from the University, faculty and Departments, applicants and candidates (through the respective administrative Units), graduates, and external stakeholders (e.g., employers, cooperating teachers, intern mentors).

Data collection for Unit operations and program quality (candidate performance) is as follows: (a) annual for Unit and University data, (b) by semester for course evaluations (faculty), course-embedded
assessments, dispositional assessments, and assessments of field experiences and clinical practice, and (c) bi-annual for employers. Many of the key assessments are done on-line (e.g., faculty course evaluations) or are uploaded as they are scanned to enter data into the data warehouse (STEP system).

Data are summarized and analyzed on an annual basis. Niagara University’s policy for annual reports requires that the Dean, Academic Department chairpersons and administrative directors provide an annual report (based on learning outcomes and assessments) to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. In addition, the appointed chairs of the Unit’s standing committees provide an annual report to the faculty. These annual reports, provide the basis to approve changes and eventually take them (as needed) to the university governance for review and approval. Data are summarized in table and graph formats, with additional data sets available in a Microsoft Excel format.

The Unit’s Committee structure forms a strong base to ensure coordination and on-going integration of assessment into the operation of the Unit (Ex. 2.1f - Assessment System Matrix). The Planning and Evaluation Committee of the College serves as the overall mechanism to review progress and recommend changes as dictated by the data. The charge of the Committee is to provide leadership for quality across the Unit through planning and assessment for the College of Education; thereby providing oversight and direction regarding implementation of the assessment plan.

The five committees of the Unit collect information, analyze data, and report on specific standards. The committee charges (Ex. 2.1h) of these formal, standing Committees are aligned with the conceptual framework of the Unit and focus on Unit standards and goals of the strategic plan. Direct linkages are made with partners in the College of Arts and Science and from the Pre-K – 12 systems through the College Advisory Committee and the University’s Education Council of Chairs (Arts and Science and Education).

Each year, the Dean’s office provides regular reports to the University leadership, the Unit, and professional community on the data produced through assessments. Unit and program data are presented to faculty at Unit-wide retreats, focusing the annual planning discussion on assessment implications. At the annual fall retreat, the focus of working sessions is on each of the strategic goals, with data elements presented to faculty prior to the meeting. Unit data is reviewed and discussed at the retreat, leading to Committee deliberations and members of the committees formulate their annual agenda based on the key indicators. Similarly, a review of candidate performance data leads into the Departmental meetings of the faculty (fall retreat of each year). The chairs of the College Committees meet regularly to ensure continuity in their work and coordination on objectives, as necessary.

Assessment data are collected, stored and analyzed using the University’s technology platform and logging systems (to ensure protection of data sets). This includes Niagara University’s Colleague system (Datatel platform); the Office of Institutional Research data base, and excel/access data systems that have been established with formula-driven spreadsheets for data (e.g., the shared drive to log, monitor and assess field experiences, and the STEP data warehouse). Continuous updating and modification of the technologies used for the Assessment System takes place to ensure that the newest technologies are incorporated and that the data systems used by the College of Education are University-based systems (i.e., upgrades in the Colleague data system used University-wide, expansion of the STEP data warehouse for course embedded assessments, and university-based web applications for the shared-drive).

2b.2. How does the unit disaggregate candidate assessment data for candidates on the main campus, at off-campus sites, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs?

The Assessment System draws from the University’s Datatel (Colleague) management system. The
University uses Datatel’s Colleague system to manage financial, student, administrative, and human resources information. It is an integrated system that provides rapid access to multidisciplinary data from many sources. All candidate profile and program information is entered using the standard coding established across the University. Faculty information is entered, as coded for the university, as well. Coding includes program, levels of study, part-time/full-time status, gender, ethnicity, as well as other fields. Drawing from the Colleague platform, the Unit database disaggregates performance data in several ways. Groups are established to create the cohort for reporting (e.g., specific program areas, specific courses for course-embedded assessment reporting). Groups are also established for demographic areas (e.g., Ontario candidates). This group builder function on the database (excel-driven formulas programmed by STEP) is integrated with Colleague allowing the disaggregation of candidate assessment data for various programs on campus. Niagara University does not offer alternative route programs or distance learning programs at this time. Off-campus sites are located in the Toronto area and data are disaggregated by the specific program code for this Ontario-accredited program. The University maintains and upgrades the Colleague system.

2b.3. How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?

The Unit maintains a record of candidates’ formal complaints and their resolution in the Office of the Dean. The Unit follows the policies of the University regarding student appeals and student rights and responsibilities (Ex. 2.6a).

The Unit’s policy and procedure for addressing candidate issues includes the following: Candidate identifies the complaint issue to a member of the faculty or person affiliated with the complaint, working with the member of the faculty to resolve the issue. If unresolved, the candidate goes to the Chairperson of the Department who sets up a three-way discussion to resolve the issue. If unresolved, the candidate can proceed to the Dean of the College of Education with written material. The Dean works with the Chair and the candidate to resolve the issue. As needed, the complaint may be referred to the Vice President of Academic Affairs and ultimately to the President of the University.

2b.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit’s data collection, analysis, and evaluation may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

| Attachment 3 - Assessment Self-Study |
| 2b.4 - Links to Exhibits |

See Attachments panel below.

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

2c.1. In what ways does the unit regularly and systematically use data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences?

The Unit is committed to using data to make decisions at the Unit, program, and candidate levels for the primary purpose of improving candidate performance and student learning and has, therefore, sought to establish a sustained culture of assessment and continuous improvement. This has been noted as a strength of the faculty during the University’s review of the Commission of Middle States (Unit recognized as leading the assessment of learning outcomes, 2007), by the Accreditation Panel of the Ontario College of Teachers during the continuing accreditation visit (team visit, March 2009), common finding across the SPA reports (July, 2009), and by the external team for the University/Unit’s readiness
A recent self-study (Attachment 3) of the faculty reported using data for continuous improvement and reflective practice. Respondents noted that they have been part of and/or noticed changes related to collaboration and collegiality (96%), structure and process (79%), involvement and leadership (75%). Faculty reported being involved in gathering, analyzing and interpreting evidence of performance through student evaluations (88%), candidate work and input in class (100%), performance reviews (88%), departmental data (79%), and outside partnerships (67%). 96% of the faculty reported using data for continuous improvement in their teaching (course changes, teaching or supervisory practice).

The Unit uses data regularly and systematically in a number of ways:

- To assess progress as aligned with the key benchmarks of the conceptual framework.
  - Key performance indicators are aligned with the conceptual framework (mission, goals, candidate proficiencies and dispositions) and discussed annually. Data are used to influence changes to the conceptual framework, revisions to the strategic plan, and to identify progress/needs.

- To improve and refine the assessment system (including course-based assessments):
  - Faculty use data to revise assessments. Revisions to assessments, rubrics, and course-embedded measures of candidate performance were described and included in the program reviews for the SPAs. A common finding noted the strength of the faculty in using performance data to improve assessment.
  - Data are used to monitor transition points and document the internal processes designed to implement specific quality assurance mechanisms. For example, the Assistant to the Dean uses the data for the entry to student teaching transition point to monitor eligibility for student teaching and organizes “Senior checks” around the requirements for completion of program (transition point).

- To improve teaching effectiveness and curriculum (course content, requirements).
  - Data are used to shape, revise and improve curriculum. Student course evaluations include indicators of teaching practice (aligned with philosophical tenets of the conceptual framework of constructivist practice, process-product, and reflective practice) as well as course indicators (rigor of study in relation to the level of the degree).
  - Data are used to evaluate and improve teaching. Multiple measures of teaching effectiveness are used, including course evaluations (every course) and teaching observations by the Dean and chairperson.

- To enhance (or even direct) scholarship.
  - Data related to scholarship are used by faculty in their performance reviews (annual, pre-tenure, tenure and promotion, and post-tenure) and across the Unit to expand the contributions of the faculty in the community and in their discipline (goal 2 of the strategic plan). In addition, the Advanced Research Committee of the Unit has used data to advocate for additional resources and capacities to support faculty research.

- To promote service and the mission of the University and assist faculty in their involvement in service (involvement in various types of service, partnerships with P-12 service).
  - Data are used to indicate the contribution of the Unit faculty to the University generally and in support of the mission.

- To direct field experiences and clinical placements.
  - Data on field placements is maintained and used by both candidates, advisors, and the Director of Student Teaching to ensure that candidates complete all required placement, hours, and the diversity of placement settings as aligned with their program requirements and area of certification.

- For advocacy.
Data are shared with University leadership and governance, government leaders, administrators, faculty, staff, school partners and advisory councils to demonstrate the culture of assessment and continuous improvement. Data are used to measure progress on standards, strategic goals, and partnership projects; internal planning and analysis; advocacy (community, Institution, State, national); and advancement (grant-writing, fundraising).

- For program, Unit and University planning.
  Data from the Unit are used to shape directions, target initiatives (through the Committee structure) and strengthen both the Unit and its programs. The Annual Part A Report of the Planning and Evaluation Committee delineates areas of continuous improvement that occur each year – areas of improvement and data sources used in the analysis are presented and discussed at the fall assessment retreat and disseminated to the Academic Vice President and professional community (website).

- For structures, operations and day-to-day processes.
  Administrative offices within the Unit use data to evaluate the efficacy of their outcomes as well. For example, the graduate admissions office directly works with data from the first transition point to direct staff, marketing, web applications, and the intake process itself. Departments are also using data in their current deliberations to reorganize into different program clusters (work of the SPA’s and operational data leading to this initiative).

- To expand and improve partnerships with P-12 schools and the community generally.
  The systemic use of data has provided critical information related to student learning and teaching practice and the outcomes of the Unit and its programs related to core issues and initiatives within the high-needs community surrounding the University (Niagara County). This systemic use of data has led to documented changes to teaching practice and course delivery, as well as to continued opportunities to expand partnership funding through external grants.

- To support and direct candidate advisement for career planning.
  Data from follow-up studies are used to share results with the community, families and candidates as they consider their majors and work with the Career Development office in planning for employment.

2c.2. What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years?

Over the past three years, numerous data-driven changes have taken place. Annually, such changes are reported as a component of the Annual Report of the Planning and Evaluation Committee. Ex. 2.8b - Continuous Improvement Summary and Ex. 2.8b Samples of SPA Section V’s highlight areas of continuous improvement. Some examples include the following (source of data is identified in the parentheses):

2008-09:
- Establish oral defense interface with a review panel for all educational leadership candidates that will require direct connection of evidence for each ELCC standard to student success (candidate performance data).
- Revised special education program – curriculum modifications to graduate level program (candidate performance data and input from SPA reviews).
- Faculty approval of math, science, technology concentration for advanced teacher education candidates (data from STEM project).
- Initiation of on-campus programs for children and youth from high-needs schools and communities and expansion of partnerships in high needs areas, including the Academy School and Niagara Street...
School (diversity of experiences of candidates, NSSE data).

2007-08:

• Developed new course, EDU 451, Assessment in Education (teaching assistantship performance data and follow-up studies).
• Revised internship in educational leadership programs to ensure an intensive and comprehensive clinical experience with enhanced communication/assessment on a weekly basis to provide greater opportunity for application and reflection (internship assessment).
• Revised final student teaching report for English 7-12 undergraduate program to more effectively measure NCTE’s 3.1-3.7 for content knowledge (student teaching performance data).
• Assessment and differentiated instruction assessment (EDU 561) were revised to further assess IRA 3.4 (performance data of advanced literacy candidates related to communicating assessment results).
• Standardized rubric and assessment, Content Area Resource Packet (in special methods course for undergraduate and graduate initial teacher education), that integrates content knowledge, planning and assessment in each of the 7-12 SPA areas (content knowledge data).
• Revised employer survey to include the three Unit dispositions (2005-06 employer survey).
• Designed and approved new jointly registered program in TESOL with Niagara Community College to expand outreach to non-traditional candidates in this area of shortage (diversity of candidates).
• Enhanced expertise related to expectations for students in high needs, low achieving areas – two members of the faculty were trained as facilitators of GESA workshops (candidate to candidate diversity).

2006-2007:

• Implementation of course-embedded assessment model for initial and advanced teacher education programs (candidate performance data from Phase I and Phase II portfolios). Standardized rubrics that aligned standards and sub-elements of the SPA standards to the assessment were developed to correspond to each signature assessment.
• Approved policy to require 30 hours of field experience in a New York State defined high needs school or one student teaching placement (high needs placement data).
• Revised intake assessment for M.S. Ed. in Administration and Supervision to incorporate an assessment interview to align with ELCC standards and Unit dispositions (intake data).
• Revision of teaching assistantship and student teaching evaluation to include indicators of dispositions (data from research student on dispositions, Rinaldo, et al.).
• Modification of required field experiences in teacher education and increased coordinated data reporting between the three phases of field experiences for entry to student teaching (data on field experiences for initial teacher candidates).
• Approval of tenure-track position and clinical faculty line (% of courses taught by full-time faculty and % of supervision by full-time university supervisors).

2c.3. What access do faculty members have to candidate assessment data and/or data systems?

Faculty has access to candidate assessment data and other data systems through both electronic means and through printed reports. All data reports are readily available to faculty through myNU, the education folder, and the Unit’s website.

The University has moved to electronic communication and reporting across the campus; therefore, faculty has regular and easy access to assessment data and data systems. Faculty has access to the faculty and staff portal which is password protected. The portal (myNU) contains University data (e.g.,
reports from Institutional Research, employment reports), Unit assessments, candidate data and all other information in the Datatel (Colleague) system. The Unit’s annual report data (including Title II) are posted on the website as well. All faculty has access to the Unit’s data (STEP data warehouse) in the Education folder – the warehouse is “read-only” and password protected. Designated faculty can access additional data systems (e.g., director of graduate admissions – application and yield data, chairperson of the Department for faculty evaluations). The data system maintained by the Unit is Colleague-based and is therefore compatible with University systems (with on-going support for faculty from the IT staff).

In addition, faculty in the Unit use Blackboard to support their teaching. Blackboard provides the classroom-based management system and data for course teaching and work with candidates in their courses. The Instructional Technology department provides support and personnel to assist faculty and students with myNU, Colleague, and Blackboard.

Faculty are directly provided hard-copies of printed reports (Unit, SPA’s, departmental) and can request data and copies. The Assessment Secretary works directly with faculty to provide additional tables and disaggregated analyses based upon their requests and needs.

2c.4. How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders to help them reflect on and improve their performance and programs?

Assessment data are shared through electronic means, formal written reports, Advisory committee meetings, faculty meetings (Departmental level), and formal Assessment Retreats of the Unit. Assessment data are shared with faculty on a regular basis, from on-going course evaluation summaries, through core assessments for the program and the Unit.

The Assessment System (Attachment 2.1a) delineates the decision points in which data are shared with faculty and stakeholders. Assessment data are shared with faculty and other stakeholders on an annual basis through required reports – these are shared in hard copy but also available electronically on the website. Faculty has access to the web portal through myNU (password protected). In addition, chairpersons of the Academic Departments, Administrative Directors, and appointed College Committee chairs have access to program data (candidate performance) through the STEP warehouse and the Assessment Secretary for the Unit.

Candidates have access to assessment data through on-going formative and summative feedback from faculty. Candidates can access course grades and mid-term evaluations on the myNU system and the Blackboard course management platform (used by most members of the faculty). Faculty are available to meet with candidates to share assessment results. For field experiences and clinical practice, candidates access performance assessment data from both the field mentor or cooperating teacher and the University supervisor. Candidates receive summaries of their field experiences each semester or anytime by request (data from shared drive to include hours and specific placement detail).

As such, the Unit systematically collects, analyzes and uses a broad array of information and data and views the assessment process as a continuous cycle that aligns assessment to standards and goals and results in the use of data to continuously improve.

2c.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the use of data for program improvement may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]
1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 2?

The Assessment System is comprehensive, deliberate, and inclusive. Utilizing tight loop design, it includes multiple input variables, systematically organizes and assesses data, involves significant stakeholders, and fosters continuous improvement.

Based on the quality and design of the system, we use data for continuous improvement. The work in this area of assessment has been in the forefront of the international program development and review in the Province of Ontario. The Ontario Accreditation Panel, while not requiring the assessment model from our NCATE work, commended the Unit on creating a culture of assessment and continuous improvement (noted by the accreditation team through interviews and document reviews).

The University provides support for assessment. The Assessment System is unified with broader University structures and resources (including Institutional Research, Planning, instructional technology) enhancing alignment, sustainability of systems, and procurement of resources. The University supports a full-time assessment secretary for the Unit and has strong university and departmental policies that support the use of data from the assessment system.

Leadership (University, unit, departmental) models high expectations for the use of assessment for continuous improvement. Expertise and commitment has been purposefully extended across the Unit to cultivate leadership from within the Unit and extend the base of expertise to transform and sustain a culture of assessment and continuous improvement.

2. What research related to Standard 2 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

- Evaluating teacher education programs using common course assignments (Foote, Valentin, Erwin).
- Statistical analysis of New York State certification examinations – relationships, predictors, and pitfalls (Sheeran et al).
- Evaluating written work of ESL graduate students (Huang and Foote).
- Assessment of dispositions (Rinaldo et al.).
- International comparisons of student reading performance and implications for American reading education (Erwin).
- Consideration of behavior states and patterns in IEP development – multiple case study approach involving students with multiple disabilities (Kozen).
- Research on ESOL assessments, including large-scale writing assessments and language testing (Huang).
- Applying standards-based constructivism (Vermette, Smith).

Internal studies on the reliability of assessments – the small scale studies and dispositional research has led to additional focus on inter-rater reliability studies using the standardized (and revised) rubrics. The Office of Student Teaching is conducting this research for multiple reviews of student teaching videos using the approved performance-based rubrics.
STANDARD 3. FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

3a.1. Who are the unit’s partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit’s field and clinical experiences?

School, university and community partnerships have been in the forefront of the work of the Unit and are a distinguishing feature of the Unit as evidenced by the success of the Unit in securing federal and State grants that require partnerships, awards and recognitions received and given to partner schools, and data collected on the results (student achievement) of partnerships for clinical experience. The Unit’s partners who contribute to the field and clinical experiences include school based faculty and leaders, university faculty in both Arts & Sciences and Education, and community partners.

P-12 school partners include 22 school districts in western New York and 17 school boards in southern Ontario. (Exhibit 4.9b: Shared Drive for Field Experiences, Teaching Assistantships, Student Teaching). The P-12 schools and the Unit share expertise to plan for and support candidate learning in field experiences and clinical practice. It is important to note that the partners of the Unit also include community partners who bring diverse experience to candidates – new partnerships with Special Olympics and with Opportunities Unlimited (rehabilitation organization for young adults with developmental disabilities) are examples of successful partnerships that were planned jointly and involve on-going clinical opportunities for candidates.

The Unit supports a standing Committee on Field Experiences and Clinical Practice. This Committee is charged with providing leadership in facilitating the design, delivery, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice. Performance indicators are included in the Assessment System and data is reviewed annually with faculty to identify strengths and areas of needed improvement. The Committee surveyed faculty to assess reciprocal partnerships of the Unit and professional education community. The information was analyzed and discussed with faculty and reported in the 2006-2007– Field Experience Committee Annual Report (May 2007; Exhibit 3.1x1).

The Institute of Applied Learning is the professional development and partnership arm of the Unit. The Assistant Dean for External Relations works directly with school districts to form partnerships that include university faculty (arts and sciences and education), pre-service candidates, in-service educators and teachers, and the general education community. The partnerships involve shared decision-making, shared resources, and shared ownership. Attachment 1 (Commitment of Resources by the Professional Community in the Field) highlights this commitment (including expertise and financial resources). The strength and depth of the Unit’s partnerships are evidenced in two grant projects with the Niagara Falls City School District that received national recognition for: P-12 gains in student achievement, change in teacher practice, model of professional development, and creation of higher level courses in math and science. (Attachment 2: AACTE “Day on the Hill” – June 2009 booklet).

3a.2. In what ways have the unit's partners contributed to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?
The Unit’s partners have strengthened the ties between research and practice, school and University policy issues, and student learning. In addition to the highlights of systemic contributions that are delineated in Att. 1 (Commitment of Resources), faculty serve on school policy committees, conduct school-based research, teach P-12 students in schools, conduct professional development, and hold University courses in P-12 schools. Likewise, school-based faculty (in teacher and leadership positions) serve on University and Unit decision-making committees and boards, teach courses in the Unit, supervise candidates, provide professional development and assist with assessments (portfolio reviews). This reciprocal work directly impacts the richness of the unit’s field and clinical experiences. Unit faculty also serve in leadership roles with statewide partnerships that directly addresses issues and innovation in clinical practice (i.e., the Higher Education Task Force for Inclusive Education, the Professional Standards and Practices Board for Teaching).

The Coordinator of Learn and Serve (early field experiences for teacher candidates), the Director of Student Teaching (for initial teacher candidates) and the program coordinators (for advanced practica) work directly with human resources administrators, school principals, and school/agency mentors to meet the clinical needs of programs and candidates (including the selection of sites based on the nature of the field experiences and program requirements, establishment of agreements, confirmation of qualifications and expectations, information sessions and orientations, and evaluation).

Partners have also contributed to curriculum development in the Unit. Niagara County Community College worked with the Unit to design a jointly registered program to prepare ESL teachers; area school districts assisted in the design of the literacy minor and STEM concentration. Each of these have field components.

School partners are directly involved in the evaluation of field experience and clinical practice. School faculty complete both formative and summative evaluations and discuss field experiences with University faculty and candidates (all programs). For advanced programs, school-based faculty are involved in the defense of the culminating portfolio. School Psychology has an advisory panel made up of school districts who advise on the contracts. Similarly, the school counseling program advisory board provides input regarding the program, updates and changes. The design and evaluation of the embedded and intensive phase of the internship for the programs in Ed Leadership has been revised, reflecting input from school partners. School leaders participate on candidate oral defense panels.

As reported annually, improvements have been made in the design, delivery and evaluation of clinical experience. The Unit’s partners have been involved in this assessment and continuous improvement.

3a.3. What are the roles of the unit and its school partners in determining how and where candidates are placed for field experiences, student teaching, and internships?

The collaboration of the Unit and school partnership for placement components across all programs resulted in the contribution of over 166,734 hours in area school districts in 2007-2008. This work contributes economically and educationally to the schools and clinics in the area. An economic contribution study is underway and will be available in spring 2010. Attachment 3, Roles of the Unit and its Partners, depicts the roles of the Unit and partners for specific placement activities in each program area. It is important to note, however, that the partnerships and collaboration extends beyond direct placements as the history and success of the University in service learning and in the embedding of field experiences from the first semester of study is long-standing. The 2004-2010 Strategic Plan of the Unit includes specific strategies that would focus attention on low-achieving, at-risk schools—expanding field placements and student learning opportunities for candidates. As a result, comprehensive partnerships have been documented and they strategically contribute to the directions and innovation being led by the Unit and its school partners in terms of clinical practice:

- Niagara Street School – special education faculty (Unit and school) are working directly with the
principal of the school in housing special education candidates on-site (courses, field experiences, faculty service). This model pilots the early stages in the design of a residency model for preparing special education candidates (undergraduate) in a high needs school.

• Academy School #44 - this Buffalo Public School is an alternative school for overage, underachieving students in grades 7-12. Unit faculty and graduate candidates are working with school faculty and students to emphasize literacy and content integration in the core subject areas. School faculty has embraced new literacy strategies and implemented action research to problem solve. University faculty in arts and sciences and education have provided professional development and mentoring; while candidates have worked directly with the students in literacy. The Board of Education, Superintendent, and school faculty were recognized at the 2009 Professional Recognition Dinner of the Unit for their collaborative role in the comprehensive partnership.

• Looping of field experiences - the partners (Arts and Sciences, Education, and P-12) have collaborated at the middle-school level in the NFCSD to “loop” the field experiences of teacher education candidates; allowing sustained clinical practice within the same school building. The model of “looping” field experiences of initial teacher education candidates (teaching assistantship and student teaching placement with the same cooperating teacher) has led to increases in student achievement and changes in pedagogy. To date, 114 education candidates have participated in this, resulting in 98% satisfaction by school-based faculty.

3a.4. How do the unit and its school partners share expertise and resources to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice?

Extensive field experiences are embedded throughout all programs – the Unit and its school partners share expertise and resources along a continuum of clinical practice from early experiences and course-embedded assessments that require working with P-12 students to intensive and culminating practica that are evaluated by school partners.

Specific expertise and resources are shared for the various program areas through on-going discussion and review of handbooks (delineate expectations, standards, roles/responsibilities), sharing of resources at school sites (practicum and other courses offered directly at school sites), completion of embedded assignments in the placement sites (working with P-12 students and school faculty), and an extensive evaluation process. All student teaching, internships and practica have extensive assessment requirements and performance criteria aligned with the standards of the program.

The Unit, through the Institute of Applied Learning, coordinates the sharing of expertise related to professional development and ongoing support. School partners offer input on topics that candidates need to be proficient in upon entering the field, such as: data analysis, assessment, literacy, differentiated instruction, response to intervention, inquiry-based learning, and technology integration. All school district partners make resources such as curriculum materials, professional development opportunities, and technology available to candidates. School-based faculty bring expertise and provide valuable guidance on site with school culture and environment and school resources (district resource centers). In credit-bearing seminars, candidates benefit from classroom guest speakers, professional development in school districts and shared materials.

3a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to collaboration between unit and school partners may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

| Attachment 1 - Commitment of Resources by the Professional Community in Field |
| Attachment 2 - AACTE Day on the Hill - June 2009 |
| Attachment 3 - Roles of the Unit and its Partners |
3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3b.1. What are the entry and exit requirements for clinical practice?
The entry and exit requirements for clinical practice are delineated transition points for the Assessment System of the Unit – Table 6 (Assessment Transition Points).

3b.2. What field experiences are required for each program or categories of programs (e.g., secondary) at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels, including graduate programs for licensed teachers and other school professionals? What clinical practice is required for each program or categories of programs in initial teacher preparation programs and programs for the preparation of other school professionals? Please complete Table 7 or upload your own table at Prompt 3b.9 below.

Table 7
Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Field Experiences</th>
<th>Clinical Practice (Student Teaching or Internship)</th>
<th>Total Number of Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3b.3. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards through field and clinical experiences in initial and advanced preparation programs?
The Unit ensures that candidates develop these proficiencies through each individual program’s alignment to the conceptual framework, the Assessment System itself, and the structure of collecting and reporting of findings. The Assessment System includes data related to multiple points of assessment, and the comprehensive collection, analysis and use of data from clinical experiences.

In Initial certification in both undergraduate and graduate teacher preparation programs, candidates complete a series of field experiences at three developmental levels. The advanced programs include field experiences that are required for the completion of course-embedded assessments and internship/practicum requirements. All field experiences are in keeping with New York State requirements (approved and registered programs) and are assessed using rubrics and performance criteria which are aligned with the approved professional standards for each program area. The analysis of candidate proficiencies in Assessment 4 for each program was reported in SPA reports (and for other programs in Standard 1: Candidate Proficiencies).

Additionally, the Academic Departments implement the following:

a. Field experiences have written requirements and assessments that are documented, discussed, and shared through handbooks (e.g., Student Teaching Handbook, School Counseling Handbook, Educational Leadership Internship Guide).
b. All field experiences are evaluated both through both formative and summative assessments. Feedback is received from candidates and school-based faculty in the field. Aggregated data is reported and discussed annually. Annual data analysis and reporting of candidate performance for each program expectation/standard provides assessment of quality of placements and candidate performance. Rubrics
for these assessments are approved at the Department level to ensure consistency.

c. Communication with school-based faculty occurs directly with clinical faculty (who work on-to-one in relation to expectations for candidates) and through resources that are designed specifically for this purpose. The resource for school-based faculty in teacher education is on the Niagara University website (www.niagara.edu/cooperating-associate-teachers ). This site provides information on expectations for field experiences, a Question and Answer format for school-based faculty and interaction with the Field Experience Office.

The requirements for field experience in initial teacher education programs are monitored through a mainframe, Colleague-based quality assurance system that is called the Shared Drive. All field experiences are logged into the Shared Drive with data presented to the candidate, clinical faculty, and placement officials each semester. The Director of Student Teaching uses the cumulative record of field experiences to identify the two student teaching placements and to work with candidates to ensure fulfillment of the field experience requirement in the program. The Assistant to the Dean uses the profile to monitor the entry to student teaching transition point. In advanced programs, the program coordinator maintains a database related to experiences of each candidate.

3b.4. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences and clinical practice?

Technology is integrated across programs, assessed in course-embedded assessments and field experience, and supported through the use of state-of-the-art technology in educational coursework on campus so as to prepare candidates to use instructional technology throughout their field experiences. Candidates use technology in their clinical practice as follows:

Initial programs: The Unit instructs candidates in the use of technology as an instructional tool. Ex. 2.1x6, (p.20), delineates the high reported use of technology by education candidates. Candidate use of technology is assessed during Student Teaching in Standard 6: Communication and Technology (Ex. 3.7a). Candidates use computer programs to facilitate a variety of effective assessment, evaluation, and communication strategies. Candidates use the computer, Internet, web sites, digital cameras, DVD players, PowerPoint , and other instructional technology to assess, evaluate, and process information efficiently and effectively and to foster inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom. Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the social, ethical, and legal issues related to technology use.

Advanced Programs: Literacy - Each common course assignment has a technology assessment based on the International Reading and program standards. EDU 558 - Using Literacy Technology course is a required course in the program (Attachment 6: EDU 558). In the Literacy Practicum, one standard identifies the use of technology. The portfolio must document the use of technology in instruction throughout the 17 standards.

School Psychology - The use of technology is integral to assessment measures. In the contract between school districts and the candidate, one domain focuses on technology and is evaluated each semester by school-based faculty.

Special Education - Candidates become comfortable in using appropriate assistive technologies to support instructional planning and individualized instruction. Candidates must demonstrate an understanding of the social, ethical, and legal issues related to technology use. Candidates are required to take EDU 700 – Educational and Assistive Technology (Attachment 7: EDU 700 Course Syllabus)

School Counseling - The New York State Education Web site is a valuable resource that school counselors can and should know how to maneuver available data that is available to help potential school counselors. Candidates learn how to make videos and bring video and audio tapes to class and they learn how to provide each other with clinical supervision.

Educational Leadership - As part of the internship, there is a major portfolio project related to
instructional technology. Candidates must demonstrate their knowledge and skill in using technology as an administrative tool in the improvement of instruction.

3b.5. What criteria are used in the selection of school-based clinical faculty? How are the criteria implemented? What evidence suggests that school-based clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals?

School-based clinical faculty in teacher education must have three years or more of successful classroom teaching experience, hold the appropriate teaching certification, hold tenure (and Master’s degree). In the Advanced education programs, school-based clinical faculty must hold a Master’s Degree, hold a New York State Certification in the field (i.e., special education, literacy), be tenured, and must have three or more years teaching experience and approved by the building administration. For School Psychology, school-based faculty must be permanently certified, have two years full-time experience and implemented national and program standards. For the School Counseling program, school-based faculty must be tenured, hold a Master’s Degree, permanent certification and experience with national and program standards. School district approval is required. For the educational leadership program internship, site mentors must be certified New York State school administrators that have received tenure and are experienced in the placement area (i.e., building level, district level). Clinical faculty, school-based faculty, and the teacher education program are evaluated by teacher candidates at the end of each semester. This information is held as confidential, but it is reviewed by the Director of Student Teaching and used for decision-making (available to the team on-site). Approximately 90% of classroom teachers are recommended for future placements; 98% of clinical faculty are highly recommended by candidates. School-based faculty who are consistently not recommended by candidates are removed from the pool. (Ex. 3.7b: Clinical Faculty/School Based Faculty Evaluation).

To ensure that the criteria are implemented, school district human resources directors and building principals certify the qualifications of the school-based faculty. The New York State TEACH system can also be accessed by the Unit to verify New York State certification credentials.

3b.6. What preparation do school-based faculty members receive for their roles as clinical supervisors?

The preparation of school-based faculty takes place at the program level as follows:
Initial programs: School based faculty are provided with a package (Ex.3.3a) that includes the Student Teaching Handbook, Student Teaching Evaluation Forms, and School Based Faculty Evaluation. The Director of Student Teaching meets annually with superintendents, principals, placement coordinators and school-based faculty. A comprehensive folder of information regarding the three phases of field experience is provided (Ex. 3.3b). In addition, clinical faculty serve as liaison between the University and the school and provide direction, clarification, and coaching.

An on-line information system is available for school-based faculty. A link allows school-based faculty to give input and raise questions and issues as the need arises (www.niagara.edu/teaching).

Advanced Programs: School-based faculty receive a packet with clear directions on each component of the practicum. A letter outlines the role of the mentor, the expectations, and the evaluation process. The school-based faculty and clinical faculty (practicum supervisor) maintain ongoing dialogue throughout the 100 hours of clinical practice. The Literacy Instruction program provides a packet information to the practicum supervisor (Ex. 3.3c). In School Psychology, school-based faculty are briefed on expectations and program requirements prior to contract signing by NU clinical faculty (Ex. 3.3d). In School Counseling (Ex. 3.3g), a contract is required outlining expectations of candidate and school-based faculty. For Special Education, there are a number of important documents, as contained in Ex. 3.3e: Special Education School Based Faculty Packet. In Educational Leadership, the mentor receives a
“mentor guide” (Ex. 3.3f) that provides immediate information regarding program expectations. Full-time clinical faculty (supervisor) meets directly with site mentors to review expectations and responsibilities.

3b.7. What evidence demonstrates that clinical faculty members provide regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing graduate programs, and other school professionals?

Expectations for clinical faculty (i.e., university supervisors) are clearly delineated in handbooks and in job descriptions (for full-time clinical faculty). Expectations, while differing across programs, include scheduled observations and meetings with candidates, observations with follow-up, intervention with school-based faculty (i.e., cooperating teachers, mentors for advanced practica and internships) as needed, and mid-point (formative) and final evaluation reports. In addition, required seminars are a core component of clinical practice in all programs, providing additional opportunity for continuous support and reflection.

The logs and reflective journals of advanced candidates also provide evidence of continuous support, reflection and self-evaluation. Weekly logs are reviewed and discussed by clinical faculty and advanced candidates who maintain a weekly log share this with both school-based faculty and clinical faculty. Weekly logs and reflections are responded to by clinical faculty, demonstrating support, encouragement and professional guidance.

Evidence of regular and continuous support from clinical faculty is also documented through the mid-point and final evaluations of clinical practice. These reviews provide on-going development of the candidate’s knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the field, with the provision of interventions when necessary.

In addition, candidates rate the performance of both school-based and clinical faculty. The evaluations (see Attachment 6: Data table on student evaluations of seminar courses) reveal consistently high scores for clinical faculty, especially related to timely and appropriate feedback, the interest of clinical faculty in assisting candidates learn and progress, accessibility and openness of the clinical faculty member in discussing concerns and solving problems, encouraging candidates to ask questions and think critically.

3b.8. What structured activities involving the analysis of data and current research are required in programs for other school professionals?

Programs for other school personnel include school psychology, school counseling, and educational leadership as delineated:

School Psychology: There is an evidence-based practice strand throughout all coursework, field experience, and clinical practice. A significant portion of the required field experience is data based decision making and accountability. Students are required to report with empirically supported interventions on academic, behavioral, and mental health concerns of P-12 students.

School Counseling: Candidates are required to analyze school district data from the New York State school report card (posted on the web) to determine the needs for primary, secondary, and tertiary intervention programs. In keeping with a model of transforming school counseling, candidates use disaggregated data to address student achievement gaps in developing strategies for school counselors to work with educators to close the gap.

Educational Leadership: Required course EDU 599, restructured in 2003, has as its sole purpose the development of candidates’ knowledge and skills related to the analysis of data, specifically as it applies to the school improvement process. Further, all courses require the candidates to read, analyze, and synthesize current research related to course subject and content.

3b.9. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here.
3c. Candidates’ Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn

3c.1. On average, how many candidates are eligible for clinical practice each semester or year? What percent, on average, complete clinical practice successfully?

Attachment 7 - Eligible and Completed Data Chart, delineates the annual placement and completion numbers for candidates who were eligible for clinical practice (2006-2009). 99-100% of initial teacher education candidates, over 95% of advanced education candidates, and over 90% of other school personnel complete their final clinical experience. Professional education faculty look to the successful completion of candidates as an indicator of the critical importance of early field experiences across programs, where candidates often decide to change their career path before the culminating clinical experience. It is noted that the intensive internship in educational leadership is monitored for completion across two academic semesters.

3c.2. What are the roles of candidates, university supervisors, and school-based faculty in assessing candidate performance and reviewing the results during clinical practice?

Candidate performance during student teaching, advanced internships and practicum are carefully assessed and reviewed. In each program, roles and expectations are delineated in the Handbook and are aligned with policies for the successful completion of clinical practice (and therefore the due process rights of candidates). Candidates, University clinical faculty (i.e., supervisors) and school-based faculty (i.e., cooperating teachers, site mentors) use the faculty-approved assessment instruments to assess the development of knowledge, skills and dispositions at multiple points during the clinical practice. Assessment instruments across programs are aligned with the approved program standards with performance criteria delineated in faculty-approved rubrics.

Specific roles within each program are as follows:
Initial teacher education programs: School-based faculty complete three assessments during the candidate’s placement: Preliminary Report (10 days into the placement); Mid-Way Report (half way through placement); and, the Final Student Teacher Report (at end of placement). Clinical faculty completes an Observation Report for each formal observation which includes: brief description of lesson, commendable features of delivery, suggestions for improvement, evidence of standards met, and candidate’s growth plan. The clinical faculty provides the candidate and school-based faculty with copies of the Observation Report.
Advanced Education Programs (Literacy Instruction and Special Education): Candidates submit a weekly mentor log and complete practicum assignments within their clinical experience. Candidates submit and defend a portfolio in the end of practicum. The school-based faculty provides instructional support and techniques to candidate, observes candidate throughout practicum, assesses candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. School-based faculty are also involved in the candidate’s defense of portfolio. Clinical faculty conduct formal observations (four) and provide feedback to the candidate and school-based faculty. Clinical faculty work with school-based faculty to determine the final practicum
School Psychology: Candidates complete a self-evaluation, learning plan, and a portfolio. School-based faculty are required to provide one hour per week of direct instruction and two hours per week in the internship. There is a mid way and end evaluation to be completed by the school-based faculty. Clinical faculty evaluate candidates twice in each setting.

School Counseling: Clinical faculty evaluate video and audio tapes, weekly journals, individual notes from counseling sessions. School-based faculty has daily interaction and assessment of the candidate during the practicum and internship. School-based faculty is responsible for a final evaluation at the end of the practicum and internship.

Educational Leadership: Candidates self-evaluate using a comprehensive skills attributes profile and a leadership inventory of six different profiles. School based faculty mentors evaluate candidates on all activities performed related to ELCC standards. The university supervisor evaluates candidates on all 72 sub-elements of the ELCC standards.

3c.3. How is time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty incorporated into field experiences and clinical practice?

Reflective practice is an integral component of the unit’s conceptual framework and is embedded throughout each of the programs. Reflections are required as one of three required elements (Artifact, Rationale for choice of artifact, Reflection on use of artifact) in each assignment per standard in the portfolio.

Structured observations. All evaluations of field experiences and clinical practice require feedback from clinical faculty at formative (mid-point) and summative (final evaluation) intervals.

- For the initial teacher education programs, candidates meet seven times in peer groups during Student Teaching, including five Professional Seminar sessions, and two small group sessions for peer discussion and reflection. In addition, there are a minimum of 4 student teaching observations.
- In the Literacy program, there are weekly and monthly logs and ongoing communication with both school-based and clinical faculty. Candidates meet with their peers seven times during seminar in the practicum semester, where there are small group reflections among candidates.
- In the School Psychology program, bi-weekly seminars are held. Candidates, through grand rounds case presentations, reflect on experiences to their peers and clinical faculty. Reflective
- In the School Counseling program, candidates are in triad sessions with the candidate, counselor and observer roles which they are taught to critique their strengths, weaknesses and what they would like to improve.
- In the graduate Special Education program, clinical faculty give feedback to candidates after submission of weekly logs, lesson plan observations, discussions with school-based faculty, and through EDU 799 which encompasses the portfolio and its review.

Credit-bearing seminars. All candidates complete a credit-bearing seminar. This seminar provides the formal component of reflective practice throughout the culminating clinical experience. Clinical faculty facilitate the seminars.

3c.4. What data from multiple assessments provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field experiences and clinical practice?

The conceptual framework of the Unit delineates the approved program standards for each program and articulates the core dispositions. Evidence related to field experiences and clinical practice includes course-embedded assessments that require working with P-12 students (assessments that are conducted during required field experiences and tied to credit-bearing courses); assessment of student teaching, internships, or practica; and the assessment of dispositions in clinical practice. Data were reported in
SPA reports (February 2009 submission) with continued collection of data through the 2008-09 academic year and on-going in the Unit (2009-2010 and beyond).

Leading to the structured practicum and student teaching evaluations, all early field experiences are assessed. These include early field experiences (referred to as Learn and Serve) and teaching assistantships for initial teacher education programs, embedded internship requirements for educational leadership, and internship experiences for other school personnel (completed before the culminating practicum in school counseling and school psychology). Data from the early and embedded field experiences provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions for helping all students learn (Standards 3 and 4) and thereby meet the requirements for entry into clinical practice (transition point).

The dispositional framework was incorporated into the evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice since the last review. These data indicate that candidates meet or exceed the benchmark in 3 of all programs, with professional relationships including the belief that all children can learn. Reliability studies demonstrate the strength of the instrumentation for assessment of dispositions (r=98.7, p,.001). These data are shared and discussed with faculty at the Fall Assessment Retreat and presented generally through the 2008-2009 Annual Report Part A, Ex. 2.1x6: Dispositions Data (p.17).

In Follow-up Assessments: Undergraduate Alumni, Graduate Alumni & Employers (2005-2007), graduates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions were reported consistently strong. The 2007-08 employer survey included measures of dispositions as adopted by the faculty. The mean employer rating for professional relationships was 4.2 on a scale of 1-5 (belief that all children can learn).

### 3c.5. What process is used to ensure that candidates collect and analyze data on student learning, reflect on those data, and improve student learning during clinical practice?

The assessment of student learning, including collection and analysis of data, reflection and improvement of learning, occurs through course embedded assessments (tied to required field experiences), student teaching or the internship/practicum, and portfolios.

a. Course embedded assessments that directly tie to student learning through Assessment 3 and 5 (SPA program reviews): including Planning Lessons (EDU 429/460 and EDU 529/760) and the Measurement Project (EDU 451/EDU 505) which are embedded assessments in the teaching assistantship/methods phase of the initial programs; and EDU 572, the reading and diagnosis and intervention project (advanced programs). These assessments include evidence of student learning, including instructional assessment and analysis of student results/impact on student learning. (Exhibit 3.7d assessments data).

b. Each program measures student learning in the culminating clinical experience. The assessment of student learning is evaluated mid-way and on the final evaluation. A “Lesson De-Briefing Template” is used (pp.36 & 37 of Handbook, Ex. 3.5a) by school-based faculty and candidate to evaluate effectiveness of lessons and student learning. In the advanced programs, candidates collect and analyze data on student learning throughout the clinical practice. The practicum evaluations include this assessment (observed and reported by University clinical faculty and school-based faculty).

c. Candidate portfolios include evidence of the candidate’s collection, analysis, and use of data to improve student learning. The portfolios are evaluated during the student teaching seminar; presented and evaluated by University and school-based faculty (advanced programs); or integrated into the culminating clinical experience (other school personnel).

The TQE and STEM projects with NFCSC directly tie clinical practice of candidates to student achievement. In the STEM project, overall science achievement among 4th and 8th grade students (NFCSD) increased from 82% overall pass rate in 2006-07 to 84% the following year (41 advanced program candidates) Increases in student achievement were also found for ELA and social studies for grades 1-8; and ELA, Math and Social Studies for grades 9-12 (113 initial teacher candidates – two semester looping). See Attachment 2: AACTE Day on the Hill. The Unit is using these research-based practices to further expand these successful models of clinical practice.
3c.6. How does the unit ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice that includes students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups?

In keeping with the mission of Niagara University and the conceptual framework of the Unit, it is required that all candidates have experiences with students from diverse backgrounds (high needs) and students with exceptionalities. The location of the Institution, supports this requirement as we are in an impoverished region. Niagara County (location of the University) has a median income for households of $44,619 (adjusted to 2005 dollars). This figure is 13.8% lower than the median income in NYS and 10.1% lower than the median in the US. Within a community such as ours, the contributions of education candidates in their field experiences is sought after, providing ample opportunity for candidates to have experiences with students across the various aspects of diversity. In fact, in education candidates contributed over 166,700 hours of clinical work (fall 2008) from early experiences to full-time practicum; contributing educationally and economically to our local community.

The Department of Teacher Education adopted a placement policy in 2007 that required 30 hours in a high-needs school or one student teaching placement. The Unit works directly with high needs districts and establishing deep, intentional partnerships in high needs schools; sharing information on the requirement (program handbooks, field experience handout), monitoring placements for advisement and assessment (individual and aggregate data from the shared drive); including course-embedded assessments that directly tie to working with P-12 students from diverse backgrounds and with exceptionalities; and reporting results. The Unit extends this commitment through the Unit’s study abroad programs which focus on schools (i.e., Netherlands and Thailand) with a new education program being established in Costa Rica (2011). Additionally, the TESOL program has led to expanded educational partnerships and placements within the ESL community, affording a range of clinical experiences with ELL students.

For the initial teacher education programs, the “shared drive” tracks the breadth and diversity of field experience for teacher candidates from Phase I to Phase II to Phase III. The tracking system includes grade levels, types of classroom (e.g., special education placements), diversity of schools and high needs placements. Phase I is monitored through the Learn and Serve Office and Phases II and III are monitored through the Teacher Education Field Experience Office.

In the Advanced and Other School Personnel Programs, clinical faculty approves all placements for clinical practice ensuring that candidates have experience with students from diverse, ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups and with disabilities. Each advanced program embeds additional assessments and clinical components into the program to extend the practicum/internship experience across areas of diversity. The analyses of these assessments are included in the SPA reports.

3c.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

| Attachment 6 - Student Evaluations for practicum and seminar |
| Attachment 7 - Eligible and Completed Data Chart |
| 3c.7 - Links to Exhibits |

SeeAttachments panel below.

**Optional**

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 3?
Service learning and contributing to the welfare of others transcends the work of candidates and faculty. Over 166,000 hours of service contributed to the needs of the local educational community. This service directly supports the mission of the University and the conceptual framework of the Unit – an economic impact study demonstrates the contributions of education candidates to the area community (results will be available in 2009). Schools recruit and welcome candidates across the various phases of clinical practice. Niagara University was named to the President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll (2009) and was selected (among 119) for the Community Engagement Classification of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2009).

Clinical practice is scaffolded throughout the entire teacher education program – beginning in the freshman year (1st semester) and continues each semester – leading to a teaching assistantship and student teaching experience. Field experiences are embedded in coursework and contribute to course-based assessments. Nearly 70% of the early field experiences are in high need (by New York State definition) schools – findings of the NSSE data for freshmen candidates in education at Niagara University support this early experience with diverse P-12 candidates.

The University fiscally supports full-time positions for clinical faculty who serve as members of the Unit – they contribute to the assessment of the programs (work with faculty to assess knowledge, skills, dispositions) and bring a wealth of knowledge and experience to the observation/reflection process (practitioners).

P-16 programming on campus that extends the mission of the University and provides opportunities for candidates by bringing children and youth to campus (literacy and STEM camps, 5th day program, prevocational program for young adults with developmental disabilities, holiday learning programs).

2. What research related to Standard 3 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Area</th>
<th>Faculty/Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High needs, urban field experiences in pre-service education programs</td>
<td>Foote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that positively or negatively influence collaborative relationships</td>
<td>Kozen, Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion study for the preparation of undergraduate candidates in special</td>
<td>Kozen - program embedded in Niagara Street (high-needs) school with research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education (Kozen) - program embedded in Niagara Street (high-needs) school</td>
<td>leading to transformational efforts to establish a residency model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of reading-prespectives from 3rd grade students</td>
<td>Ciminelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration contributes to Model of mentoring P-12 students through the</td>
<td>Rinaldo, Sheeran, Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnership work of the University faculty and candidates – the mentor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connector program (Rinaldo, Sheeran, Smith).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of teachers and teacher candidates (in Puerto Rico) regarding the</td>
<td>Valentin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitudes toward teaching ESL, current practices, and areas for future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional development – research resulting from work in early childhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education (Kindergarten) in the Moca School District in Puerto Rico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD 4. DIVERSITY

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

### 4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

#### 4a.1. What proficiencies related to diversity are candidates expected to develop and demonstrate?

Consistent with the University mission and conceptual framework of the Unit, the faculty and administration are committed to preparing candidates who help all students learn given the increasing diversity in our schools and our community. Tenure-track and clinical faculty share the commitment across program areas and the standards for each program include a focus on curriculum, field experiences and clinical practice that promote (and assess) knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to diversity.

Goal 1 of the College’s strategic plan states this commitment. Outcomes and core strategies related to this goal are integrated into the strategic plan of the Unit; including initiatives in the areas of faculty development, curriculum, assessment of candidate performance, partnerships with high needs schools, work with high-needs students on campus, and field and clinical practices. The Unit’s standing Committee on Diversity is charged with ensuring that the curriculum, field experiences and assessments in all programs in the Unit meet diversity outcome standards; faculty and staff are knowledgeable about diversity with access to current theory and practice; and faculty and candidates represent the balance of diversity inherent in our goals.

The proficiencies that candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate reflect those that address institutional standards, New York State standards, Unit expectations and proficiencies across programs.

1. The general education core. Undergraduate candidates are required to complete a 3 credit hour course as designated to meet the cultural diversity requirement in general education. This general education goal is that courses address cultural diversity, the validity of other cultures, and the social and political ramifications of global integration, globally and at home.

2. Expectations and proficiencies across programs. In 2005, the Unit approved the College of Education Framework for Standards and Assessment of Diversity (Exhibit 4.1b). This Framework identified the adopted knowledge base and set of proficiencies that were based upon the Irvine and Armento (2001) principles for culturally relevant teaching. All programs worked with the core proficiencies to further align the approved culturally relevant teaching principles with their disciplines and approved standards. Program proficiencies are found in the following exhibits: Exhibit 4.2c (Initial Teacher Education Program); Exhibit 4.2d (Graduate Initial Education Programs); Exhibit 4.2a (Literacy Instruction); and Exhibit 4.2b (Other School Personnel). Assessment tools and results are described in Section 4a.3.

3. The Framework for Standards and Assessment of Diversity also illustrates the integration of Unit’s efforts in the domain of diversity with the university mission, university-wide committee on diversity, the conceptual framework of the Unit, the Strategic plan, College Committee on Diversity, and High Needs school partnerships. Unit-level indicators of diversity include candidate enrollment, diversity of placements, diversity of faculty, and international participation.

4. The approved dispositions and indicators further define the expected proficiencies. One of the adopted dispositions of the Unit is professional relationships, which includes the belief that all children can learn. Observable behaviors are associated with the overarching dispositions and assessed for all candidates.
4a.2. What required coursework and experiences enable teacher candidates and candidates for other school professional roles to develop:

- awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning; and
- the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to adapt instruction and/or services for diverse populations, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities?

In addition to the embedded instructional objectives related to diversity, candidates in the Unit are required to complete core coursework addressing diversity principles in the instruction of students P through 12. All candidates enrolled in initial training programs are required to successfully complete three courses related to the education of students from diverse backgrounds and with diverse needs. At the initial level, candidates must successfully complete EDU 214, Cultural and Multicultural Foundations of Education, and EDU 239, Educating Students with Exceptional Needs. Likewise, initial teacher preparation candidates must complete one course surrounding the topic of diversity to meet the general education requirement of cultural diversity. Courses such as developing English as a Second Language Literacy through multicultural literature (EDU 379/EDU579), Civilization and Culture of Latin America (SPA 307), and Introduction to Latin American Studies (LAS 100) fulfill this requirement.

At the advanced level, candidates are required to complete EDU 528, Multicultural Education, and EDU 539, Characteristics of Students with Exceptional Needs. Students enrolled in graduate programs such as School Counseling and School Psychology are required to successfully complete coursework in Multicultural Counseling (EDU 652). Candidates enrolled in the School Psychology program must complete EDU 539, Characteristics of Students with Exceptional Needs. Candidates in the Educational Leadership programs must complete an Internship course (EDU 691 - building; EDU 692 –district; or EDU 693 – building/district). Each course has a required “diversity project” that requires the candidate to be directly involved in a leadership activity that demonstrates proficiencies related to diversity from a leadership perspective.

In terms of clinical experience, candidates in the initial teacher education programs complete early field experiences, teaching assistantships, and student teaching in schools with diverse and high needs populations. Prior to the commencement of student teaching, all initial candidates must complete at least 30 hours of direct service in a school district classified as “high needs” by the State of New York. Similarly, all initial education students are required to participate in Learn and Serve, a University outreach program designed to increase awareness of the importance of social justice and service to high needs communities. A direct manifestation of the University mission to increase personal responsibility for aiding marginalized persons, including the poor, education candidates are responsible for providing service to students in the community working as teacher assistants or tutors. All pre-service students dedicate 20 hours per semester for five semesters engaged in Learn and Serve work, assisting or tutoring in domains directly linked to their area of future certification.

Though detailed in another section, it is important to note that teaching assistantship and student teaching placements reflect service to a variety of high needs and culturally diverse schools. Assistantships and student teaching placements have and continue to reflect the Unit’s dedication to the importance of creating educators who are proficient in the teaching of diverse learners. To best allow candidates the opportunity to apply their knowledge of culturally relevant pedagogy, the Unit continues to explore opportunities to provide additional placement hours in culturally diverse or high needs districts at the assistantship or student teaching level. Attachment 1, Coursework and Field Experiences Related to Diversity, summarizes required coursework and experiences by program.

Additionally, the Unit has taken innovative and strategic steps to expand experiences related to diversity through the resources of the University itself and the needs of the surrounding community. Through the Institute of Applied Learning, programs for high-needs children and youth and young adults with
disabilities have been implemented on campus. Since 2008 when this core strategy began (in concert with the new Academic Complex), 437 children and youth from the local community have participated in literacy or math/science programs, with 260 candidates working with students in these programs. Further experience is planned through the partnership of the Unit with the Castellani Art Museum that is on campus. Faculty work with education director of the Museum to align exhibitions with Pre-K curriculum, providing authentic experiences for candidates to extend their proficiencies related to diversity. The Museum houses a permanent exhibit of the Underground Railroad in which faculty and candidates have been involved with curriculum (over 22 schools, 1000 students) and an exhibit of Native American Children’s Book Illustrations (14 schools, over 700 students).

4a.3. What key assessments provide evidence about candidates' proficiencies related to diversity? How are candidates performing on these assessments?

In addition to adopting a uniform set of principles and expectations regarding culturally relevant pedagogy, program area faculty have identified key indicators of proficiency, linking such indicators to appropriate assessment tools. Data regarding candidate performance in each CRT domain, in combination with related national standards, are collected and analyzed each year as per the Unit’s assessment framework. Routine data analysis allows for greater awareness of individual candidate’s proficiency related to culturally relevant pedagogy and the ability of initial and advanced candidates to meet the needs of P-12 students from diverse backgrounds. As per the units’ assessment model, program area faculty routinely use data regarding candidate performance in CRT domains to advise individual and large scale instructional decision making.

Data yielded from the CRT assessments: Exhibit 4.1c (Initial Teacher Education Program); Exhibit 4.1d (Graduate Initial Education Programs); Exhibit 4.1e (Literacy Instruction); and Exhibit 4.1f (Other School Personnel). Assessment measures are also described (need descriptions of measures). Undergraduate and graduate candidates across program areas continue to evidence success in completing required measures of culturally relevant instruction. At the undergraduate level, candidates have attained mastery at a level of 90% or higher on all CRT measures (Exhibit 4.1c), with the exception of three measures linked to principle 3, 8, and 10a, on which candidates attained an average of 75% or higher. At the graduate level (Exhibit 4.1d), candidates attained a similar level of proficiency on CRT measures, evidencing mastery levels of 90% or higher on all CRT principles, with the exception of 3b, 4, 8, 10a and 10b (see chart), on which candidates received proficiency ratings of 68% or higher. Unit faculty continue to analyze trends in student performance ratings for instructional decision making. Dispositional assessments show that candidates exceed the benchmark of 3 in professional relationships (belief that all children can learn) and professional commitment and responsibility (fairness) in the initial teacher education programs, advanced education, and other school personnel. Indicators in these areas of the dispositions relate to aspects of teaching and learning with diverse groups of students (Exhibit 4.1g (Initial Program Candidates: Assessment of Candidate Dispositions, 2007-2009).

Exhibit 1.7b provides the data table on Follow-Up Assessments. On the indicator related to working with diverse learners and communities (question 2), an increase is noted among employers (mean of 3.3 for the class of 2004 to a mean of 4.2 for the class of 2006 – scale of 1-5), with alumni reporting a mean rating of 4.3 and 4.4 on this indicator (undergraduate and graduate respectively, class of 2007).

4a.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to diversity proficiencies and assessments may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Attachment 1 - Coursework and Field Experiences Related to Diversity

4a.4 - Links to Exhibits
4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

4b.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with higher education and/or school-based faculty from diverse groups?

Diverse faculty within the University, the Unit and the educational community (school faculty) provide multiple opportunities for candidates to engage in professional interactions with across a broad range of backgrounds and experiences. Thirty-eight (38) percent of the faculty (2008) are from diverse and international background. The percentage of diverse Unit faculty compared to the percentage of University faculty demonstrates that the Unit is providing leadership for the campus in the recruiting, hiring, and retention of a diverse teaching staff. This is exemplified by the campus-wide initiatives related to diversity that have been led by diverse members of the Unit (e.g., campus-wide discussion of issues of African children, educational panels with principals of high needs schools, co-chairing of University diversity committee).

Over the course of the past several years, initial and advanced candidates within the Unit have significantly benefited from deep partnerships with local school districts either meeting NYS high needs criteria or that are known to be culturally and socioeconomically diverse. Working in such schools, including the Niagara Falls City School District, as well as School #44 in the City of Buffalo, allows students to interact with a great number of school faculty and school administrators from diverse backgrounds. Candidates interact with faculty from diverse backgrounds through the Study Abroad Program, as well. The programs (two offered specifically for education candidates) have increased the exposure of candidates to educators and students from diverse backgrounds. The study of various aspects of teaching and learning while visiting locations such as Thailand, Netherlands and Spain has allowed for in-vivo exposure to multicultural issues in education, while influencing their multicultural worldview.

4b.2. What knowledge and experiences do faculty have related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups?

The Unit’s professional education faculty has been involved in a wealth of scholarly and service oriented activities related to the education of students from diverse cultural backgrounds, including those evidencing diverse learning needs, linguistic differences, as well as diversity in socioeconomic status, gender identity, and sexual orientation. The individual research and service pursuits of faculty illuminate remarkable dedication to not only preparing candidates for work with diverse populations, but disseminating cutting edge information to other professionals in the academic and school community. Since 2006, twenty-five of thirty eight members of the Unit’s faculty have sought to increase awareness of multicultural issues in education through the authoring of original articles or books, scholarly presentations at national, state, and local conferences, as well as service activities in the schools and community at large. In most cases, faculty members were involved in three or more activities related to diversity in education. A review of Table 11 yields over 160 contributions related to the education of diverse learners, including categorical breakdowns in accordance with contribution type.

In addition, the Unit has sought to establish expertise among the faculty in core areas of need among candidates and the education community in general. Two members of the faculty (Valentin, Heaggans) have been trained by GESA (Generating Expectations for Student Achievement) and now serve as professional development consultants related to increasing achievement among high needs students. Several members of the faculty focus on issues related to African children and refugees (Hamza, Cianca), with Unit faculty chairing the African Educational Alliance in Western New York (Hamza).
Expertise on culturally relevant pedagogy and working with ELL’s has increased through new hires (Zambon studied with Dr. Ladson-Billings, Huang and Hahn with expertise in working with ELL’s) and faculty sabbatical leaves have extended expertise in various disciplines (Valentin worked in early childhood education in Puerto Rico, Smith studied and taught in China), international presentations in special education (Sze). In addition, the Unit has extending its expertise to the schools in new ways (Heaggans serving on a State team for a school under review, Hahn working in the Alternative Schools). It was reported to the University that in 2007-08, 44% of the Unit’s full-time faculty were involved in international study and research. Since the last review, the Unit has strategically looked to an international perspective for teacher education and leadership preparation (delineated and funded in the strategic plan) to extend expertise and work with issues of diversity on a national and international level.

4b.3. How diverse are the faculty members who work with education candidates? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 8 can also be presented and/or discussed, if data are available, in response to other prompts for this element.] Please complete Table 8 or upload your own table at Prompt 4b.5 below.

Table 8
Faculty Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)</th>
<th>Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Advanced Programs n (%)</th>
<th>Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach in Both Initial Teacher Preparation &amp; Advanced Programs n (%)</th>
<th>All Faculty in the Institution n (%)</th>
<th>School-based faculty n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4b.4. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain a diverse faculty?

The Unit follows all University plans, policies and procedures in an effort to attract, hire and retain faculty from diverse backgrounds. The University’s Affirmative Action plan delineates these procedures and expectations.

The Unit remains strong in its dedication to increasing diversity among professional faculty. The Unit’s Diversity Committee has regularly collaborated with search committees to generate suggestions for increasing the diversity of applicants, and continues to deliberate additional means of increasing multicultural representation within the Unit. The Unit’s commitment to developing a diverse faculty is reflected in the great number of searches that have been re-opened due to the limited number of applicants from diverse backgrounds in the applicant pool.
Faculty within the Unit, in conjunction with the Diversity Committee, continues to focus attention on the importance of increasing faculty diversity through additional strategic actions such as establishing partnerships with urban doctoral institutions and historically Black/Hispanic colleges for teaching fellowships and exchange opportunities; creating opportunities for co-teaching with practitioners and experts (co-teaching has involved J. Weinholdt, native American culture teacher, and B. Walls, expert on the underground railroad) in 2009; funding for faculty to recruit (through direct networking) at conferences (University provides additional funding for faculty); organizing and supporting faculty engagement through professional development sessions and conferences held on campus (retention of existing faculty, increasing the reputation of the Unit in professional communities) – international leadership conference, underground railroad presentation (Walls, Richberg); and engaging faculty in opportunities for campus-wide leadership, discussion and student life (retention of faculty).

4b.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty diversity may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8- Faculty Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

4c.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with candidates from diverse groups?

Candidates in the Unit have opportunities to interact with candidates from diverse groups across campus. On campus, groups such as the office Multicultural and International Student Affairs, Diversity Advocates, NU Alliance, and Bienvenidos engage university students in a variety of activities related to the diversity of students and their professional endeavors.

Of significance are the Unit’s efforts to coordinate with the Niagara University Opportunity Program (NUOP) and with high-needs, urban districts related to “grow-your-own” programs to prepare paraprofessionals to become certified teachers. The Unit has specifically initiated collaboration with NUOP in order to attract candidates into teaching. This effort has resulted in the increase of NUOP students in the Unit and the opportunity for candidates to interact with this group of students. Members of the faculty and administration (i.e., Dr. Erwin, C. Wilson, Assistant to the Dean) have worked directly with NUOP to maximize the opportunities for candidate interaction.

The Unit has successfully worked with teacher aides from the Buffalo Public Schools through the Teacher Leader Quality Partnership Project – 16 TLQP participants received BA and MS degrees in critical shortage areas. This project served 25 candidates (all of whom were from diverse backgrounds); again increasing the opportunities for candidates to interact with this diverse group of candidates.

Over 55% of NU students are from the three neediest groups according to the 2008 key performance indicators. It is important to note that the Unit enrolls many graduate candidates from the province of Ontario. These international candidates are highly diverse and provide a tremendous opportunity for graduate interaction. While these candidates are considered “non-resident aliens” for the U.S. affirmative action reporting, the linguistic and cultural diversity represented by candidates from the greater Toronto area represents a unique opportunity for candidates.

A review of the NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) data (aggregated for the Unit) delineates important findings related to diversity. Freshmen in education report that diverse perspectives are often (rating of 3 on a scale of 4) in class discussion or writing assignments (higher mean as
compared with the University generally, Carnegie peers, and NSSE reporting group). This is significant as the professional education faculty have “frontloaded” coursework and field experiences related to diversity. Education candidates also reported increases in their conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity from their freshmen to senior year of study – this increase as noted by education candidates was not found in the mean comparison among Niagara University students. Exhibit 2.1x6 (p.20) includes these data.

4c.2. How diverse are the candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 9 can also be presented and discussed, if data are available, in other prompts of this element.] Please complete Table 9 or upload your own table at Prompt 4c.4 below.

Table 9
Candidate Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity of Geographical Area Served by Institution (%)</th>
<th>All Students in the Institution n (%)</th>
<th>Candidates in Advanced Preparation Programs n (%)</th>
<th>Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4c.3. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups?

The Unit, in conjunction with admissions, continues to make tremendous efforts to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups, including international students. The Office of Admissions has engaged in extensive recruitment outreach efforts in the cities of Buffalo, Niagara Falls, and New York. Unit recruiters continue to make extensive efforts recruiting graduate students in highly diverse city centers, such as Toronto. University representatives regularly attend the National Hispanic College Fair, NACAC, and fairs in regions known to attract multicultural applicants. The University has made a special movement toward continued participation in the Catholic College Fair in Puerto Rico, arranged by the NACAC.

Extensive efforts have been made through the Niagara Falls City School District High School Visitation Partnership to facilitate the admission of students from high needs backgrounds. Similarly, 5th day programs and college preparatory initiatives have been instituted by the Unit to bring youth from the diverse areas of Niagara Falls and Lockport to campus.

The Unit, in collaboration with the Office of Financial Aid, is a provider of TEACH grants. In addition, efforts of the Unit to augment scholarships have resulted in the increase of tuition assistance for candidates who are most in need (e.g., Argy Scholarships, Dr. Moretti Scholarship).

The Unit has specifically looked to stronger partnerships with community colleges – a new jointly registered program with Niagara County Community College has been approved for TESOL. This is the first jointly registered program at the University and we expect to recruit and retain a more diverse group of candidates through this partnership.
Retention of candidates from diverse backgrounds is a central aim of the University and Unit. On campus, the office of Multicultural and International Student Affairs (MISA) serves as a primary support mechanism for students from diverse backgrounds (Exhibit 4.7w).

4c.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to candidate diversity may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9- Candidate Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

4d.1. How does the unit ensure that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical practice?

Extensive field experiences and the demonstration of work with diverse students (high needs, ELL’s, low SES) was a common finding in the SPA reports (February 2009 submissions.) The Unit ensures this by working directly with high needs districts and establishing deep, intentional partnerships in high needs schools; monitoring placements for advisement and assessment (individual and aggregate data from the shared drive); including course-embedded assessments that directly tie to working with P-12 students from diverse backgrounds and with exceptionalities; and reporting results.

For the initial teacher education programs, a “Field Experience Profile Sheet” is generated for individual candidates. The “shared drive” tracks the breadth and diversity of field experience for teacher candidates and is monitored through the Teacher Education Field Experience Office.

In the Advanced and Other School Personnel Programs, clinical faculty approves all placements for clinical practice ensuring that candidates have experience with students from diverse, ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups and with disabilities. Each advanced program embeds additional assessments and clinical components into the program to extend the practicum/internship experience across areas of diversity. The analyses of these assessments are included in the SPA reports. Unit faculty ensure that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity through the direct assessment of such skills via the clinical faculty evaluations (Exhibit 3.7a and Exhibit 4.1g). All candidates at the Institution benefit from field based experiences and partnerships in schools representative of the diverse communities in which they are housed, providing ample opportunities for the practice of diversity related skills. Approximately 69 to 70% of early field experiences occur in districts that are either considered urban, 30% or more non-White, or 65% high poverty. At the assistantship level, 57 to 70% of placements meet the aforementioned criteria, with approximately 71 to 88% of student teaching assignments occurring in environments meeting the aforementioned criteria for at least one placement (Diversity placement summaries are generated from the Shared Drive).

4d.2. How diverse are the P-12 students in the settings in which candidates participate in field experiences and clinical practice? Please complete Table 10 or upload your own table at Prompt 4d.4 below. [Although NCATE encourages institutions to report the data available for each school used for clinical practice, units may not have these data available by school. If the unit uses more than 20 schools for clinical practice, school district data may be substituted for school data in the table below. In addition, data may be reported for other schools in which field experiences, but not clinical practice, occur. Please indicate where this is the case.]
4d.3. How does the unit ensure that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups?

Based on the approved Framework for Standards and Assessment of Diversity, indicators of diversity are embedded in coursework and field experiences in all programs. Through both formative and summative feedback, candidates have the opportunity to confront issues of diversity that affect teaching and student learning in their courses, through a variety of campus-life activities, through professional development opportunities, and in their required clinical practice. Throughout courses, candidates receive and use feedback and have the opportunity to evaluate the quality and timeliness of feedback from faculty on the course and instructor evaluation (every course). Data are collected during field experiences by clinical and school-based faculty who evaluate candidate performance on indicators that include working with students from diverse backgrounds. This information is discussed with candidates (mid-way and final reports) – should the need arise, a plan of action is jointly developed to assist candidates in using this feedback in a productive, learning experience. The required seminars (for all culminating clinical practice) also provide an opportunity for candidates to use feedback to reflect on their skills.

4d.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the diversity of P-12 students in schools in which education candidates do their field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Table 10 - School District Placement Table (includes Ontario)

4d.4 - Links to Exhibits

See Attachments panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 4?

The Unit has responded to the need for heightened attention to issues of diversity in our programs. The ability of the faculty to agree on the knowledge-base, integrate principles across each program (courses and field experiences), and assess proficiencies has been a most notable aspect of the collective work of the faculty. In fact, members of the Diversity Committee who have led this effort for the Unit have been successful in the presentation of this initiative nationally.

The success of the paraprofessional program is a highlight of our work. The embedded model of
working with teacher’s aides in a high-needs, urban school district resulted in many lessons learned, changes in teaching practice, and renewed partnerships – 14 teacher aides completed their degree programs, became certified, were hired. They remain teaching in high needs schools.

Deep and deliberate partnerships with high-needs schools are a strength in both the character of the University with its mission and in the dedication of faculty to bringing candidates to our underserved schools. These reciprocal partnership have now resulted in programming on campus for those most in need – youth with developmental disabilities attending day programs on campus; high needs, underserved children in literacy camps on campus (with parent attendance).

The leadership of the faculty across campus in areas of diversity – new study abroad programs, co-chairing the diversity committee, leading campus-wide discussions on bias, bringing key speakers to the professional education community (partnership with Ms. Addie Richburg of the National Alliance of Faith and Justice), serving on State review team for a school in need of improvement. The contributions of this faculty through service and scholarship in the domain of diversity is highly noteworthy.

2. What research related to Standard 4 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

The 21st Century Hip-Hop Minstrel Show: Are continuing the blackface tradition? (Heaggans).

When two cultures meet in the classroom (Huang).

Comparative analysis of diversity in teacher education programs (what and how) within a global perspective (Zambon).

International research by faculty – participation and scholarship from the international leadership conference at Niagara University (2006) with the reciprocal conference in Germany (2007).

Focus on Africa and the needs of immigrant children from African countries: AERA SIG on Research Focus on Education in the Caribbean and Africa (Hamza), educating the African newcomer student (Hamza), educational policy and research project in Malawi (Cianca).

School climate for sexual minority youth and gender identity (Kilanowski-Press).

Supporting English language learners in mainstream classrooms (Valentin).

Bridging the cultural disconnect – teacher educators and diverse learners (Heaggans).

Assessment and treatment for reading difficulties in students with learning disabilities (Sze).

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.

[In this section the unit must include the professional education faculty in (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-
5a. Qualified Faculty

5a.1. What are the qualifications of the full- and part-time professional education faculty (e.g., earned degrees, experience, and expertise)? Please complete Table 11 or upload your own table at Prompt 5a.5 below. [Professional Education Faculty information compiled by AIMS from earlier reports submitted for the national review of programs and updated by your institution (see Manage Faculty Information page in your AIMS workspace) can be imported into Table 11. For further guidance on completing this table, see the directions provided below (select link "click here") as well as in the Help document (click on "Help" in the upper right corner of your screen.)]

Table 11
Faculty Qualification Summary

5a.2. What expertise qualifies professional education faculty members who do not hold terminal degrees for their assignments?

Professional education faculty who hold tenure-track positions have earned doctorates (100% as delineated in Table 11), have contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels that they supervise, and are meaningfully engaged in related scholarship. They are licensed in the fields that they teach or supervise. Professional education faculty who do not hold terminal degrees for their job assignments are clinical faculty who have the full-time responsibility of serving as a University supervisor; these are non-tenure track positions. There are 6 members of the faculty who are in full-time clinical positions for the initial teacher education program (supervisors of student teaching) and for the educational leadership program (supervisor of the administrative internship). These full-time clinical faculty (who supervise internships or student teaching) hold teaching certification or are licensed in the fields that they supervise, hold a Masters degree and advanced credentials depending on their discipline (e.g., educational leadership), have many years of professional experiences in school settings, and are recognized for their achievements and leadership. Clinical faculty in teacher education are considered to be exemplary teachers, having experience in both teaching and teacher supervision; whereas clinical faculty in educational leadership are considered to be leaders among school leadership personnel and to have supervised/mentored educational leaders at building, and district levels. Full-time tenure-track faculty are used in a clinical faculty role for school counseling, school psychology, literacy instruction, and special education (graduate). A job description for the University Field Supervisor is attached. (Exhibit 5.1b)

5a.3. How many of the school-based faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or are supervising? How does the unit ensure that school-based faculty members are adequately licensed?

School-based faculty (cooperating teachers and internship/practicum supervisors) are required to be licensed in the field they supervise. The Unit works with school districts who meet the requirements for highly qualified personnel and information is shared on certification and licensing needs in the determination of placements (criteria for the selection of cooperating teachers). The Director of Student Teaching is responsible for ensuring that school faculty has the appropriate certification for student teachers; Department Chairpersons are responsible for the approval and processing of school-based faculty who serve as mentors for advanced practicum/internships. Department Chairpersons work
directly with schools to ensure that both the placements and the selection of school-based faculty are authorized by school district administrative personnel. As a result, 100% of school-based faculty members are licensed in the areas they supervise. New York State’s TEACH system provides an online system to verify credentials.

5a.4. What contemporary professional experiences do higher education clinical faculty members have in school settings?

Higher education clinical faculty in the Unit consist of full-time clinical faculty (who supervise and teach seminar courses) and adjunct faculty who are selected based on their contemporary experience related to their supervisory load or the course they are assigned (e.g., literacy coach in a school setting who teaches a literacy course; a director of special education in a local school district teaching a higher-level special education course offering; a doctorally prepared specialist to teach psychopharmacology). Clinical faculty must possess an array of background knowledge that reflects the unit’s conceptual framework and constructivist practices. It is expected that clinical faculty model best professional practices in teaching and bring to the Unit research-based practices and current experience in keeping with the learning outcomes of the course they will teach. Table 11 (5a.1) in column “teaching and other professional experience in P-12 schools” highlights the contemporary school experiences of clinical faculty in the Unit.

To remain current about the Unit’s student teaching and internship policies and procedures and University/program requirements, clinical faculty are required to participate in Unit and Department sessions. Full-time clinical faculty serve on Unit committees, attend Unit-wide meetings and retreats. All clinical faculty who supervise student teachers meet regularly with the Director of Student Teaching; clinical faculty who serve as adjuncts meet each semester with the Chairpersons. The University’s approval process for the appointment of adjunct members of the faculty requires the delineation of expertise in relation to the professional experiences necessary to teach designated courses or to supervise in the field. These experiences are reviewed by the Department Chairperson and included in the recommendation (Dean and Academic Vice-President approvals).

5a.5. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty qualifications may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

5b.1. How does instruction by professional education faculty reflect the conceptual framework as well as current research and developments in the fields?

We are proud of the teaching focus of our faculty and in the leadership they have shown in promoting an academic vision across the campus that incorporates key components and research from the Unit’s Conceptual Framework. Niagara University adopted an academic vision of active, integrated learning in 2005 (includes aspects of constructivism and reflective practice) and established the University’s Committee on College Teaching and Learning (CCTL). Members of professional education faculty have led this University committee. In addition, faculty have been recognized as outstanding teachers by candidates and peers, Dr. Vermette (Professor of Education) was awarded the 2007 Outstanding Teacher
Education Award from the New York State Association of Teacher Educators.

As aligned with the Unit’s Assessment System and in keeping with the NULTA contract, professional faculty are expected to demonstrate a high degree of proficiency as teachers, using multiple measures of assessment. All evaluation forms used by the Unit for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness provide direct measurement of instruction related to the conceptual framework’s theoretical dimensions and include indicators of the currency of the faculty in their teaching practice. These include the classroom visitation (observation) form used by the Dean (Exhibit 5.6d: Dean’s Observation Form), the Departmental classroom observation form (Exhibit 5.6b) was revised to reflect a stronger alignment to the conceptual framework; and the student evaluation form (Exhibit 5.6a: Course and Instructor Evaluation Form). Evidence of Conceptual Framework and current research in the fields in faculty teaching is highly evident in the review portfolios and self-evaluations by faculty address the Conceptual Framework with evidence of candidate performance often included.

Indicators from the NSSE data support this work of the faculty. Education candidates rate their participation in “community based projects as part of a course” higher than peers at Niagara University and at peer institutions (NSSE, 2008). The education candidates also rated their “contributions to the welfare of the community” significantly higher than at peer institutions (NSSE, 2008). These indicators are directly related to the conceptual framework of the Unit – 2005, 2006, and 2007 analyses are included in the Unit Annual Report Part A (Exhibit 2.1x6, page 22).

5b.2. How do unit faculty members encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions?

Dispositions and reflective practice are components of the Unit’s Conceptual Framework and embedded in every course and throughout program assessments, such as portfolios, clinical observations, diagnosing reading difficulties, reflecting on field and clinical experiences, case studies, and designing research that promotes the development of critical thinking and problem solving. The results of these measures have been demonstrated in SPA reports across multiple assessments of standards.

Professional dispositions are embedded in the conceptual framework of the Unit. Observable indicators of performance were identified for each of the core dispositions. Candidate’s professional dispositions are measured in each course, in all field experiences, and on employer surveys. There are three years of collected data on professional dispositions (Exhibit 2.1x6, page 17).

Measures of reflection, dispositions, constructivism, process-product (e.g., critical thinking and problem solving) and reflective practice are included in employer surveys. Employers rate graduates above a rate of 4 (scale of 1-5) on questions related to reflective practice, using a variety of instructional strategies, knowledge of subject matter, and working with diverse learners. Dispositional ratings have averaged above 4 as well (Ex. 1.7b: Follow-up Assessments).

The evaluation instrument used by candidates to evaluate courses and instructors (Ex. 5.6a) through indicators of the appropriateness of the course readings, assignments, discussions and workload to the degree level; and relevance of the course to professional expectations. Additionally, the evaluation addresses problem solving (question 9), promotion of critical thinking (question 12), questioning and differences of opinion (questions 13 and 15), among other indicators. Exhibit 5.6f delineates aggregate data on these indicators and shows that candidates consistently rate faculty in the range of 4 or above (Very Good)

5b.3. What types of instructional strategies and assessments do unit faculty members model?
Modeling instructional strategies and assessments is a primary focus of the Unit as demonstrated in the three dimensions of the Conceptual Framework (constructivist practice, process-product, and reflective practice) and in the academic vision of the University (active, integrated learning). In every course taught within the Unit, faculty will model a variety of instructional strategies and assessment methods, including, but not limited to, the use of learning logs, cooperative learning, simulations, role play, case studies, pair/share and technology integration. Faculty will also, consistent with the theoretical dimension of process/product, model research-based practices and differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners. Faculty ensure that candidates are actively engaged and responsible for their own learning. Reflective practice is also ingrained in every course taught in the Unit. Faculty require candidates to do reflective writing involving self-assessment and processing their experiences to generate alternative ways of viewing situations to create new and expanded understandings.

Faculty use rubric-based authentic assessments to assess candidate performance in clinical experiences and throughout the programs (aligned with national standards for the specific program areas and reported in SPA program reviews). Rubrics are designed to measure progress toward accomplishment of required program standards. Faculty are continuously monitoring candidate progress with assessments that are integrated into all aspects of instruction. These include, but are not limited to, performance-based assessments, assessments that address student learning through course-embedded work conducted in the schools (alignment of field experience and course requirements), research-based assessments, and self-reflection.

Instruments used by the Dean and the Department Chairs for the observations of faculty teaching address modeling of instructional practices and the use of various assessments to measure course objectives (Department Chair’s Observation Form, Exhibit 5.6b), the extent to which the professor clearly presents through various instructional methodologies and engages candidates in demonstrating their understanding of the material (Dean’s Classroom Visitation Report, Exhibit 5.6d). The formal classroom observation process provides documentation of strategies and assessment, and aligns this work with the conceptual framework.

**5b.4. How do unit faculty members incorporate the use of technology into instruction?**

Technology is integrated throughout all coursework in each program as identified in each SPA report. The Academic Complex which houses the Unit is a state-of-the-art facility with the following technologies available: Interactive white boards, video and audio conferencing, podcasting, and online learning through Blackboard. Every course syllabus outlines the use of required technology through assignments, class presentations, and lesson plans. Faculty model technology that is identified in courses with common course assignments and assess students using a rubric adapted from the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) Standards. Technology expectations are clearly outlined in undergraduate, graduate initial programs (Attachment 1: Initial Teacher Education Program – Technology Expectations). Faculty use of technology is shown in Attachment 2 (Faculty Technology Usage), and shows a significant increase in interactive SmartBoard usage from 28% to 74%, with a minor decrease in the usage of Blackboard from 88% to 70%.

As faculty incorporate technology into their instruction, it is noted that education candidates report a high level of use of technology as noted in the following assessments:

- Education candidates report (NSSE data indicators, 2008) that they use technology quite a bit or very much across indicators (e.g., computers, information technology, electronic medium). Data from 2005-
2008 are shown in Exhibit 2.1x6, 2008-2009 Annual Report Part A.
• Sub-test scores among program completers on the Liberal Arts and Sciences Test (LAST) demonstrate an mean scaled score of 266 (2007-08), 266 (2006-07), and 264 (2005-06) on the sub-test of scientific, mathematical and technology processes (220 is the passing score).
• Employer surveys have demonstrated a significant increase in rating of candidates use of technology from 2.8 (class of 2004) to 3.8 (class of 2006) – data from the class of 2008 is currently being analyzed and will be available for the team visit. (Exhibit 1.7b: Follow up Assessment).

5b.5. How do unit faculty members systematically engage in self-assessment of their own teaching?

Faculty systemically engage in self-assessment and reflection as both a professional practice and as a mandatory requirement of the NULTA contract (Exhibit 5.5a, pg. 49). Accordingly, faculty complete a self-evaluation that includes multiple assessments and reflection on teaching, as well as the articulation of professional goals and expectations. This self-evaluation is a core component of the peer review process, evaluation from the Department Chairperson and Dean, as well as the subsequent reviews through the Promotion and Tenure Committee and University leadership. Multiple assessments that are included in the annual process are classroom observations by the Dean and the Chairperson of the Department, student evaluations (each course, each semester) and other information collected by the faculty member. Candidate evaluations (course and instructor) are aggregated by course on a semester basis and provided to the member of the faculty.

The faculty review process is annual, leading to tenure, and includes a post-tenure process every five years. As noted in the recent self-study assessment survey of the faculty, 100% report using assessment data for continuous improvement and reflective practice and 100% report using these data in their teaching (including, but not limited to course changes, teaching practice).

5b.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty teaching may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

| Attachment 1 - Initial Teacher Education Program - Technology Expectations |
| Attachment 2 - Faculty Technology Usage |
| 5b.6 - Links to Exhibits |

See Attachments panel below.

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

5c.1. What types of scholarly work are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and unit's mission?

Faculty is expected to offer a record of substantial scholarship, as defined and described in the NULTA contract (Exhibit 5.5a: NULTA Contract, p.17). Faculty are expected to:
• create new knowledge based on original investigation that adds knowledge of significance to one’s field;
• synthesize, criticize, or theorize in original ways; clarifies extant knowledge;
• communicate unique connections between existing knowledge and practical applications; and/or
• stimulate the intellectual development of one’s colleagues in the field.
Expectations for scholarly work also consider the degree to which the member of the faculty has disseminated his or her work to the board scholarly community and the impact of the research (for example, number of citations, testimony from outside scholars, number of libraries that have purchased the book). Increased expectations for scholarship are delineated for each of the ranks, leading to the rank of professor, wherein full professors are “expected to be creative and productive scholars, clearly recognized for their achievements within academic circles, professional associations, or other external agencies or enterprises directly related to their field or discipline.”

Niagara University has taken direct, financial steps to provide incentives to increase faculty research and provide incentives for faculty to undertake research directly related to the mission of serving individuals who are most in need.

- Funds for research, research assistance, and presentations increased by 22% since 2006. From 2006-2009, 8 members of the faculty in the Unit have been awarded summer research grants (14 applied) and 16 members of the Unit faculty were awarded research support grants (25 members applied).
- Funds have been allocated by the University for research that directly addresses poverty. To date, two members of the faculty have applied for these funds, with one being granted (2008-09).

5c.2. In what types of scholarship activities are faculty members engaged? How is their scholarship related to teaching and learning? What percentage of the unit's faculty is engaged in scholarship? (Review the definition of scholarship in the NCATE glossary.) [A table could be attached at Prompt 5c.3 below to show different scholarly activities in which faculty members are involved and the number involved in each activity.]

All full-time, tenure-track faculty members in the Unit are engaged in scholarship. The specific scholarship of the faculty has been reviewed comprehensively as 42%, 68%, and 48% of the faculty (2006-08, 2007-08, 2008-09, respectively) have been reviewed (annual, pre-tenure, tenure and promotion, post-tenure). The faculty are engaged in scholarship across the various aspects of the criteria as delineated in the NULTA contract (p. 25). Each of these reviews involves individual self-evaluation and presentation of accomplishments, peer reviews, reviews by the Department Chairperson and the Dean, and continuing reviews through the Promotion and Tenure Committee and senior administration of the University.

Attachment 3, Faculty Contribution to Scholarship 2004-2008, depicts the scholarly activities in which faculty members of are involved and the increases in scholarship over the past five years, with an increase scholarly productivity from 2005 to 2008. In 2008-09, 94% of faculty in the Unit presented at international, national, state and regional conferences, 81% has published their work, and 50% of the Unit’s faculty received grants/awards from internal sources that were directly related to research and/or studies being undertaken.

Given the professional nature of the Unit and its faculty, many faculty members focus their research agendas on aspects of teaching and learning in their respective fields through publication of textbooks for K-12 and college environments; research studies related to teaching, assessment, and field experience methodologies; and publications aimed at providing an impact and direct source of knowledge for practitioners. An examination of faculty vitae and review portfolios indicates substantial detail beyond the highlights found in Table 11.

In addition, the Unit has on-going scholarly projects that are undertaken in collaboration with the professional community. This scholarship is noted in Table 11; however some examples include research related to mentoring students in grades 9 and 10 (findings addressed attendance and achievement), preparing teachers for urban schools, literacy development in math and science in the
middle school, social-emotional development and achievement, perceptions and involvement of parents of students with disabilities (factors that influence collaborative relationships), and educating English language learners with no formal schooling (SIFE). Most recently, the Unit was a partner in the submission of a $19M research grant with two major Universities and the Niagara Falls City School District to study literacy interventions in this urban, high needs school district.

5c.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty scholarship may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment 3 - Faculty Contribution to Scholarship 2004-2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5c.3 - Links to Exhibits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

5d.1. What types of service are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and the unit's mission?

The mission of the University promotes the value of service to individuals both personally and professionally. Promotion and tenure criteria at the University includes the willingness to engage in substantial service, with the level and breath of involvement expected to become more substantial as the length of employment increases. Service may include the following: departmental duties and responsibilities, college-wide duties and responsibilities, University-wide duties and responsibilities, duties and responsibilities of organizations related to the faculty member’s discipline, duties and responsibilities related to the profession, and duties and responsibilities which benefit the external community. Faculty members serve on many University and college committees allowing for collaborative efforts across the colleges of the university.

It is expected that Unit faculty serve in P-12 schools. This type of service counts in meeting the University’s service requirement for promotion and tenure. In addition to service in the P-12 community, faculty service includes service in the Department (all faculty), service on Unit-level committees (all faculty), service on University-wide committees, and service in one’s profession. In the faculty assessment, compiled in the FQPD Survey, there are three areas that are aggregated for the Unit’s assessment system and faculty discussion: 1) leader roles in professional organizations, 2) service aligned to the university’s mission, and 3) university service. Over the last five years (Exhibit 2.1x6: 2008-2009 Annual Report Part A, p. 12-13):

- between 32% to 83% of the faculty have held leadership roles in professional organizations
- between 31% to 71% engaged in service aligned to the university’s mission; and
- 90% of unit faculty has contributed to university service.

5d.2. In what types of service activities are faculty members engaged? Provide examples of faculty service related to practice in P-12 schools and service to the profession at the local, state, national, and international levels (e.g., through professional associations). What percentage of the faculty is actively involved in these various types of service activities? [A table could be attached at Prompt 5d.3 below to show different service activities in which faculty members are involved and the number involved in each activity.]
In keeping with the Vincentian mission of the University, faculty members in the Unit are highly service oriented. One hundred percent (100%) of the faculty are engaged in activities related to service in P-12 schools (Attachment 4: Areas of Faculty Participation in P-12 Schools 2005-2009). These activities include, but are not limited to, participation on school councils and decision-making bodies at the building or district level; active research in P-12 settings; supervision of candidates; teaching University courses in schools; conducting professional development with P-12 teachers, leaders, or counselors; and assisting in school classrooms by teaching P-12 student or providing counseling/psychological services in the community. Portfolio reviews include evidence of this work as it is included in the promotion and tenure decisions. The faculty is also engaged at the state, regional, and national level in professional organizations and many hold leadership positions (Table 11).

As part of the Assessment System, data are collected, analyzed and discussed annually related to the involvement of faculty in P-12 schools. These data are widely disseminated through the Annual Report (Part A) and discussed at the Fall Assessment Retreat. Data have influenced research grants (for action research in schools, proposal for faculty 2007-08), mentoring of new faculty in school-related projects (e.g., appointment to Higher Education System Change, appointment to school-based shared decision-making team), and the planned involvement of faculty across professional development and grant-related work in the Institute of Applied Learning.

5d.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty service may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment 4 - Areas of Faculty Participation in P-12 Schools 2005-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5d.3 - Links to Exhibits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

5e.1. How are faculty evaluated? How regular, systematic, and comprehensive are the unit evaluations of adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants?

The University and the Unit have a systematic and comprehensive evaluation system which includes regular and comprehensive reviews of the professional education faculty’s teaching, scholarship, service, collaboration with the professional community, and leadership in the institution and profession. An evaluation process is in place for full-time, tenure-track faculty, full-time clinical faculty (non-tenured), and adjunct members of the faculty.

In terms of full-time, tenure-track faculty, the evaluation process is negotiated and included in the collective bargaining agreement. The terms and criteria, specific process (annual, pre-tenure, promotion, tenure and post-tenure), and timelines are delineated in the NULTA contract (Exhibit 5.5a). Article XII (pages 47-61) specifies the process for each category of faculty evaluations. On pages 62-69, charts summarize the elements of evaluation, timeframes, and the roles of the responsible parties. The evaluations include a comprehensive self-appraisal, student evaluations, direct observations, and the annual performance review.

Clinical faculty are evaluated annually by the Director of Student Teaching or a Department Chairperson, as may be appropriate. This evaluation process is directly by the Office of Human
Resources and includes an opportunity for self-appraisal and formal reviews by the direct supervisor, Dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Exhibit 5.8a, University Policy for Evaluation of Professional and Non-Professional Staff, includes the process of evaluation for professional and non-professional staff.

Part-time faculty are evaluated in accordance with the existing systematic and comprehensive adjunct faculty evaluation process approved by the University. The University’s Statement of Policy and Procedures regarding Part-Time Faculty delineates the process and expectations and is included as Exhibit 5.6g: Statement of Policies and Procedures for Part-Time Faculty Evaluations. Part-time faculty are evaluated each semester through the student evaluation process (collected for every class). The evaluations are reviewed by the Chairperson of the Department. Direct classroom observations by the Department Chair or program coordinators are conducted on a rotating basis, with student evaluations reviewed and discussed annually (or each semester if needed). Information from these assessments is used to recommend promotions in rank for part-time faculty (lecturer, senior instructor, adjunct professor). It is important to note that assessments of adjunct faculty are used in renewal decisions.

5e.2. How well do faculty perform on the unit's evaluations? [A table summarizing faculty performance could be attached at Prompt 5e.4 below.)

The process for faculty evaluations is highly structured. The following data summarize faculty annual, pre-tenure, promotion and tenure performance over the past three years: 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09. Attachment 1 depicts the results of tenure-track faculty reviews.

Candidate evaluations (course and instructor indicators) are included in the reviews listed above. Across courses offered in the Unit, candidate evaluations indicate a high level of teaching performance. Aggregated data from student evaluations is included in Exhibit 5.6f.

5e.3. How are faculty evaluations used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service?

Evaluation of faculty is an extensive part of the culture of the University and of the collective bargaining negotiations themselves. Faculty evaluations are used to improve teaching, scholarship and service at the level of professional practice, at the level of the Department, at the Unit-level, and across the University.

Faculty evaluations directly influence professional practice among faculty as the results of multiple assessment are used in the self-evaluation and portfolio process. Faculty use this information to identify their professional goals and plans.

At the Departmental level, peer reviews provide the opportunity for faculty to use evaluations to further mentor peers in the three areas of the review and to use this information to shape professional development, mentoring, and orientations for faculty. At the Unit level, the same is true. Collectively, strengths and opportunities are used to shape directions in the strategic plan and in the operation of the Unit. For example, an Advanced Research Committee was formulated to mentor and assist faculty in their expanded scholarship. Appointments for University and Unit-level service are solicited (and made) based upon faculty evaluations and issues/needs noted through the annual process.

Formative letters are written annually by the Department Chairs and the Dean, outlining strengths and recommendations. The Dean meets with each member of the faculty to review this letter (signatures required) with follow-up as needed. A pre-tenure process (year 3) is designed to evaluate faculty progress toward tenure, using the collective data from annual reviews to improve teaching, scholarship
and service as expected for tenure. Formative letters that provide evidence of how these types of reviews are used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service will be available in individual faculty files (maintained as confidential documents).

5e.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit’s evaluation of professional education faculty may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

5f.1. How is professional development related to needs identified in unit evaluations of faculty? How does this occur?

The Unit has implemented a planning and assessment structure to address the contributions of faculty and the needs for on-going professional learning. Goal 3 of the Unit’s strategic plan includes this commitment and related objectives. Objectives in this goal are linked to University planning and to the annual work of a standing Committee in the Unit, Faculty Qualification, Performance and Development (FQPD). The FQPD Committee is charged to promote the best professional practices in scholarship, service and teaching through on-going assessment and evaluation, collaboration, and professional development for both full-time members of the faculty and staff and for adjunct professors. Each program area of the Unit is represented on the FQPD Committee which allows for adequate representation to convey professional development needs for their respective sector.

Annually, full-time faculty complete a survey (Exhibit 5.7b) generated by the FQPD Committee. The survey requests that faculty articulate their professional development needs for the subsequent year. The Committee compiles the data and determines the professional development offerings based on identified faculty needs and issues and topics aligned to the conceptual framework and strategic plan of the College of Education. The Annual Report of this Committee is presented annually and discussed/approved by all faculty in the Unit. A copy of the most recent Annual Report is included in Exhibit 2.1x6.

The Institute of Applied Learning, the professional development arm of the College of Education works in conjunction with the FQPD committee on all professional development offerings. Professional development is designed as a continuum of learning focusing on long term planning based on faculty needs and the needs of our P-12 school partnerships.

5f.2. What professional development activities are offered to faculty related to performance assessment, diversity, technology, emerging practices, and/or the unit’s conceptual framework?

Professional development for full-time and part-time faculty is offered through professional affiliations and involvement, the University, the College and its Departments, the Institute, and on-going partnerships with P-12 schools. The Institute of Applied Learning, created in 2005 as the professional development (P-16) center for the Unit, serves a pivotal role in the coordination of professional development.

Professional service: Funding has increased for faculty in areas related to professional engagement and
research. Funds for the improvement of teaching, research, and travel for presentations have served to increase the involvement of faculty in professional development within their discipline – this engagement at state, national and international levels is paramount to the professional development strategy in the Unit.

University: Professional development at the University level has increased substantially over the past three years and is coordinated through the Office of Instructional Support and the Committee on College Teaching and Learning. Professional development offered by the University has focused on instructional technology (numerous sessions covering types of technologies and instructional design using technology), assessment of learning outcomes, direct and indirect measures of assessments (Office of Instructional Support) and on active, integrated learning.

Unit-level: At the Unit-level, the priorities for professional development have supported the goals of the strategic plan and the respective objectives of the Unit Committees. These priorities have included diversity and the achievement gap, partnerships for student learning (tied to initiatives with P-12), instructional technology, assessment and research, constructivism, RTI, and STEM.

P-12 schools: It has become a systemic practice that the Unit works collaboratively with P-12 schools to include all faculty in professional development offerings. As a result, University faculty have participated in professional development sessions with P-12 faculty in areas such as leadership development, Americas choice research-based strategies in literacy, methodologies for teaching math and science, and Response to Intervention (to name a few).

### 5f.3. How often does faculty participate in professional development activities both on and off campus? [Include adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants.]

All faculty routinely participate in professional development activities on and off campus. All professional development offerings are offered to full-time and part-time faculty, graduate assistants, professional staff, and school district partners. Faculty members are encouraged to offer professional development in areas that are aligned to the Conceptual Framework, faculty needs and topics that require continuous updates and training. In keeping with the Plan for Professional Development of Adjunct and Clinical Faculty that was approved by the faculty in May 2007 (Attachment 5 - Full Time and Adjunct Faculty Professional Development Policy), adjunct faculty are required to complete six hours of professional development annually.

Professional education faculty regularly offer professional development throughout the education community. Over the last four years, 60% of full-time faculty have provided professional development in P-12 schools (Attachment 1). Furthermore, the Unit has sought to establish expertise among the faculty so as to expand both internal and external professional development involvement. Examples:

1. GESA trainers (Valentin, Heaggans)
2. PD for culturally responsive pedagogical practice (Hamza).
3. SPA reviewers (Bardsley – NAEYC, Huang – TESOL, and Zambon – NCSS)
4. RTI (Kilanowski-Press)
5. Regional constructivism conference (Iannarelli, Vermette)
6. Collective bargaining, school finance, and long range facilities planning (Mills)

### 5f.4. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit’s
facilitation of professional development may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment 5 - Full Time and Adjunct Faculty Professional Development Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5f.4 - Links to Exhibits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 5?

Faculty contributions to leadership in teaching and learning permeate the University campus (e.g., CCTL). Contributions to service (related to the mission) and leadership in State and national organizations is highly noted and evident in the documentation of faculty contributions.

Faculty is engaged in P-12 learning. While 100% of the faculty report working in P-12, their roles in the schools extend across a continuum with a depth and breadth of engagement and contribution. Their work supports the needed change in the paradigm from “needing placements” to shared decision-making and direct assistance of faculty in education in P-12 schools.

P-16 partnerships are a strength of the Unit and include faculty in education, school faculty, and faculty in arts and sciences. This resulted in increased and substantial involvement of the Arts and Sciences faculty in P-16 initiatives (e.g., middle-school math, literacy in the core content areas, science campus, social studies) and the school community as equal and involved partners.

Two partnership projects with P-12 schools have resulted in documented increases in student achievement in a high needs, urban school district (Niagara Falls City School District) – the Teacher Quality Enhancement program and the STEM program. Using research-based practices that bring university faculty (education and arts and sciences), school faculty and teacher candidates equally into the classroom, the model resulted in data-based gains in student achievement, enhancements to teacher practice, and documentation of high level thinking across courses (school and university). This model of professional development and preservice practice was published as an exemplary model in the recent publication of AACTE (2009), Innovation and Reform in Teacher Preparation.

2. What research related to Standard 5 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

Change in teacher practice over a five year period through an evolving model of professional development resulting in P-12 student achievement gains (Erwin and Bardsley).

Research on transitional skills to pre-vocational employment for consumers with learning disabilities (Brown).

Investigation of factors that positively or negatively influence collaborative relations – school partnerships and involvement of parents and the educational community related to the needs of students with disabilities (Kozen, Augustyniak, Iamarelli, Brown).

Collaboration contributes to achievement – schools and universities working together for children (Erwin).
6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

6a.1. How does the unit manage or coordinate the planning, delivery, and operation of all programs at the institution for the preparation of educators?

The Unit’s management and coordination of all programs for the preparation of educators begins first and foremost with the commitment of the University. The leadership at Niagara University is committed to providing the highest quality programs and services, ensuring distinctiveness through national accreditation in each of its Colleges, and establishing a recognized record of career success among graduates. As noted in the 2008-2011 Strategic Plan of the University, Niagara has concentrated its investments and actions in three key areas: academic excellence and student engagement, institutional effectiveness, and mission – each of which provide the foundation from which the Unit leads, plans, and operates.

This commitment transcends the College of Education as we focus on preparing high quality candidates to be successful in the diverse array of schools and communities in New York State, Southern Ontario, and beyond. As such, the Unit engages appropriate people in planning, delivery and operation and supports an infrastructure to do so; has a set of processes that insures that the plans are appropriate from both a curricular and budgetary basis; and has the budget, personnel, facilities, and resources to ensure quality delivery and operation.

The Unit is the College of Education at Niagara University. Within the organizational structure of the University, the Dean of the College of Education works within the academic sector under the leadership of the Executive Vice President and Vice President of Academic Affairs. The Dean’s Council is the chief academic policy-making and planning Unit within the academic sector. Through the Dean’s Council, formal collaboration with the Dean of Arts and Sciences (as well as the Dean for Business Administration and Hospitality and Tourism) takes place.

Exhibit 6.2a – Unit Organizational Chart provides an overview of the structure. Two Department chairs, Teacher Education and Educational Leadership and Counseling provide the leadership and overall management of professional education programs (see Table 2 in Overview) within their Department. Program coordinators are appointed (recommended by Department chairpersons and appointed by the Dean) to oversee the program-specific issues and assessment of outcomes (i.e., Early Childhood and Childhood, Adolescence Education, and Special Education). The Unit leadership also includes the Assistant Dean for External Relations (serves as the P-16 coordinator in establishing partnerships and P-12 opportunities with faculty and the Director of the Institute of Applied Learning), Director of Student Teaching, Director of Graduate Education (intake and graduate admissions office), and Director of Ontario Programs (the Ontario programs are accredited by the Ontario College of Teachers in the Province of Ontario).
The Unit also supports an NCATE Coordinator, an Assessment Secretary, an Assistant to the Dean who provides support for teacher candidates and monitors transition points, and an Administrative Coordinator whose position includes candidate assistance in processing New York State and Ontario certification.

Processes for approval of courses and programs with the Unit and the University are driven by the faculty and approved at the Departmental level, through the College curriculum committee (Program and Assessment committee), the Academic Senate, and the Board of Trustees as appropriate. The University’s processes and procedures for curriculum review and approval are faculty-driven and reflect an approval process that ensures input, quality, and fiscal considerations.

The Unit and other faculty from Arts and Sciences and Business Administration collaborate formally with school practitioners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of programs through the University Education Council of Chairs and the Advisory Councils of the Unit (described in question 6a.5 below). In addition, partnerships with the P-12 schools are planned and operationalized through the Unit’s Institute of Applied Learning.

The placement of initial teacher candidates in their early field experiences is conducted through the University’s Learn and Serve office. The Director of the Learn and Serve office serves on the Field Experience Committee of the Unit, attends Assessment Retreats of the faculty, and works collaboratively with the Office of Student Teaching.

It is important to note that the leadership of the Unit extends across campus and the profession. With 91% of the Unit faculty serving on University committees and 56% conducting service directly related to the mission, their leadership serves to influence the broader learning community. These leadership roles are highlighted in Attachment 1, Highlights of Leadership of Education Faculty in Service.

6a.2. What are the unit's recruiting and admissions policies? How does the unit ensure that they are clearly and consistently described in publications and catalogues?

Undergraduate and graduate admissions are coordinated through the Office of Admissions and through the Director of Graduate Education. The Dean, the Director of Graduate Education and the Assistant to the Dean participate in University-wide recruitment efforts and faculty is directly involved in open house and recruitment “information sessions”. The Office of Admissions has a designated liaison to the College of Education. The Unit’s Director of Graduate Education coordinates marketing initiatives with the Vice President for Marketing to ensure consistency in the approach, message, and mission.

The criteria for admissions into programs in the Unit are established by the Unit and delineated in the first Transition Point (entry to program – see Table 6: Assessment Transition Points). The Unit also works with the Niagara University Opportunity Program (NUOP) to identify and advise candidates who are historically underrepresented and may need additional academic assistance to meet the on-going criteria for the program.

The process for recruitment and admission to graduate study is directed through the Office of the Director of Graduate Education. The Director of Graduate Education is responsible for the consistent implementation of the admissions process (including timelines) and the selection of candidates in keeping with the faculty-driven criteria for entry into the program.
Admissions policies are stated in the Undergraduate Catalog (Exhibit: Gen.1a - 2009-2011 - Undergraduate Catalog), the Graduate Catalog (Exhibit: Gen.1b - 2009-2010 - Graduate Catalog), in recruiting materials, and on the College and University website. The Unit ensures that these policies are clearly and consistently described in publications and catalogues. The process used to establish accuracy of the policies and publications related to recruitment and admissions is described under 6a.3 below.

6a.3. How does the unit ensure that its academic calendars, catalogues, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current?

The Unit works with the Office of the Academic Vice President, Vice President of Public Relations and Vice President of Marketing to ensure that academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies and advertising are accurate and current. There are established deadlines, lines of review, and processes for change relative to the assurance for accuracy. For University publications, information is generated by the administrative Unit with layers of review and approval by the Department chairperson, Dean of the College, and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. Timelines and levels of the review are monitored through the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs and/or the Office of the Vice President of Public Relations, depending on the nature of the publication.

The academic calendar (Exhibit 6.5b: University Academic Calendar) for the University is maintained by the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the University’s Registrar, with respective approvals through the Executive Vice President and the University’s Administrative Council. The Student Teaching calendar is maintained by the Director of Student Teaching and is approved by the Chairperson of the Department of Teacher Education and the Dean (Exhibit 6.5c: Student Teaching Calendar).

Advertising is monitored by the Vice President for Marketing. He works collaboratively with all administrative Units to ensure consistency with the mission, planning for key messages (and the accuracy of such), and budgeting for advertising.

Grading policies are established through the Academic Senate and implemented through the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The Dean oversees the implementation of these policies at the unit level, and the Department Chairs oversee policies at the academic department level. Changes in grading policies are approved by the Academic Senate and ultimately by the President. Policies are delineated in University catalogs.

6a.4. How does the unit ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling?

The Unit ensures that candidates have access to student services (including the academic learning center, advisement, career services, counseling services, health services, disability services, and assistance for certification examinations and processing) in a number of ways:

1. All candidates receive handbooks on student services during their orientation sessions. These materials address the types of services which are available and how to access them. These materials are also easily accessible to candidates through the student portal, myNU.

2. Based on assessment through the Academic Learning Center, students in need of support services are notified by the Academic Support Center. Student progress information is routinely forwarded to faculty advisors and the Assistant to the Dean (so as to ensure program-level follow-up and continuing support).
3. A first-year symposium course (NUS 102) has designated sections for freshmen candidates in education. The course is facilitated by staff in education and the curriculum includes services and support (Attachment 2: NUS 102 Syllabus).

4. All candidates are assigned an advisor. Undergraduate candidates have two (one in education and one in Arts and Sciences); graduate candidates have an advisor in their field of study. Advisors are assigned by the Chairpersons of the Academic Departments.

5. Student academic progress is formally monitored each semester in keeping with the Satisfactory Academic Progress policy of the University (Exhibit 2.3c: Satisfactory Academic Progress). The Assistant to the Dean in the Unit is responsible to review transcripts and advise candidates who are experiencing academic difficulty. Programs are “audited” for the program completion transition point during “Senior checks” during which time the Assistant to the Dean meets with candidates in keeping with the transition point assessment and university policy for graduation.

6a.5. Which members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation? In what ways do they participate?

The Unit and other faculty from Arts and Sciences and Business Administration collaborate formally with school practitioners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of programs through the following formal avenues:

- Advisory councils serve both the Department of Teacher Education and the Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling. The Advisory Council is a key mechanism for receiving input from the general education community on issues of the design, delivery and evaluation of education programs.
- Members of the Unit serve on advisory councils, curriculum committees and shared decision-making committees in the area P-12 schools. This provides a continual opportunity for shared input in design, implementation and evaluation.
- Faculty in education, arts and sciences, and schools collaborate on strategies implemented through the Institute of Applied Learning. The Institute, under the leadership of the Assistant Dean, formalizes these partnerships and ensures that all projects include these three areas of the partnership.
- Other opportunities for collaboration are established as needed for the design of new programs (e.g., literacy minor) or to address key issues in the strategic plan.
- Collaboration between Education and Arts and Sciences is on-going and stems from a strong commitment to collaboration from the Deans of these two colleges. The University Education Council of Chairs was established as the coordinating mechanism for the elected chairpersons of the Departments of Education and Arts and Sciences.

In addition, the Unit seeks input from the professional community informally through on-going collaboration with P-12 initiatives as 100% of the faculty report working in schools/clinics in various capacities (reciprocal partnerships) and the Dean, Assistant Dean and Director of Student Teaching work directly with school superintendents. The employer survey is administered bi-annually.

6a.6. How does the unit facilitate collaboration with other academic units involved in the preparation of professional educators?

The Unit collaborates with other academic Units through faculty participation in University service, the Council of Deans, and the Education Council of Chairs.

Ninety percent (90%) of the faculty in the Unit report their involvement on University-level committees. This extraordinarily high-level of involvement of education faculty across the University speaks to the
level of collaboration and influence for programs and preparation of professional educators, counselors and school psychologists. Examples include roles on the University Planning Committee; chairing of the Senate Outcomes Assessment Committee; chairing of the University Committee of Teaching and Learning; and co-chairing the University Diversity Committee; membership on the Academic Senate, membership on the Retention Committee; to name a few. The University Education Council of Chairs is the formal committee for the elected chairpersons of the academic departments for Education and Arts and Sciences (addressing content standards, content assessments, advisement and coordination for course offerings). The Dean serves on the Council of Deans which is chaired by the Vice President of Academic Affairs and includes the Deans of the other Colleges, Enrollment Management, Student Services, and the Associate Deans in the Vice President’s office.

6a.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit leadership and authority may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

| Attachment 1 - Highlights of Leadership of Education Faculty in Service |
| Attachment 2 - NUS 2009 syllabus |
| 6a.7 - Links to Exhibits |

See Attachments panel below.

6b. Unit Budget

6b.1. What is the budget available to support programs preparing candidates to meet standards? How does the unit's budget compare to the budgets of other units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other institutions?

The Unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations to prepare candidates in keeping with international (Ontario), national, state, and institutional standards. Budget discussions, planning, and allocations are continually assessed based on strategic planning, enrollment trends, and needs. Growth in the Unit has reflected a 15% increase in graduate and undergraduate enrollment from 2004-05 through 2008-09 (Exhibit 2.1x6 – see p.7) and a slight decrease in summer credit hour registrations.

Increases in the budget have occurred since 2004 in terms of the overall Unit budget (including personnel), the operating budget, and new revenues. The University’s allocation to the College of Education has increased from $3,528,000 in 2005-06 to $4,847,603 in 2008-09 (includes benefits). The Unit has also received funding from the University’s strategic plan ($88,300 for 2008-09) and has aggressively generated a new Institute of Applied Learning. The Unit budget compares favorably to the budgets of other Units. Each of the Colleges equally access travel funds (based on number of faculty), allocation of research assistance, retention funds (allocated for Departments based on enrollment), and in-direct cost allocations. Through the Institute, however, the Unit has been able to generate funds that remain in the Unit and used for core strategies of the faculty. This fiscal strategy supports innovation and is being reviewed for possible application to other units across campus.

Budget items that support the work of the Unit are also found in the budget for the vice president of academic affairs (retention funds for education, professional development, office equipment/furniture, special projects), the library, instructional technology Unit, and the learning center.

Other resources for the Unit include media, library, career development and cultural resources. The Learning Center, a part of the University’s office of academic support, is designed to provide assistance
to students through courses, tutoring, disability services and a writing center.

Resources are also available to the Unit through the Learn and Serve program. The Learn and Serve staff work with education students and faculty in the placement and evaluation of teacher candidates in their early field experiences. Transportation is provided by the University for these early field experiences.

6b.2. How adequately does the budget support all programs for the preparation of educators? What changes to the budget over the past few years have affected the quality of the programs offered?

Budget allocations for the Unit are adequate to support all programs; clinical and field experiences; enhance the teaching, scholarship, service of the faculty; support P-12 partnerships; and to inspire innovation that addresses student learning and the conceptual framework of the Unit. The College of Education has taken steps to increase resources to support high-quality programs and initiate exemplary projects that meet the needs of the professional community (partnership projects).

Changes to the budget over the past few years have had a positive effect on the quality of programs. These include:

• The investment of $18.6 million in the Academic Complex – the new home of the College of Education (Exhibit 6.10a), (Also see section 6d.1 of the IR).
• The creation and funding of the Teaching Studio and Resource Center in the Library.
• The generation of revenues from the Institute of Applied Learning that would be maintained in the Unit and directed toward strategic initiatives (grants, partnership initiatives, professional development coursework) - $715,000 in 2008-09.
• Allocations from the budget of the University’s Strategic Plan (included assessment resources, faculty).
• Approval of the B.P.S. program in Ontario (and renewal of Ministerial Consent) – although this program is separately accredited, the resulting budget augments the work of the faculty in education as applied to both jurisdictions.
• Increases in funding for faculty research and professional development (see Section 6.e).
• Capital campaign of the University, launched in 2007. Many initiatives of the College of Education are included in the $80 million campaign. The campaign seeks $3.5 million for the College of Education.
• Scholarship funds (exceeding $423,000) have been secured through Advancement to assist education candidates who are most in need (e.g., Dr. Rita Moretti Scholarship, Argy Scholarship, Cynthia Pittman Memorial Scholarship)

6b.3. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's budget may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

See Attachments panel below.

6c. Personnel

6c.1. What are the institution's and unit's workload policies? What is included in the workloads of faculty (e.g., hours of teaching, advising of candidates, supervising student teachers, work in P-12 schools, independent study, research, administrative duties, and dissertation advisement)?
Workload policies and practices are clearly delineated in the collective bargaining agreement (Exhibit 5.5a: NULTA Agreement). These responsibilities are negotiated with the current collective bargaining agreement covering 2007-2011. Faculty is expected to be engaged in teaching, scholarship and service. The administrative duties of the elected chairpersons of Academic Departments are described on pages 71-74 of the NULTA contract.

Teaching: The negotiated teaching load for full-time faculty has been 4 courses each semester (fall, spring) for undergraduate (12 semester hours) or 3 courses each semester if teaching graduate courses (9 semester hours). The current contract moves to a 3/3 load for all faculty (undergraduate and graduate) by 2010-2011. Faculty in the Unit have had a 3/3 load (as reported to PEDS) due to the graduate teaching responsibilities across the Unit. First year faculty receive a one-course download support their orientation to the University; chairpersons receive a one-course download; however for large Departments, two downloads may be approved by the Vice President (the chair of the Department of Teacher Education receives a two-course download). The expectations for teaching effectiveness are articulated on pages 25-27 of the NULTA contract. Faculty are expected to demonstrate a high degree of proficiency as a teacher and a high regard for the welfare of students (multiple measures).

Scholarship and Service: The expectations for research and service are articulated on pages 25-27 of the NULTA contract. The criteria for service includes service to the profession and the external community confirming as an expectation for promotion and tenure the work of education faculty in P-12 schools. Faculty work in P-12 schools is reported in Exhibit 2.1x6: p.13.

Advisement: The faculty workload includes the responsibility for advisement and maintaining office hours (6 hours per week). Undergraduate students in education are assigned two advisors: one from education and one representing their content area concentration (e.g., English, Mathematics). The current faculty advisement average is 50.

Other areas of workload: Faculty has the opportunity for independent studies, honors thesis, proctoring of comprehensive examinations. Additional stipends are provided for this work.

**6c.2. What are the faculty workloads for teaching and the supervision of clinical practice?**

The faculty workload for teaching and supervision (NULTA Contract pgs. 92-97) is as follows:

Teaching: Workloads for teaching are described above in 6c.1: 12 credits per semester for undergraduate courses or 9 credits per semester for graduate. Faculty in education have averaged 3 courses per semester due to the loading of graduate coursework (as reported in PEDS).

Supervision: The load equivalency for supervising student teaching and practicum is (1) semester hour for each five (5) observations and three (3) on-campus meetings between the supervisors and the candidates observed.

**6c.3. To what extent do workloads and class size allow faculty to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service (including time for such responsibilities as advisement, developing assessments, and online courses)?**

Since the last NCATE visit, the Unit secured additional faculty. The number of full-time teaching faculty in the Unit has increased from 26 in 2004-05 to 33 in 2008-09, with three tenure-track lines currently open. As depicted in Attachment 3, the percentage of courses taught by full-time faculty has increased and stabilized even with increasing numbers of faculty on sabbatical leaves (60%, 74% and
68% in teacher education, leadership, and counseling respectively: 2008-09). Increases in the supervision of student teachers by full-time faculty (clinical and teaching) are also noted. Attachment 4 depicts the impact of full-time supervisors in the supervision of student teachers, 2004-2009.

Workload policies and practices, in combination with the increased number of full-time faculty (teaching and clinical), are appropriate for faculty to engage in teaching, scholarship, and service. Recent changes in the teaching workload of faculty (as negotiated by NULTA for the 2007-2011) dramatically lowered the teaching workload (from 4:4 to 3:3) in order to enhance undergraduate faculty engagement in teaching, service, and scholarship.

In the Unit, the average class size is small in order to support teaching effectiveness. The average class size has remained constant: 17.9 in the 2007-08 academic year, 19.3 in the 2007-08 academic year, and 20.4 in 2008-09. The Unit’s target class size is 20-25, with 20 being the maximum for methods courses and research. Enrollment in the few on-line courses offered by the Unit is the same as traditional course enrollment. Advisement loads have decreased over the past three years, due to additional full-time faculty (57.2, 2006; 54.6, 2007, 50.1, 2008).

6c.4. How does the unit ensure that the use of part-time faculty contributes to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the unit and its programs?

The Unit ensures that part-time faculty contribute to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the Unit and its program. Part-time faculty are selected for specific aspects of the programs and serve to ensure clear ties with current methodology (content methods professors) and issues of high needs schools (part-time professors and supervisors from Buffalo, Rochester and Niagara Falls). The Unit also secures part-time professors for courses with unique applications, e.g., educational policies and politics (taught by Chancellor Emeritus Robert Bennett of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York). The Unit reported 46 members of the part-time faculty in the 2008 PEDS data report.

Since the last review, faculty developed and approved a plan for professional development of adjunct and clinical faculty (approved, May 2007) and a link established on the Unit’s website with information and professional development offerings. As reported in Standard 5, increases have been noted in the participation of part-time faculty in professional development.

It is important to note that the new Academic Complex includes space for part-time faculty within the faculty suites. This dedicated space was planned with architects based on the commitment of faculty in education to work closely with members of the adjunct faculty to improve integrity and consistency. As the building is wireless, adjunct faculty now have access and space for working directly with their candidates and with faculty.

In addition, the University supports orientation sessions for part-time members of the faculty and has instituted practices that enhances access of adjunct faculty to myNU and to a University e-mail account to enhance communication, training, and coherence university-wide. The 2008-2011 Strategic Plan of the University included funding to improve the recruitment, retention and support of effective part-time faculty (strategy 7).

6c.5. What personnel provide support for the unit? How does the unit ensure that it has an adequate number of support personnel?

Since the last NCATE visit, the Unit has secured additional personnel, both instructional and non-instructional, to support the work of the Unit. The Unit currently consists of 59 members, including 39
full-time teaching and clinical faculty (with three additional tenure-track lines in the search process), 18 administrative and support personnel, and 2 graduate assistants (2008-09). In addition, the Unit and its Departments hires work-study students each semester. Exhibit 6.6c, Support Personnel Summary 2004-2009, depicts the increase in Unit personnel.

The Unit ensures an adequate number of support personnel through planning and assessment with directors and chairpersons. Since the last visit, new positions have been added to support the Unit. These include an Administrative coordinator in the Office of Student Teaching, a new Department secretary to serve Ontario teacher candidates, an Assistant Director of Graduate Admissions, an Assistant Dean for External Relations, a secretary (served through a graduate assistantship) for the Institute, a director of the TLQP grant, director (and professor) for the Center of Excellence in Catholic Education, and a full-time (previously part-time) Assessment Secretary for the Unit. New positions were created in these support capacities based on documented needs, enrollment and annual data as delineated through the Assessment System.

6c.6. What financial support is available for professional development activities for faculty?

The University and Unit provide various sources of financial support for professional development activities. The standard amount of funding provided each professional education tenure-track faculty member within the Unit is $900. These funds are augmented by numerous supplemental funds and initiatives for which faculty may apply. These include funds through the CCTL, the Research Council, the Fund for the Improvement of Teaching, support for student assistance with research projects. Exhibit 6.6d depicts the 22% increase in the University budget (2006-2009) to support these initiatives.

Other professional development opportunities are also available for faculty. These include regular sabbatical opportunities that allow faculty to be released from the campus-responsibilities to engage in professional learning initiatives (semester or full-year, by approval of the Vice President of Academic Affairs), University-wide professional development related to instructional technology, and Unit-specific professional development as lead by the FQPD committee (reported in Standard 5).

The revenues generated through the Institute of Applied Learning (created in 2006) have served to directly augment revenues for faculty development. The Unit has provided professional development through each grant funded partnership; including a new three year TLQP grant ($740,000); the previous TLQP grant ( $800 over 6 years), the STEM grant ($2.4M over 3 years with Niagara Falls District as lead agent), Niagara’s Choice Partnership for Literacy with Niagara Falls District ($200,000 annually – currently in third year of the partnership), and the TQE grant (3.4M over 5 years with Niagara Falls District as lead agent). In addition, it has become common practice for faculty in the Unit to participate in professional development initiatives offered by the P-12 schools, augmenting the resources and impact of professional development activities.

6c.7. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to personnel may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment 3 - Percentage of courses by FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 4 - Percentage of Full time super vs part time supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c.7 - Links to Exhibits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.
6d. Unit facilities

6d.1. How adequate are unit--classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, the technology infrastructure, and school facilities--to support teaching and learning? [Describe facilities on the main campus as well as the facilities at off-campus sites if they exist.]

The Unit has been intricately involved in the planning and construction of a new education building and teaching studio. The Academic Complex is a state-of-the art facility that houses the College of Education and the College of Business Administration (see Exhibit 6.10a).

"X Model Pre-K ¡V 12 classroom - this models a middle-level classroom. This room is organized into different learning areas, with spaces created for working groups and differentiated instruction and interactive technologies.

"X Center for teaching excellence ¡V this classroom is designed to simulate teaching (and counseling) scenarios. The room, set up in quadrants is equipped with five Smartboard stations.

"X Diagnostic/observation classrooms - classroom triads with observation facilities provide the clinical opportunity for candidates.

"X The Family Literacy and Counseling Center provides an on-campus, educational opportunity for at-risk children, youth and their families.

The Teaching Studio, located in the Main Library, provides print-based and electronic resources for candidates and faculty, as well as supplies/materials for teacher-made resources and equipment to support this work (e.g., Edison machine, lamination).

All academic and student buildings have wireless technology, allowing students to access the University and the Internet from laptops from virtually anywhere on campus. The University budgets $400k annually to upgrade and replace technology. Computer facilities and classrooms and research equipment and laboratories include computer labs in St. Vincent¡¦s Hall, the library, and the Academic Complex (financial services lab) and research laboratories for biology, bioinformatics/chemistry, GIS/environmental studies, videoconferencing labs, modern language labs. Two laptop carts exist as mobile classroom labs (available for the Academic Complex) and digital multimedia work stations are available in Dunleavy Hall, as are DVD and DC authorizing, video production, television studios, video retrieval, and interactive videoconferencing. A portable distance learning system is also available.

Facilities also include the Castellani Art Museum. Numerous areas of collaboration have focused on student learning (e.g., Underground Railroad Permanent Exhibit, Native American authors exhibit, children¡¦s authors such as Eric Carle).

Faculty offices are designed in suites with common areas for collaboration. Each faculty member is provided a furnished office, a laptop (printers in each suite). Standard programs are loaded on laptops and faculty can request additional programs as needed (e.g., SPSS). Faculty offices are designed in suites so as to provide additional, collaborative space.

In addition to on-campus offerings, education classes are conducted in P-12 schools, providing a strong link between theory and practice and allowing for the use of school-based resources as aligned with the learning standards.

6d.2. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit facilities may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]
See Attachments panel below.

### 6e. Unit resources including technology

#### 6e.1. How does the unit allocate resources across programs to ensure candidates meet standards in their field of study?

The College of Education has taken steps to increase resources to support high-quality programs and initiate exemplary projects that meet the needs of the professional community (partnership projects). The Assessment System provides opportunity for Departmental-level reporting, addressing candidate performance and issues (including budgetary). The Assessment, Planning and Budgeting (APB) process of the University ties these reports to planning, operation and funding requests. This process was designed to help shape university priorities in ways that are consistent with the mission and desired strategic and student learning outcomes.

The budget process allows the Deans and Chairpersons the opportunity to submit requests for budget items. This occurs for both the operational budget process and the University’s strategic planning process. The Unit is represented on each of the University planning and budgeting committees. Two members of the Unit (currently the Dean and Dr. Denig) sit on the University Planning Committee, the Dean participates in budget discussions at the Dean’s Council as well as in enrollment management discussions. In addition, there are formal processes (and timelines) for the request of capital improvements and additions to the Department’s operating budgets.

#### 6e.2. What information technology resources support faculty and candidates? What evidence shows that candidates and faculty use these resources?

Information technology resources support faculty and candidates by (a) ensure the integration of technology into all of the education programs, (b) ensure the connection with P-12 schools in using technology to enhance performance in the content areas, (c) bring Arts and Sciences faculty into the schools, and (d) increase instructional technology for effective teaching.

All academic and student buildings have wireless technology, allowing students to access the university and the Internet from laptops from virtually anywhere on campus. Most of the classrooms are connected to the Internet and have technology teaching stations with touch screen access, LCD projector, document camera, video retrieval system, DVD, and computer. Specialty rooms have been added for group conferencing/distance learning, a geographical information systems lab, and computational chemistry lab. The university budgets $400k annually to upgrade and replace technology, including computers, servers, network and telephone hardware. Budget increases are planning in the coming years. Computer facilities, classrooms, research equipment, and laboratories are extensive and delineated in Exhibit 6.10c: Niagara University Technology Support Brochure.

Evidence that candidates and faculty use these resources is obtained through the FQPD survey (technology use among faculty), the NSSE survey (disaggregated for education candidates) and through the technology assessment component within programs.

Attachment 5, Faculty Technology Usage, depicts the faculty use of technology (2007-2009) and Attachment 6, NSSE Data Table (Technology), demonstrates the candidate use of technology. In addition, faculty participation in training sessions supports their use of these resources: In 2008-09, 141 participants attended Instructional Support workshops last year and 136 who attended the CCTL conference. The Office of Instructional Support offered 16 instructional technology workshops in 2008-
2009, and offered additional training to faculty in the Instructional Technology; specialized training will continue this year for faculty in the Distance and Online Education. In addition to these workshops, dozens of faculty received one-on-one instruction in Blackboard, Classroom Response Systems, and other instructional technologies. In the Unit, 90% of the faculty participated in Unit-specific sessions related to informational and instructional technology (Exhibit 6.13a).

6e.3. What resources are available for the development and implementation of the unit's assessment system?

The development and implementation of the Unit’s assessment system draws upon the University’s Datatel platform and, therefore, assessment data and resources are coordinated from existing sources whenever possible. In this way, the Unit has been able to maximize resources from the respective leadership and staff across campus. This includes coordination with the Office of the Vice President of Planning, the Office of Institutional Research, the Office of Career Development and the Office Information Technology. In addition, key personnel in the Unit have direct responsibilities related to the Assessment System – the Unit supports an Assessment secretary, a graduate assistant, support assistance in the Office of Student Teaching (shared-drive component of the Assessment System), assistant director of graduate admissions (admissions transition point), the Assistant to the Dean (entry to student teaching and program completion transition points). The Unit is directly served by staff in the Office of Information Technology as well, and has received much assistance from the developer and support specialist in that office. Upgrades to the technology infrastructure of the Assessment System have been routinely reported in the Unit’s annual reports to NCATE.

The Assessment System has been included of the University’s Strategic Plan. Since the last review, the Unit targeted funds for assessment through the Strategic Pan to include a full-time position for the Assessment Secretary, funds for program assessment, downloads (or stipends) for faculty who led the SPA program, and enhancement of technology (Exhibit 6.6b: Strategic Plan Budgets). The Unit also allocated funds to enhance the data warehouse system (STEP), the shared drive for field experiences, and in supporting meetings and retreats of faculty and staff for analyses and use of data through an accreditation allocation, special projects funds, and performance contracts.

6e.4. What library and curricular resources exist at the institution? How does the unit ensure they are sufficient and current?

In 2008-2009, the Library expended $495,225 on information resources. This represents a 15% increase since 2005-06. The collection currently consists of 202,402 book and audiovisual titles and more than 22,000 periodical titles in print and electronic formats. Approximately 5,000 book and audiovisual titles are purchased each year.

In the summer of 2009, the Library and the College of Education collaborated to create a curriculum room and “hands-on” teaching material production area to the main Library (moving the former Curriculum Resource Room) More than $30,000 was invested in a renamed Teachers’ Studio and Resource Room. Its purpose is to provide education candidates with access to the materials and equipment they need to develop curricula, lesson plans, and instructional materials. The Children’s Literature collection exceeds 1,200 titles. The Library also provides access to two databases providing access to children’s magazines—MAS Ultra and Primary Search.

The Library subscribes to a diverse collection of more than 90 databases including many that provide excellent access to scholarly journals and other periodicals in the field of education. For example Academic Search Complete, ERIC, JSTOR, Professional Development Collection, and PsycINFO, PsycARTICLES, and Sage Premier (particular strength of this database is education).
The Library provides access to 900 print and electronic journals in the field of education. The book collection in the field of education exceeds 9,000 titles. In 2008-09, the Library expended $5,493 on education books. This is a typical yearly expenditure and does not include New York State grant funds that are also allocated to book purchases supporting the College (which varies from year to year).

Candidates can acquire materials not owned by Niagara University by making use of robust Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery services. In 2007, the Library made a substantial investment to acquire ILLiad, the premier Interlibrary Loan management system. All Niagara University students and faculty can easily create interlibrary loan requests, track those requests, and receive articles from journals delivered to their desktops.

The Library ensures service quality through ongoing assessment. Decision-making is data driven, and the findings of assessment activities are shared with the University community via the Library web site. Database usage and circulation statistics are regularly examined for collection development purposes. Search logs in the online catalog are examined. Regular benchmark studies comparing NU to peer schools are conducted. Faculty and students are surveyed about their needs. Library liaisons meet with departments, which results in improvements to the journal, book, and audiovisual collections.

6e.5. How does the unit ensure the accessibility of resources to candidates, including candidates in off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, through electronic means?

All Niagara University students have access through myNU, the University portal through which all information and services can be accessed (including registration, student accounts, emergency announcements, research and library services, and program requirements). Students access the portal with a password and have access to on-line support (or by phone) through the Information Technology help desk. Niagara University does not offer an alternative route program for teacher education and has only a few on-line course offerings. A number of candidates study at off-campus sites in the Province of Ontario – this program has recently received full accreditation by the Ontario College of Teachers (June 2009 for a period of seven years) and is not included in this NCATE review (as confirmed by NCATE).

6e.6. (Optional Upload) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit resources, including technology, may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment 5 - Faculty Technology Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment 6 - NSSE Data Table (Technology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e.6 - Links to Exhibits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachments panel below.

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 6?

State-of-the-Art Facility: The Academic Complex is state-of-the-art in terms of instructional technology, model P-12 classrooms, and collaborative space for candidates and faculty. The Academic Complex has been recognized by architects (green roofs and green aspects of the building) and by Business First – Niagara University won the Business First "Brick by Brick"award for the best educational building in
Niagara University was honored by being one of 39 Colleges and universities named to the Chronicle of Higher Education’s Honor Roll of “Great Colleges to Work For” (July, 2009).

P-16 governance and structure (the Institute of Applied Learning) was designed and supported by the university and professional education community. Institute has generated revenues, brought community to campus (over 400 high-needs children and youth in faculty/candidate driven programs), coordinated partnerships and research-based models of professional development. It is a model for university-school-community partnerships with the university component representing both education and arts and sciences.

University fully funds the structure and governance for the field experience operation of the Unit – including a Learn and Serve director, Director of Student Teaching, support staff, full-time clinical faculty (teacher education and leadership), and the technology data system.

Leadership within the policy context – Dean co-chairs the New York State Professional Standards Board for Teaching, serves on the Board of Directors of AACTE and of AILACTE. Chancellor Emeritus Robert Bennett of the New York State Board of Regents serves as a visiting professor in the Unit.

2. What research related to Standard 6 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

- Outreach and development of a professional development school model in Ontario – international options for policy, accreditation, and systems development – (Donovan, Rinaldo, Cowden).
- Designing learning space – (architecture and learning) - (Colley, Hayes)
- Quasi-experimental model of embedded, sustained professional development (Wrobel, Bianco).
- Economic impact of field experiences from a school of education (Snider, Colley).