NCATE

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★ *Report*

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:
Mr. Larry C. Lashway
Dr. Patricia E. Hacker
Dr. Lisa K. Eaton
Dr. Damara R. Hightower-Davis

State Team:
Dr. John W. Rhodes
Dr. Lotta Larson
Dr. Marilyn J. Dishman-Horst

State Consultant:
Dr. Catherine Chmidling

NEA or AFT Representative:
Charles Walther

Continuous Improvement Visit to:

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

School of Education
1122 West Campus Road
Lawrence, KS 66045-3101
October 26-28, 2014

Type of Visit:
Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

BOE Report for Continuous Improvement Pathway (Updated May 2013)

Summary for Professional Education Unit

Institution Name:

University of Kansas

Team Recommendations on Meeting Standards:

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

Not Applicable = Unit not reviewed for this standard and/or level

Team Recommendations on Movement Toward Target:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 4: Diversity	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	At Target (attained)	At Target (attained)
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Not Applicable = Unit did not select this as a target standard

I. Introduction

I.1 Brief Overview of the institution and the unit.

Founded in 1866, the University of Kansas is a public research institution located in Lawrence, Kansas, with additional campuses in Kansas City, Overland Park, Wichita, and Salina. As of fall 2013, the university had over 27,000 students, about evenly split between men and women. There are about 2,700 faculty. The university encompasses 13 schools, with over 345 degree programs in 200 fields.

The unit is the School of Education (SOE), which enrolls around 1600 students (about 5% of total university enrollment). In fall of 2013, 683 of these students were undergraduates and 923 were graduate. The school consists of five departments: Curriculum and Teaching; Educational Leadership and Policy Studies; Health, Sport, and Exercise Sciences (HSES); Psychology and Research in Education; and Special Education.

The SOE offers 29 licensure programs approved by the Kansas State Department of Education. The unit's school psychology program is approved by NASP. There is also a Master in Curriculum and Instruction program that is self-evaluated because it does not lead to licensure. Other non-licensure

programs are offered in HSES and Psychology and Research in Education.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This was a joint CAEP-state visit conducted under terms of the Kansas state protocol. There were no known deviations from the protocol. The visit was initially scheduled as a Sunday-Wednesday visit (as provided by the protocol), but the unit requested a Sunday-Tuesday visit. After consultation among state officials, CAEP staff, and the team co-chairs, it was determined that a Sunday-Tuesday visit was acceptable within terms of the protocol.

I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

The School of Education provides course offerings at Kansas City as well as the main campus in Lawrence. Arrangements were made to include representatives of all sites in interviews. The unit is in the process of developing a number of wholly online programs. However, the first of these began operation during the current academic year and did not fall within the scope of the review.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

There were no unusual circumstances that affected the visit. One state team member who participated in the offsite review was unable to participate in the onsite review, but a replacement was found well before the visit.

II. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P–12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The unit identifies its core mission as (1) preparing individuals to be leaders and practitioners in education and related human service fields, (2) expanding and deepening understanding of education as a fundamental human endeavor, and (3) helping society define and respond to its educational responsibilities and challenges.

Its core values are defined as:
1. committing to excellence through self-study and periodic review
2. valuing of multiple perspectives
3. fostering a sequential, cumulative preparation for life-long learning
4. upholding professional and ethical standards of conduct
5. treating others with dignity, courtesy and respect
6. connecting research and best practice

The mission and values are expressed in the instructional program in the form of three strands: Research

and Best Practice (knowledge and application of both formal and informal research lead to effective, informed practices), Content and Pedagogical Knowledge (subject matter expertise and knowledge of purpose, curriculum, materials, and strategies), and Professionalism (commitment to caring and ethical practice, not only in the classroom but within the larger community and professional associations).

The conceptual framework at KU is clearly articulated, not only at the abstract level, but as specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions that candidates are expected to master (Table 1 of Exhibit 1.5.3). These expectations have been aligned with the assessment system, identifying which assessments tap into the proficiencies (Exhibit 1.4.c.3).

III. Unit Standards

The following pages contain a summary of the findings for each of the six NCATE unit standards.

Standard 1

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.

1.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Twenty-eight of the unit's 29 licensure programs have been reviewed and approved by the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) through January 2021; The school psychology program has been reviewed and recognized by NASP through February 2015. In addition, the Master in C&I is an advanced program that is self-evaluated and does not lead to licensure and is not reviewed by KSDE or a SPA.

The following items were listed in the offsite report as needing verification on the IR Addendum or onsite visit: explanation of procedures for monitoring dispositions (4), C&I data (6), C&I numbers and dispositions (7), C&I GPAs (8), C&I pedagogical and professional knowledge (9), Doctoral program data (10), advanced teacher pedagogy and learning (11), professional activity engagement (12), OSP use of technology (13), school psychology knowledge and use of school and community resources and engagement with students, families and communities (14), e-portfolio timelines (15), OSP follow up surveys (16), and key assessment requirements for C&I masters (17). Interviews and inspection of records onsite resolved all of these issues.

Candidates seeking admission to initial and advanced teacher education licensure programs must meet rigorous admission requirements. Most initial programs require that applicants have completed or be enrolled in courses required for admission, meet a 2.75 cumulative grade point average, have satisfactory references, and produce a series of satisfactory essays (C&T department website).

As explained in the offsite report, candidates in all initial programs demonstrate content knowledge through consistently high scores on the state-required standardized assessments of content and pedagogy including the Principals of Learning and Teaching (PLT) and Praxis II Content exams. The 2012-2013 PLT pass rate by content area ranged from 87.5 percent to 100 percent (IR exhibit 1.4.d.2); similarly,

Praxis II content exam scores pass rate ranged from 80 percent to 100 percent (IR exhibit 1.4.d.3). According to the IR addendum, Praxis scores are reported by program area after a candidate completes a program; a score would not be included in a report if the candidate is not a completer in the tested area. In other words, if a candidate who completes a biology program takes both the biology and chemistry tests, only the biology record would be matched by program completion data and included in accreditation reports. Interviews revealed that school principals view content knowledge as a strength in initial candidates.

Candidates in initial programs demonstrate pedagogical content knowledge and skills through consistently high PLT scores; course assignments, including lesson plan writing, implementation, and reflection; field experiences; and the Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP), a work sample designed for the teacher education candidates to demonstrate content and pedagogical competency including instructional planning; ability to make accommodations for students with learning challenges; and ability to design, implement, and analyze assessments to investigate the impact of their teaching on student learning. In interviews, current initial candidates expressed confidence in integrating technology to support student learning in field experiences. The IR Addendum clarifies KPTP scale scores and scoring procedures (Addendum exhibit 1.5.3). To qualify for initial licensure, the state requires that candidates score a minimum of 20 points on the KPTP. Assessment data for 2010-2013 suggest that close to 100 percent of initial candidates meet this requirement (IR exhibit 1.4.d.4). Interviews revealed that the few candidates who score below 20 points are placed on an individualized remediation plan under the supportive guidance of the associate dean and content area faculty.

Through a series of diverse placements in multiple schools (urban, suburban, and rural), candidates consider the school, family, and community contexts to develop meaningful learning experiences. Specifically, results of the KPTP assessment further provide strong evidence of professional knowledge and skills as candidates demonstrate how to use contextual factors in a classroom to design, implement, evaluate, and reflect upon a unit of study. KPTP scores of focus areas B, indicate that candidates understand how to design instructional opportunities that are equitable, based on developmental levels, and adapted to diverse learners (IR exhibit 1.4.d.4, IR addendum exhibit 1.5.3). In interviews, current initial candidates expressed confidence in their abilities to use current educational research findings and assessment data to make and support instructional decisions. Furthermore, they communicated that the unit prepares them to become "modern educators" who remain lifelong learners who incorporate new information into their practice as appropriate.

As explained in the offsite report, candidates' professional knowledge and skills are also evaluated in the clinical experience summative observation form covering domains of assessment, classroom management, instructional planning, instructional implementation, technology, and professionalism. According to the IR Addendum, scale scores represent the average clinical and university supervisor ratings of candidates for each domain, and an average total score is provided as well. All teacher candidates score in the Skilled to Exemplary range on the clinical experience summative observation form (IR exhibits 1.4.f.2; IR Addendum).

Initial candidates are well prepared to focus on student learning in the classroom. Interviews with current candidates and faculty suggested a strong emphasis on differentiating instruction based on students' developmental and academic levels, prior experiences, and contextual factors. Candidates are engaged in multiple school observations and field experiences throughout the programs, culminating in a semester-long student teaching experience. During their student teaching/internship, the candidates in the initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate their ability to assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instructions, and monitor student progress through the KPTP. Examples of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning KPTP sections suggest candidates' ability to focus on student learning and make appropriate instructional decisions based on students' learning and assessment results (IR exhibits 1.4.g.2-1.4.g.7). Interviews suggested that initial candidates feel well

prepared to teach in diverse settings and have a strong understanding of achievement gaps and specific factors that impact student learning.

The unit has a robust system to assess professional dispositions of all candidates (initial and advanced) throughout the program. Upon admission into all programs, all candidates sign a disposition form indicating that they are familiar with the expected professional dispositions and agree that they will be assessed on these dispositions throughout the program (IR exhibits 1.4.e.2, 1.4.e.3, 1.4.e.4). Faculty complete course disposition forms each semester on all candidates. The data from the course disposition forms are used to provide feedback to faculty, candidates, and the unit as candidates progress through the program. A section on professionalism in the clinical experience summative observation forms provides further evidence on dispositions. The Teacher Candidate Course Disposition Assessment (Exhibit 1.4.e.4) presented in the IR for assessment of dispositions by faculty of all candidates consists of a checklist of 30 items arranged in four domains: Research and Best Practices, Content and Pedagogical Knowledge, Professionalism, and Communication Methods (IR exhibits 1.4.e.5, 1.4.f.2, and 1.4.f.3). In interviews, faculty members and academic advisors shared that they frequently emphasize professional dispositions; they model professional behaviors and communicate the message that candidates should conduct themselves as professional educators at all times. Fewer than five percent of candidates fail to meet all expectations. Interviews revealed that candidates who do not meet professional dispositions are placed on an individualized remediation plan under the supportive guidance of the associate dean, academic advisors, and/or content area faculty.

Advanced programs use the Praxis II content exam for each area to measure content knowledge. Pass rates exceeded 97 percent for all areas and programs. The C&I master's program requires that each candidate present an undergraduate cumulative GPA of 3.0 (or 2.75 for provisional status) and evidence of holding or applying for a teaching license in their field. Content and pedagogical content knowledge for advanced and OSP candidates in building leadership, district leadership, adaptive and functional special education, reading specialist, school psychologist, and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) are approved by the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE).

Advanced and OSP programs listed on the Program Assessment Spreadsheet (IR Exhibit 1.4.c.4) indicate that only the Praxis content exam is required for those programs. Praxis content pass rates for 2012-13, were 100 percent for all programs. IR Exhibit 1.4.c.4 also indicates that planning is evaluated for adaptive special education using the IEP Planning Project, for functional special education using the Designing a Student's Educational Program assessment, for ESOL using the Instructional Unit, for reading specialist using the Staffing Data and Plan for Instruction, for school psychologist using the Consultation Cases, for building leadership using the Clinical Supervision/Evaluation Project, and for district leadership using the District Leadership Final Case Study. As described in the offsite report, performance in field experiences are evaluated for all of these programs using specialized rubrics in each area, except for reading specialist, which uses a case study approach.

Content and professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are monitored through cumulative GPA of all cohorts of the C&I master's program as they pass through two required courses. GPAs reported in IR Exhibit 1.4.d.7, p. 4 were as follows: C&T 709 – 3.927, PRE 715 – 3.834. IR Exhibit 1.4.c.14 (NCATE Assessment System for C&I Masters Program) contains a table of contents that lists a rubric for assessing the culminating task for degree; those data appear to be essential for assessing much of that program but were not present in the IR exhibit, as only the table of contents was provided in the IR, but this was corrected in the IR addendum. Additional interviews with candidates, completers, and faculty from this program indicated that a rigorous application of these assessments through exam, thesis, or project is used to sample in-depth content knowledge, pedagogy, and assessment, using individualized prompts developed for each candidate by a collaboration among faculty in the program. Candidates earning less than a passing score on this culminating activity are allowed to redress minor issues and must retake the assessment one semester later if a failing score is assessed (per interviews onsite).

Review of all advanced programs' Assessment 4 (required in KSDE program approval reports) for each of the other school professionals revealed that each of these programs has its own unique way of measuring student learning as reported in the offsite report.

Advanced and OSP dispositions are monitored throughout the program as indicated by IR Addendum 1.5.4. and verified through onsite interviews with candidates, completers, and faculty. About 2/3 of C&I master's candidates return to the classroom each year, and no candidates have been counseled out of the program due to dispositions (IR Addendum).

Eight candidates have been allowed provisional admission with GPAs lower than required. Some of these are resulting from a previous five-year degree program that has transitioned to a four-year program, and others were admitted by petition. All eight of the provisional admissions candidates have completed their program with a 3.0 or greater GPA. (IR Addendum)

In-depth pedagogical and professional knowledge is examined by the culminating activity in the C&I masters program. Candidates have the option of choosing an exam, project, or portfolio format; for the exam, three faculty members collaborate to develop prompts that require in-depth content, content pedagogy, pedagogical and professional knowledge, and student learning. Detailed prompts are provided to ensure depth of response and results are recorded using the rubric provided on p. 12 of IR Addendum Exhibit 1.5.17: NCATE Assessment System for CI Masters Programs, Sept 2014. Onsite interviews provided verification of the rigor with which these assessments are conducted. Candidates who provide weak responses are occasionally allowed to write an addendum, but those failing to pass the activity must register for the exam again a minimum of 90 days later. Additionally, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills are represented in GPAs for two courses.

Only Ed.D. candidates are prepared for leadership roles in P-12 schools. The Ph.D. programs are for preparing researchers for positions in higher education. There are two Ed.D.s currently offered: a new program in the Curriculum and Teaching Department for which there are not yet any completer data and an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership.

All KSDE-approved programs must meet a standard for professionalism within their programs. Interviews onsite with candidates and completers revealed a multitude of professional activities in which candidates and graduates from all ADV and OSP programs engaged throughout their programs and after employment in their new roles. All candidates and graduates interviewed onsite also reported consistently on a high degree of technological proficiency and leadership in the professional community as a result of their work at KU. Interviews with employers verified this finding.

Rubrics and data provided in IR Addendum Exhibit 1.5.14 show a high level of mastery by school psychology candidates on six indicators aligned to state and national standards requiring knowledge and use of school and community resources to support learning and engaging students, families, and communities in program Assessment #3 and #7 in practica and internships.

The e-portfolio is currently being piloted in the C&I master's and school psychology programs, and data are not yet available.

The most recent employer/completer surveys resulted in an insufficient return rate from advanced and OSP completers, and no plan was apparent onsite for improving this issue for future studies. However, onsite interviews revealed that programs stayed in close contact with employing agencies with multiple follow up contacts and advisory functions; and that completers also stayed in touch with the school as evidenced by numerous references in interviews to such contacts initiated by both completers and

program personnel routinely and as a mechanism for problem solving. Various other mechanisms for gaining input from the practicing community are in place within the different programs.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

NA

1.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit is aware of the university's upcoming changes in admission standards and is currently reviewing the potential impact on admission to initial teacher preparation programs. Interviews revealed that faculty seek to ensure that new admission requirements do not adversely, or inadvertently, impact recruitment and retention efforts of minority groups.

All candidates in the unit's initial licensure program now complete the Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) during their student teaching/internship clinical experience (Exhibit 1.4.c.6). This assessment is a state requirement for teacher licensure and provides the initial programs and unit with data about the quality of the unit's teacher preparation program based on what the candidates show they have learned and on their impact on student learning.

As were reported in the IR, the offsite report, and verified through interviews, the following programs refined and/or improved alignment of assessments and rubrics to standards: building leadership, district leadership, ESOL, and functional special education.

As reported in the offsite report, course content and course offerings were revised to better prepare candidates for licensure exams and to include additional use of technology to better align with components of KSDE program standards. Visual arts education created a new course addressing technology: VAE 520, Instructional Technology in Art Education. School psychology implemented electronic portfolios for candidates' annual reviews to streamline its continuous assessment process. E-portfolios will capture candidates' course grades, Praxis II scores, field placement evaluations, class projects, and other assessment items. (Examples cited above from IR Exhibit 2.4.g.2)

1.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Teacher candidates reflect a thorough understanding of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They develop meaningful learning experiences to facilitate learning for all students. They reflect on their practice and make necessary adjustments to enhance student learning. Onsite interviews with faculty, P-12 partners, and current initial candidates revealed evidence of candidates' involvement in professional learning communities and successful completion of course assignments in which candidates plan and implement lessons, assess student learning, and reflect on professional practice. KPTP scores further support candidates'

professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

Candidates in advanced programs for teachers and OSP take on leadership roles in the professional community and collaborate with colleagues to contribute to school improvement and renewal. Onsite interviews of completers from all advanced programs shared multiple examples membership on building leadership teams, equity teams, technology teams, district curriculum teams, development of instruments adopted and used by districts, instructional coaching, development of peer instructional programs at schools, and providing professional development to peers at schools and district-wide.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. ***OR*** There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

1.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

1.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

1.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

1.4 Recommendations

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 2

Standard 2: Assessment System And Unit Evaluation

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

2.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

During the offsite review, the team did not identify any major areas of concern with Standard 2, but sought clarification and additional information in several areas. The information provided in the addendum, combined with onsite interviews, provided sufficient documentation and verification of evidence to support a recommendation of "met" for both initial and advanced programs.

Documents such as the Assessment Task Calendar (Exhibit 2.4.d.2), along with samples of recent assessment reports, showed a clearly articulated assessment system that specifies the roles and responsibilities of SOE faculty and staff to systematically collect, analyze, and review assessment data at both the initial and advanced levels. These data are collected via multiple assessments at the designated transition points of admittance, coursework/knowledge acquisition, field experience, and program completion. Both initial and advanced programs use the same transition points, with key assessments yielding data in four areas: state assessments, planning, field experience, and impact on student learning. Key assessments are linked to the unit's conceptual framework.

Programs at both initial and advanced levels use a number of standardized assessments that have undergone extensive reliability and validity checks at the national or state level, such as Praxis tests and the Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP). Programs have also developed a number of their own assessments (most specific to particular programs), and have adopted a variety of strategies for assuring fairness and reliability. For example, clinical supervisors in the initial program undergo calibration exercises for implementation of the final student teaching evaluation, and then communicate those expectations to cooperating teachers. Such procedures appear somewhat more variable in advanced programs, but rubrics at all levels reflect efforts to achieve clarity and consistency.

Interviews with faculty and staff confirmed that faculty at both unit and program levels, as well as faculty in other divisions who teach candidates in the unit, have been involved in developing and maintaining the assessment system. Interviews with P-12 partners who serve on the Superintendents' Circle advisory group or who work in PDS schools indicated that they are often asked to review and comment on assessment data or to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the KU program. For example, they noted extensive involvement in the recent move to a four-year program from a five-year

program. They described frequent opportunities to interact and share ideas with SOE faculty through a variety of collaborative projects.

In addition to assessment of candidate performance on designated key assessments, the unit also assesses candidate dispositions at both initial and advanced levels and conducts follow-up surveys of graduates. Follow-up data include results of the Educational Benchmarks, Inc. (EBI) exit survey, alumni survey, and a recent Kansas Educator Employer and Alumni Survey. For advanced programs, these efforts have been less helpful because of relatively low numbers and/or limitations in the instruments.

Data are collected through the unit's in-house platform, InSite, which tracks candidate enrollment and progress, as well as outcome-based assessment information. During the onsite visit, the assessment coordinator demonstrated use of this system, which allows entry of data from assessments in each program, as well as easy importation of data from the larger university data system and from external sources (e.g., State Department of Education and testing companies). The InSite system not only serves as a repository for information, but also generates reports incorporating a wide variety of data. It can aggregate assessment results across programs, as well as disaggregating by program. It includes data from application though completion, as well as follow-up surveys, and collects data from candidates, faculty, and P-12 educators. The InSite system is maintained by the assessment coordinator, but is also accessible to faculty upon request.

The unit maintains a detailed calendar that identifies responsibilities and timelines for collecting, analyzing, and sharing assessment results. The unit has an assessment committee that does not have formal governance authority, but monitors and supports assessment activities. Onsite interviews also explained the role of designated "data stewards" in each program who help faculty understand and implement assessment issues.

The unit provided extensive information on university and unit grievance processes, which include policies covering grievances, academic misconduct, and appeals of denial for admission to student teaching. The unit also maintains a file of well documented candidate complaints that was reviewed by the team during the visit. A designated SOE administrator is responsible for maintaining the file and is also involved in supporting and consulting with faculty and staff involved in such complaints.

Interviews with SOE faculty and administrators confirmed that assessment data are regularly reviewed, analyzed, and used for program improvement in all programs at the initial and advanced levels. As outlined in the Assessment Task Calendar, programs semi-annually send program assessment data to the assessment coordinator, who compiles them with unit-wide assessment results such as Praxis tests and KPTP and shares them with programs. Program staff then prepare an annual assessment report that is sent to the assessment coordinator and used as the basis for the unit assessment report. The program reports include the program's analysis and interpretation of assessment results, as well as changes or proposed changes deemed necessary. The Teacher Education Committee then synthesizes the program reports into a unit report that is then shared with faculty. Program reports consistently showed changes being considered or implemented as a result of assessment data. For example, in 2013 the health and physical education program responded to inconsistent content test scores related to understanding of motor development by retooling an existing course to give greater emphasis to developmental issues. Similarly, the elementary education program noted room for improvement in the Reflective Practitioner portion of the Principles of Learning and Teaching exam, and recommended more opportunities for guided reflection in field experience placements. The team reviewed multiple examples of program reports and found systematic consideration of the implications of assessment data, as well as reflections on possible issues with the assessment instruments.

As noted earlier, P-12 partners indicated that the unit shared assessment data and actively solicited feedback on program effectiveness and were able to cite multiple specific examples of the unit's

openness to change and responsiveness to suggestions.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

NA

2.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Since the previous visit, the unit has developed systematic procedures for assuring that data from key assessments are reviewed, analyzed, and used for program improvement, and has developed an in-house comprehensive data management system that integrates data from multiple sources, including other university databases and the Kansas State Department of Education. Documentation provided by the unit showing regular collection and use of assessment data was confirmed by interviews with unit faculty and P-12 partners.

The unit has also revised its assessment system to align with recent changes in Kansas state assessment expectations, particularly the Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio.

Additionally, the unit has strengthened its process for assessing dispositions, with enhanced procedures for collecting faculty judgments of candidate dispositions, and clearer communication to candidates about the expectations.

Currently, the unit is reviewing its PDS program to determine the impact of the move to a four-year program and make any necessary adjustments.

2.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

The unit has designed, developed, and fully implemented new information technology in the form of its InSite data platform. As described above, this platform facilitates easy compilation, aggregation, analysis, and reporting of all key assessments. It provides flexible support for faculty use of data, ranging from simple compilation to generation of customized reports. The assessment coordinator and members of the assessment committee, along with data stewards in each program, can provide help to faculty in need of assistance in using the platform.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the

| demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.

AND

There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.

OR

There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

[BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.] | unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.

AND

There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. | unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.

AND

There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. |

2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Although programs are involved in the collection of data, the unit does not systematically evaluate those data for unit improvements. (INIT, ADV)	The unit has systematic procedures for assuring that data from key assessments are reviewed, analyzed, and used for program improvement.

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

2.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

2.4 Recommendations

For Standard 2

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 3

Standard 3: Field Experiences And Clinical Practice

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

3.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

During the offsite review, the team identified a number of questions requiring clarification or additional information. Additional documentation provided in the IR addendum or during the visit, combined with onsite interviews, fully answered these questions.

For initial programs, both unit and school-based faculty are involved in designing, implementing, and evaluating the programs in the unit. Specifically, stakeholders share expertise and integrate resources to support candidate learning. School based faculty reported that they are regularly asked for input in regards to program components including field and clinical experiences. Unit faculty provide professional development to participating schools and view stakeholders as valued partners in creating the most successful programs for candidates.

Initial candidates participate in both field and clinical experiences prior to completion of the education program. Candidates begin classroom observations as early as their freshmen year in C&T 100 (Introduction to the Education Profession). During the sophomore year, all candidates participate in field experiences through C&T 235 (Multicultural Education) at inner city or diverse schools. Other field experience requirements are dependent on their program of study. For example, elementary education candidates complete a literacy practicum along with co-teaching experience for math, science, and social studies. Candidates working toward middle school or high school certification complete field experiences in their specific content areas. All candidates complete a student teaching assignment. Elementary candidates complete 8-10 weeks during the fall semester and an additional 16 weeks with a different grade level at a different school during the spring semester. Candidates in the secondary program complete an advanced practicum in the fall while completing their content requirements and student teaching in the spring semester of their senior year.

Field experiences vary by course and content area. Course faculty design field experience requirements and work with the field experience director to identify specific placements. Faculty evaluate candidates during the field experiences and use the evaluation results as a portion of the overall course grade. The field experience director works with the coordinators from each program to coordinate placement options for candidates preparing for student teaching and tracks the placements of all candidates throughout their entire time in the program (initial and advanced). The director ensures that placements are not duplicated in terms of location, grade level, or type of student population. These data are compiled into a "field experience transcript" for each candidate. Interview data along with a demonstration of the data collection system verified information presented in the IR.

Initial candidates are evaluated formally three times during the student teaching experience. Evaluations are conducted by both the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. Summative evaluation data are submitted electronically to the database managed by the field experiences director. This data is also uploaded to InSite, the unit's assessment system. University supervisors shared that they also provide journal topics each week that candidates must reflect on and respond based on experiences they have had in their classroom placement. The journals are submitted electronically for review and allow the university supervisors to have weekly contact with each candidate.

Assessment data, along with interviews with principals and cooperating teachers, confirm that

candidates are very well prepared in the areas of content knowledge, skills, and dispositions prior to student teaching. Many cooperating teachers and principals indicated that candidates from the unit were more prepared in these areas than candidates from other institutions who were also completing student teaching at the same school. Forty percent of the candidates choose to participate with the Professional Development Schools (PDS). Data revealed that PDS schools are rich in diversity in staff, students, and the community. All candidates are continually evaluated on their abilities to work with all type of learners using both formative and summative tools.

For advanced programs, the unit and other members of the professional community evaluate field and clinical experiences. The P-12 partners meet regularly to discuss program components, review data, and evaluate field/clinical experiences.

Advanced candidates in areas other than educational leadership complete field and clinical experiences as developed by their individual programs. Candidates are empowered to select sites for field and clinical experiences based on their individual needs and career interests. Current advanced candidates described that they were able to plan the sequence of course work and field experiences individually rather than everyone having the same courses and field experiences at the same time.

Advanced candidates in the educational leadership programs do not complete field experiences prior to their clinical experience (the unit refers to this as an internship). Principals and supervisors confirmed through interviews that candidates are assessed throughout their two-year internship (a minimum of 240 hours) with the use of both formative and summative tools. The intern supervisor and university supervisor provide both formative and summative feedback to the candidates. Weekly conferences are held between the candidate and the intern supervisor. Feedback is verbal and formative in nature. Summative feedback is provided using a 1-5 scale and candidates must score 3 or higher in all areas to successfully complete their internship. Data are submitted electronically to the assessment coordinator. The assessment coordinator compiles reports for faculty depicting various types of data from summative evaluations of the candidates. These data show a mean overall mastery score of 4.5 among advanced candidates in the educational leadership program.

Each advanced program has a faculty member who is in charge of placing advanced candidates for clinical practice (internship). Advanced candidates are often placed at the same location in which they are employed. However, there have been a few candidates who have worked full-time alongside their intern supervisor to complete the internship requirement. Current advanced candidates and the placement coordinator for the Special Education Department confirmed that advanced candidates in the online programs have the same field and clinical practice experiences that are required for candidates completing the program on campus.

Advanced candidates who are completing their internship are required to spend time at schools with varying student populations and/or grade levels. Since advanced candidates are employed at the same location as their practicum assignment, school faculty and intern supervisors work together to provide opportunities for candidates to work with diverse populations throughout the two-year internship.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

NA

3.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Stakeholders are involved in the evaluation of the field experiences program. School-based partners have been working with unit faculty to discuss the expectations of the co-teaching model in the P-12 schools so that unit curriculum could be adjusted to match current models. Specifically, special education is working on developing a tiered support model in which teachers and candidates were trained together on effective co-teaching models and how to adjust curriculum for various tiers of student performance in any classroom.

Cooperating teachers noted an increase in communication from university supervisors over the last few years. Continuity with university supervisor assignments along with weekly communication has been helpful to create a true partnership in working and evaluating teacher candidates. Cooperating teachers and advanced program internship supervisors feel valued as members of the College of Education team and now attend orientation with candidates prior to student teaching. Cooperating teachers and principals expressed concern that candidates were not beginning practicum experiences early enough in their programs. As a result of this input, some programs have added practicum components in addition to the ones during freshmen and sophomore years. Candidates expressed that they were pleased to see the number of hours in the classrooms increase prior to student teaching.

The unit has recently adjusted its education programs to be completed in four years rather than five. At first, cooperating teachers were concerned about this change but have since discovered that the quality of the candidates has remained consistently high and candidates are prepared to handle a more demanding caseload. Stakeholders were involved in the planning process so as to develop ownership along with the unit. Partners were asked if candidates were lacking any specific skills or if there were any skills that already appeared to be mastered. The unit was very receptive to this feedback and utilized this information when redesigning content requirements for unit programs. Partners agreed that despite early concerns, the new program aligns field experiences more appropriately with content being taught during a specific term.

Educational leadership faculty are aware that even though diversity standards are being taught in the program courses, more opportunities need to be developed for advanced candidates to implement the standards being taught. Unit faculty are working with principals and superintendents to plan more opportunities for diverse experiences while completing the internship. One noted change was the adjustment of the requirements of the action research projects to include issues that are not observed in candidates' current place of employment. This could be within a different type of classroom, with a diverse group of students, or even at a neighboring school.

3.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Both unit and school-based faculty are involved in designing, implementing, and evaluating the unit's initial program for candidates. The PDS council meets quarterly to discuss field experiences, clinical practice, and program planning. School-based faculty cited more than one instance in which suggestions were made at council meetings which were later implemented in program revisions. One suggestion was that candidates completing student teaching were following the institution's calendar for holidays and other days off. It was difficult for the schools, and they recommended that candidates follow the school calendar during the semester in which they were completing their student teaching. Another instance

was when the unit was adjusting the length of the program of study from five years to four. Cooperating teachers, principals, and supervisors all came to together to agree on some of the final field and clinical experiences requirements in the newly designed model. Stakeholders were interviewed and expressed that they felt that their input was valued by the unit. This partnership was described by stakeholders as collaborative in nature and truly a team effort to develop the best program to effectively prepare candidates.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. **_AND_** There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. **_OR_** There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. **_AND_** There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. **_AND_** There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

3.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

3.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

3.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

3.4 Recommendations

For Standard 3

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 4

Standard 4: Diversity

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

4.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Evidence provided in the IR and IR addendum indicated, and the onsite visit confirmed, that the School of Education (SOE) has operationalized its commitment to design, implement, and evaluate experiences that prepare candidates to work with students and faculty from diverse populations. Interviews, school visits, and document reviews conducted during the onsite visit evidenced the numerous and deliberative efforts to structure the curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practice placements in ways intended to develop teacher candidates who possess the capacity to demonstrate and apply the clearly articulated proficiencies related to diversity at the initial and advanced levels.

Six questions and two areas of concern were raised during the offsite visit in relation to diversity and each were addressed by the IR addendum or supplementary documentation and later triangulated through school visits and interviews conducted during the onsite visit. While the SOE is forthright in recognizing the need to continue efforts to advance its work on matters of diversity in general and providing opportunities for candidates to work with other candidates and faculty from diverse populations more specifically, what follows is a brief discussion which serves to demonstrate how the SOE continues to meet Standard Four.

The curriculum is designed to offer a large number of diversity components and the SOE clearly articulates proficiencies related to diversity through the three themes of their conceptual framework, ten knowledge proficiencies, nine skills proficiencies, and four dispositions. Exhibit 4.5.2 provides a detailed matrix of curriculum components and experiences that address diversity themes and are aligned with candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The IR appeared to have several different sets of diversity proficiencies, and relationship among the proficiencies was not immediately apparent. However, information provided in the IR addendum clarified that the proficiencies were organized based on diversity proficiencies related to knowledge, skills, and dispositions separately. The proficiencies are also provided by programs and themes and according to the different sets of educator preparation standards that must be addressed in the state of Kansas.

Interviews with core faculty and candidates confirmed that all undergraduate candidates are required to take the following courses with diversity components: C&T 235: Multicultural Education, ELPS 250: Education and Society, C&T 330 Instructional Approaches for ESOL Learners, SPED 326: Teaching Exceptional Children and Youth , and SPED 506 Advanced Practices for Children with Disabilities. Additionally, there are programs that require additional preparation regarding diversity just as indicated in the IR.

Given the nature of the graduate programs offered by the SOE, there are no specific courses required across all advanced programs. However, interviews with the faculty of advanced programs confirmed that all programs with the exception of the school psychology have professionalism standards that explicitly convey the expectation of candidates to effectively educate all students. The school psychology program has a standard related to life-long learning, and many of its standards discuss ethics that require a disposition toward equity. A comprehensive listing of the advanced professionalism standards can be found in exhibit 1.5.12.

Demographically, advanced programs collectively reflect a slightly more diverse population of candidates with 87.8 percent of non-minority candidates at the initial level and 82.4 percent of non-minority candidates at the advanced level. Exhibit 4.4.e.2 provides the data disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender. The expansion of hybrid or blended class offerings, the ability to continue employment, and opportunities to engage in action research and practicums at their place of employment have made the programs more accessible and have helped to diversify enrollment, according to comments shared during faculty interviews.

Systematic efforts to ensure candidates have opportunities to apply their content knowledge in diverse field placements are very well documented across programs at the initial level and for the majority of programs at the advanced level. Interviews with the field placement coordinator, candidates, core faculty, and P-12 partners confirmed great care is taken to ensure that candidates are placed in multiple and diverse settings. Spreadsheets delineating the various types of placements and hours completed by initial candidates were readily available and reviewed by BOE members to confirm ample opportunities for placements in rural, suburban, and urban settings with varying ranges of diversity in terms of socio-economic status, race and ethnicity, English Language Learners, and students with exceptionalities. Conversations with school and district-level administrators revealed that candidates from the SOE are very well received in area schools. One principal offered that teachers who are initially hesitant to take on a practicum students often ask "Where are they from?" Once it is shared the candidate is from the institution and SOE, the response changes immediately. Candidates from the unit are highly sought after for placements and hiring. This was attributed to the numerous practicum and filed experiences afforded to candidates throughout their programs which have aided in advancing their collegiality and professionalism.

While there are numerous opportunities to engage with P-12 students from diverse backgrounds, the SOE acknowledges continued efforts are needed to provide opportunities for candidates to work with diverse faculty and the unit has aggressively begun that work. During the onsite visit, the dean provided an introduction to the institution and the unit that addressed the progress and implementation of the diversity initiatives identified in the strategic plan entitled Advancing an SOE Diversity and Equity Agenda. A list of eleven retreats, workshops, and presentations were highlighted during the introduction, and several faculty members frequently referenced the knowledge and skills gained from their participation in many of the offerings. The following is a representative list of the range and scope of professional development opportunities provided and areas of diversity addressed:

• Faculty and Staff Retreat –focusing on culture and diversity led by Shaun Harper, University of Pennsylvania (approximately 80 participants)
• Working with transgender students (approximately 55 participants)

• "Life, Work and Learning at KU with a Disability" (approximately 35 participants)
• Co-sponsor –Brown v. Board of Education 60th Anniversary conference with Dr. Lee Bollinger as keynote presenter (80+ participants across KU)
• "Excellence vs. Access: Real Talk about Race and Racism" Terrell Strayhorn, Ohio State University (approximately 100 participants
• SOE Town Hall Meeting: Sexual Assault on Campus (approximately 35 participants)

In addition to providing professional development to current faculty, the unit has worked closely with the Office of Human Resources to advance its effort to recruit and retain more faculty from diverse backgrounds. Exhibit 4.4.d in the IR indicates the percentage of minority faculty among the professional education faculty in the SOE is minimal and additional efforts may be necessary. At the undergraduate level, 3.7 percent of faculty are African-American with no other minority groups represented, and 5.9 percent of faculty are Asian with representation from no other minority groups at the advanced level. Interviews with the Multicultural Committee provided specific examples of efforts to increase diversity during recent searches. One faculty member offered an example of an instance when minority candidates were sought in an effort to hire faculty and staff who more closely reflected the backgrounds of candidates served. A high quality minority candidate was identified and offered the position, but did not accept due to familial constraints. Despite those examples, the committee acknowledged that increased efforts are needed. To that end, the SOE continues to follow the policies and procedures specified by the Hiring for Excellence program and utilize the resources such as publications and websites with emphases on minority populations. Moreover, the institution has hired a new provost for equity and diversity. One of the chief responsibilities of this position is to support diverse faculty when they are hired.

Similar challenges related to developing a diverse faculty apply to increasing diversity among candidates. Because the demographics for the state and institution reflect small percentages of minority populations, recruitment of such candidates poses great challenges that will continue to require committed resources and efforts from the unit. As the development and implementation of the strategic plan corroborates, the SOE has clearly made this commitment, and several efforts are underway. Given the circumstances, retaining candidates from diverse backgrounds becomes increasingly important. Programs such as the Multicultural Scholars Program offer academic and cultural support for minority recruits. The UKAN Teach program leverages many resources to prepare STEM educators and effort to recruit and support underrepresented populations in STEM are a priority. There are also several support services at the institutional level to support international students, English language learners, and students with exceptionalism that are available to teacher candidates as well.

Despite the challenges, it is important to note 2013-2014 data from the 2013 administration of the NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) indicate fifty-seven percent of senior students reported that their experience "quite a bit" or "very much" contributed to their understanding of people from other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, religious, nation, etc.), and more specific to the SOE candidates, data from the 2013-2014 administration of the 2014 The Educational Benchmarking Survey (EBI) revealed 81 percent of respondents felt the SOE is committed to creating a climate that values students, regardless of race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, political ideologies, religious views, etc. Eighty-one percent of respondents indicated they believe that the program's faculty members were knowledgeable and sensitive to ways to prepare them to work with diverse groups that include individuals with exceptionalities.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

NA

4.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

A number of continuous improvement efforts are evident. A well articulated and promulgated Diversity Agenda has been put forward at both the institutional and unit levels, as evidenced by the document "Bold Inspirations" from the Office of the Provost and the SOE strategic plan which detail the numerous diversity efforts undertaken. The commitment to increase diversity has already begun to show signs of promise. There has been a newly established position and appointment of a vice provost for diversity and equity and according to the E-newsletter, Provost E-news – Shaping a Vision of Diversity, "the entering class of first-time frosh grew 2.1 percent to 4,084 and was the most diverse on record, comprising 23 percent minorities." To advance its diversity agenda, he SOE has contracted with Eduventures annually to conduct a follow-up study on the perceptions of diversity preparedness of candidates upon the completion of student teaching. The data are analyzed to identify trends in responses and were used to inform the work of Multicultural committee.

Additionally, the curriculum continues to be revised based on continuous and extensive curriculum mapping and revisions to identify strength and address weaknesses in relation to diversity. Item analyses of assessments such as the Teacher Observation Instrument have been developed and amended to include diversity proficiencies in instructional planning, instructional implementation and professionalism to provide clear data on candidate effectiveness in providing instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners. Several candidates shared that, while they are keenly aware that they are assessed annually on dispositions regarding diversity and the SOE reserves the right to dismiss them from the program if they do not display expected dispositions, they felt their respective programs are more than preparing them to be effective in meeting the instructional needs of all students.

4.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

NA

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. ***AND***	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. ***OR*** There are plans and	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are plans and	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are plans and

There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

4.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

4.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

4.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

4.4 Recommendations

For Standard 4

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 5

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance And Development

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

5.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Evidence presented in the IR addendum and responses to onsite visit questions answered questions posed in the offsite report and verified information in the IR, providing clear evidence of faculty qualifications, performance, and development.

Evidence clearly indicates that the education faculty members are highly qualified. Eighty-four faculty members hold doctorates, one has an LL.M, and six have master's degrees. Documentation shows that faculty members have experience in the area they teach or supervise and content faculty hold licenses in areas in which they teach and supervise. In addition, 100 percent of clinical faculty hold a current teaching license and have teaching experience in the areas they supervise. Faculty members conduct meaningful, scholarly research in effective teaching strategies in their areas, which are infused in their courses. For example, members of the Teacher Education Committee shared descriptions of research in areas such as art, early childhood, special education, music, math, and technology. As a result, faculty noted changes in candidate thinking, decision making, problem solving, technology use, and classroom management skills. Clinical faculty members who work with candidates have teaching experience and competence in the areas they supervise and are selected for their expertise. The UKanTeach initiative exemplifies this concept through the collaboration between master teachers from the SOE and from the districts with whom candidates work.

Evidence gathered during onsite interviews with faculty, candidates, P-12 partners and school administrators indicate that faculty model best professional practices in their teaching and collaboration. They focus research on innovative teaching practices in their content areas and implement findings in their courses to model effective teaching practice. Candidates incorporate these practices in their field experiences and reflect upon the results of the strategy. Courses are aligned with professional and state standards and with the conceptual framework and are evaluated with multiple assessments to determine that standards are met. Data from these assessments are used to improve practice. One example of modeling described during the onsite visit was the UKanTeach initiative, in which faculty model using inquiry for candidates who are math and science majors. Candidates then implement these strategies during their student teaching experience. In addition, faculty described how they use assessment data to revise curricula and adjust teaching in art, early childhood, special education, and music. The unit's P-12 partners also noted that KU candidates have experienced and are fully versed in collaborative approaches, enabling them to participate productively in professional learning communities. The unit has made a focused effort to address and infuse diversity and technology into their courses, field experiences, and clinical practice as shown by their syllabi. Faculty model a variety of technology, such as TeachLivE, in their courses. Faculty members are active in national, state, and local professional organizations in which they serve as leaders and are recognized for excellence in the university and by the candidates, as shown through interviews and evaluations.

Onsite interviews verified documentation in the IR, presenting clear evidence that professional faculty demonstrate scholarly work related to teaching, learning, and their content areas. The unit defines its mission in the conceptual framework as research and best practice, content and pedagogical knowledge, and professionalism. These concepts drive the inquiry and research of faculty, which focus on innovative educational practices. Through their research, faculty determine the effectiveness of the strategies they study and infuse effective teaching methods in their practice. During onsite interviews, for example, one math faculty member described a framework developed as the outcome of a study about strategies secondary students use to solve math problems. This framework is shared with candidates in class through demonstration and discussion; candidates in turn share it with their students in the field and assess results. All professional faculty members conduct extensive scholarly activities, including a wide variety of presentations at local, state, and national educational organizations. In addition, digital copies of faculty professional writing in refereed journals, book chapters, and books verify scholarship in the content areas they teach and supervise, as well as expertise in teaching and learning.

Faculty members provide service to professional organizations, university, school, and department as active participants in the development and implementation of instructional programs. For example, they serve on local, state, and national committees and in professional organizations, donating time as officers, members of committees and editorial boards, and editors of professional publications. At the university level, they are active in a number of committees; most recently faculty were active in the development of the university-wide Core Initiative establishing core content across the university. At the unit level, SOE faculty collaborated with stakeholders and worked together to transform the previous five-year program into the current four-year design. Faculty members actively collaborate with P-12 practitioners through the multiple field experiences of candidates and through additional efforts such as the UKanTeach initiative.

The unit's evaluation process is systematic and comprehensive. All faculty members submit an annual report, which must include examples of scholarship, service, and modeling professional practice. The evaluation reports additional data such as faculty collaboration and contributions to the profession, which can include a variety of documentation such as submission of grants, leadership roles, and research activities. The evaluation process includes an analysis of progress on goals set the previous year as well as the development of goals for the coming year based upon the results of the evaluation. Completed evaluations are submitted to either the department chair, or in some departments, to the Personnel Committee, which is elected by faculty from the department. The committee and/or chair review the evaluation and write a letter of response, which is shared with the faculty member. The evaluation then is submitted to the dean, who summarizes and shares the results with faculty to determine ways to improve the process.

The unit has both policies and practices that provide varied professional development to create a community of scholars. The process of continuous learning begins when faculty enter the unit. A professional education faculty member is assigned as a mentor to the new hire for three years too offer support in areas of scholarship, service, and professional practice, components of the evaluation process. To facilitate learning, the unit provides professional development aligned with the unit mission and subsequent focus. For example, to address the goal to use technology as both a teaching and modeling tool, the unit presents focused professional development throughout the year such as a summer technology camp, a conference on technology, and training in the use of available technology such as iPads. Micro-aggression training and a sexual orientation awareness workshop are two examples of professional development to address diversity, which is another unit focus. Both the unit and university, through KU Center for Teaching and other centers, provide additional learning opportunities focusing on teaching and inquiry, which feature renowned scholars, symposiums, conferences, and seminars throughout the year. In addition to faculty, area practitioners participate in these experiences, thus extending the learning community. Each department allocates funds for professional development, presentations, and conferences, which provide incentive to continue scholarly work. Faculty present professional development for P-12 faculty on the local, state, and national levels; of note is the Co-Teaching and Collaboration initiative with Professional Development School partners.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

5.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Clear and convincing evidence presented by the unit and verified during the onsite visit demonstrates the high qualifications of professional education faculty. Data included in the IR, addendum, and during the onsite visit provide examples of faculty education, expertise, and scholarship. In addition, all clinical faculty, including both higher education and school, are licensed educators, have experience in the areas they teach or supervise, and are selected for their expertise.

Responses from onsite interviews verified that faculty model best professional practices in their teaching. Faculty incorporate results of their research, which is focused on teaching practices, in their courses to model best practices. Faculty use multiple assessments to assess candidate performance and progress toward meeting the standards for improvement of practice. Faculty members actively participate in national, state, and local professional organizations, receiving honors for their expertise and contributions.

Inquiry and research efforts of all faculty, which focus on innovative educational practices, are aligned to the unit mission described in the CF. Through their research, faculty study the effectiveness of the strategies and incorporate these teaching approaches in their instruction. Results of faculty research are also disseminated to the educational community through presentations and writing, such as articles, book chapters, and books.

Faculty members provide service to professional organizations, university, school, department and P-12 schools as active participants in the development and implementation of instructional programs. At each level, faculty members serve as committee members, officers, editors, and/or board members. As collaborators in such roles, they contribute to the design and delivery of instruction through participation in the community of learners.

The unit's evaluation process is systematic and comprehensive. Annually, all faculty members include documentation on their evaluation showing their teaching, scholarship, service, collaboration and leadership. Following review, faculty members individually meet with the department chair to review progress on previous goals and establish goals for the upcoming year. Finally, the dean summarizes results to share with the faculty for improvement of the process.

Unit policies and practices provide varied and intentional professional development to create a community of scholars. A professional education faculty member is assigned as a mentor to each new faculty member to assist with progress on the unit evaluation components. Throughout the year, the unit and institution provide learning opportunities focused on unit goals and faculty needs to support continuous learning.

5.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

NA

5.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

NA

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET	AT TARGET

	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. <center>***AND***</center> There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. <center>***OR***</center> There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. <center>***AND***</center> There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. <center>***AND***</center> There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

5.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

5.4 Recommendations

For Standard 5

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	At Target (attained)
Advanced Preparation	At Target (attained)

Standard 6

Standard 6: Unit Governance And Resources

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

6.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit at the University of Kansas is the School of Education (SOE), led by the dean, assisted by the associate dean for undergraduate programs and teacher education, and the associate dean for graduate programs and research. The dean is supported by an assistant dean and an administrative assistant. There are five departments, each with a chair. The School Code defines procedures for governance and policy-making within the school. There are several advisory councils under the purview of the dean, all clearly detailed in the IR and supporting documents. Two of the major advisory councils in place for governance are the Teacher Education Committee (TEC), which has jurisdiction over decisions related to the undergraduate teacher education programs, and the Educator Preparation Program Advisory Council (EPPAC), which coordinates collaboration and participation of faculty and other personnel in Departments within the School and across the University that (1) contribute to any Educator Preparation Program, and/or (2) provide service and support to P-12 schools.

Programs for teacher education involve departments in four schools/colleges, including the SOE, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the Department of Visual Arts for art education, and the School of Music for music education. Information regarding degree programs is readily available to candidates, both from the Academic Advising Office as well as from informational flyers (provided in exhibits 6.4.e.2-6.4.e.8). Academic calendars are provided online, as are all the unit's other publications including catalogs, information regarding grading policies, and counseling services.

The mechanisms for leadership are clearly delineated in the policy structure and include collaboration with colleagues from other units and the P-12 partners. Faculty commented in interviews that if an issue that comes up where they feel something needs to be changed they can be part of the process for that change.

The institution now uses an "all funds budget model" that allows for looking at budgets and pulling up information differently than when this report was initially prepared and exhibits were structured. Since the offsite review, the team acquired additional information on allocations of student tuition dollars and fees that resolved initial questions. The information regarding endowment dollars and how those funds are allocated and spent was also more clearly explained. IR 6.4.f Table 3 indicates that the dollars dedicated to research expenditures have increased each year. IR 6.4.f Table 4 details base budgets by department (state-funded). The same is true for faculty/staff FTE; SOE FTE is higher than four of those it is compared to and lower than one. However, with regard to dollars generated per FTE, SOE generates a higher total of dollars than three of the comparison schools/colleges, and lower than two of those used as a comparison. The Schools of Business and Law were excluded from this comparison as they were more highly paid professional schools. This allocation of dollars is felt by unit administrators to be consistent with other like units on campus, and thus is equitable funding for the unit.

The unit also receives funding (IR 6.4.f Table 2), dedicated to student scholarships. As indicated in the IR, KU is involved in an eight-year major capital campaign through spring 2016, with the SOE target being $12,000,000. The target has been met, with two years remaining, with an endowment of approximately $17, 285,000, with unrestricted expendable funds totaling $470,473. In addition to these

dollars, the SOE has approximately $2.3 million in indirect cost recovery funds. As reported earlier, Table 3 delineates the research expenditures by SOE faculty, affiliated faculty and education-related research centers. In FY13 research expenditures per tenure-track faculty in the SOE was $299,661, above the university average and second highest among all KU schools and colleges. One additional small source of SOE funding reported in FY14 was a total of $325,000, generated through activities, publications, application fees, etc. Each department has a base budget allocated from state funds supplemented by the dean's office and any grant or other dollars the department raises. There is also a small development account and funds from fees and other revenues.

The SOE initiated two programs to support faculty research and teaching. The research support program has $200,000 provided each year to support grant development, summer sabbatical, summer writing, grant proposal development, and professional development support, and on-line/distance education course development. Funding for part-time faculty is negotiated by department chairs with the dean in annual budget negotiations. Departments are able to prioritize needs and then go to the dean to negotiate their budgets.

Faculty workload follows university expectation. Teaching is equated to four three-credit hour courses per academic year. The faculty workload assignment is the responsibility of the department chair, and the assignment takes place in the spring semester for the following academic year, in consultation with the faculty member following the annual performance review. In trying to keep the process transparent, at each step the faculty member is allowed to respond to the comments that have been made regarding the performance.

Department chairs were not clear that there was a structured policy in place for annual review of lecturers or professors of the practice (non-tenure track senior faculty with a full-time appointment in both teaching and service), although the paperwork associated with the evaluation of lecturer, multi-term lecturer, and professor of the practice is very definitive (as is noted in Supplemental Information Requested during the Onsite Visit Sources tab on the KU Accreditation web site, under "Professor of the Practice and Multi-Term Lecturer Forms."). Two of the department heads indicated they do an annual review of those faculty the same way they review tenure-track faculty; another department head indicated there are forms the person must fill out for the review.

Teaching and research assignments can be adjusted within the guidelines of the policy, but alterations must be approved by the department chair and the dean (see IR exhibit 6.4.h.1 for specifics). There is a Salary Savings Incentive Policy, which rewards faculty with merit pay for exceptional performance in research, teaching, and service.

The unit is housed in three buildings. The Health, Sport, and Exercise Sciences department is housed in the Robinson Center; the Edwards campus is housed in Overland Park, KS; and the main education building, Joseph R. Pearson Hall (JRP), houses the remaining departments of C&T, ELPS, PRE, SPED, and two research institutes. The Robinson Center is considered adequate by university standards. The Edwards campus, as reported in the IR, is modern, with numerous rooms available for instruction. JRP, a renovated dormitory, is more modern and houses offices, classrooms, conference rooms, meeting room, and library space. There are 31 instructional rooms for the SOE on the Lawrence campus. The space that is available for candidates and faculty to work in is ample, with opportunities for a variety of spaces that support alternative settings for teaching and cooperative learning.

Standard technology in each SOE instructional space includes a computer, a projector/screen, document projector, and a VHS/DVD/CD player. Several rooms also have Apple TV. Three rooms in JRP can handle video conferencing. Two rooms have Promethean Boards and a mobile Smart Board is available. Wireless broadband is available throughout the SOE. The TeachLive lab, used for the avatar technology, is housed in a dedicated room. JRP has a computer classroom with 41 iMac computers with iOS and

Windows capability and a computer laboratory within the Learning Resource Center (LRC) with 18 iMacs. Robinson houses a computer lab with 15 Windows computers. There are large plasma TVs in each building announcing SOE information. All SOE offices are equipped with computers/monitors with access to multiple function printers.

The LRC houses all library resources and technology. The resources in the library are extensive, with additional materials being added. The experimental collaboration space, the "sandbox," supports assistive technologies and various supportive services for faculty, staff and candidates. The technology help desk staff are in the LRC and are extremely helpful to faculty and candidates, as reported by KU faculty and candidates, often assisting with problems that having nothing to do with coursework.

The unit uses Blackboard as its instructional platform. There is no additional information in the IR regarding additional technology used for budgeting. It was mentioned that there may be the potential for a Microsoft product tied to Microsoft Office that will be brought online that will allow candidates to collaborate without having to use the Sandbox; it is not clear when or if this will take place, or if it is just in the talking stages.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

6.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

NA

6.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

In 2009, the SOE moved to a state-developed teacher performance assessment for pre-service candidates. KU was one of the pilot sites for developing the new portfolio assessment, the Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP), and determining the state cut score for licensure. Additionally, the UKan Teach math and science education initiative has been fully institutionalized. It was initially funded by external funding, but is now paid for by the institution. Results of this initiative were discussed at many meetings; it appears to be very successful.

In 2013, KU defined a set of core educational goals that were integrated into all degrees and majors; this, in turn, impacted the various educator preparation programs by requiring that each program determine which courses would meet both the KU core learning outcomes and state licensure requirements.

In 2008, a centralized Undergraduate Advising Center was created in response to feedback from faculty and students on EBI surveys. This center relieves faculty of the time burden of undergraduate advising and provides undergraduates with consistent up-to-date advising information. The advising center provides information to students, has staff available to work with students, and provides services to students when needed.

Program quality has been improved through articulation agreements with school districts accepting KU

student teachers and interns. The affiliation agreement was patterned after those of other state institution, reviewed by the KU counsel's office, and piloted by several participating school districts before being fully implemented. In like manner, the PDS model was revised and expanded around a co-teaching model with participating schools. One PDS, Argentine Middle School, has developed a very clearly defined set of guidelines they present to PDS candidates when they come to the school; these are patterned after the KU handbook, but also mirror the school's Teacher Handbook.

The organizational structure of the SOE was reviewed, and the recommendation was made to change it from a committee of the whole model to a Committee for Academic Programs and Curriculum (CAPC). Part of the strategic planning process included a climate survey in 2013, out of which came a five-year diversity agenda for the school, tasked to the Multicultural Committee. The TEC was formed, as well as the EPPAC. The TEC has become a very active group, with many members who have served for a number of years. They consider their role to be very important in the function of the teacher education program, particularly as they represent more than SOE programs (based on conversations with TEC members on Monday morning).

A substantial fiscal commitment has been made to support technology and its academic application. To this end there is a research agenda being developed related to online instruction, with several facets. First, iPads were provided to all faculty beginning in 2012 (now all new faculty receive an iPad). Beginning in summer 2012 there was a two-day summer tech camp that is repeated each year. Faculty are paid $500 to attend the workshop, and they must participate in monthly user groups during the year.

The SOE has developed a distance education program to provide faculty financial support for creating online or hybrid courses. In 2013, $106,000 was awarded for course development. The company Everspring was hired to help with development of a completely online graduate degree and certificate programs for the SOE. In the next three years, 15 programs are to be implemented. The first program started spring 2014. A faculty committee will be put in place to evaluate completely online courses and programs, as well as to develop a research agenda for studying distance education.

Finally, the SOE has upgraded faculty performance expectations, based on the strategic plan's emphasis on strengthening faculty research and teaching. Departments have been given the task of raising their annual performance evaluation expectations in these two areas (faculty research and teaching); a template was developed for departments to consider, and it is currently under review.

6.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

University administrators, SOE faculty, and P-12 partners recognize and respect the leadership provided by the School of Education, as demonstrated in projects such as the Professional Development School initiative and the recent commitment to develop a completely online graduate degree program. Such innovative efforts are also effectively supported through judicious and flexible management of budgetary resources.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the

demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.
AND	*OR*	*AND*	*AND*
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

6.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

6.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
NA	

6.4 Recommendations

For Standard 6

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

IV. Sources of Evidence

Documents Reviewed

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

List of Exhibits Reviewed
List of Interviewees

See **Attachment** panel below.

V. State Addendum (if applicable)

Please upload the state addendum (if applicable).

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.