



Professional Education Unit

NCATE IR Addendum

**Based on
Academic Year 2008-09
With 2009-10 Update Information**

**For
Continuing Accreditation Visit
Bowling Green, KY
Spring 2011**

Electronic Document Room Homepage Link: <http://edtech.wku.edu/peu/index.htm>

Final Version: February 28, 2011

Note: Any questions or comments regarding the contents of this report should be directed to Tony Norman (tony.norman@wku.edu), CEBS Associate Dean, Accountability & Research.

This addendum addresses the areas (in italics below) that the Offsite BOE Team identified during its electronic visit on November 12, 2010, in the document, *Offsite BOE Report: Western Kentucky University* to be validated during its upcoming on-site visit to ensure that each NCATE standard continues to be met. Although the *Offsite BOE Report* indicates that “this validation will occur as the team interviews faculty, administrators, school-based partners, and other members of the professional community” and “could also occur in the visits to schools and observations on campus,” it also provides some specific documentation that the team plans to review during the onsite visit. Wherever possible, this addendum directs the on-site team to specific documents, sections in the original WKU IR, or additional evidence that should validate that each standard continues to be met. Additionally, this addendum seeks to make a stronger case for why the Areas for Improvement listed under Standard 2.3 should be removed.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.4 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Clarification of endorsements offered. Tables in the IR do not include endorsements such as English as a second language. What endorsements are offered and approved by the state?

Based on conversations with Allison Bell at the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB), the IR tables have been revised below to indicate more clearly the initial, advanced, and endorsement programs we offer.

IR Table 2. Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

Program Name	Award Level	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2008-09)	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Report Submitted for Review	State Approval Status	National Recognition Status by NCATE**
Interdisc. Early Child. Ed.	Bachelor’s & Master’s	61	State	No	Approved	NA
Elementary Ed.	Bachelor’s	1115	State	No	Approved	NA
Middle Grades Ed.	Bachelor’s	279	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Secondary School for Grades 8-12</i>						
Biological Science	Bachelor’s	37	State	No	Approved	NA
Chemistry	Bachelor’s	8	State	No	Approved	NA
Earth Science	Bachelor’s	5	State	No	Approved	NA
English	Bachelor’s	129	State	No	Approved	NA
Mathematics	Bachelor’s	68	State	No	Approved	NA
Physics	Bachelor’s	2	State	No	Approved	NA
Social Studies	Bachelor’s	172	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Certificates for Grades 5-12</i>						
Agriculture	Bachelor’s	40	State	No	Approved	NA
Business/Market Ed.	Bachelor’s	51	State	No	Approved	NA
Family/Cons. Science	Bachelor’s	43	State	No	Approved	NA
Occupation-Based Career & Technical Education (formerly Industrial Education)	Bachelor’s	20	State	No	Approved	NA
Engineering & Tech. Ed.	Bachelor’s	1	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Certificates for All Grade Levels</i>						
Art	Bachelor’s	28	State	No	Approved	NA

French	Bachelor's	3	State	No	Approved	NA
German	Bachelor's	1	State	No	Approved	NA
Health Ed.	Minor within a Certifiable Bachelor's	3	State	No	Approved	NA
Music Ed. (Instrumental, Integrated, & Vocal)	Bachelor's	99	NASM/State	Yes	Approved	Recognized
Physical Ed.	Bachelor's	90	State	No	Approved	NA
Spanish	Bachelor's	25	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Exceptional Children Grades P-12</i>						
Comm. Disorders	Master's	175	ASHA/State	Yes	Approved	Recognized
Exceptional Ed. (LBD/MSD)	Bachelor's & Master's	143	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Other School Personnel</i>						
Sch. Media Librarian	Master's	4	State	Yes	Approved	Recognized
<i>Alternative Certification Programs (Option 6) – Available in all certification areas except Elementary Education, Exceptional Education-MSD, and Physical Education</i>						
Alternative Certification	Master's	64	State	No	Approved	NA

IR Table 3. Advanced Preparation and Endorsement Programs and Their Review Status

Program Name	Award Level	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2008-09)	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Report Submitted for Review	State Approval Status	National Recognition Status by NCATE**
Comm. Disorders	Planned 6 th Yr	5	ASHA/State	Yes	Approved	Recognized
Interdisc. Early Child. Ed.	Master's	6	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Endorsements</i>						
English as a Second Language	Endorsement	6	State	No	Approved	NA
Environmental Education	Endorsement	0	State	No	Under Review	NA
Gifted Education	Endorsement	10	State	No	Approved	NA
Instructional Computer Technology	Endorsement	8	State	No	Approved	NA
Individual Intellectual Assessment	Endorsement	1	State	No	Approved	NA
Literacy (Read/Write)	Master's	19	State	No	Approved	NA
Teacher Leader	Endorsement	(See below)	State	No	Approved	NA
<i>Teacher Leader Master's Programs** (First Students to be Admitted January 2011)</i>						
Elementary Education	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Middle Grades Ed.	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Secondary Education	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
5-12 Education	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
P-12 Education	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Learning Behavior Dis.	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Moderate Severe Dis.	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
English	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Mathematics	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA
Physical Ed.	Master's	0	State	No	Approved	NA

<i>Other School Personnel Certification Programs</i>						
Sch. Media Librarian	Master's	193	ALA/State	Yes	Approved	Recognized
School Counseling	Master's & Specialist	171	State	No	Approved	NA
School Psychology	Specialist	27	NASP/State	Yes	Approved	Recognized
<i>Educational Leadership Programs – Include the following: Director of Pupil Personnel Services, Director of Special Education, School Principal (Traditional & Alternate Route), School Superintendent (Traditional & Alternate Route), Supervisor of Instruction, and Career & Technical School Principal</i>						
Educational Leadership	Master's, Specialist, Doctorate	225	State	No	Approved*	NA
<i>Education Specialist and Planned 6th Year Programs</i>						
Elementary Education	EdS/Planned 6 th Yr	22	State	No	Approved	NA
Middle Grades Ed.	Planned 6 th Yr	3	State	No	Approved	NA
Secondary Education	EdS/Planned 6 th Yr	6	State	No	Approved	NA

*The Educational Leadership Doctorate program is approved by Kentucky's Council on Postsecondary Education rather than by Kentucky's Education Professional Standards Board.

**Teacher Leader programs may be configured as Master's, Planned Fifth Year/Rank II, or Planned Sixth Year/Rank I (as a second Master's) programs.

(2) Follow-up data for advanced teaching and other school professional programs. What follow-up studies are conducted? What has the unit learned from the follow-up data?

Follow-up data for advanced teaching and other school professional programs were reported in the WKU IR under the following heading and table: 1e.3 and Table I. Also, each program reports what has been learned from survey results in [Annual Program Reports](#) (See Communication Disorders, School Psychology, Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research, School Counseling, and Library Media Education). As can be seen, all other school professional programs complete some combination of exit, employer, or alumni survey on an annual basis. Until recently, alumni surveys for advanced teaching programs were conducted every two years. However, once we began work on the Teacher Leader master's program and collected data in Table I to guide curriculum development, no further follow-up studies were conducted, as these "old programs" were to be discontinued by December 2010. In the future, we will administer exit or alumni surveys to the graduates from our Teacher Leader programs in a manner similar to what all our other advanced preparation programs do.

Although all other school professional programs can demonstrate alignment between their program standards and build on the Kentucky Teacher Standards, because of the unique qualities and goals of these programs, exit/follow-up survey results are not comparable across programs. However, each program's Annual Program Report indicates what has been learned from survey data.

(3) Results of follow-up data on initial teacher completers that was collected by the state for 2009-2010. These surveys were conducted by the state, but were not available to the offsite team during its meeting.

The report on this state survey was not available at the time of the writing of the WKU IR. Please follow this link, [2009-10 EPSB Teacher Survey Results](#), to see the results, which indicate that on all Kentucky Standards and indicators, WKU students average at least 3 or higher on a scale of 1= Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, and 4 = Excellent.

(4) *Data on initial and advanced programs for teachers. What do the student learning data show about candidates' impact on student learning?*

In our Institutional Report, Standard 1, sections 1d and 1f, and Standard 3, section 3c, we describe how we measure our candidates' impact on student learning. Most of these measures are indirect, in that as we assess our candidates' proficiency in developing assessment plans and analyzing student learning within Teacher Work Samples or other critical performances, we assume that we are assessing their ability to positively impact student learning. However, in [Developing an "In-House" Web-Based Accountability System](#), we report early work to measure impact on student learning within the Teacher Work Sample. Also, as reported on pages 17-18 ("Teacher Work Sample Results: Impact on P-12 Student Learning") of the [WKU 2009-10 Unit Wide Assessment Report](#), we have developed a process to collect and analyze these data. Clearly, both early and more recent results show that our candidates positively impact student learning. However, more time and thought must be invested in how best to use such results to make judgments about the quality of our programs.

What are the scales for the assessments identified in Table J and elsewhere? What is the scale and range for scores that are presented as mean scores?

For all tables with assessment results throughout the IR, a brief description regarding the scale for each assessment is provided. But for the most part, assessment and surveys follow a 4-point scale of 1 = Poor, Not Met, or Beginning; 2 = Fair, Partially Met, or Developing; 3 = Good, At Standard, or Proficient; and 4 = Excellent, Above Standard, or Exemplary. The only exception to this rule is that *indicators* within the Teacher Work Sample components are on a 3-point scale of 1 = Not Met, 2 = Partially Met, and 3 = Met. This exception is described in the appropriate sections of the IR. In some data tables, percentages are presented. In these cases, the percentages represent the number of candidates who achieved some target level on a particular assessment. The target level is always provided in the paragraphs preceding each table.

What data exist for 2009-2010?

As in earlier years, the [WKU 2009-10 Unit Wide Assessment Report](#) summarizes all data for initial preparation programs. Additionally, [Annual Program Report](#) data for the 2009-10 academic year are available for each program. To make finding these data simpler, the following tables are provided with "Y" indicating that a link to an annual report is available at the [Annual Program Report](#) website, "N" indicating no annual report is available, and "IP" indicating that the report is in progress. The comments section provides an explanation for programs with missing or no reports or with special reports.

Table A1. Initial Teacher Preparation Programs

Program Name	2009-10 APR	2008-09 APR	2007-08 APR	Comments
Interdisc. Early Child. Ed.	Y	Y	Y	Reports available for both UG and GR IP programs.
Elementary Ed.	Y	Y	Y	
Middle Grades Ed.	Y	Y	Y	
<i>Secondary School for Grades 8-12</i>				
Biological Science	Y	N	N	2009-10 is the first report for this program.
Chemistry	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program.
Earth Science	N	N	N	Insufficient candidate numbers for reporting purposes. However, candidates are reported within the larger Secondary Education Annual Program Report.
English	Y	Y	Y	
Mathematics	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program.

Physics	N	N	N	Insufficient candidate numbers for reporting purposes. However, candidates are reported within the larger Secondary Education Annual Program Report.
Social Studies	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program.
<i>Certificates for Grades 5-12</i>				
Agriculture	IP	N	N	2009-10 is the first report for this program. It is "in progress" because of a recent faculty resignation.
Business/Market Ed.	Y	Y	Y	
Family/Cons. Science	Y	N	N	2009-10 is the first report for this program.
Occupation-Based Career & Technical Education (formerly Industrial Education)	N	N	N	Insufficient candidate numbers for reporting purposes.
Technology Education	N	N	N	Insufficient candidate numbers for reporting purposes.
<i>Certificates for All Grade Levels</i>				
Art	Y	N	N	2009-10 is the first report for this program.
French	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program (under Modern Languages).
German	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program (under Modern Languages).
Health Ed.	N	Y	N	Insufficient 2009-10 candidate numbers for reporting purposes.
Music Ed. (Instrumental, Integrated, & Vocal)	Y	Y	Y	
Physical Ed.	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program.
Sch. Media Librarian	Y	Y	Y	
Spanish	Y	Y	N	2008-09 is the first report for this program (under Modern Languages).
<i>Exceptional Children Grades P-12</i>				
Comm. Disorders	Y	Y	Y	
Exceptional Ed. (LBD/MSD)	Y	Y	Y	

Table A2. Advanced Preparation and Endorsement Programs

Program Name	2009-10 APR	2008-09 APR	2007-08 APR	Comments
<i>Endorsements</i>				
English as a Second Language	N	N	N	As this is a 12-hour endorsement, we have not required an annual report.
Environmental Education	N	N	N	As this is a 12-hour endorsement, we have not required an annual report.
Gifted Education	N	N	N	As this is a 12-hour endorsement, we have not required an annual report.
Instructional Computer Technology	N	N	N	As this is a 12-hour endorsement, we have not required an annual report.
Literacy (Read/Write)	Y	Y	Y	As this endorsement includes a WKU Master's program, we require an annual report.
<i>Teacher Leader Master's Programs</i>				
Elementary Education	N	N	N	All of these programs are new as of January 2011. Critical performance and other program measures are under development.

Middle Grades Ed.	N	N	N	All of these programs are new as of January 2011. Critical performance and other program measures are under development.
Secondary Education	N	N	N	
5-12 Education	N	N	N	
P-12 Education	N	N	N	
Learning Behavior Dis.	N	N	N	
Moderate Severe Dis.	N	N	N	
English	N	N	N	
Mathematics	N	N	N	
Physical Ed.	N	N	N	
<i>Other Advanced Programs</i>				
Sch. Media Librarian	Y	Y	Y	
Educational Leadership	Y	Y	Y	
<i>Other Instructional Services</i>				
Individual Intellectual Assessment	N	N	N	As this is a 12-hour endorsement, we have not required an annual report.
School Counseling	Y	Y	Y	
School Psychology	Y	Y	Y	

Why are data not presented for consecutive years for each program?

Tables A1 and A2 provide a clearer indication of when Annual Program Reports have been completed for each program. As our NCATE Annual Reports reveal, since our last NCATE on-site visit, programs have been collecting and reporting assessment data to the CEBS Associate Dean assigned as the NCATE Coordinator as he compiled these reports. Much of these data were gathered within an early version of the WKU E-PASS electronic accountability system developed in the late 1990's. However, when a new associate dean arrived in 2007 and wrote that year's NCATE Annual Report (PEDS Part C) as well as the first [Unit Wide Assessment Report](#) for Initial Preparation Programs, it became clear that although all programs were collecting some assessment data, there was no systematic process in place to ensure all programs were collected all the assessment data the unit envisioned in its Conceptual Framework. Thus, in fall 2007, the associate dean crafted the WKU Professional Education Unit Continuous Assessment Plan (CAP) that was then reviewed and adopted by the WKU Professional Education Council. He then began working with individual program coordinators to develop [Program Assessment Plans](#) that lived out the CAP. He also then developed an annual process whereby program coordinators, along with program faculty, wrote the Annual Program Reports delineated in Tables A1 and A2. As with all new processes, some programs, especially those with large numbers of candidates and several program faculty, were more prepared to lead the way in these efforts; programs with smaller candidate numbers and fewer faculty needed more time to identify assessment points and, in particular, had to deal with the potential for disclosing students' identities in reporting, as well as how to make data-based decisions on the assessment of so few students. Regardless, even for programs that did not prepare an annual report, program level data have been collected and provided to program coordinators for analysis and reflection since 2008. And it should be noted that even for initial programs that have not completed annual reports, their data have been aggregated at the unit level within the yearly [Unit-Wide Assessment Reports](#), as well as disaggregated at the program type level (Elementary, Middle Grades, Secondary, P-12, 5-12, IECE, and Exceptional Education) within these reports. Furthermore, advanced preparation programs have consistently provided program data within either the Annual Program Reports and/or for the NCATE Annual Reports.

What evidence indicates that candidates learn to be reflective?

Every program has developed assessments related to Kentucky Teacher Standard 7 – Reflection. Also programs collect dispositions evidence on candidates related to “Professionalism - Commitment to

Reflection and Growth.” Evidence related to candidate development of reflection is reported in the following places in the WKU IR:

- Tables H1-2 – WKU New Teacher Survey Results (KTS 7)
- Table I – Advanced Teacher Preparation Survey Results (KTS 7)
- 1a.3 – Describes the EDU 501 and EDU 596/598 portfolio process that would include KTS 7
- Tables K1-3 – Teacher Work Sample Results (KTS 7)
- Tables L1-2 – Student Teaching Evaluation Results (KTS 7)
- Tables M1-3 – Teacher Work Sample Results (TWS Component “Reflection and Self-Evaluation”)
- Tables O1-2 – Education Professional Standards Board New Teacher Survey (Reflection)
- 3c.3 – Describes candidate reflection as part of field and clinical experiences
- 3c.5 – Describes candidate reflection related to student learning
- Tables S1-4 – Initial Preparation Dispositions Data (Professionalism)
- Table T – Advanced Preparation Dispositions Data (Professionalism)

How does the unit know that candidates have developed proficiencies in the use of technology; considering school, family, and community contexts; and other areas at the target level?

For technology, every program has developed assessments related to Kentucky Teacher Standard 6 – Technology. For school, family, and community contexts, every program has developed assessments related to Kentucky Teacher Standard 1 – Content Knowledge, which includes indicators 1.2: Connects content to life experiences of students and 1.4: Guides students to understand content from various perspectives, Kentucky Teacher Standard 2 – Designs and Plans Instruction, which includes indicators 2.2: Uses contextual data to design instruction relevant to students and 2.4: Plans instructional strategies and activities that address learning objectives for all students, and Kentucky Teacher Standard 8 – Collaboration. Evidence related to candidate development in these areas is reported in the following places in the WKU IR:

- Tables H1-2 – WKU New Teacher Survey Results (KTS 1,2,6, & 8)
- Table I – Advanced Teacher Preparation Survey Results (KTS 1,2,6, & 8)
- 1a.3 – Describes the EDU 501 and EDU 596/598 portfolio process that would include KTS 1,2,6, and 8)
- Tables K1-3 – Teacher Work Sample Results (KTS 1,2, & 6)
- Tables L1-2 – Student Teaching Evaluation Results (KTS 1,2,6, & 8)
- Tables M1-3 – Teacher Work Sample Results (TWS Components “Contextual Factors,” “Learning Goals,” and “Design for Instruction”)
- Tables O1-2 – Education Professional Standards Board New Teacher Survey (In particular, Contextual Information, Connecting to Real Life, and Collaboration)

In addition, the [WKU 2009-10 Unit Wide Assessment Report](#) includes more current information regarding candidate performance on Kentucky Teacher Standards 1, 2, 6, and 8, as measured by the WKU New Teacher Survey Results and Student Teacher Evaluation. Furthermore, this report indicates that nearly 100% of candidates are scoring proficient on Teacher Work Samples components associated with KTS 1, 2, and 6 (e.g., see [WKU 2009-10 Unit Wide Assessment Report](#), Table 12).

What happens to candidates when assessments are incomplete or candidates are not performing at acceptable levels?

Because critical performance (CP) assessments are embedded within courses, students who do not complete them receive a course grade of “Incomplete” until they upload the CP. Every CP prompt and rubric informs students that “completion and uploading of this performance into the electronic portfolio is a requirement for a passing grade.” It is each faculty member’s discretion whether the student must earn a passing grade on the CP in order to pass the course. However, the Professional Education Council adopted a [Transitions Points](#) document in spring 2008 that delineates levels of proficiency that candidates must achieve in order to move through programs. Then, program coordinators worked with program faculty to adopt and/or adapt these transition points based on the unique qualities of their program. For each major transition, they also delineated “remediation opportunities” (See individual [Program Assessment Plans](#) for descriptions of these opportunities.). For the most part, candidates who were not successful on CPs were encouraged to reach proficiency before completing each course. Those who did not could move forward but would be stopped at the next transition point if their average performance on CPS associated with each Kentucky Teacher Standard or average disposition ratings were below the acceptable level. Because of the size of our initial preparation program and consequences once the Transition Points document was put into effect, the PEC revised the [Transitions Points](#) document in fall 2010 to provide the Professional Education Unit a more consistent and systematic way to remediate candidates who were nearing the student teaching phase of their program but were below proficiency on one or more Kentucky Teacher Standards. In essence, candidates develop a remediation plan where they delineate how they plan to improve their proficiency during the student teaching experience. For dispositions, the Director of Teacher Services continues to work one-on-one with candidates who have only few low dispositions ratings, but calls on program faculty and the Professional Education Council for advice or a final decision for those candidates with a consistent record of low dispositions ratings.

(5) Annual Program reports on other school professional programs. What is being learned from these data?

Each program reports what has been learned in [Annual Program Reports](#) (See Communication Disorders; School Psychology; Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research; School Counseling; Library Media Education; and School Psychology).

(6) Assessment plan and critical performance measures for the redesigned master’s program. What are the critical performance measures for this master’s program?

The following [Critical Performances](#) were proposed when WKU presented its Teacher Leader proposal to the Education Professional Standards Board. Although these original CPs have continued to inform the development of the actual CPs, faculty concluded that the originals did not really assess advanced levels of the Kentucky Teacher Standards. Thus, the [TCHL 500 CP](#) that has been adopted and added to WKU E-PASS requires advanced teacher preparation candidates to assess and plan professional development through the lens of the Kentucky Teacher Standards at the advanced level. The CPs for [TCHL 540](#), [TCHL 544](#), and [TCHL 548](#) have been similarly improved. The other CPs associated with the Teacher Leader Program will be finalized and added to WKU E-PASS when these courses are taught for the first time.

(7) *Follow-up on IECE program assessments and pass rate. What assessments are used for this program? How are candidates performing on these assessments?*

Three years of [Annual Program Reports](#) are available for the IECE Initial Preparation program at both the undergraduate and graduate Levels. The BOE team would benefit by meeting with Vicki Stayton and Sylvia Dietrich about this program.

(8) *Data system for indicating that initial teacher candidates and advanced teaching candidates are meeting the 10 Kentucky Teacher Standards and the dispositions articulated in the conceptual framework. What assessments are used? How and when are data collected? How are the data used?*

Please see [PowerPoint presentations](#) on our website that describe aspects of the WKU E-PASS system. We also plan to demonstrate the system on Sunday, March 27, 2011, once the on-site BOE team arrives.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs corrected from last visit:

AFI	Apply to	AFI Rationale
Assessment system data are not used to inform unit operations.	ADV	Documentation from agendas and minutes of faculty meetings and Annual Program and Annual Unit-Wide Assessment Reports provide evidence that the unit regularly and systematically uses data to evaluate and make changes in courses, programs, and clinical experiences.

AFIs continued from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
Not all programs use the unit assessment system to aggregate, analyze, and report candidate data.	ADV	Evidence not found that this AFI has been corrected.
Inconsistencies exist in providing feedback to inform programs across the unit.	ITP,ADV	Evidence not found that this AFI has been corrected.

Again, Tables A1 and A2 provide a clearer indication of when [Annual Program Reports](#) have been completed for each program. As our NCATE Annual Reports reveal, since our last NCATE on-site visit, programs have been collecting and reporting assessment data to the CEBS Associate Dean assigned as the NCATE Coordinator as he compiled these reports. Much of these data were gathered within an early version of the WKU E-PASS electronic accountability system developed in the late 1990's. However, when a new associate dean arrived in 2007 and wrote that year's NCATE Annual Report (PEDS Part C) as well as the first [Unit Wide Assessment Report](#) for Initial Preparation Programs, it became clear that although all programs were collecting some assessment data, there was no systematic process in place to ensure all programs were collecting all the assessment data the unit envisioned in its Conceptual Framework. Thus, in fall 2007, the associate dean crafted the WKU Professional Education Unit Continuous Assessment Plan (CAP) that was then reviewed and adopted by the WKU Professional Education Council. He then began working with individual program coordinators to develop [Program Assessment Plans](#) that lived out the CAP. He also then developed an annual process whereby program coordinators, along with program faculty, wrote the Annual Program Reports delineated in Tables A1 and

A2. As with all new processes, some programs, especially those with large numbers of candidates and several program faculty, were more prepared to lead the way in these efforts; programs with smaller candidate numbers and fewer faculty needed more time to identify assessment points and, in particular, had to deal with the potential for disclosing students' identities in reporting, as well as how to make data-based decisions on the assessment of so few students. Regardless, even for programs that did not prepare an annual report, program level data have been collected and provided to program coordinators for analysis and reflection since 2008. And it should be noted that even for initial programs that have not completed annual reports, their data have been aggregated at the unit level within the yearly [Unit-Wide Assessment Reports](#), as well as disaggregated at the program type level (Elementary, Middle Grades, Secondary, P-12, 5-12, IECE, and Exceptional Education) within these reports. Furthermore, advanced preparation programs have consistently provided program data within either the Annual Program Reports above and/or for the NCATE Annual Reports.

The annual reporting process is now cyclical and systematic, with the CEBS Associate Dean for Accountability and Research and the Manager of the Education Technology Center (and developer of WKU E-PASS) working together each summer to extract all the assessment data from the previous year. The associate dean then disaggregates the various datasets by program type (Elementary, Music, etc.) and level (Initial Preparation or Advanced Preparation) and provides these to each education program coordinator. The coordinator works with other program faculty to report the data within the [Annual Program Reports](#), as well as reflect on the data for program evaluation and decisions about program improvement. Because of evidence provided in the WKU's 2007 and 2008 NCATE Annual Reports, the EPSB's [Accreditation Audit Committee](#) reported that all three of WKU's AFI's appeared to have been addressed.

2.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) *System for collecting, aggregating, and reporting data at transition points. Why are data for each standard/value of each component not reported by all programs for consecutive years? Are programs on different reporting cycles? Is there a report that compiles the data at a unit level?*

See the information provided under 2.3 above.

- (2) *Process and procedures for ensuring "consistency in assessment" and "fairness in assessment." How are these verified across the range of assessments used at both the initial and advanced preparation levels? (also relates to Standard 1)*

In our [Continuous Assessment Plan](#), we describe our process for ensuring consistency and fairness in assessment. As described in that document,

To ensure accuracy and fairness of assessments, critical performances are developed by all faculty members who frequently teach a particular course. They also work together to develop descriptive scoring rubrics and to determine which Kentucky Teacher Standard(s) the assessment measures. Use of descriptive rubrics represents best educational practice for consistent scoring of performance assessments, in that behaviors or skills for each performance level are fully described so that assessors are less likely to use extraneous behaviors or "impressions" to score candidate performance. The use of multiple assessments and evaluation tools ensures that candidates are given every opportunity to demonstrate proficiency.

An example of WKU's commitment to "accuracy, fairness, and consistency" has been the resources and research it has invested to ensure that these qualities exist in its development and scoring of the TWS, the culminating performance for initial preparation programs. Historically, research (Denner et

al., 2004) has determined that educators view the TWS as a valid measure of key skills that prospective teachers need to be successful and that, with training, even raters from different institutions can independently reach agreement on the level of candidate proficiency. Currently, WKU has instituted a yearly process by which all TWS are scored by two additional independent trained scorers beyond the faculty of record. Research at WKU and other TWS institutions consistently demonstrate the validity of the TWS instrument and the ability of scorers to reach acceptable levels of agreement regarding candidate performance (Denner, Norman, & Lin, 2007; Norman, 2007).

Since that document was written the professional education faculty have continued to conduct additional TWS research related to validity and reliability (Kirchner, Evans, & Norman, 2010; Norman, Evans, & Pankratz, 2011; Stobaugh, Tassell, & Norman, 2010). These studies have led professional education faculty from across campus and in conjunction with P-12 practitioners and administrators to revise the TWS in the fall 2010. Faculty review of data from the fall led to additional modifications this spring.

A similar process of broad professional education faculty and P-12 practitioner involvement in developing the new Teacher Leader program also demonstrates our commitment to accuracy, fairness, and consistency. This program and proposed assessments were developed based on data collected from teachers and administrators in our service region, many of whom also worked alongside faculty during actual development of the program. Furthermore, the EPSB review committee that approved our Teacher Leader framework had strong representation from the P-12 community. As we have begun developing the critical performances for this program, teams of faculty across subject areas and grade levels have worked on each, and these teams have used the Kentucky Teacher Standards (Advanced Level Preparation Indicators) to create the criteria by which to assess each critical performance.

We also ensure fairness in that program faculty and/or the Professional Education Council work toward consensus regarding the continued progress of students. Opportunities for remediation at major transition points allow candidates to make their case that they are making progress to standards and values outlined in our Conceptual Framework. Thus, no one faculty member or poor CP performance and disposition assessment is able to stop a candidate's progress without consensus from other program faculty or program representatives on the Professional Education Council.

(3) *Exit, alumni, and employer surveys. Where are follow-up data for each program? How generic are the data collected across programs? What are the differences across programs? (Tables 5 and 6 suggest that different assessments are required by different programs.) What is the unit learning from employers about the competence of completers?*

Follow-up surveys for initial programs are conducted annually both internally and at the state level. State level surveys not only include alumni but also mentor teachers and university supervisors who worked with alumni as they complete the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program. These first-year teachers are also assessed on all Kentucky Teacher Standards during their internship. Results from these assessments are reported in Tables Q1-2 of the WKU IR. All program completers receive the same survey that is based on the Kentucky Teacher Standards. In fact, last year the state changed its survey to align with the Kentucky Teacher Standards so we can more easily compare our internal results with state results. As reported earlier, [2009-10 EPSB Teacher Survey Results](#) indicate that on all Kentucky Standards and indicators WKU students average at least 3 or higher on a scale of 1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, and 4 = Excellent.

Follow-up data for advanced teaching and other school professional programs were reported in the WKU IR under the following heading and table: 1e.3 and Table I. Also, each program reports what has been learned from survey results in [Annual Program Reports](#) (See Communication Disorders; School

Psychology; Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research; School Counseling; Library Media Education; and School Psychology). As can be seen, all other school professional programs complete some combination of exit, employer, or alumni survey on an annual basis. Year-to-year results indicate that survey respondents believe our candidates are meeting program standards. Until recently, alumni surveys for advanced teaching programs were conducted every two years. However, once we began work on the Teacher Leader master's program and collected data in Table I to guide curriculum development, no further follow-up studies were conducted, as these "old programs" were to be discontinued by December 2010. In the future, we will administer exit or alumni surveys to the graduates from our Teacher Leader programs in a manner similar to what all our other advanced preparation programs do.

Although all other school professional programs can demonstrate alignment between their program standards and the Kentucky Teacher Standards, because of the unique qualities and goals of these programs, exit/follow-up survey results are not comparable across programs. However, each program's Annual Program Report indicates what has been learned from survey data.

Table 5 indicates the various Praxis content exams required by the state for each program, so these assessments logically could not be the same. Although Table 6 indicates some differences in program requirements across advanced programs, these reflect unique programs (especially other school professionals) that are not easily comparable. However, all initial preparation programs have similar transition points. At the advanced teacher preparation level, what differences may have existed have been replaced by common entrance, program progress, and exit standards for all the programs under the Teacher Leader framework.

(4) Instrument(s) used to evaluate unit operations. What evaluations of unit operations have been conducted over the past few years? What has the unit learned from these evaluations?

Each year, the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences (CEBS) as a whole, as well as education programs both within CEBS or housed elsewhere, develop [Action Plans](#) based on the goals and indicators of the WKU Strategic Plan. These plans require identifying annual goals, criteria for success, measures of success, and targets/benchmarks of success. At the end of the year, CEBS and other programs "close the loop" by reporting and reflecting on collected data to establish goals for improvement. As can be seen in each [Action Plan](#), because the CEBS Dean is the head of the WKU Professional Education Unit, the CEBS action plan includes goals and their evaluation related to professional education. Professional education data collected within these plans and used to improve unit operations have included surveys of faculty needs related to education technology and faculty satisfaction related to services and support provided by the CEBS Associate Dean/NCATE Coordinator.

Additionally, since fall 2007 the CEBS Associate Dean/NCATE Coordinator presents data from and provides a copy of the [Annual Unit-Wide Assessment Reports](#) to the Professional Education Council (PEC) and the WKU deans from colleges that house professional education programs. He encourages the PEC and deans to share these data with faculty. Although these reports consist mostly of assessment data, the CEBS Associate Dean also includes a section entitled, "Key Decisions Made and to be Considered" (only available in unabridged copies of the reports on campus) that discuss issues related to unit operations that need to be addressed.

(5) Annual Unit-Wide Assessment Reports for advanced preparation. What reports exist for advanced teaching and other school professionals?

An annual unit-wide assessment report has not been developed for advanced teacher preparation programs beyond what is reported in the NCATE Annual Reports. A unit-wide report for other school professionals does not seem feasible because each program focuses more specifically on program level

standards, and programs produce candidates who serve such different roles in schools. Also, these programs have unique courses, CP assessments, and faculty. Thus, we have focused on Annual Program Reports that allow other school professional programs to focus on their program standards (that are aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Standards).

- (6) *Operation of the unit assessment system. What evidence documents that all programs at the initial and advanced preparation levels collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data? What evidence documents that all programs at the initial and advanced preparation levels use the unit assessment system to aggregate, analyze, and report candidate data?*

Please see [PowerPoint presentations](#) on our website that describe aspects of the WKU E-PASS system. We also plan to demonstrate the system on Sunday, March 27, 2011, once the on-site BOE team arrives.

- (7) *Use of data to inform all programs at both the initial and advanced preparation levels. What data are reviewed by faculty? How often? What changes have resulted from the review of assessment data at the advanced level?*

Please see [PowerPoint presentations](#) on our website that describe aspects of the WKU E-PASS system. We also plan to demonstrate the system on Sunday, March 27, 2011, once the on-site BOE team arrives. But, in summary, faculty members have instant electronic access via the internet to all assessment data with the Accountability System portion of WKU E-PASS. However, program level data are provided to each program coordinator on an annual basis. They work with other program faculty to reflect on data for program evaluation and improvement and to write the [Annual Program Reports](#).

- (8) *Disaggregated data for online and alternate route programs. What data indicates how candidates in these programs are performing on assessments? What has the unit learned from the data?*

Unlike some institutions, we have no parallel programs where some candidates might complete an on-line version of a program while others complete a campus version. Programs that are completely on-line are only offered in this venue; other programs that are partially on-line typically have some courses that students complete on line with other courses taken on campus by students. Thus, there are no two versions of programs where students can be disaggregated for comparison. Assessment information about alternate route candidates is described in 1a.3. Furthermore, 2b.2 describes the challenges we have had disaggregating data, especially at the graduate level, and steps we are taking to resolve these challenges.

However, we are able to disaggregate candidate performance based on those who enroll in a particular course on-line versus face-to-face. Table A3 below presents the 2009-10 candidate proficiency rates by Kentucky Teacher Standards on critical performances in each course venue. It should be noted that, regardless of course type, all candidates complete the same critical performance for any given course. For each critical performance, standards-based rubrics are used to evaluate candidate performance at four levels: 1 – Beginning, 2 – Developing, 3 – Proficient, and 4 – Exemplary. Candidates receiving an overall rating of 3 or 4 on a CP are considered to have “passed” the standards associated with the CP. Clearly, candidates in both course venues are scoring equally well.

Table A3. Percent of Students by Course Venue Scoring Proficient on CPs by KTS (2009-10)

Course Venue	Kentucky Teacher Standards*									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Face-to-Face	97%	98%	100%	97%	98%	98%	98%	100%	97%	--
On-line	97%	98%	100%	96%	98%	99%	99%	96%	100%	94%

*KTS Key: 1 – Content Knowledge, 2 – Designs/Plans Instruction, 3 – Maintains Learning Climate, 4 – Implements/Manages Instruction, 5 – Assessment/Evaluation, 6 – Technology, 7 – Reflection, 8 – Collaboration, 9 – Professional Development, 10 – Leadership

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) *Preparation of candidates for their field experiences. How do instructors prepare candidates to “use a variety of scenarios to orient candidates to the classroom prior to actual field experiences?” What are some examples? How does the unit ensure that all candidates have access to these scenarios?*

In early field experiences, candidates mainly observe or provide minor aid to teachers as requested. All students are prepared for these experiences by being reminded of expectations of professional behavior. Additionally, in the introductory course for all undergraduate initial preparation programs, EDU 250/MGE 275, a common textbook has been adopted for all sections of the course. The textbook contains a variety of scenarios that apply to the P-12 classroom (both written and on DVD). Instructors also use the supplemental videos to facilitate class discussion of current issues in the P-12 classroom, including ones from the KTIP program and YouTube (e.g. "Power Teaching"). Teacher candidates read or view the scenarios and engage in small and whole group discussions where they critique the scenario and make connections to the Kentucky Teacher Standards. Since all instructors of the course are educators, they are also able to use scenarios from their personal experiences to enrich and clarify issues in education. Additionally, teacher candidates are encouraged to share their personal experiences related to the topic being discussed. For example, students are asked to identify the characteristics of their most effective teachers, and these characteristics are used as a springboard to discuss the Kentucky Teacher Standards and what they should be observing in the field setting. This cross-referencing among text/video, storytelling and personal experiences of teacher candidates enables them to view the topic from different perspectives and gain a deeper understanding of educational issues that affect teachers and students.

For specific field experiences identified by each program in its Program Assessment Plan, faculty go over the dispositions form and alert candidates of behavioral expectations that will be rated using the dispositions forms. As candidates progress into later field experiences where they are expected to teach lessons, faculty provide candidates opportunities to develop lessons using templates and other guides and then provide classroom time for such activities as peer/group teaching, coaching, and presentations to acclimate candidates to the responsibilities they will encounter in the classroom.

In terms of actual student teaching placement, the Director of Teacher Services conducts an Orientation to Student Teaching for all student teachers each semester prior to our students going out into their assigned schools the following semester. He also meets each semester with the university supervisors of student teaching to ensure their understanding of the needs and responsibilities of the student teachers.

- (2) *Field experiences and clinical practice with students from diverse groups. How does the unit systematically verify, validate, and record candidate participation in diverse and multiple settings? How does the unit track these placements? What are the requirements for advanced programs? What are the requirements for advanced teaching? What is the status of the SKyTeach program? What are the required field experiences and clinical practice for SKyTeach?*

As stated in WKU IR 3c.6, to ensure that all our program candidates work with diverse students, every program has identified in its [Program Assessment Plan](#) at least one clinical field placement or other related experience as the designated experience where candidates are placed in diverse settings. Typically, this field placement is associated with a core course that all candidates in that program are required to take. To provide guidance for programs to choose sites, we determined our most diverse settings by averaging the ethnic diversity of the schools in our service area (about 11%) and designating schools that exceed this percentage as “diverse.” These schools also include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse linguistic and socioeconomic groups. The diversity of these placements is ensured because the identified courses have been reported to the Office of Teacher Services Field Placement Coordinator, who places students in these courses only in schools that have been designated “diverse.” For students who enroll in these courses at our off-site campuses, field coordinators have been provided a list of the most diverse schools surrounding these campuses for student placement.

Other school professional programs were required to make the same determination of at least one diverse placement/experience. The new Teacher Leader advanced teaching programs have also been designed to address the issue of diversity through Professional Learning Communities where teachers in less diverse schools will collaborate and communicate with teachers in more diverse schools.

Within WKU E-PASS, records are kept of designated student field experience placements and their self-report in terms of the diversity of the experience. However, the very reason that programs identified a core “diverse” placement was because it was otherwise nearly impossible to track the diversity of placements at an individual level. Although we believe that, as WKU IR Table Y attests, candidates are provided multiple opportunities to learn about diversity and work in diverse settings, the above “at least one diverse setting” policy was our way to guarantee that all candidates have diverse experiences prior to program completion.

The SKyTeach program has been fully approved through the WKU university curriculum process and has been approved by the state. It is now the program for all middle and secondary education candidates who choose to pursue math or science for certification. From its inception, SKyTeach was designed with early and diverse field placements in mind. As with all our programs, SKyTeach has identified the required core course, SMED 320, as its “diverse” placement. However, even its introductory courses, SMED 101 and SMED 102, where students learn how to conduct a lesson and actually teach the lesson in schools under supervision by SKyTeach master teachers (associated with WKU) and the cooperating teacher, these candidates are teaching these lessons in our most diverse schools.

- (3) *Sample of the “field summary report” form and field experience “guidelines” that the OTS and course instructor prepare for the cooperating teachers. Are the same guidelines used across courses and programs? If not, why not? Who reviews these forms and guidelines? How is the information used?*

The Field Summary Report Form can be viewed at our [Unit Wide Forms](#) webpage. Forms and guidelines provided to cooperating teachers and university supervisors can be found in the [Student Teaching Handbook](#). All initial preparation programs use the same handbook. These forms are periodically reviewed by the Director of Teacher Services, the Director of the School of Teacher

Education, the Professional Education Council, and faculty to improve the quality of the guidelines and forms and to strengthen the teacher preparation programs.

- (4) *Procedure if a candidate has an unsuccessful field or clinical experience. How does the unit monitor success? What steps are taken if a candidate is not being successful?*

Formally, many field experiences include the assessment of student dispositions. Dispositions are reviewed at each program transition point with candidates having to demonstrate established levels in order to continue in the program. As was described earlier, because of the size of our initial preparation program and consequences once the Transition Points document was put into effect, the PEC revised the [Transitions Points](#) document in fall 2010 to provide the Professional Education Unit a more consistent and systematic way to remediate candidates who were nearing the student teaching phase of their program but were below proficiency on one or more Kentucky Teacher Standards or dispositions. In essence, candidates develop a remediation plan where they delineate how they plan to improve their proficiency during the student teaching experience. For dispositions, the Director of Teacher Services continues to work one-on-one with candidates who have only a few low dispositions ratings, but calls on program faculty and the Professional Education Council for advice or a final decision for those candidates with a consistent record of low dispositions ratings. Additionally, candidates who do not have an initially successful student teaching or clinical experience have the opportunity to work with program coordinators and/or the Director of Teacher Services to attempt the clinical experience a second time with stronger monitoring and support systems in place. Candidates who continue to be unsuccessful are removed from the experience and advised out of the education preparation program.

- (5) *Orientation sessions for supervising teachers. What orientations are provided? What is the content of those orientation sessions?*

Following selection of outstanding individuals who are experienced educators to serve as university supervisors for student teachers, the Director of Teacher Services meets individually with these new hires to introduce the process, provide and explain the forms used, and to orient them to the process. As indicated earlier, the Director also provides an update orientation every semester for our supervising teachers. This involves about 50 retired P-12 teachers and administrators as well as a good sampling of university professors. [Agendas](#) for university supervisors and student teachers are available for review in the NCATE document room.

- (6) *Development of technology skills by candidates in alternate route programs. How does the unit ensure that these candidates are using technology in their field experiences and clinical practice?*

Candidates are only admitted into the alternate route program if they have been hired as the teacher of record in a school setting. As the Alternate Route [Program Assessment Plan](#) indicates, during their program students complete a Kentucky Teacher Standards based Professional Growth Plan during EDU 501 and then create a portfolio indicating their proficiency on all ten standards in EDU 596. Kentucky Teacher Standard 6 is dedicated to teachers using technology in the classroom. Furthermore, all candidates begin a Teacher Work Sample in EDU 520 that they complete and implement in EDU 590, which includes how candidates use technology in instruction, as well as how they analyze student learning results to improve instruction.

- (7) *Understandings between advanced teacher leader programs and their P-12 or community professional partners. What written understandings exist?*

WKU's [Teacher Leader Proposal](#), submitted to the Kentucky EPSB, includes Table J1. Memorandum of Agreement District List (p. 72) that identifies all the agreements we have on file from the various school districts in our service area.

- (8) *Samples of advanced teacher leader candidate's professional growth plan. What are the requirements for these growth plans? How are they being used by programs?*

As our Teacher Leader programs will have only begun in spring 2011, few professional growth plans may have been uploaded into WKU E-PASS by the time of the BOE team visit. However, the [TCHL 500 CP](#) has been adopted and was added to WKU E-PASS for the winter 2011 semester. This critical performance requires advanced teacher preparation candidates to assess and plan professional development through the lens of the Kentucky Teacher Standards at the advanced level. A review of this CP will show the requirements of the professional growth plan and how this plan will be used to guide each candidate's program of study.

Standard 4: Diversity

4.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) *Links to the institution's diversity plan and recruitment/retention practices. These links were not working at the time of the offsite meeting. What information do those sites contain related to this standard?*

As WKU IR 4c.3 describes, Goals 2 and 3 of WKU's strategic plan, [Challenging the Spirit](#), are to "grow a high quality, diverse, and engaged student body" and "enhance academic excellence through premier faculty and staff" (which includes efforts to diversify faculty and staff). The university's Chief Diversity Officer, Dr. Richard Miller, has promoted these goals through hiring policies and financial incentives. However, a specific diversity plan is still in development. The BOE team would benefit by meeting with Dr. Miller and members of the diversity plan committee to discuss WKU's progress in developing this plan and particular policies, activities, and incentives that will be provided to help WKU reach its diversity goals.

- (2) *Goals and activities of the following groups that contribute to addressing diversity: International Committee, Male Leadership Academy, Multicultural Cadet Corp, and Future Educators Association. How does the dual credit introduction to education course contribute to increasing candidate diversity?*

The BOE team would benefit by meeting with Dr. Fred Carter and Denise Hardesty in the Office of Teacher Services to learn more about these activities.

- (3) *The MERR director's recruitment and retention efforts. What efforts are underway? How effective have the efforts been over the past few years?*

These efforts, conducted every year, are described in WKU IR 4c.3:

To promote the state's Minority Educator Recruitment and Retention (MERR) Program, throughout the year the Center coordinator visits middle and high schools, as well as community colleges, to discuss education careers and make students aware of available scholarship dollars. The coordinator

also participates in college fairs, open houses, and “Focus on Western” events, and hosts student groups on campus. The coordinator also works on a special project within the Young Male Leadership Academy, with a local high school on the Multicultural Cadet Corp, and with local Future Educator of America groups in an effort to “grow our own” future educators from diverse backgrounds. Such efforts typically bring an additional 12 or more diverse students per year.

To retain students, the coordinator offers support through ACT/PPST, Praxis II, résumé writing, and interview workshops (open to all, but targeted for these students), involving students in professional development, and meeting with them regularly. Furthermore, school district administrative personnel are invited to talk to students about their districts and what their districts have to offer them upon program completion. At any given time, about 30-35 WKU students are involved in the MERR program.

However, the BOE team would benefit by meeting with Denise Hardesty in the Office of Teacher Services to learning more about these activities.

(4) The incorporation of diversity in the Professional Certificate for Principals and GSKyTeach programs. What proficiencies related to diversity do candidates develop in these programs?

Within all of the Department of Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research [Program Review Documents](#), including the Professional Certificate for Principals documents, matrices show the alignment of the program to standards related to diversity. For example, candidates develop proficiencies in designing and monitoring programs based on diverse student needs; applying laws assuring equal education opportunities for all students; developing school community profiles in order to meet diverse student and community needs; and recruiting, selecting, and retaining personnel to meet the needs of a diverse society.

The most focused attention to diversity in GSKyTeach is in the course SMED 530, Designing Instructions for Students with Special Needs and Promoting Literacy. In this course, candidates learn about the diverse needs of students and develop concepts of vocabulary, reading comprehension, and study skills for diverse populations. Teachers prepare and teach inquiry lessons with imbedded reading experiences that challenge, motivate, and involve diverse sets of students. Students investigate cooperative learning and cultural diversity and use innovative technology to address diverse needs. Specific course objectives include:

1. Design instruction that will meet the literacy needs of diverse learners
2. Develop concepts of vocabulary, especially as it relates to specific math and science content for diverse learners
3. Develop the ability to promote reading/study skills in secondary science and math for diverse learners
4. Develop instructional strategies in the content areas of math and science that promote student achievement for all subgroups
5. Submit lesson plans and revise them using best practice in reading instruction for diverse learners in math and science

While completing this course, candidates teach four days a week in high school classes with more than 30 percent students from diverse backgrounds and practice various elements of instruction.

(5) *The roles of the Administrative Leadership Institute, Green River Region initiative, Project TREE, and the Bowling Green After School initiatives in addressing diversity issues. How does the unit work with these initiatives to increase and retain diverse candidates and faculty in the unit?*

The Department of Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research (EALR) is running the 12th consecutive cohort of the Administrative Leadership Institute (ALI), making a total of 154 minority participants over twelve years. ALI is a collaborative project between the Kentucky Department of Education, the Kentucky Alliance of Black School Educators, and Western Kentucky University, which pays tuition and related costs for minority educators working on leadership certifications.

EALR department faculty worked with two minority candidates in the Kentucky Department of Education's Superintendent Internship Program to complete certification. In both cases the participants received superintendent certification and went on to earn an Ed.D. degree in school leadership.

Finally, in collaboration with the Green River Regional Educational Cooperative, the EALR department ran the Aspiring Principal Program for two years. The pilot program focused on methods to recruit and support diverse aspiring principals in rural districts, through tuition scholarships, school district commitment, and various approaches to course delivery leading to certification.

Project TREE was a "grow your own" project funded for four years by the Kentucky Department of Education. This project increased WKU's presence in communities with large populations of underrepresented groups. WKU ran camps for middle school African-American males, with the first of these students coming to college in fall 2011. The camps were intended to encourage these students to pursue teaching careers, which many of them have stated as their intent. Although only time will tell, we believe that many of these students will choose to pursue education at WKU.

As mentioned in the WKU NCATE IR, the literacy program faculty has developed relationships with associations and organizations that are geared toward working with underrepresented groups, especially the Housing Authority of Bowling Green's (HABG) Learning Center, which serves a population that represents 9 major ethnic groups with an overall 98% diverse population being served in the After School and Summer School programs. The HABG sets a goal of 100% postsecondary education for all learners it serves. Thus, not only do these programs allow WKU candidates to interact with and tutor students from diverse backgrounds, it also allows candidates to serve as role models and mentors for these diverse students and to encourage them to continue their pursuit of education beyond high school, and, of course, to consider WKU as a welcoming place to reach their educational goals.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

5.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) *Reflection of the conceptual framework in instruction. How is the CF incorporated into instruction as shown in syllabi, assessments, or other sources?*

As described in WKU IR 5b.1 and as illustrated in [course syllabi](#), faculty members incorporate key values, beliefs, and standards within their course descriptions, objectives, and assignments. Furthermore, based on program alignment processes, specific courses have core assessments, called critical performances, that are aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Standards (KTS). As can be seen by viewing any critical performance on the [Electronic Portfolio](#) portion of WKU E-PASS, the alignment of critical performance to KTS is clearly delineated on each CP. Program Assessment Plans also ensure that program faculty members coordinate their instruction and assessments so that every candidate learns about and has opportunity to demonstrate proficiency on each Kentucky Teacher Standard.

Although faculty are free to include CF and KTS language on their syllabi, and many do, we made a conscious decision not to require faculty to do so because of a sense that this would lead to a minimum compliance mentality. Instead, we have focused efforts on actual evidence of each course's contribution to the CF and KTS through the development of the Program Assessment Plans where the experiences and associated assessments for the course and their alignment to the KTS and/or other CF values are clearly articulated. The plans allow for verification that CF values and KTS are actually being addressed and assessed because we can go to the WKU E-PASS system to see the student uploads and faculty scores associated with them.

(2) Faculty scholarship. In what types of scholarship are faculty involved? How actively involved in scholarship are faculty members? How is the information on scholarly development being collected digitally? What is the unit learning from these data? How does this information inform the growth and improvement of faculty?

WKU IR 5c.2 and [Faculty Summary Information](#) describe faculty scholarship. As can be seen, faculty members are involved in publication of books and articles and various presentations. Within one calendar year, 70% of faculty reported scholarship activities. Although all faculty members must enter data into the Digital Measures system for their annual review, faculty can voluntarily choose to put in all their data or some portion of it. Thus, 70% likely underestimates the portion of faculty involved in scholarship. It is hard to determine what the "unit" is learning from these data, but clearly growth in faculty scholarship is a requirement for tenure and promotion within the university. Clear procedures and policies are in place to inform faculty that they are meeting scholarship standards developed by each department. If faculty members fall below these standards, they develop growth plans that are reviewed and approved by department heads and deans (WKU IR 5e.2 and 5e.3).

Additionally, CEBS academic units have revised their tenure and promotion standards and have increased or refined expectations in these areas. Furthermore, WKU has placed greater emphasis on scholarship across the university, evidenced by the hiring of a Vice President for Research who will in coming weeks unveil a plan to encourage and support greater faculty activity in the areas of research, grant writing, and other forms of scholarship/creative activity.

As mentioned earlier, faculty involvement in research related to the Teacher Work Sample has guided recent efforts to refine/revise the process to ensure greater validity and reliability (Kirchner, Evans, & Norman, 2010; Norman, Evans, & Pankratz, 2011; Stobaugh, Tassell, & Norman, 2010). Other professional education faculty conduct research or lead grants, such as the Math Science Project work with Middle Schools, SKyTeach/GSKyTeach, College Readiness, Sextant, and several Kentucky Collaborative Center for Literacy Development, just to name a few, that study similar practical issues affecting schools, students, or professional education in general. These, as well as other faculty research and grant initiatives, certainly lead to faculty, program, and unit growth and improvement.

(3) Faculty service to and participation in public schools. In what types of service to public schools are faculty engaged? What information is being collected in Digital Measures? How do faculty members participate in P-12 schools? To what extent do faculty provide service and are engaged in schools?

WKU IR 5d.2 and [Faculty Service Summary](#) describe faculty service to public schools, as well as other organizations.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

6.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

(1) Roles of Associate Deans. Is the Director of the School of Teacher Education also an Associate Dean for curriculum and academic programs? Or are these separate positions? What are the responsibilities of the other Associate Dean who appears to oversee research (web information/directory title compared to title in the IR) and structures for oversight and support of grants management in the unit and outside of the unit?

As described in WKU IR 6a.1, the WKU College of Education and Behavioral Sciences has three Associate Deans:

Tony Norman (Accountability and Research) – Responsibilities include unit-wide and program accountability efforts; developing/updating Program Assessment Plans; approving faculty developed CPs; ensuring collection of assessment data and other data associated with CF values; overseeing changes to WKU E-PASS; providing annual data to program coordinators for Annual Program Reports; writing and disseminating Unit Wide Assessment Report; writing NCATE Annual Report, PEDS, and Title II reporting; supporting faculty research and grant writing efforts as needed; reviewing theses and education specialist projects

Retta Poe (Academic Programs) – Responsibilities include overseeing programs; chairing CEBS Curriculum Committee; overseeing advising/student issues (e.g., schedule exception requests, grade appeals, admission); approving CEBS recruitment materials; coordinating new faculty activities and faculty professional development activities; overseeing graduate admissions/comprehensive exams

Sherry Powers (Director of the School of Teacher Education) – Responsibilities include day-to-day oversight of School of Teacher Education faculty and programs

(2) Candidates' access to faculty advisement. Do all candidates have access to faculty advisement? It appears that some program candidates have access only to advisors through the Office of Teacher Services. How adequate is the advisement for candidates? How do faculty advisement assignments affect faculty loads?

WKU IR 6a.4 provides this information. At the initial preparation level, all teacher education candidates have access to faculty advisement. In addition to specific subject matter advisors for those seeking secondary certification, two full-time student advisors, Ms. Denise Garner and Ms. Deborah Sloss, have regular office hours and advise elementary and middle grades majors. Specialty areas such as exceptional education, IECE, and Communication Disorders have faculty members who serve as advisors for individual students. Also, Ms. Michelle Kahler advises those students who are seeking alternative certification as well as serving as another resource for those students who plan to major in secondary education.

Through the use of face-to-face advising, Blackboard activities, web-based informational sources, email, etc., all of our students have the opportunity to be fully prepared to navigate successfully the instructional programs leading to teacher certification.

Advanced preparation and other school professional program candidates are individually advised by program faculty. Faculty advising is considered as part of the service portion of the faculty workload.

(3) *Specific data and fiscal information related to off-campus sites including Glasgow, Elizabethtown, and Owensboro campuses.*

Dennis George, Dean of the University College, which houses the regional campuses, will be prepared to provide data as needed about each site. Also, websites for [Glasgow](#), [Elizabethtown](#), and [Owensboro](#) campuses are available for review, as well as an additional [document](#) in the NCATE Document Room.

(4) *Comparative budget information . How does the budget for CEBS compare with other university units, especially units with clinical components?*

Comparison budgets for CEBS and the College of Health and Human Services are available [here](#). In nearly all categories, CEBS is faring as well or better in budgeted funds.

(5) *Resources and support for the school psychology program (condition from last visit). How have these changed since the previous visit?*

By the time the BOE members come to the WKU campus, the school psychology program will have submitted its SPA report that delineates program improvements to address the conditions.

(6) *Resources for online programs. How do these compare to online programs in other academic and professional areas? How adequate are the resources?*

WKU has excellent IT and Distance learning infrastructure and licenses a current version of BlackBoard (BB) as the course management system for its online and F2F courses. Online courses are distributed through the WKU's Internet server using the BB System and are available to students by password. All registered students are provided with a WKU account, allowing online access to WKU electronic services including: email, online registration and tuition payment, student records, financial aid, and more.

The Department of Academic Technology (AT) has three full-time staff specifically for Faculty Blackboard support. The online courses web site includes a help desk phone number available 7 days a week. WKU also licenses Tegrity, class capture software that automatically captures, stores, and indexes multimedia content for replay. The multimedia content can then be accessed online, on an iPod, or by a variety of other mobile devices.

The WKU Office of Distance Learning (ODL) assists and supports Faculty developing and teaching distance learning courses by providing training and technical support. The WKU Office of Distance Learning has a full- and part-time staff of 32, including five full-time instructional designers, several Graduate Assistants, a Student Support Specialist, and a Testing Specialist all dedicated to supporting faculty and students involved in distance learning courses.

The Office of Distance Learning's Testing Center provides proctored Exams nationwide and is a member of the Consortium of College Testing Centers (CCTC), an organization of testing professionals in post-secondary institutions and testing companies. It provides a free referral service to facilitate distance learning. The Testing Center assists faculty and both resident and out-of state students in scheduling and administering proctored exams. These services are provided in traditional paper-pencil formats as well as by on-line, web-based servers at some sites.

The WKU Office of Distance Learning maintains a website listing all online courses and provides potential online students a skills assessment while introducing them to WKU online services and resources. The website also includes an introduction to online learning and information on software and hardware requirements necessary for successful course completion.