



# Board of Examiners Report

## SUMMARY FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

### Institution:

Troy University

### Team Findings:

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

Not Applicable (Programs not offered at this level)

## I. INTRODUCTION

### 1. Provide a brief overview of the institution and the unit.

Troy University's tradition of teaching dates to its founding on February 26, 1887, when an act of the Alabama Legislature established Troy State Normal School as an institution to train teachers for Alabama's schools. In 1893, the school was renamed Troy State Normal College. In 1929 it was renamed as Troy State Teacher's College. The enrollment of the College more than doubled after World War II, leading to the introduction of degree programs in disciplines other than education. In 1957, the State Board of Education dropped "Teacher's" from Troy State College's name.

The decade of the 1950s also marked the University's long relationship with the United States military, as extension courses were offered on nearby bases, first at Fort Rucker, near Dothan, and later at Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery. A separate Troy State College teaching center was established at Fort Rucker in 1961, which evolved into the present-day Dothan Campus. A similar center, begun at Maxwell Air Force Base in 1965, led to the creation of the present-day Montgomery Campus. These programs were the forerunners of the modern TROY Global Campus division of Troy University, which operates all TROY teaching sites outside of Alabama. Today, TROY Global Campus operates more than 60 sites in 17 U.S. states and 11 nations.

The name changed to Troy State University in 1967 and in 1975, the Phenix City Campus was opened as a branch of the main campus. In 1982, the Troy State University System was formed, as the campuses in Dothan and Montgomery were granted independent accreditation status. In April of 2004 the Board of Trustees voted to drop "State" from the University's name to better reflect the institution's worldwide mission. Starting August 2005, all Troy University campuses were again unified under one regional accreditation.

The unit is defined as the College of Education, which provides leadership for all programs that prepare teachers at the initial and advanced levels and educators for other school professional positions. The unit

is comprised of College of Education personnel on the four campuses -- Troy, Phenix City, Dothan and Montgomery--and methods and discipline specialists in the College of Arts and Sciences on both the Troy and Dothan campuses. Methods and discipline faculty in the College of Communication and Fine Arts and the College of Health and Human Services on the Troy campus are also members of the unit. The unit offers 14 initial programs and 23 advanced programs to more than 1500 candidates. The largest programs at each level are the elementary initial program (300 candidates), the elementary master's degree advanced preparation program (124 candidates), the elementary educational specialist program (358 candidates) and the educational administration program (288 candidates). Sixty-three full-time faculty, 28 faculty who are full-time in the institution, but part-time in the unit, and 64 adjunct faculty provide instruction.

The stated mission of the unit is to prepare educators, counselors, administrators, and other professionals to be life-long, innovative, informed, reflective decision makers effectively trained to achieve the goals, competencies, and skills identified by the accrediting and professional organizations for each program. Programs in music and counseling received specialized accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP).

**2. Describe the type 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?**

A continuing accreditation site visit occurred at Troy State University, including Phenix City campus, in April 2004; the NCATE action letter of November 2004 to the university reported that the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) extended the continuing accreditation to the Troy and Phenix City campuses for both initial and advanced level programs with all standards met and three areas for improvement cited. All were retained at the current visit. Troy State University Dothan received a continuing accreditation visit in October 2003. Standards 1 and 2 were cited in the BOE report as not met at the initial and advanced levels. However, the action letter sent in November 2004 from NCATE stated that continuing accreditation had been retained and that the conditions for Standard 2 had been removed and the institution returned to regular accreditation. Six AFIs were cited. The BOE team found three AFIs corrected and retained three AFIs from the previous visit. The Montgomery campus was participating in its first NCATE visit.

The following NCATE policy for merger of institutions was followed: When two NCATE accredited institutions merge, the next NCATE visit will be scheduled to coincide with that of the institution whose accreditation cycle first expires, pending approval of the state partner. The action letter to Troy University Dothan stated "the next NCATE visit is scheduled for fall 2008" and it became the date for the visit to all four campuses, 38 months after the merger.

The NCATE/State Partnership Protocol for Continuing Reviews of Professional Education Units in the State of Alabama guided the visit. A team of seven NCATE BOE members and two state team members (who are NCATE BOE trained) jointly conducted the visit. The Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) Director of Teacher Education and Certification served as co-chair of the team, conducted program reviews and documented compliance with state regulations. A representative of the Alabama Education Association assisted in the visit. Nine voting members conducted interviews and school visits, met jointly to share findings, and voted equally on standards. All programs were reviewed by a State Subject Area Specialist (SAS) team prior to the visit. Prior to the joint NCATE/Alabama BOE visit, all initial and advanced programs documented full compliance with all applicable state program standards. Almost all of Alabama's "College and University Standards" have been met. A status report on those

standards will be provided to NCATE by March 1, 2009. All requirements of the NCATE/Alabama protocol were fulfilled.

**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.).**

As described above, Troy University now operates as a single university with teacher preparation programs on four campuses in Alabama. No certification programs are offered at Global Campus sites. The TROY eCampus, providing courses and programs via distance technologies, does not include certification programs. While no program can be completed with more than 50% of its courses via distance learning, candidates can and do complete courses in a variety of formats such as on-line, Internet, DVD, audio tape, and Live Course on Tape (LCOT) delivered from the Phenix City campus, including courses required by several advanced level programs. The Live to Tape course delivery mode is used for graduate courses in Elementary Education and School Counseling, with full-time faculty providing instruction. Critical assignments are not collected in LiveText in this course format. These courses require candidates to be present to take midterm and final exams. The team talked with one instructor who was teaching courses in the Educational Leadership program in Florida at the time of the visit. This program is being phased out and its delivery at the Florida site was not considered as part of the visit.

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

At the pre-visit, the dean announced to the BOE chair and the state department consultant that he had recently learned the Troy campus would be closed during the week of the visit for fall break. After consulting with NCATE staff via a conference call and e-mail, it was decided that the visit would go forward. The schedule was revised with four team members arriving on Thursday to conduct interviews at Troy on Friday, the only day that faculty and candidates would be available. A schedule was developed to accommodate this situation, and approved by the institution, the BOE chair, state consultant and NCATE staff. During the site visit, team members learned that the institution's calendar approval process begins a year in advance. The university requested dates for the site visit from NCATE in April, 2008 and received approval on May 28. Based upon this information, it appears that the unusual schedule the team followed during its visit would have been avoided by the unit checking the Troy calendar prior to requesting review dates. Members were told onsite that Troy personnel became aware of the conflict two weeks after the dates were confirmed but did not request a date change. Dothan and Montgomery campuses are an hour's drive from Troy; Phenix City is about a 90 minute drive. The team spent the majority of its time on the main campus in Troy, conducting interviews with administrators, faculty, staff, candidates, recent graduates, cooperating teachers, administrators, and other school partners. The poster session on Sunday night occurred on the Troy campus with faculty and candidates from all four campuses represented. Afterward, team members conducted interviews with adjunct faculty, school administrators, interns in initial programs, and candidates in the four programs for other school professionals. All campuses were represented in all interviews on Sunday evening. On Monday morning, two team members traveled to each of the other campuses. One team member at Montgomery and one at Dothan interviewed administrators and faculty and toured the facilities. One interviewed administrators, faculty and candidates at Phenix City and toured facilities. The second visited schools used by each site for field experiences/clinical practice, interviewing interns, administrators, cooperating teachers and current candidates in advanced programs. Monday afternoon all members conducted interviews on the Troy campus using V-TEL technology to connect with the other

campuses.

An administrator of the education program on the Phenix City campus died the week before the site visit. One BOE team member left on Monday morning, due to a death in the family. His assignment was assumed by other members.

## 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.

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

The unit's educator preparation programs are designed to develop informed, innovative and reflective teachers, administrators, counselors, school psychometrists and school psychologists. The conceptual framework identifies 10 proficiencies related to knowledge, pedagogy and dispositions.

1. Demonstrate an understanding of and show effective performance with diverse learning populations in a variety of school cultures
2. Demonstrate proactive leadership, professional conduct and well-balanced professional dispositions
3. Demonstrate effectiveness as communicators, facilitators, pedagogues and scholars
4. Build multi-level collaborative partnerships and mentoring relationships
5. Demonstrate competencies in content area knowledge, assessment and emerging technologies
6. Demonstrate cutting-edge competencies in pedagogical and applied research skills
7. Practice authentic self-assessment, critical and reflective thinking, and the continual monitoring of progress and development
8. Demonstrate an ability to generalize and creatively problem-solve
9. Refine and evaluate innovative delivery and assessment models
10. Demonstrate professional qualities that contribute to building safe, supportive, creative and stimulating learning environments

The current conceptual framework evolved from the conceptual frameworks that had guided the programs at Troy/Phenix City and at Dothan during their prior site visits. Committees representing all programs met to find common elements of both documents; the current framework grew from the series of drafts that resulted from these deliberations. The framework's philosophy is based on an article by Colton and Sparks-Langer (1993) in which they described the development of teacher reflection and decision making. It is said to be grounded in best practice, current and time-tested educational theories, national initiatives, teacher education reform elements, and responsive to change. It was aligned to the NCATE, INTASC, NBPTS, ISLLS, CACREP, and the Alabama State Department of Education Standards.

Completion of the Alabama Performance Assessment Template (PAT) for Alabama Quality Teaching Standards (AQTS), applicable to all initial certification programs, and the PAT for each separate teaching field, a required component of the Alabama review process, resulted in the unit's alignment of one or more components of the conceptual framework to every state standard applicable to each program. Although LiveText will "stamp," i.e., document alignment across the conceptual framework with SPA standards and state standards when asked to do so, the unit has not asked LiveText to provide

that “stamping.”

The conceptual framework was not aligned with the unit’s assessments. A review of master syllabi for methods courses and internships in 14 initial programs found that the conceptual framework was referenced in six courses. Candidates in interviews gave examples of how they were being prepared to be informed, innovative and reflective.

### III. STANDARDS

In its responses to each standard, the team should indicate when differences exist among the main campus, distance learning programs, and off-campus programs.

#### 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. Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)**

Yes

No

jñ

jñ

**If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.**

#### 1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼

#### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Data from the state licensure and program completion documents for initial teacher education preparation programs and two components of the Alabama Prospective Teacher Testing Program (APTTP), three basic skills assessments and the Praxis II [presented in Table 4 on page 13 of the IR] show that candidates have sufficient general education and content knowledge. The pass rates for all programs are above 80 percent. This claim is supported by data from key and critical assessments of content knowledge including essays, philosophy paper, lesson plans, and internship evaluations (item 2.5 on Alabama’s Professional Education Personnel Evaluation (PEPE) system, and teacher field exit exams. Additionally, the performance profile on the Alabama State Department of Education Report Card presents an A grade on the basic skills assessment and Praxis II. A local high school principal stated that Troy graduates have a working knowledge of what to do on the first day. Another principal

asserted that Troy graduates already know and use our current language when they arrive in our schools.

Critical assignments such as essays, unit plans, and lesson plans are used to assess content knowledge of teacher candidates. Another assessment tool used for such purpose is the required Quality Teaching Standards Exit Exam. The test bank for the exam covers such areas as classroom management, curriculum and instructional delivery, and educational assessment, educational psychology, diverse learners, language and literacy, the professional educator, technology, and methods. Topics mirror various courses taught in the professional studies curriculum.

Survey results completed by 186 employers of Troy University’s teacher candidates on the 2006-2007 Employer Survey show that 100 percent of the unit’s graduates have excellent skills. Additional 2007-2008 survey results completed by 36 employers indicated 97 percent rating for good skills. A grade of A for on- the-job performance is noted on the state’s report card. Data results completed by 158 initial program candidates on the 2006-2007 Graduating Student Survey show that 83 percent agreed/strongly agreed that courses in their field were valuable, and 89 percent agreed/strongly agreed that the degree program in which they enrolled was valuable for them and their employment. However, there was not adequate evidence available to show that assessments of candidate knowledge and skills are aligned with the unit’s conceptual framework.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:**

Advanced programs depend on several assessment sources for determining the content knowledge of teachers. The sources vary by program, but are common across campuses. For example, several programs rely on the comprehensive examinations and most report 100 percent pass rates. Upon request, copies of the examination and sample graded exams were provided for advanced programs on all campuses. Copies of teacher work samples were provided for programs that use them upon request.. Several programs rely on Praxis II. Faculty were able to discuss the knowledge of their candidates across all advanced programs and school administrators who hired Troy candidates concurred that their knowledge was acceptable.

The institutional data on LiveText which, while extensive, do not help in the understanding of candidate content knowledge and do not include a summary of content knowledge of advanced candidates by program or for the unit. There is also a lack of variation in the reported results, with most candidates scoring at the highest level of competence. Some faculty and some programs do not use LiveText and some faculty in some programs did not know how to access LiveText.

However, the review of comprehensive examinations and other candidate documents, interviews with faculty, interviews with candidates, and interviews with employers confirm that teachers in advanced programs have the requisite content knowledge and skills. It should be noted that Alabama’s protocol does not require national SPA reviews, although faculty in the program in Elementary Education, the advanced program for teachers with the largest number of candidates, were able to articulate the standards of their professional disciplinary association and used them, along with NBPTS standards in designing their program and assessing candidates. This is also true of the programs in music and art, but not true of the other programs in the unit.

**1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates**

Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced	

Teacher Preparation

Unacceptable

### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The Professional Education Personnel Evaluation (PEPE) system, an Alabama evaluation tool, is designed to assess teacher performance on all levels including teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. Using PEPE indicators, teacher candidates are evaluated during internship and on the job. In regard to preparing candidates in pedagogical content knowledge, the unit received an A grade from the Alabama State Department of Education.

Data from the following assessments provide further evidence of candidate pedagogical content knowledge: internship final evaluation during clinical practice, follow-up surveys, second-year teacher surveys, and administrator surveys. All initial candidates scored above the required 3.5 on a scale of one-four with four demonstrating excellence on competencies related to pedagogy. This information confirms that candidates in all programs have mastered the pedagogical content knowledge needed to become effective teachers.

Survey results on the 2007 Employer Survey completed by 37 employers of Troy University's teacher candidates indicated that employers rated the university graduates at the 92nd percentile in their educational preparation. Also, survey results completed by local school systems for the 2006-2007 Teacher Performance Profile revealed that 100 percent of the local school systems were satisfied or very satisfied with candidates' pedagogical content knowledge.

The majority of candidates received As and Bs in the two required technology courses, EDU 4499 Technology Across the Curriculum and EDU 3305 Microcomputers in Education, over the last two years. Cooperating teachers reported that interns used a variety of technology in preparing and teaching lessons.

### Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

Pedagogical content knowledge for advanced teacher preparation is assessed through the use of teacher work samples in the advanced programs for teachers. Candidates in these programs are not observed in their teaching. Two examples of teacher work samples were provided in LiveText. Upon request, additional examples were provided. There appears to be no significant evidence of pedagogical content knowledge within the teacher work samples provided. Reflections and self evaluations, learning and assessment goals, and a description of how instructional decisions are made were found in the work samples, although theories from the conceptual framework were not used as part of the reflection. No summaries of competence in pedagogical content knowledge for advanced programs were in evidence. There is evidence that candidates study the use of technology as part of their preparation and technology is evident in teacher work samples.

### 1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation

Acceptable

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation

Unacceptable

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

According to the state’s report card, candidates have sufficient professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Key assessments that measure initial candidates’ professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills include portfolios, exit interviews, internship evaluations, first-year teacher surveys, and administrative surveys.

Data from the sample Professional Educator Survey, completed by candidates, indicate that candidates score as being well prepared on using strategies for teaching [Table on page 124 of the COE Data Report].

Data from portfolio submission indicate that candidates have sufficient professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Aggregated exit assessment data by program for each of the relevant competencies indicate that candidates across programs are meeting competencies.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:**

Regarding the assessment of pedagogical content knowledge, there is no direct observation of teaching to provide evidence of teaching excellence. The work samples provided show how candidates planned their lessons, but did not show how successful their pedagogy was in carrying out the instruction. Examination of courses showed that candidates did study the applications of technology to pedagogy, but the unit provided no evidence of the application of technology in practice. There were no summarized findings of candidate work using teacher work samples. The institution cites surveys of employers as evidence of the pedagogical and professional knowledge of candidates, but these surveys report on all graduates of the program (although the n for the most recent survey was only 35), not just those in or who have completed advanced programs for teachers.

There is no evidence that major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning are systematically included in the programs or that candidates regularly interpret research. Candidates interviewed did not relate their views to either theory or research and did not use theory in their reflection on teaching.

**1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates**

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Student Learning for Teacher Candidates – Advanced Teacher Preparation	Unacceptable

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

Internship evaluations, the professional portfolio, and Part II of the student accountability plan are key assessments that provide the unit with information regarding candidates’ ability to assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences for all students. The Professional Educator Survey revealed

that 80 percent of candidates agreed that courses in their curriculum contributed to the ability to assess the needs and growth of students and their ability to use the assessment results in the instructional decision-making process. Teacher work sample methodology is used in most initial programs during the clinical practice internship. Artifacts reflect that candidates assess and adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students. For example, the elementary education candidates highlight impact on student learning in a portfolio section on reading, mathematics, and science. Secondary education programs focus on various examinations. Data presented by the unit onsite show that the majority of candidates score at the acceptable levels on these assessments. The initial average mean performance ratings were 3.46 for fall 2007 and 3.67 for spring 2008. A remediation plan is implemented for teacher candidates who score below the acceptable level on given assignments.

Interviews with initial teacher candidates indicated that they were comfortable and confident in their ability to assess and adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students. The Accountability Plan Part II, an internship form, follow-up surveys, and discussions with cooperating teachers and P-12 administrators indicate a high level of satisfaction with Troy University graduates. Overall, COE graduates confirmed that they feel prepared and confident in their role of student assessment.

### **Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:**

The institution reports as evidence that candidates in advanced teacher preparation programs understand how to assess student learning the fact that they already hold a certificate from an initial teaching program which requires such understanding. The unit further cites, as was the case with pedagogical and professional knowledge, surveys of employers which do not include only advanced teacher preparation candidates, but rather any graduates of the university. Data for advanced teacher preparation candidates are not disaggregated from the report.

The team found little or no use of major concepts and theories of assessment, and none are cited in the theoretical basis for the program within the Conceptual Framework. A review of the teacher work sample revealed no evidence that candidates used classroom performance data to make instructional decisions. Community resources were not regularly mentioned in the primary data sources.

### **1e. Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals**

Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals

Acceptable

### **Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

The institution reports data from the internship required of candidates in programs for other school professionals in leadership, counseling, school psychology and school psychometry. A review of the data reported, including critical assignments embedded in courses and portfolios demonstrates that candidates in advanced programs for other school personnel possess the requisite professional knowledge and skills.

### **1f. Student Learning for Other School Professionals**

Student Learning for Other School Professionals

Acceptable

## Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Candidates in programs for other school personnel demonstrate their mastery of understanding how to measure and assess student learning through portfolios and internships. Portfolios for candidates in educational leadership similarly demonstrate understanding of student learning. The program in educational administration reviewed is being phased out and replaced by a program in instructional leadership, which is expected to give even more attention to this area. Although mentioned in the IR, the team did not find summarized data on this standard.

### 1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation

Acceptable

Professional Dispositions for All Candidates – Advanced Preparation

Acceptable

### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

A review of the assessment handbook (page 94), data reports in LiveText, and interviews with faculty and candidates confirmed that professional dispositions are assessed within programs using candidates' portfolios, course assignments, reflections, and clinical evaluations. Survey results completed by local school systems on the 2006-2007 Teacher Performance Profile revealed that 100 percent of the local school systems were satisfied with candidates' dispositions needed to help all students learn. The unit monitors candidates' professional dispositions at all transition points in the program, assessing them with a variety of measures and specific rubrics. On a scale of one-five, candidates are assessed on professional dispositions at least three times-- by self assessment, by the university supervisor, and by cooperating teachers. With the rank of five being the highest, the average ratings were 4.8.

As reflected in LiveText, the professional portfolio process begins in EDU 3310 The Professional Educator. Assessment data presented by the unit show that initial and alternative candidates exceed the minimum acceptable score of 3.00 on competencies related to professional dispositions. The mean performance rating was 3.46 for fall 2007 and 3.67 for spring 2008. Exit scores exceed the minimum acceptable score of 3.5 on the same competencies. Cooperating teachers and P-12 administrators indicated that candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions required to be effective teachers. They are satisfied with candidates' professionalism and content knowledge. However, inadequate evidence was provided to show that assessments of candidates' dispositions are aligned with the unit's conceptual framework.

### Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation:

As part of the admissions process, the unit examines evidence of the presence of particular dispositions or the likelihood that particular dispositions will be demonstrated. The primary vehicle for work on dispositions is the Professional Development Plan in which candidates review their progress toward developing dispositions and meet with faculty advisors in the course of plan development. The team reviewed sample reports of disposition development and feels confident that the unit focuses on the development and achievement of dispositions in candidates finishing the program.

## Summary of Findings for the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

As part of the admissions process, the unit examines evidence of the presence of particular dispositions or the likelihood that particular dispositions will be demonstrated. The primary vehicle for work on dispositions is the Professional Development Plan in which candidates review their progress toward developing dispositions and meet with faculty advisors in the course of plan development. The team reviewed sample reports of disposition development and feels confident that the unit focuses on the development and achievement of dispositions in candidates finishing the program.

### Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit provides a variety of learning experiences for teacher candidates. Overall, teacher candidates at the initial level know the content they plan to teach and have appropriate mastery of pedagogical content, pedagogical and professional knowledge, and knowledge of student learning. Eighty percent or more of the unit's program completers pass content examinations for licensure. Candidates in all advanced programs have mastered appropriate content and demonstrate appropriate dispositions. Based on the data submitted, all candidates except those in advanced programs for teachers, have pedagogical content knowledge, and knowledge of student learning appropriate for the element.

**Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]**

### Areas for Improvement and Rationales

#### AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. Performance data are limited in all program areas.	The AFI does not apply to all programs and the new AFI addresses a similar area more specifically.

#### AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. Assessments of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions are not aligned with the unit's conceptual framework and institution's outcomes.	Inadequate evidence was available to show that assessments of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions are aligned with the unit's conceptual framework.

#### New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. Data provided by the unit as evidence were inadequate to demonstrate that candidates in advanced programs for teachers have the pedagogical knowledge and skills or the knowledge and skills related to student learning required by the standard.	Data in the College of Education Data Report for 2007-2008, which are relied upon heavily as evidence, are not related to the elements of the standards. Most of the data reported are general survey results regarding candidate or employer satisfaction and are not direct evidence of whether the knowledge and skills are present and used. Disaggregated data on candidates in advanced programs were not available.

## Recommendation for Standard 1

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

**Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]**

N/A

## 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.

**Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 2 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)**

Yes

No

jñ

jñ

**If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.**

### 2a. Assessment System

Assessment System – Initial Teacher Preparation	Unacceptable
Assessment System – Advanced Preparation	Unacceptable

### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

The current assessment system is a composite of components of previous systems at the Dothan, Troy, and Phenix City campuses. The current system was piloted during the 2006-2007 academic year. The assessment system was approved by the Executive committee and evaluated by members of the college faculty in 2007. The consolidated conceptual framework was also approved at this time. The Unit Assessment System identifies five transition points for undergraduate and advanced programs: admission to the teacher education program, entry to clinical practice, exit from clinical practice, graduation, and post-graduation. Key assessments are identified for each transition point. The Assessment System Handbook identifies a seven-step process providing a plan for the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data (p 7). Data from external and internal sources are forwarded to the unit head and then sent to the cross-departmental Assessment Committee for analysis. The committee prepares analysis reports which are sent to the unit head and department chairs. Reports are analyzed by

faculty to determine whether further action is needed. Proposals for changes are presented to the College of Education Executive Committee and if approved are sent through appropriate academic committees for approval.

Assessments include multiple indicators of candidate performance. Although the program assessments are aligned to state standards there is no chart reflecting alignment to standards from national professional organizations with the exception of the music program (NASM) and the English/ language arts program (NCTE). The unit does not formally acknowledge the relationship or linkage that exists between the state standards and the professional discipline standards (SPAs); however, the state standards incorporated professional standards in their development. Also, Alabama is a partnership state that does not require SPA reports for NCATE institutions. Interviews indicate that the unit operates under the assumption that professional standards are met through state standards.

The unit assessment system does not identify how critical assessments identified for each course at the initial and advanced levels align to the unit’s conceptual framework. A review of course syllabi for all methods-based and internship courses across programs at the initial level indicated only six of the fourteen referenced the conceptual framework. The required Alabama Quality Teaching Standards provide a basic scaffold for the alignment of the principles identified in the conceptual framework and the course-level critical assessments. The current assessment system does not reflect the conceptual framework and no evidence was available to verify the conceptual framework is systematically evaluated.

A system is in place for utilizing multiple readers for comprehensive exams and initial program exit exams and rubrics for critical assessments to assure accuracy and fairness of course and program level evaluation. Although rubrics were confirmed to support the unit’s system to eliminate bias and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency in its internal assessment of courses, portfolios, and internships, data were not available for all programs or for all critical assignments within programs.

Interviews with faculty, committees, administrators and review of documents failed to document the unit’s use of data to facilitate unit level improvements. The current policy and procedures support a program-level system only.

A process was outlined in the IR that uses a Program Data Analysis and Planning (PDAP) form to make policy recommendations to improve curriculum, resources, enrollment and retention, and faculty development. Interviews and review of completed PDAP forms indicate that the process is not linked to data derived from the unit’s assessment system; no evidence was available to document implementation of data-driven unit-level decisions.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

Same as the Summary of Findings for the Initial Assessment System.

**2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation**

Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

The unit maintains the assessment system through the use of LiveText, a web-based portal (Prolepsis), and Microsoft Office tools and provides information on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, and competence of graduates at the initial level. The unit follows a data management system timeline (Assessment System Handbook, p 8). Data available through LiveText and Prolepsis provide a repository and dissemination mechanism. Course-level data are compiled, analyzed, and summarized by programs annually and the Program Data Analysis and Planning (PDAP) form provides a structure for documenting and making recommendations related to areas of improvement at the program level.

Initial candidates have the opportunity to evaluate courses and instructors each semester. At the initial level, candidates provide feedback to the unit on field experiences and internships through reflective journals and evaluation forms. Initial candidates provide additional feedback through course-level evaluation of critical assessments and Professional Educator Exit surveys.

There are no unit-level policies or procedures to maintain records of candidate complaints and resolutions. A university level complaint and appeal process is described in the student handbook and the undergraduate/graduate catalogues. Although detailed records are maintained at each campus or by individual programs regarding complaints and resolution, the unit has no formal policy to maintain unit - level records or to inform the unit head of all complaints and resolutions.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

The unit maintains the assessment system through the use of LiveText, a web-based portal (Prolepsis), and Microsoft Office tools and provides information on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, and competence of graduates at the advanced level. The unit follows a data management system timeline (Assessment System Handbook, p 8). Data available through LiveText and Prolepsis provide a repository and dissemination mechanism. Course-level data are compiled, analyzed, and summarized by programs annually and the Program Data Analysis and Planning (PDAP) form provides a structure for documenting and making recommendations related to areas of improvement at the program level.

Advanced candidates have the opportunity to evaluate courses and instructors each semester. Advanced candidates provide additional feedback through course-level evaluation of critical assessments and Professional Educator Exit surveys.

There are no unit-level policies or procedures to maintain records of candidate complaints and resolutions. A University level complaint and appeal process is described in the student handbook and the undergraduate/graduate catalogues. Although detailed records are maintained at each campus or by individual programs regarding complaints and resolution, the unit has no formal policy to maintain unit - level records or to inform the unit head of all complaints and resolutions.

**2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement**

Use of Data for Program Improvement – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Use of Data for Program Improvement – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data within programs that are used to improve candidate performance and program efficiency. There is evidence that data are reviewed by program-level groups and through the PDAP such groups may initiate recommendations for program changes. For example, the process identified lower than expected Praxis II scores for candidates in the mathematics education program. The program faculty reviewed the mathematics course content and improved alignment with the domains assessed by the Praxis II. The process, as indicated by committee minutes and various interviews, is not used to facilitate data-driven improvements at the unit level. Onsite evidence also confirmed that recent unit-level decisions were administratively developed and implemented and were not informed by the assessment system.

The Assessment System identifies five transition points for undergraduate programs and key assessments are identified for each transition point. Candidate performance is assessed and reflected at the initial level at these identified points. Programs systematically use data from these assessments and candidate reflections to develop individualized remediation plans when needed.

The process for evaluating faculty outlined in the faculty handbook uses data collected from candidate evaluation of courses and faculty teaching ability on a semester basis. Faculty also review the annual program-level data report. Results of these evaluations and reviews are used to refine teaching and improve curriculum.

The unit relies on the Prolepsis portal to share data with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders who may use this information to assess goals and formulate new ones. However, interviews with faculty, candidates, and P-12 partners indicated inconsistency in the level of awareness of the unit's data sharing Prolepsis portal and the overall use of the available data for program and unit improvement. No system was evident to ensure that data are shared with internal and external stakeholders.

### **Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data within programs that are used to improve candidate performance and program efficiency. There is evidence that data are reviewed by program-level groups and through the PDAP such groups may initiate recommendations for program changes. The process, as indicated by committee minutes and various interviews, is not used to facilitate data-driven improvements at the unit level. Onsite evidence also confirmed that recent unit-level decisions were administratively developed and implemented and were not informed by the assessment system.

The Assessment System identifies five transition points for advanced programs and key assessments are identified for each transition point. Candidate performance is assessed and reflected on at the advanced level at these identified points. Programs systematically use data from these assessments and candidate reflections to develop individualized remediation plans when needed.

The process for evaluating faculty outlined in the faculty handbook uses data collected from candidate evaluation of courses and faculty teaching ability on a semester basis. Faculty also review the annual program-level data report. Results of these evaluations and reviews are used to refine teaching and improve curriculum.

The unit relies on the Prolepsis portal to share data with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders who may use this information to assess goals and formulate new ones. However, interviews with faculty, candidates, and P-12 partners indicated inconsistency in the level of awareness of the unit's data sharing Prolepsis portal and the overall use of the available data for program and unit improvement. No system

was evident to ensure that data are shared with internal and external stakeholders.

### Overall Assessment of Standard

The current assessment system does not reflect the conceptual framework and no evidence was available to verify that the conceptual framework is systematically evaluated. The assessment system collects and analyzes data within programs that are used to improve candidate performance and program efficiency. The process, as indicated by committee minutes and various interviews, is not used to facilitate data-driven improvements at the unit level. Onsite evidence also confirmed that recent unit-level decisions were administratively developed and implemented and were not informed by the assessment system.

The unit relies on the Prolepsis portal to share data with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders who may use this information to assess goals and formulate new ones. However, interviews with faculty, candidates, and P-12 partners indicated inconsistency in the level of awareness of the unit's data sharing Prolepsis portal and the overall use of the available data for program and unit improvement. No system was evident to ensure that data are shared with internal and external stakeholders.

**Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]**

### Areas for Improvement and Rationales

#### AFIs from last visit: Corrected

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
none	

#### AFIs from last visit: Continued

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. Systematic analysis and summary of data across programs are lacking, limiting data driven unit improvements. (I&A)	Although the unit systematically analyzes and summarizes data within programs, the unit does not systematically analyze and summarize the data across programs.

#### New AFIs

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. The unit assessment system is not aligned with the unit's conceptual framework. (I&A)	The unit assessment system does not identify how critical assessments for each course at the initial and advanced levels align to the unit's conceptual framework.
2. The unit has not developed and implemented policies or procedures to assess and improve unit operations. (I&A)	Faculty and administrator interviews and document review indicate assessment and improvements based upon data are made at the program-level only.
3. There are no unit-level policies or procedures to maintain records of candidate complaints and resolutions. (I&A)	No unit-level policies or procedure exists; however, records are maintained at each campus and/or by individual program areas documenting candidate complaints and resolution.

**Recommendation for Standard 2**

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

**Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]**

Table 6 was incomplete when compared to catalogs, state reports, and unit publications. The unit revised the table during the visit.

**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.**

**Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 3 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)**

Yes No  
 jn jn

**If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.**

**3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners**

Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Collaboration between Unit and School Partners – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

The unit has a positive working relationship with several public and private school districts located throughout Alabama, Georgia, and Florida. The department chairs, course instructors, site and district administrators, candidates, and university supervisors plan field experiences and clinical practice. Periodic meetings and regularly planned workshops allow the unit to be focused, to make changes as needed, and to have well-managed coordination of all sites. There is evidence of collaboration and partnership between the unit and school partners that include teacher advisory groups, secondary math and science initiatives, mentor teachers, stakeholders within the community, as well as those involved in grant activities.

Together, program faculty and candidates determine placement of clinical practice interns. There is documented evidence that a collaborative effort exists between the unit and the school districts to determine the final placement. Furthermore, the unit and school partners share expertise to support

candidates' learning. As a result, through the unit, the partner schools and other professional community members, candidates are afforded quality opportunities that allow them to develop knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions with regard to their respective program. Meetings, surveys, and evaluations that occur on a regular basis indicate that collaboration is an on-going process at the university and that work is done to strengthen the program and to make changes in areas as needed.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

Collaboration among the department chairs, course instructors, site and district administrators, students, and university supervisors jointly plan field experiences and clinical practice. There is evidence of collaboration and partnership between the unit and school partners that include teacher advisory groups, counseling advisory groups, secondary math and science initiatives, mentor teachers, stakeholders within the community, and those involved in grant programs. Final placement for the clinical internship rests with the individual programs; however, it should be noted that some advanced candidates often are already working in a school and may, in consultation with the unit, agree on a specific field placement or clinical internship assignment. Some individuals place themselves. A mutual, collaborative effort is made to strengthen candidate performance in field experiences and clinical practice.

**3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

Records and documentation provide evidence that candidates have met specific criteria before beginning clinical practice. Field experiences and clinical practice are aligned with state standards. This includes at least 150 hours of field experiences that help candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to be successful. However, the unit has not implemented a well-documented, written system to coordinate all field placements, to ensure that candidates have experiences in a variety of clinical setting.

During clinical experiences, a self assessment of candidates' professional dispositions, a variety of assessment instruments (both formal and informal), reflections, and peer, self, and supervisor evaluations occur. Faculty advisors evaluate the candidate's professional dispositions. Two satisfactory recommendations and a satisfactory assessment of dispositions are required.

Field experiences give candidates the opportunity to use technology as an instructional tool. All candidates are required to submit course specific, critical assignments using Livetext. Integrated technology is found throughout the course syllabi in all areas including the completion of several webquests by respective teacher candidates. Through technology training, candidates learn about smart boards, document cameras, laptop operation, tele-conferencing, and the requirement of submitting a portfolio using the tools of technology.

Criteria for clinical faculty members are documented and evidenced through an orientation session each

semester providing appropriate insight into the program. An orientation session is conducted periodically to provide faculty with recent updates on state, national, and institutional requirements.

Observation and subsequent follow-up discussions, assessment of candidate journals, dialogue forums, the Alabama Perspective Teacher Testing Program (APTTP) scores, and collecting and analyzing data on student learning through the Student Accountability Plan provide the unit with multiple assessments for candidate performance.

Clinical interns are observed at least four times by the cooperating teacher and at least four times by the university supervisor during a semester. The cooperating teacher and the university supervisor write a summative or final evaluation for each placement. Should a candidate be less than acceptable in a particular area, a remediation plan is developed. All summarized internship data are maintained and managed by the unit.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

Advanced level candidates meet specific criteria before beginning clinical practice. Field experiences and clinical practice are aligned with state standards. Field experiences are limited at the advanced level program for teachers. However, through teacher work samples downloaded onto LiveText, candidates are able to demonstrate a variety of teaching methods that they incorporate into both their field experience and their clinical practice.

Technology also becomes an integral part of the advanced program through specific coursework as well as application. All candidates are required to submit course specific, critical assignments using LiveText and are given instruction in the use of smart boards, document cameras, laptop operation, tele-conferencing, and the requirement of submitting lesson plans and portfolios.

Through observation and subsequent follow-up discussions, assessment of candidate journal logs, reflective experiences, multiple observations, and critical assessment tests, advanced candidates are provided the mechanisms by which to succeed. Many rich opportunities such as running summer school programs or planning an academic ceremony provide candidates with unique internship experiences that prepare them to achieve the proficiencies in their program of study. Interviews with graduates provide strong evidence of the confidence they have acquired through internship experiences to handle the work challenges they have faced.

**3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn**

Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

Candidates are rigorously assessed and evaluated through multiple measures before admission into and during clinical placements to rate each candidate's impact on student learning. By the end of the clinical

practice, candidates have been assessed by a number of professionals, including university faculty, supervisors, mentors, master teachers, and site administrators. Through reflection and other forms of self-evaluation, candidates assess themselves and develop skills that support and promote student learning. Research-based assessments are conducted by the school and the unit faculty through various observations that take place throughout the semester. Differentiated lesson plans provide additional evidence of preparing candidates to work with students from diverse populations.

The preparation program builds broad analysis of student diversity at the initial level into its curriculum so candidates are able to effectively work with exceptionalities, cultural and linguistic diversity, issues of poverty/hopelessness, and other at-risk situations they may encounter during their field experiences and clinical practice. In addition, candidates are placed in urban and rural settings and in multiple grade levels.

The incorporation of reflection and feedback are also an integral part of field experiences and clinical practice. Candidates collection of data on student learning is accomplished through the Student Accountability Plan, Part II, part of the internship requirements. Candidates are required to look at specific student work, citing strengths and weaknesses and what the candidate needs to do to help students of varying backgrounds.

### **Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

Limited evidence was found that advanced program candidates demonstrate and document their development of pedagogical and content knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn. Through reflection and other forms of self-evaluation, candidates in programs for other school personnel assess themselves and develop skills that support school learning. At the advanced level, even though a concerted effort is made, the unit does not have a successful tracking system to ensure that all candidates have appropriate opportunities to work with students from diverse populations. However, the classroom preparation at this level builds broad analysis of student diversity into its curriculum so candidates are able to effectively work with exceptionalities, cultural and linguistic diversity, issues of poverty/hopelessness, and other at-risk situations they may encounter in their clinical internship. Reflective writings, logs, research, portfolios, and numerous evaluations provide additional evidence of preparing candidates to be successful with all students.

### **Overall Assessment of Standard**

The unit has established procedures to ensure that collaboration is imbedded in the field experiences and clinical practice/internships. Many members of the professional community work together to enable candidates to develop their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. The unit and the schools work together sharing expertise and make changes as needed to support candidates' learning.

**Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]**

N/A

### **Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
None	

**AFIs from last visit: Continued**

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. The unit has no formal system to manage and coordinate field experiences to ensure that candidates are placed in a variety of settings. (Initial and advanced; revised).	There are not systematic, documented, written policies to provide consistency among the four campuses for field placement at the initial or advanced levels. Therefore, the unit cannot ensure that all candidates benefit from placement in a variety of clinical settings.
2. Cooperating teachers at the initial level are not systematically prepared for their roles as supervisors.	The unit does not ensure that all cooperating teachers are systematically prepared to support initial candidates in field experiences and clinical practice.

**New AFIs**

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
None	

**Recommendation for Standard 3**

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

**Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]**

--

**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.**

**Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 4 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)**

Yes

No

jn

jn

**If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.**

--

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

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

#### **Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:**

The unit uses the NCATE definition to define diversity. A review of documents shows that the unit links candidates' dispositions toward working with students from diverse populations to two proficiencies of the conceptual framework: (1) demonstrate an understanding of and show effective performance with diverse learning populations in a variety of school cultures and (4) build multilevel collaborative partnerships and mentoring relationships. The unit defines candidate proficiencies related to diversity through the Alabama state rules which contain the state diversity standards. A review of documents shows minimal alignment between these diversity proficiencies and the unit's conceptual framework.

The unit assesses candidates' dispositions related to diversity at the beginning, midpoint and end of the clinical experience. Interviews with candidates and P-12 school personnel, as well as unit dispositions assessment data and graduate surveys, show that most candidates are developed/well developed but that there is some variation as to the level of candidate disposition development regarding these two dispositions. For example, in Spring 2008 unit data show that candidates' development of proficiency #1 shows that 14 percent of candidates are slightly developed, 58 percent are moderately developed, and 16 percent are developed, with no response from 21 percent of the group. The unit aligns master syllabi components (goals, objectives, course content, and critical assignments) to the state's diversity standards.

The unit ensures that candidates have opportunities to gain understanding and assesses candidates' proficiencies related to diverse populations through the curriculum, with the exception of opportunities for working with English language learners. Diversity proficiencies are particularly addressed in the core courses EDU 3310 The Professional Educator and SPE 3340 Diverse Learners. State diversity standards are also addressed in other master syllabi through critical assignments, and examination of candidate artifacts show research papers and case studies that address proficiencies related to working with diverse populations.

Regarding candidates' understanding of working with ELL students, a review of master syllabi of core courses and candidate interviews reveals that this area of preparation is not systematically addressed in the curriculum. Candidate interviews reveal that in general they initiate discussion of this issue in their courses and/or when they encounter ELL students during field experiences, and that such discussions generally focus on resource acquisition. P-12 school administrators commented in interviews that the unit needs to foster understanding of candidates' knowledge and skills regarding socioeconomic diversity, i.e., that students in poverty can come from any race or ethnicity.

During early field experiences and the internship experience, initial candidates have opportunities to learn about diverse student populations. Examination of rubrics, assessments and candidate artifacts shows that all candidates are assessed for proficiency using the Diversity Proficiency Standards Matrix and through the portfolio. Master syllabi, portfolio work, assessments, and candidate interviews confirm that candidates are aware of the different learning styles of their potential students and that they can adapt their instruction to help all students learn, to connect lessons and instruction to students' cultures and experiences. Candidate artifacts and interviews confirm that candidates create and deliver lessons and instruction which incorporate multiple perspectives, exhibit the belief that all students can learn, and communicate with students' families. Candidates receive feedback to assessments verbally and through assessment by rubric.

**Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

The unit uses the NCATE definition to define diversity. A review of documents shows that the unit links candidates' dispositions toward working with students from diverse populations to two proficiencies of the conceptual framework, cited above. For the master's degree program for teachers and Education Leadership programs, the unit defines candidate proficiencies related to diversity through the Alabama state rules which contain the state diversity and technology standards. For other OSP programs, the unit defines proficiencies through both Alabama state rules and CACREP standards. A review of documents shows minimal alignment between these diversity proficiencies and the unit's conceptual framework. Interviews with candidates and aggregated dispositions assessment data show that candidates demonstrate acceptable development of disposition proficiencies.

The unit aligns master syllabi to the state's diversity standards in the master's program for teachers and in all OSP programs except the EdS degree in Education Leadership. For this EdS degree, minimal documents were provided and candidate interviews provided little information. The unit provides all other OSP candidates and master's degree teacher candidates with opportunities to gain and apply knowledge related to diversity in core courses. Program data show that each program assesses proficiencies related to diversity in coursework. In the advanced program for teachers, all candidates enter with certification credentials and the unit ensures that all candidates have demonstrated proficiency with state diversity standards one of two ways: by entering the program with current Alabama teaching credentials or by taking a special education survey course. However, in field experiences, the unit lacks a clear tracking system to ensure that candidates are provided opportunities to work with P-12 students from diverse populations. Candidate interviews and artifacts did not clearly demonstrate that diversity is addressed systemically during the internship or practicum experience. Candidate artifacts and interviews do show that they create and deliver lessons which incorporate multiple perspectives and exhibit the belief that all students can learn, but this is not ensured systematically by the unit. Candidates acknowledge that content related to working with ELL students is not addressed unless this issue is raised during class discussion.

**4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty**

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

**Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation**

The professional education faculty in all initial programs are predominantly white, non-Hispanic. Remaining faculty members are Asian and African American. Unit faculty members are evenly split between male and female. Institution faculty members are also predominantly white, with a slightly lower percentage than within the unit. Remaining institution faculty members are American Indian/Alaskan native, African American, Asian, or Hispanic. Three fourths of school based faculty are white, the remainder African American. [A complete breakdown of the percentages can be found in the IR on Table 8.]

Faculty show diversity of teaching experience. Many faculty members have multiple years of experience as teachers and/or administrators in P-12 schools. The unit has provided a listing of faculty activities addressing diversity, including presentations, publications, service to the university, community outreach, research, publication and international activity. Unit faculty are particularly involved in diversity experiences in community outreach, showing over 60 recent activities related to working with diversity issues and diverse student populations in their communities. One faculty member has published a book in Spanish. Many faculty members have traveled extensively. A review of faculty interviews, vitae and professional development plans confirms this information.

The institution has undertaken good faith efforts to increase faculty diversity. The Institution Diversity Program Planning Committee (IDPPC) compiles an annual diversity report which includes analysis of faculty demographics and employment search demographics. In addition, the institution's strategic plan Vision 2010 set a goal in 2006 of increasing the number of African American faculty by 30 percent by fall 2010. A mid-point analysis shows that ongoing recruitment has led to a 3 percent increase in this goal by February 2008. In addition, the African American Fellowship Program provides an average of four fellowships a year, up to \$45,000 for each fellow, to African American candidates who want to begin their doctoral study, in exchange for a commitment to teach at a Troy University Alabama campus for at least three years. To date, 22 fellowships have been awarded and this year, the institution will offer five additional fellowships from a pool of 30 applicants. An interview with the Director of Minority Recruitment confirmed the information in the IDPPC annual diversity report, the status of the Vision 2010 goal, and the success of the fellowship program.

### **Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:**

The professional education faculty in all advanced programs are predominantly white, non-Hispanic. Remaining faculty members are Asian and African American. Unit faculty members are evenly split between male and female at the advanced level. [A complete breakdown of the percentages can be found in the IR on Table 8.]

Faculty members bring a wealth of diversity in their P-12 teaching experience. Many faculty members have multiple years experience as teachers and/or administrators in P-12 schools. Candidates work with faculty who have knowledge and experiences related to preparing them to work with diverse student populations. Advanced faculty members also participate in activities addressing diversity, particularly related to community outreach. Faculty members have traveled extensively. A review of faculty interviews, vitae and professional development plans confirms this information.

Good faith efforts to increase faculty diversity were described in the previous summary. Particular to the advanced level, interviews confirm that one faculty member in the professional education unit obtained his terminal degree through the African American Fellowship Program.

#### 4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Initial Teacher Preparation

Acceptable

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates – Advanced Preparation

Acceptable

##### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Approximately two-thirds of initial preparation candidates are white, non-Hispanic. One quarter of candidates are African American. Remaining candidates are American Indian/Alaskan native, Hispanic, or Asian. Institution demographics are similar to unit demographics, with half of the population being white, non-Hispanic and 40 percent of the population African American. Remaining populations are Asian, American Indian/Alaskan native, or Hispanic. Candidates are predominantly female. [A complete breakdown of the percentages can be found in the IR on Table 9.]

Interviews with many candidates and graduates show that they have multiple opportunities to work with diverse candidates in groups and on education projects during course assignments and field experiences. They also have opportunities to participate on all campuses in activities, committees, projects and programs. This was confirmed through candidate interviews, an interview with the Director of Minority Recruitment, and the institution's most recent IDPPC annual diversity report. There is also a large international population of students on the Troy campus.

The unit, as part of the institution, makes good faith efforts to attract and retain a diverse pool of candidates. The IDPPC annual diversity report shows and the Director of Minority Recruitment confirms that the institution has the second highest number of African American students among non-Historically Black Institutions in Alabama. An analysis of trend data for the racial composition of the student body from the IDPPC report shows that from 1993 to 2007, the number of African Americans enrolled in undergraduate programs increased 149 percent; the number of other non-white students enrolled increased 277 percent in this time; and the number of white students enrolled decreased 16 percent. [See Attachment 3 in the IDPPC annual report, Exhibit 4.c.3.] The institution also makes efforts to retain its diverse population. On the Troy campus, which has the largest, youngest student population, the Office of Student Development is housed in Eldridge Hall and provides support to students through the departments of Student Development, Adaptive Needs Program, Career Services, and the Conditional Student Program. The Dean of First Year Studies is also housed there. Troy campus also offers free confidential counseling. All other campuses offer departments of student services, counseling, career services and support. These efforts are confirmed by document review, interviews with institution faculty and visits to campuses.

##### Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Approximately two-thirds of candidates at the advanced level are white, non-Hispanic; one third of candidates are African American. Remaining candidates are American Indian/Alaskan native, Hispanic, or Asian. Institution demographics are similar, with half of the population being white, non-Hispanic and 40 percent of the population African American. Remaining populations are Asian, American Indian/Alaskan native, or Hispanic. Candidates are predominantly female. [A complete breakdown of the percentages can be found in the IR on Table 9.]

Advanced candidate interviews indicate that they have multiple opportunities to work with diverse candidates in groups and during education projects during course assignments and field experiences.

They also have similar opportunities to participate in activities, committees, projects and programs on all campuses.

As part of the institution, the unit makes good faith efforts to attract and retain a diverse pool of candidates. The IDPPC annual diversity reports show and the Director of Minority Recruitment confirms that the institution has the second highest number of African American students among non-Historically Black Institutions in Alabama. An analysis of trend data for the racial composition of the student body from the IDPPC report shows that from 1993 to 2007, the number of African Americans enrolled in graduate programs increased 155 percent the number of other non-white students enrolled increased 215 percent in this time; and the number of white students enrolled decreased 26 percent during this time period. [See Attachment 3 in the IDPPC annual report, Exhibit 4.c.3.] The institution also makes efforts to retain its diverse population. A review of the student handbook and interviews with institution faculty show that all campuses offer departments of student services, free counseling, career services and additional support.

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

Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

##### Summary of Findings for Initial Teacher Preparation:

Based on demographic data provided, initial candidates are generally placed in city and/or county schools in Alabama or Georgia. A review of demographic data from P-12 school sites indicates that the overwhelming majority of these schools contain students with diverse backgrounds, including the areas of gender, race, ethnicity, socioeconomics, special needs, and English language acquisition. Review of unit procedures and candidate and graduate interviews shows that diverse placement is taken into account when determining where candidates will be placed for field experiences and clinical practice. Candidates are given a card during their early field experiences that they are required to use to record the diversity of their experiences. They retain this card, and it is used by the candidate and adviser to identify where the candidate should be placed during clinical practice. In addition, the unit requires cooperating teachers to turn in a form showing their agreement to take an intern, which requires cooperating teachers to include data about classroom diversity. These data are compiled in a report of field experience by the office of teacher education. Feedback to candidates occurs through multiple evaluations and through the Diversity Proficiency Standards Matrix during the clinical practice.

##### Summary of Findings for Advanced Teacher Preparation and/or the Preparation of Other School Professionals:

Based on demographic data provided, advanced candidates have opportunities to be placed in city and/or county schools in Alabama or Georgia. A review of demographic data from P-12 school sites indicates that the overwhelming majority of these schools contain students with diverse backgrounds, including the areas of gender, race, ethnicity, socioeconomics, special needs, and English language acquisition. Review of unit procedures and candidate and graduate interviews shows that diverse placement is taken into account when determining where candidates will be placed for the practicum in the counseling, psychology, and school psychometry programs. In all other advanced programs, candidates often self-select placement sites. Interviews with candidates and graduates revealed that candidates often self-select placement, and faculty sometimes do not review such placements until after the field experience

has begun. In the advanced teacher preparation program, candidates who are currently teaching often use their own classrooms for field experiences; faculty interviews show that candidates in this situation are expected to address the missing diversity areas, although no documentation shows how the unit assures that this actually occurs. Candidates who are not teaching in their own classrooms stated that they either work with a faculty member for help with placement or have to seek placement on their own. In the Education Leadership program, candidates self-select schools and, when discussing diversity of placement, focus on grade level placement.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

At the program level, the unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum related to working with students from diverse populations. Field experiences provide structured opportunities to work with diverse P-12 students for initial candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. The unit does not systematically ensure that all advanced candidates have appropriate opportunities to work with P-12 students from diverse populations. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences are provided for candidates to work with diverse higher education faculty, P-12 school faculty and candidates.

**Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]**

--

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
None	

**AFIs from last visit: Continued**

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. The unit does not have a tracking system to ensure that all candidates have appropriate opportunities to work with P-12 students from diverse populations. (Advanced)	Interviews with candidates and faculty indicate that there is no system in place to assure that placements are in diverse settings.
2. The unit does not conduct systematic assessment to ensure that all advanced candidates have met proficiencies in working with P-12 students from diverse populations. (Advanced, revised)	The unit now provides data, assessments, and rubrics to show that it systematically ensures candidate proficiencies at the initial level, but not at the advanced level.

**New AFIs**

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale

1. The unit does not ensure that candidates are being systematically prepared to adapt instruction or services to meet the needs of English language learners. (Initial and Advanced)	A review of master syllabi and interviews of candidates and graduates do not show that this area is being systematically addressed.
---	---

**Recommendation for Standard 4**

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

**Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]**

In Table 8, the IR indicates that there are 48 female professional education faculty members in advanced programs. There are actually 28. On page 52, question 4, in the professional education exit survey, the IR table shows an n=22 when the unit data report shows an n=20. Also on page 52, question 4, the IR indicates that 23 percent of candidates believe they have adequate preparation, but the unit data report shows that the actual percent is 21.7 percent.

**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.**

**Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 5 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)**

Yes No  
 jn jn

**If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.**

**5a. Qualified Faculty**

Qualified Faculty – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Qualified Faculty – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

The university, as a result of its history, goes to extensive lengths to establish and maintain active partnerships that demonstrate the collaborative development of expertise in teaching and learning in the professional education unit. These relationships have created a variety of classifications for teaching

faculty: full-time in unit (FT/FT), full-time in university/part-time in unit (FT/PT), part-time in university/part-time in unit (PT/PT), content faculty, and collaborating teachers (school-based clinical faculty).

The unit defines faculty as full-time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, and teaching personnel with such other titles as may be approved by the Board of Trustees. Persons holding adjunct appointments are not considered to be members of the ranked instructional faculty.

Professional education faculty have earned doctorates or exceptional expertise that qualifies them for their assignments. School faculty are licensed in the fields that they teach or supervise, but often do not hold the doctorate. There are sixty-three FT teacher education faculty members with a terminal degree and twenty-eight PT members of the faculty who are full-time to the university housed in the College of Communication and Fine Arts and the College of Health and Human Services (IR, Table 11). Adjunct faculty members possess significant years of experience in P-12 schools as teachers, principals, curriculum specialists and superintendents. There are 64 part-time/adjunct faculty members (Exhibit 5.1.2).

The unit requires faculty to provide documentation of current and past P-12 teaching and school administrative licenses. These sources of documentation are a part of the personnel files located in the unit (Exhibit 5.1.2).

Clinical faculty participate in campus-based professional experiences, including developing professional school partnerships, supervision of candidates and student teaching experiences (Alabama State Department of Education, Supp.No.07-3, Teacher Education 290-3-3.02(6)(a)2., (s) page 253).

Faculty members provide professional development programs in P-12 schools and collaborate in school-based research activities. Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

**5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching**

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

To a limited extent, faculty for the initial and advanced programs incorporate the conceptual framework into course syllabi, course instruction, field experiences and student teaching. [Exhibit 5.b.1]. The motto of informed, innovative, reflective decision makers is embedded in field experiences as candidates provide service through their work in the Troy professional educational community. The faculty of the unit are engaged in the scholarship of teaching and learning with a goal to improve the educational community.

The IR indicates that unit faculty members are actively engaged in student-centered, activity directed

instruction that promotes the teacher candidate as problem solver and creative thinker. The course syllabi reflect the recognition of the faculty member as a researcher seeking to improve student learning by recognizing that school climate changes. (Exhibit 5.b.2). Faculty members actively implement performance-based assessment of candidates in instruction as detailed in course syllabi (Exhibit 5.b.1).

Teaching by professional education faculty helps candidates develop the proficiencies outlined in professional, Alabama professional education standards, and institutional standards and guides candidates in the application of research, theories, and current developments in their respective field, content area and in teaching. Professional education faculty use a variety of instructional strategies that reflect an understanding of diverse learning styles. According to the IR, and verified onsite, technology and diversity are integrated throughout the unit by the professional education faculty.

In initial and advanced programs, diverse learning is provided through classroom-based learning, in P-12 school settings, and through research on effective best teaching practices for diverse learner groups. The unit has implemented technological learning tools throughout the unit programs both at the initial and the advanced levels. Programs have adopted LiveText for the purpose of aiding with collection of assessment data and the development of the candidates' portfolios, classroom programs and projects.

The institution recognizes that teaching effectiveness is the most important attribute of any faculty member. The Faculty Handbook (page 41) outlines the attributes and qualification which should be considered and documented in evaluating teaching effectiveness. Courses and faculty at both the initial and advanced levels are evaluated in every course and in all programs in the unit. Unit faculty receive evaluation data from an objectively-based, evaluation instrument. (Interviews, Exhibit Room, Exhibit 5.b.2; 5.b.3) All faculty, including adjunct faculty, are required to use the institutional performance-based measurement instrument to address course and instructor effectiveness.

**5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship**

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable ▼
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable ▼

**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

As identified in the university faculty handbook, (page 43), the university promotes and encourages a variety of scholarly work. Evidence of appropriate endeavors and activities includes: publications, research grants and sponsored research projects, inventions and patents, artistic works and performances, reviews of creative and scholarly work, and the creation of educational materials.

Most professional education faculty demonstrate scholarly work in their fields of specialization. They are engaged in different types of scholarly work, based in part on the vision, mission, and conceptual framework of the unit and their professional development.

Unit faculty members are active participants at conferences and symposiums, publishing book reviews, conducting reviews for conference presentations, preparing grants and sponsored research projects, creating artistic works and performances, serving the P-12 community as professional experts and authoring educational materials and publications (Faculty Handbook, page 32). In reviewing professional faculty research records, there is evidence of a variety of examples of scholarship (Exhibit Room, Exhibit 5.1; 5.2) Faculty research is reflective of the mission and vision of the institution and the

unit.

### 5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

#### Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

Summary of Findings:

The professional education faculty provide service to the college, university, schools, and the broad educational community in ways that are consistent with the Troy University and unit missions. Faculty collaborate with the professional community in P-12 schools and with faculty in other colleges in order to improve teaching and facilitate candidate learning. A review of faculty personnel data reflects that they are actively involved in professional associations at the state, national and local levels (Exhibit, 5.d.1).

Faculty members are expected to cooperate with supervisors and other faculty of the college by attending meetings (Faculty Handbook, page 42), serving on committees, and in accepting other work assigned at the college level. Faculty are committed to service in the unit to include academic advising, student groups, short-term administrative assignments and serving the institution by representing the unit at professional meetings and conferences.

The faculty are committed to advocating lifelong success through effective service to the unit and department by fulfilling, directing, and managing academic projects and programs. They serve as consultants in collaborative initiatives, provide leadership in professional organizations, and make useful contributions to the larger Troy community and the professional education community.

### 5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

#### Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The unit conducts systematic and comprehensive evaluations of faculty teaching performance to enhance the competence and intellectual vitality of the professional education faculty. Evaluations and professional development plans are used to improve faculty teaching, scholarship and service.

All part-time and adjunct faculty are expected to conduct course evaluation by using the unit evaluation form for every course taught. Evaluations are collected and evaluated for adjunct faculty in the same manner as full-time faculty. Faculty are given copies of evaluations and expected to use the feedback to make adjustments in their courses. Additionally, the department chairs meet with adjunct faculty to make adjustments to their courses when the need arises during the academic year [Exhibit Room, Exhibits 5.e.1; 5.e.2; 5.e.3].

Faculty evaluation data are used to assess instructional competence and provide annual and ongoing instructional goals and objectives for continued professional growth. Each faculty member is expected to maintain a high level of professional competence and to keep abreast of the developments in the respective academic discipline. All faculty members are evaluated on a regular basis. Unranked faculty, non-tenured faculty, and tenured faculty below the rank of professor are evaluated each year. Tenured faculty holding the rank of professor are evaluated every third year, reflecting performance and activities occurring during the period evaluated (Faculty Handbook, page 32, Part III, Personnel Policies). The unit provided documentation that faculty members are evaluated according to stated documents.

The College of Education Tenure and Promotion Guidelines serve as the adopted expectations for faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure within the unit. The institution's faculty handbook, Part III, Personnel Policies and the unit promotion and tenure guidelines establish benchmarks for teaching effectiveness, research and creative work, professional competence and activities, and service used in the application and review of tenure and/or promotion portfolios.

**5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development**

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Facilitation of Professional Development – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

During the spring 2008 semester, (Exhibit Room, Exhibit # 5f.1; 5.f.2; 5.f.3) faculty members submitted a self-evaluation of their performance in teaching, scholarship, and service at the institution. The document illustrates growth as a teacher, scholarly accomplishments and professional plans, service contributions to the unit, university and the profession.

Through faculty evaluation, the unit identifies the professional development needs and plans professional development activities accordingly. (Exhibit Room, Exhibit 5.f.1; 5.f.2). There are opportunities for faculty to develop new knowledge and skills, performance assessment, technology, and participate in and learn emerging practices in the field of education.

The institution's faculty handbook was provided to members of the team. The handbook publication date is effective August 1, 2008 by action of the Troy University Board of Trustees on May 1, 2008. (Faculty Handbook). There is updated information and documentation for professional faculty that is inclusive of organization, administration, councils and standing committees, personnel policies and miscellaneous personnel information.

At a meeting with the College of Education Executive Committee, BOE members learned that the

university instituted a standardized process of faculty professional development that incorporated and reflected the merger of each of the four college locations. During the 2007-2008 academic year, faculty members prepared their professional development plans using these new guidelines.

Faculty members are active participants in professional development both on campus and off-campus (Exhibit Room, E). The assessment of their effectiveness as teachers includes the positive effects they plan and have with candidates' learning and performance. Formal professional development policies, guidelines and processes are provided to ensure continuous support of faculty.

**Overall Assessment of Standard**

Faculty members are highly qualified as verified by the curriculum vitae and documented professional P-12 experiences. Faculty members have a teaching load arrangement as defined by the university Faculty Handbook dated August 1, 2008. Faculty members routinely engage in professional development activities and have established a scholarship agenda reflective of the art and science of teaching.

**Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed "target" or "acceptable." However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]**

--

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1. The processes and procedures for annual faculty evaluation are not consistently documented.	Evidence was found that processes and procedures for annual faculty evaluation are consistently being documented by the unit.

**AFIs from last visit: Continued**

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
None	

**New AFIs:**

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
None	

**Recommendation for Standard 5**

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

**Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]**

**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.**

**Information reported in the Institutional Report for Standard 6 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation.)**

Yes

No

**If your answer is "No" to above question, provide an explanation.**

**6a. Unit Leadership and Authority**

Unit Leadership and Authority – Initial Teacher Preparation	Unacceptable ▼
Unit Leadership and Authority – Advanced Preparation	Unacceptable ▼

**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

The Troy University unit defines itself as the College of Education. According to the Institutional Report the unit leadership across the four campuses (Troy, Montgomery, Dothan, and Phenix City) is vested in the dean of the College of Education. The dean is housed on the Troy campus. The Institutional Report reflects that the associate deans on three of the campuses provide, under the direction of the dean, administrative support for the daily operational functions of the teacher education unit. The associate deans at Montgomery and Dothan provide leadership for the education programs delivered at their respective sites. The Phenix City campus teacher education unit reports directly to the College of Education dean.

The dean of the College of Education is responsible for initial and advanced programs that reside within the College of Education across the four campuses. Interviews and documentation reflect that while the dean of the College of Education is considered to be the leader of teacher education he does not have administrative responsibility or oversight for secondary education programs at the initial level in biology, chemistry, history, English/language arts, general science, mathematics, or social science or advanced master’s teacher certification programs in biology, history, English/language arts, general science, mathematics, or social science. The dean of the College of Education does not have administrative responsibility or oversight for the P-12 programs in art, health, music or physical education. Oversight for these programs is the responsibility of the dean of the college in which each

program and their faculties are administered.

The IR provides tables that depict the current administrative and organizational structure of the College of Education. Reviewed documents provide the current administrative and organizational structure for the university. The university provides, in its Standing Committees of Troy publication, the guidelines for the operation of committees and the purposes, membership and eligibility criteria for each standing university committee. The university and college committee organizational structures do not include any committee, undergraduate or graduate, made up of teacher educators across colleges that considers or has any level of approval or oversight for curriculum or programmatic changes to teacher education or related school personnel programs. There are no formal written policies in place that assure that changes to the programs that are administered by deans of other colleges are subject to formal review or approval by the College of Education or a curriculum body made up faculty whose expertise is teacher education and preparation of school personnel. P-12 partners are not systematically involved in program design, implementation or evaluation.

Troy University has a well defined planning process which includes strategic planning. The university strategic plan includes an initiative specific to quality academic programs and program accreditation. The College of Education strategic plan reflects three college goals: Establish and expand strong and effective leadership with constituents; Strengthen internationalization opportunities for students, faculty, and staff;” and Establish and expand high quality programs within the college. None of the college objectives in the strategic plan specific to these three goals address collaboration between unit faculty and faculty in other units of the institution involved in the preparation of professional educators.

## 6b. Unit Budget

Unit Budget – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Budget – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

### Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):

The institutional report reflects that the unit perceives it “benefits from a robust unit budget.” The institutional report reflects that “per student expenditures compare very favorably with internship programs in the university’s other colleges.” The institutional report also states that per “student teacher education expenditures” in the College of Education in FY 2007 was less than \$2000. The report says that this is “approximately 4 percent more than is spent on an accounting student and 10 percent less than on a computer science student.” For the University as a whole in FY07, the FTE expenditure per student was \$9406.

In FY07 expenditures for Troy University for instruction, research, public service, academic support, and student services was \$112,492,466 and for the College of Education the total across these expenditures was \$2,833,216. Review of College budget sheets for three fiscal years reflects that the College’s actual spending was less than the budgeted amounts in each of the three fiscal years: FY 06, 07, and 08. College monies and expenditures include non-teacher education programs at the undergraduate and graduate level. Budget sheets examined reflected expenditures for the Troy, Dothan, and Phenix City campuses for salaries including teaching, part-time faculty, graduate assistants, and secretaries, and other operating expenses such as copier rental, instructional supplies, office supplies, travel, postage, and contractual services. Budget information for the Montgomery campus was not provided for review.

The Institutional Report (IR) reflects that the College of Education “allocates 50 percent of its travel budget exclusively to the 33 teacher education faculty members who comprise 50 percent of the faculty.” In FY 07, the IR reports that teacher education faculty had access to \$50,585, or just over \$1500 per faculty member. In the examination of travel expenditures across the three fiscal years there were numerous discrete reimbursements to individuals in amounts that seemed to be consistent with reimbursement of faculty for clinical work and single expenditures in the \$750 to \$1600 range that had the appearance of being reimbursements for professional travel. In interviews some faculty reported they had received around \$750 while others reported they had received around \$1200.

Faculty in Education have at least three sources in addition to college monies to support travel, professional development and research: The Chancellor’s Award for International Travel, the College Professional Development Committee Awards to present papers at professional meetings, and the College Professional Development Committee Awards to support publication of research. There are written processes and forms for application and awarding of these awards. A proposal submitted by a College of Education faculty for the Chancellor award was a request for funding to go to Malaysia to explore a counselor education program there.

**6c. Personnel**

Personnel – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Personnel – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

Table 1 of the IR says there are 63 faculty who are full time in the unit. The “Faculty Teaching Load by Semester” electronic exhibit reflects the workload of 77 individuals, some of whom are in administrative roles. The faculty loads of these 77 individuals across the four campuses range from three to 16 semester hours for Fall 2005-Fall 2007 with the majority being in the 9-12 range. Teaching faculty also report doing advisement and some supervision of interns and/or field experiences.

The university “faculty certification” process requires chairs to complete a form on each full and part-time faculty member, that specifies the courses he/she is qualified to teach. The chair, the dean, the associate provost and dean of undergraduate or graduate studies sign the form. The process is designed to provide documentation that faculty are qualified to teach courses assigned to them.

The IR Table 1 reflects 28 faculty members who were full-time in the institution, but part-time in the unit and 64 more who were part time at the institution. Workload data and course assignments for these individuals were not provided for review.

Data on numbers of full-time as compared to part-time in the College of Education were addressed in one interview. For Phenix City, it was reported that there are in this academic term eight full-time faculty and 40 adjuncts; in Montgomery there are five full-time and 30 part-time, and in Dothan there are reportedly eight full-time and 28 adjuncts. In a subsequent interview it was ascertained that in Montgomery only five or six of the 30 part-time faculty members were involved in delivery of teacher education, school personnel courses or supervision.

The existence of non-teacher education programs in the College of Education and the departments that comprise the college on the four campuses and the fact that administration and oversight of other teacher education programs reside in other colleges makes it difficult to determine whether or not the unit makes appropriate use of full-time, part-time, and clinical faculty. The issue of whether the ratio of full-time to part-time/adjunct faculty delivering instruction threatens in any way coherence or integrity of the teacher and professional education programs is difficult to confirm or refute.

The IR states the unit is “adequately staffed.” Interviews with the nine support staff revealed they are involved in detailed administrative work, routine office duties, support of faculty and candidates, and advice and counseling of candidates to facilitate progress toward program completion. Given the numbers of candidates in teacher education, the complexity of the admission, retention, and graduation criteria, the additional processes and requirements for candidates in professional education programs, and the complexity of programs, the number of support staff is inadequate. Support staff, in response to questions, admit to having to routinely work overtime.

**6d. Unit Facilities**

Unit Facilities – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Facilities – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

The College of Education has facilities on four campuses. The current facilities on each campus were found to be sufficient to support programs and candidates. College of Education facilities in each location were clean and well maintained. Facilities include classrooms, faculty offices, administrative and support staff offices, conference rooms, computer labs, and distance education classrooms. The new building, with new classroom space which will house the administrative unit of the College of Education and the Troy faculties, is approximately 70,000 square feet and will be in full use by January 2009. This new building will support the most recent developments in technology and should allow faculty on the Troy campus to model the use of technology even more effectively.

The current facilities at each location -- Troy, Dothan, Phenix City, and Montgomery-- support faculty and candidate use of information technology in teaching and learning.

**6e. Unit Resources including Technology**

Unit Resources including Technology – Initial Teacher Preparation	Acceptable
Unit Resources including Technology – Advanced Preparation	Acceptable

**Summary of Findings for ALL Levels (Initial Teacher Preparation and/or Advanced Preparation):**

Faculty and candidates have access to sufficient and current library and curricular resources and electronic information with the exception of P-12 textbooks series. Three of the four Troy campuses have libraries -- Troy, Montgomery, and Dothan. The library for the Phenix City campus is provided through a university subcontract with the Chattahoochee Valley Community College. As reported in the

IR, the online library and resources are available 24 hours a day to all Troy University students. The Troy University libraries provide on-line tutorials to help students learn how to access materials. Also provided is a “Live Chat,” available 24 hours a day, where students can ask and get answers to questions on how to access or locate materials. During the hours the Troy library is open the reference librarian on duty responds to these electronic queries. At other times individuals enrolled by the University of Alabama or University of Hawaii who have had at least one library reference course respond to questions. Any questions that can not be adequately answered are referred to a designated librarian on the Troy campus.

Also maintained on the Troy campus in addition to the collection of books related to disciplines, including education, there is an area dedicated to teaching related resources such as children’s books, computer programs to use with children, DVDs to use with children, a collection of “Big Books,” and teacher resource materials. Also available are P-12 textbooks for reading, math, language arts, social studies, and science. The most recent of these are dated 2004; replacements are needed. The librarian responsible for this area said there was no funding available to buy textbooks and the library was hopeful the College of Education would be successful in getting on a state list that would provide free new textbooks.

The unit has the information technology to collect assessment system data. Currently available information technology allows the unit to aggregate, disaggregate, analyze and provide data in varying dissemination formats. Interviews with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness and the Senior Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business Affairs reflect that in addition to the performance data generated internal to the college through LiveText, the institution has the capacity to provide varied meaningful and useable data for purposes of improvement of unit operations. This capacity provides the unit with an additional source of data to analyze and improve unit operations.

### **Overall Assessment of Standard**

The Troy University unit defines itself as the College of Education. According to the institutional report, the unit leadership across the four campuses -- Troy, Montgomery, Dothan, and Phenix City-- is vested in the dean of the College of Education. The dean is housed on the Troy campus.

There are no formal written policies in place that assure that changes to the programs that are administered by deans of other colleges are subject to formal review or approval by the College of Education or by a curriculum body made up faculty whose expertise is teacher education and preparation of school personnel.

The institutional report reflects that the unit perceives it “benefits from a robust unit budget.” The institutional report reflects that “per student expenditures compare favorably with internship programs in the university’s other colleges.” Adequate financial support allows the unit to fulfill its mission.

There are 63 faculty who are full time in the unit; faculty loads across the four campuses range from three to 16 semester hours for Fall 2005-Fall 2007 with the majority being in the nine to 12 range. Teaching faculty also report doing advisement and some faculty supervise interns and/or field experiences.

The existence of non-teacher education programs in the College of Education and the departments that comprise the college on the four campuses and the fact that administration and oversight of other teacher education programs reside in other colleges make it difficult to determine whether or not the unit makes appropriate use of full-time, part-time, and clinical faculty. The issue of whether the ratio of full-time to

part-time/adjunct faculty delivering instruction threatens in any way coherence or integrity of the teacher and professional education programs is difficult to confirm or refute.

The College of Education has facilities on four campuses. The current facilities on each campus were found to be sufficient to support programs and candidates.

The unit has the information technology capacity to collect assessment system data. The unit is not systematically using information technology to aggregate and disaggregate unit data. Data are not being used by the unit to evaluate and improve unit operations.

**Strengths [Note: A strength should be cited only if some aspect of a target level rubric has been demonstrated by the unit. A strength can be cited regardless of whether the entire element is deemed “target” or “acceptable.” However, strengths should clearly indicate outstanding practice.]**

---

**Areas for Improvement and Rationales**

**AFIs from last visit: Corrected**

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1.Lack of an accessible, effective database impedes systematic record-keeping and advising.	The unit has accessible databases. LiveText and Prolepsis are available and other university information technologies have the capacity to generate data for the unit.

**AFIs from last visit: Continued**

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
None	

**New AFIs**

AFI Number & Text	AFI Rationale
1.The unit does not have the authority to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study.	The unit is complex and this is further complicated in that the unit programs are provided on four campuses. While the dean of the College of Education is considered to be the leader of teacher education he does not have administrative responsibility or oversight for initial secondary education programs in biology, chemistry, history, English/language arts, general science, mathematics, or social science or advanced teacher certification programs in biology, history, English/language arts, general science, mathematics, or social science. The Dean of the College of Education does not have administrative responsibility or oversight for the P-12 programs in art, health education, music or physical education.
2. The unit does not have written policies to guide unit operations and to provide mechanisms to facilitate collaboration between unit faculty and faculty in other units of the institution involved in the preparation of professional educators.	There are no written policies to guide unit operations and ensure coherent program delivery across the four campuses and to assure collaboration across colleges and faculties involved in educator preparation within and across colleges.
3. The unit does not systematically and consistently involve P-12	The unit has not systematically and consistently involved P-12 practitioners and other members of the professional community in

practitioners and other members of the professional community in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its program.	program design, implementation, and evaluation. In the IR, the unit indicated it has a Teacher Education and other advisory committees but there was little evidence that these entities have been consistently and systematically involved in unit decision making.
4.The unit does not consistently provide an adequate number of support personnel to provide for the needs of programs and administration.	Support staff are expected to fulfill a multitude of roles to support candidates, faculties, administrators, and administrative functions. Given the number of candidates, the complexity of programs, and the coordination required across the four campuses, the number of support staff is under heavy demand to fulfill all functions.

**Recommendation for Standard 6**

Initial Teacher Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>
Advanced Preparation	Met <input type="button" value="v"/>

**Corrections to the Institutional Report [Include any factual corrections to information found in the Institutional Report. This includes important information such as corrections to tables, percentages, and other findings which may have been inaccurately reported in the Institutional Report.]**

**IV. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE**

You may either type the sources of evidence and persons interviewed in the text boxes below or upload files using the prompt at the end of the page.

**Documents Reviewed**

**Persons Interviewed**

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

Interviews
Hyperlinks in Institutional Report
Electronic Exhibit List
Physical Exhibits
Additional Materials

See **Attachments** panel below.

**(Optional) State Addendum:**