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**Introduction**

This *Radford University IR Addendum Report* responds to areas of concerns described in the NCATE Off-Site Report and provides additional evidence for the Onsite Board of Examiners. The *RU IR Addendum Report* and the *RU IR Addendum Appendices* have been archived on flash drives and sent to On-Site BOE members. Exhibits which seem particularly related to the areas of concern and additional evidence have been saved in the file*, RU IR Addendum Exhibits,* which is also on the flash drives.

* “Appendices” will be labeled as “**Appendix \_\_ Title of the Appendix”** and will be found in the *RU IR Addendum Appendices* file.
* “Exhibits” will be labeled “*Standard X, Exhibit number and name”* and will be found in the *RU IR Addendum Exhibits* under the related Standard*.*

The *Radford University Institutional Report* and the full set of *NCATE Exhibits for the Institutional Report* are also saved on the flash drives.

**Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**

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

1. *Program list in NCATE’s Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS). All programs at both initial teacher and advanced preparation must be entered into AIMS.*

**Appendix A Professional Education Program Information Chart** includes the following for each program: the state licensure endorsement area(s) addressed; whether the program is initial or advanced or both; graduate or undergraduate; college and departmental affiliation; state and national accrediting or review bodies; status of National Recognition by Specialized Professional Associations; and listings of faculty.

A set of hard copy files will be available onsite for each of the programs which include:

* Letters confirming final review and approval by the Virginia Department of Education and Board of Education
* 2003 SPA reviews of programs which are nationally recognized until 2012 or 2019
* 2010-2011 Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports for each program (based on SPA report guidelines)
* Clinical and/or field experience handbooks
* Samples of “work samples” or “unit studies” as appropriate to the program.

1. *Clarification of advanced teaching programs. Are there advanced programs in music and English Education? What are the key assessments and candidate data for advanced programs?*

The Music Department has a M.S. in Music Therapy and an M.A. degree in Music, but neither are programs in music education. The description for the degree can be found online at <http://grad-music.asp.radford.edu/ma.html>.

The M.S. degree in English is an initial licensure program (post-baccalaureate) program. Candidates in the program are evaluated through the Secondary English Assessment Plan. The Annual Candidate Performance and Program Assessment Report lists and describes the assessments and includes results of the assessments and discussions of these (see *RU IR Addendum Exhibits:* *Standard I: Candidate Performance Evidence, Exhibit 1.3 Annual Candidate Performance and Assessment Reports*). **Appendix B English Education Graduate Program Key Assessments** includes Sections II and III of the annual report which lists the key assessments and shows which standards are evaluated with each assessment.

**Appendix C: Brief Description of the M.S. in Education Degree** provides a description of the degree and concentrations in the degree and their development, and information on enrollments, etc. In addition, the *Candidate and Program Assessment Report* for the M.S. in Education outlines the assessments, evaluation tools, and plans for improvement and can be found in the *RU IR Addendum Exhibits*, *Standard I: Candidate Performance Evidence, Exhibit 1.3 Annual Candidate Performance and Assessment Reports.* The M.S. in Education degree has concentrations in the following areas:

* 1. **Curriculum and Instruction** (C/I) **Concentration**: this concentration primarily serves post-baccalaureate initial licensure candidates in elementary, middle, and secondary education science and social studies. Previously, candidates would pursue this route to complete licensure requirements and it was identified as a “licensure-only” route. Recently, more students are completing the entire degree.
     1. The M.S. in Education degree and the C/I concentration have been extensively revised during 2008-2010. Faculty have developed assessments for the core courses in the M.S. in Education and for the courses in the C/I concentration but have not completed a full assessment cycle. Candidate assessment data have not been collected and compiled.
     2. M.S. in Education Curriculum and Instruction initial teacher education candidates are enrolled in the elementary, middle school, and secondary mathematics and social studies programs along with the undergraduate students. They participate in the Assessment Plans for these programs.
     3. The M.S. in Education Curriculum and Instruction option for Secondary Science Education was approved by the state in 2010. This program has established an Assessment Plan based on NSTA standards and has filed the *Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Report* (located in the RU IR Addendum Exhibits under *Standard I: Candidate Performance Evidence, Exhibit 1.3 Annual Candidate Performance and Assessment Reports*).
  2. **Technology Education Concentration**: This program was “frozen” during recent budget cuts and during a time of university restructuring (2008-2010). Faculty have revised the program and moved it through internal program approval. We have our first cohort enrolled in the revised program this Fall 2011. The faculty is in the preliminary stages of developing the Assessment Plan and assessment tasks and rubrics. No data have been collected and compiled. Since there is no license in educational technology in Virginia, this program has not been reviewed by the State DOE. This program prepares individuals to use technology in a variety of settings, including P-12 schools. Several graduates have gone on to work in higher education settings.
  3. **Content Studies: Mathematics**: This is a new program being piloted in collaboration with Virginia Commonwealth University. It is a special RU project funded through a Virginia 2011 legislative amendment. We have developed an Assessment Plan and assessment tasks and rubrics, but have not collected assessment data. The program consists of the M.S. in Education core courses and 18 hours of mathematics content courses offered through the Department of Mathematics and Statistics and the School of Teacher Education and Leadership in collaboration with VCU and the Math Science Innovation Center in Richmond.
  4. **Early Childhood Education/Early Childhood Special Education:** This concentration is the fifth year of professional studies for candidates in the Five-Year Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education initial licensure program. This program has been reviewed and approved by the Virginia Department of Education and has been consistently implementing the Assessment Plan based on CEC standards (see the *Candidate and Program Assessment Report* for this program in the *RU IR Addendum Exhibits*, *Standard I: Candidate Performance Evidence, Exhibit 1.3 Annual Candidate Performance and Assessment Reports.*

1. *Program details for the programs offered at Virginia Western Community College and in collaboration with Lynchburg College.*

**RU/Virginia Western Community College 2+2 Program.** The College has developed an articulation agreement that includes an associate’s degree from VWCC and the Interdisciplinary Studies (IDS) degree (B.A., B.S.) from Radford with licensure in elementary education. This is the only program in professional education at this site. Courses from the Associate’s degree meet some of the IDS requirements. Radford University delivers face-to-face courses at the Roanoke Higher Education Center that meet the final requirements in the IDS degree (including concentrations in English and in Special Education) and the professional studies course work required for the elementary education program. Students complete early field experiences and student teaching in partner schools in Roanoke City and are supervised by RU elementary education faculty. The program is identical to the on-campus program, and candidates are evaluated through the Elementary Education Assessment Plan. The Assessment Office conducts studies to review equivalency with other elementary education cohorts on such measures as candidate qualifications and performance. For a sample of a comparative study of off-campus and on-campus cohorts, see RU IR Addendum Exhibits,

**RU/Lynchburg Program in Early Childhood Special Education.** The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) awarded to Radford University (grantee) and Lynchburg College a personnel preparation grant to develop a consortium to provide necessary coursework to alleviate the critical shortage of Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) endorsed teachers in Virginia, with a focus on Regions 5, 6, 7, and 8. Faculty members from Radford University include Dr. Kathryn Hoover (grant coordinator) and Dr. Sharon Gilbert. Faculty members from Lynchburg College include Dr. Glenn Buck and Dr. Deanna Cash. Beginning in the summer of 2007, and continuing through fall 2011, the Virginia Consortium for Teacher Education in ECSE has provided coursework in four and now six courses necessary for endorsement in ECSE.

The ECSE Consortium has as its guiding principles the effective, appropriate best practices in instruction coupled with the latest technology for course packaging and delivery to reach the largest number of teachers in the target area (and now across the entire state) and to support these teachers in learning and implementing best practices in the area of ECSE. The distance delivery includes courses offered on-line, hybrid, asynchronous, synchronous, and live distance video conference: one course is asynchronous online; two are asynchronous with 1-2 face to face all day meetings; three courses are currently live video conference distance classes (one of these will be converted to synchronous online with 1-2 face to face all day meetings beginning spring, 2012, and one may be converted to asynchronous online in summer 2012). The ECSE Consortium serves approximately 30-50 students per school year, a number that has increased dramatically and has included students from all over Virginia, since courses have been offered online.  An approximate total of over 100 teachers have completed requirements for the ECSE endorsement since the inception of the ECSE Consortium.

Additional information regarding programs which are delivered through distance education is provided in **Appendix L Distance Education Programs and NCATE Standards**.

1. *Initial and advanced program reports submitted to VDOE, including the biennial reports and the past three Title II reports.*

Initial and advanced reports submitted to the VDOE are located in the *RU IR Addendum Exhibits*, *Standard I: Candidate Performance Evidence: Exhibit 1.1 State DOE Program Review and State Findings.* In addition, the Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports, which are modeled on the national report templates for the Specialized Professional Associations, are located in the *RU IR Addendum Exhibits*, *Standard I: Candidate Performance Evidence: Exhibit 1.3 Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports.* The 2007-2009 and 2009-2011 Biennial Reports and the Title II Reports for the past three years are available in **Appendix Q:** **Biennial and Title II Reports.**

1. *Reports of VDOE action identifying areas for improvement and met/not met standards, including the letter from the state about approved programs and other required state findings.*

The letters from the State Department of Teacher Education and Licensure announcing program approvals are found in **Appendix R: State Program Approval Letters.**Reports regarding VDOE formative program review identifying areas for improvement and met/not met standards will be on file at the on-campus visit in hard-copy files.

1. *Data related to the candidates’ professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. What assessments provide this information? How are candidates performing on these assessments?*

Each program has identified key assessments for evaluating candidates’ ability to plan and to implement instruction and to impact student learning. Some of these assessments are program-specific, particularly the ability to plan and the ability to impact student learning, and would be described in the *Candidate and Program Assessment Reports.* These reports list key assessments (Section II) and discuss results of those assessments (Section IV) regarding teacher education candidates’ professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

The evaluation of teacher education candidates during early field experiences and during student teaching are considered comprehensive evaluations addressing candidates’ competencies in seven performance categories: 1) content knowledge and content pedagogical knowledge; 2) applying an understanding of learner development and individual differences; 3) establishing a culture for learning; 4) planning and implementing instruction; 5) modeling professionalism; 6) specific content and content pedagogical knowledge; and 7) professional characteristics and dispositions. See **Appendix D Assessments of Teacher Education Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills** whichincludes: 1) a description of the basic performance expectations regarding professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills and a discussion of the results of student teaching evaluations from Fall 2009 to Spring 2011; and 2) a copy of the data report showing the ratings student teachers received from cooperating professionals and university supervisors from Fall 2009 to Spring 2011. Candidates consistently perform at the “satisfactory” or above levels on final evaluations, which is required for retention in and completion of programs. Candidates who receive ratings of “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” work with field-based and university-based faculty to improve their knowledge, skills, or dispositions. If the candidate demonstrates significant areas of weakness, the candidates work with faculty to develop and implement an Improvement Plan.

Programs preparing other school personnel also identify specific assessments to document candidates’ performance regarding professional knowledge and skills. **Appendix G: Key Assessments in Advanced Programs** includes Section II List of Assessments for each program and how the assessments are aligned with SPA standards. The description of the assessments and the results of these assessments are reported in Section IV in the annual *Candidate and Program Assessment* Reports. Because the programs are unique with regard to expectations for professional knowledge and skills, there are no “across-program” evaluations or compilations and reporting of results of assessments across programs in these skill areas. Candidates must make satisfactory progress as identified by the program in order to progress to the next phase in the program. Candidates who are not making satisfactory progress meet with faculty members teaching the course or with the faculty supervisor for clinical experiences in order to improve their knowledge, skills, and dispositions. If candidates demonstrate significant areas of weakness, the candidates work with faculty to develop and implement an Improvement Plan.

In Section V in the *Candidate and Program Assessment* reports, faculty “summarize the overall strengths and weaknesses in candidates’ content knowledge and pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions” and use the results of these evaluations to “improve candidate performance, the program or operations or procedures.” The Dean and the Director of College Assessment review programs’ Assessment Plans on an on-going basis and review the *Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports* each year to ensure that programs are adequately monitoring candidate performance. See **Appendix E: Part I and Part II of the Review of Annual Candidates and Program Assessment Reports**.

Related to this question is the fact that the unit implemented a new data management system in 2006, *rGrade*, which allows users to view assessment data aggregated and reported at the individual program level but not at the unit level. *rGrade* allows users to: build assessment plans with decision points and assessments; use a variety of evaluation tools (rubrics, rating systems, etc.); monitor the progress of individual candidates in the program across the decision points; and conduct an audit to determine if the program assessments are addressing all standards. The unit conducts a few across-program evaluations for teacher education programs (described later in this document).

1. *Action taken when candidates are not meeting proficiencies. What type of remediation is provided by the unit?*

Initial Teacher Education Programs

Initial teacher education candidates must meet several requirements for admission to the Teacher Education Program (e.g., GPA, passing scores on basic proficiency exams and subject matter exams, professional characteristics and dispositions) and the unit has taken several steps to assist students in meeting these requirements. The College’s Recruitment, Advising, and Retention Committee has instituted professional development workshops for students in all CEHD programs in order to assist students in meeting program requirements (for example, one workshop addresses preparation for Praxis I and II exams). The Center for Advising and Student Support identifies students who are falling behind in meeting program GPA requirements and holds special advising meetings with these students. A group of faculty (“The United Front”) in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership has taken special steps to communicate expectations to students in courses preceding admission to the Teacher Education Program and to monitor students’ progress and provide feedback to them.

The Field Experience Program Office conducts orientation sessions and provides information and support for students in meeting requirements. Admission applications are screened for requirements met and readiness to participate in the program. Students who have not met the testing requirements or who have incomplete packets are advised individually on how to access the testing resources through LARC, or DRO, or through individual instructor assistance. Test Anxiety support groups have been started to assist students in taking exams.

Completed applications are sent to the program faculty for an additional screening (“Departmental Review”) to ensure that faculty concur that each student is well-prepared and ready to be admitted to the program. Students may be admitted through the Departmental Review as “Provisional.” This means that there is some concern by the faculty in an area such as academics, or dispositional, or low test scores, but that the student has met basic eligibility requirements. At the start of the semester, an individual meeting with the student, supervisor, and Associate Dean is set to provide scaffolding and at which time the student develops an Action Plan for success.

The College Dean and Associate Dean work closely with faculty and chairs in the academic programs within the college and across campus to take specific steps to especially help students prepare for Praxis II exams. Faculty in programs and in the Learning Assistance Resource Center have taken the Praxis II exams and provide Praxis II workshops and tutor individual students and they locate and develop test-preparation materials. Programs with 15% or more students who are experiencing difficulty passing the exams must submit an action plan outlining steps to provide more specific, departmental assistance to students.

Should any difficulty occur during the Early Field Experience or Student Teaching placements, a Plan of Improvement is made with the supervisor, cooperating teacher, and intern and a meeting is set with the associate dean to review and ensure that actions are being taken to assist the student toward achieving the goals set. Follow up continues through the supervisor. If a serious situation requires administrative (temporary or permanent) removal from an internship, due process is outlined in the *Basic Field Experience Handbbook* under the Policies and Procedures (see **Appendix F: Policies and Procedures Governing Admission, Placement, Retention and Program Completion** and in the *Basic Field Experience handbook* which is located in the *RU IR Addendum Exhibits* in *Standard III Clinical Experience Evidence, Exhibit 3.5 Examples of Handbooks*). Hardcopies of field experience handbooks will be available for the Onsite BOE Team.

Advanced Teacher Education Programs and Programs Preparing Other School Personnel

Candidates in advanced teacher education programs and programs for other school personnel apply to the College of Graduate and Professional Studies. When applications are complete, they are sent to Program Coordinators for review. The Program Coordinators provide information to students regarding program requirements to make sure they know what is required for admission. This often includes directly contacting the applicant to discuss admission and program requirements. If M.S. in Education applicants are seeking to complete licensure requirements while pursuing the degree, the Program Coordinator provides information on the licensure program requirements and on being admitted to the Teacher Education Program. Applicants pursuing teaching licensure receive additional information and support from the Field Experience Program Office. Generally, because applicants are fully informed by the Graduate College and by graduate Program Coordinators of the requirements for admission, candidates who finally complete the application process are those who meet qualifications for admission.

Faculty members in the program continuously monitor candidates’ progress through the decision points in the Assessment Plan (e.g., admission to the program, admission to final internship, program completion). Faculty advisors work with students who experience difficulty in meeting requirements in courses or in field experiences, and who are not progressing satisfactorily at each decision point. When issues regarding progress or retention emerge, program faculty members meet to discuss concerns and strategies for developing improvement plans if needed. If the candidate demonstrates continuing patterns of weakness or unsatisfactory progress, the faculty develops an Improvement Plan detailing the standards for performance, resources and referrals, clear expectations regarding improvement, and dates by which improvement should occur. Faculty advisors and/or faculty supervisors follow up to ensure that the candidate demonstrates the expected level of performance outlined in the plan in order to continue in the program.

1. *Explanation and examples of “work sample” and data for the assessment. What scoring guides are used with this assessment? How are candidates performing on the assessment?*

Several teacher education programs use a “work sample” or similar capstone assessment task to evaluate key proficiencies regarding candidates’ content knowledge, professional knowledge and skills, and ability to assess student learning and to use the results of assessments to improve student learning and their teaching. Because these vary by program area, a hard-copy file including the description of work-samples and similar tasks and the results of assessments will be provided for the Onsite Visit Team. The description of such assessments, the evaluation tools used, and the results of assessments and how these results are used are documented in the *Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports* located in the RU IR Addendum Exhibits in *Standard I: Candidate Performance Evidence: Exhibit 1.3 Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports.*

1. *Alignment of the “professional characteristics dispositions” to the conceptual framework for initial and advanced teaching programs. What are the dispositions outlined in the conceptual framework? How are those dispositions assessed?*

The Professional Characteristics and Dispositions (PCDs) address various types of expectations regarding work habits, basic communication skills, interpersonal skills, as well as dispositions. There is not an explicit statement in the conceptual framework listing the Professional Characteristics and Dispositions. Faculty identified these PCDs as part of the set of standards we expect candidates to demonstrate as developing “Professional Educators.” These are communicated to students prior to their enrollment and continuing throughout their program.

The primary connection between the conceptual framework and the Professional Characteristics and Dispositions is the emphasis upon “professionalism” in the conceptual framework, and especially in the unit’s commitment toward developing “responsive and engaged human service professionals who lead, teach, and serve in a pluralistic society.” The executive summary of the conceptual framework is “The Professional Educator.” The initial purpose for developing the Professional Characteristics and Dispositions was to define “Professional” and to articulate to students, from the very beginning, that they are not just college students, but are “professionals in training.” Becoming a professional requires more than attending classes and earning good grades---that they must also demonstrate good communication skills, critical thinking skills, and solid work habits (punctuality, stress management, positive use of constructive feedback); they should hold high standards for their professional work; and they should have strong interpersonal skills and demonstrate collegiality and respect for others. These are all qualities that “pre-dispose” them to become successful, professional educators.

The other aspects of the “professional” emphasis are that we are “human service professionals leading, teaching, and serving in a pluralistic society.” We expect candidates to take initiative and to be a strong contributor, often as a leader. And we expect candidates to “effectively develop professional/personal connections with students which contribute to student development; to act on the strong believe that all students can learn” and to “consistently demonstrate a commitment to understanding diversity and to teach from multiple perspectives.”

1. *Summary data for key assessments for initial and advanced programs. What assessments are required for advanced teaching (e.g., C&I, content studies, and technology) and other advanced teaching and school professional programs? How is student learning assessed in advanced programs?*

The annual *Candidate Performance and Program Assessment Reports* located in the *RU IR Addendum Exhibits* for *Standard I: Candidate Performance Evidence: Exhibit 1.3 Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports* provide summary data for key assessments for initial and advanced programs. As mentioned above, most key assessment data are aggregated at the program level, particularly in advanced programs. In addition, with the exception of evaluation of teacher education interns during field placements, most assessments are program-specific.

In order to provide more direct access to summarized examples of the information available in the annual reports, the key assessments for advanced teacher education programs and programs preparing other school personnel are listed in **Appendix G: Key Assessments in Advanced** Programs. The list of assessments provides some basic information on how student learning is assessed in advanced programs: what types of assessments are used and when these are administered. Also, **Appendix D Assessment of Teacher Education Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills** provides an example of the evaluation of student teaching, which is an “across-program” assessment, including a discussion of the results of student teaching evaluations for Fall 2009 through Spring 2011.

1. *Clarification of return rates on follow-up of alumni and employer surveys. What is the return rate on the employer survey? What steps has the unit taken to improve return rates on these surveys?*

The return rate on the most recent employer survey was 52%. Historically, since 1998, return rates on surveys of alumni have been 10% - 17%. We have taken the following steps to improve return rates on alumni surveys:

1. Joined the university in obtaining purchased addresses of alumni.
2. Asked faculty to assist in encouraging alumni participation, since many of them have maintained contact with students.
3. Created a schedule of multiple distributions, including:
   1. Email
   2. Postcards
   3. Letters
4. Offered incentives (e.g., iPods)
5. Conducted focus groups

We are exploring social networks and holding regional breakfasts with focus group interviews to attract more participation among our alumni.

**Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

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

* + - 1. *Alignment of assessments with candidate outcomes in the conceptual framework. What assessments provide feedback on the CF outcomes? How are candidates performing on these assessments?*

Unit candidate learning outcomes outlined in the Conceptual Framework are aligned with INTASC, SPA, and NCATE standards. The *RU IR Addendum Exhibit Standard I: Candidate Performance Evidence: Exhibit 1.0 Jan 06 Outline of Candidate and Program Assessment Reports,* provides examples of how faculty can report and use results of assessments related to the CF areas of content knowledge: knowledge of learners and of best practices (professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in planning and implementation and impact on student learning and on the learning environment); and professional characteristics and dispositions. The Candidate Performance Assessment Frameworks show how assessments used at decision points are aligned with candidate outcomes in the conceptual framework (e.g., content knowledge, professional knowledge and skills, impact on student learning). The results of these assessments are reported in the annual *Candidate and Program Assessment* reports.

The Dean and Director of College Assessment review the annual *Candidate and Program Assessment* reports (see **Appendix E: Part I and Part II of the Review of Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports)**. The reports indicate that faculty are monitoring whether or not candidates admitted in programs are performing at the satisfactory or above levels. Records also indicate that candidates who are not performing at the satisfactory level work with faculty in improving their performance, and if a candidate shows patterns of weaknesses, the faculty and candidate develop a Plan for Improvement which outlines the areas of weakness related to standards, describes expectations for improvement and provides resources or referrals, and gives a date by which improvement should be observed. The candidate either meets expectations for improvement and this is documented on the Plan, or, if they do not, is counseled out of the program and into another career path.

* + - 1. *Operation of unit’s assessment system, rGrade. How does the system work? Who is responsible for data collection? What reports are generated from the system? How are faculty and candidates involved in the assessment system? When do faculty and candidates review assessment data? Is there evidence of how the unit involves the faculty in discussions about the data and its implications for program improvement? Is it the primarily the Director of Assessment who is charged with making the analysis and provides the reports? To whom? How?*

The rGrade Data Management System

*rGrade* is one of the three major data management systems used in the unit’s reporting and assessment system. *rGrade* is specifically used to manage program Assessment Plans regarding candidate performance. All programs with the exception of PK-12 Dance, PK-12 Art, and PK-12 Music (low enrollment programs) are using rGrade to manage candidate and program assessment data. Each program has outlined the decision points in the program and the assessments associated with those decision points in the *Candidate Performance Assessment Framework*. The assessments are entered into rGrade within the decision points in the framework.

How are data collected and entered into the rGrade system?

Data on initial teacher education candidates such as GPA are extracted from the university student data system using programs developed by the College Technology Coordinator. Additional candidate data related to program admissions criteria (e.g., test scores on exams) are entered by the Clinical Coordinator into the data system in the Field Experience Program Office and again are extracted via programs developed by the College Technology Coordinator.

Results of program candidate assessments are entered by program faculty or their designees. All instructors of record associated with the courses in which key assessment occur have rGrade accounts and have access to data entry forms and analysis options throughout the academic year. The system is accessible from on-campus locations as well as through the VPN client from off-campus sites with internet access. Results of the University Supervisors’ (US) and Cooperating Professionals’ (CP) evaluations of Early Field Experience (EFE) Interns and Student Teaching (ST) Interns are entered by the University Supervisor. The Assessment Office assists in entering the Cooperating Professionals’ evaluations of interns. Program coordinators or their designees have licensed access to the system and are able to generate reports on program-specific assessments and on the CP and US evaluations of interns in EFE and STU. The Director of College Assessment assists faculty in entering data and in generating reports on candidate performance for the program’s annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports.

The CEHD Assessment and Evaluation data management system

The College has a separate, older system, the CEHD Assessment and Evaluation system, that is used to enter, compile, and report data from teacher education candidates’ surveys and Faculty Annual Reports. Data from the following surveys related to the Teacher Education Program are managed through this system:

* Intern’s Evaluation of Field Experience Placement
* Early field Experience and Student Teaching Intern Survey of Diversity Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions
* Early field Experience and Student Teaching Intern Survey: Impact on Student Learning and Parental Involvement
* Early field Experience and Student Teaching Intern Survey: Student Intern’s Self-Efficacy Survey
* Intern Pre-Employment Survey

How are data entered and reported in the CEHD Assessment and Evaluation system?

The Associate Dean and Director of the Field Experience Program Office, the Clinical Coordinator, and the Director of College Assessment are responsible for collecting the candidate survey data during Assessment Day which is held at the end of each semester. The Director of College Assessment compiles, analyzes, and reports the results of these assessments. These reports are made available to faculty by being posted on the CEHD Assessment and Evaluation Support web site. The reports are regularly reviewed by the Professional Education Committee.

The College’s electronic Faculty Annual Report is also managed through the CEHD Assessment and Evaluation System. Faculty members in the College enter their annual reports regarding teaching, service, and professional contributions and professional development which constitute part of the annual faculty evaluation. The CEHD Technology Coordinator assists in generating reports from this system (e.g., reports on faculty professional productivity).

Collecting and reporting data from other sources

Graduate program coordinators either use the rGrade system or their own data management systems to collect, compile, and report the results of candidate performance assessments. Programs in Educational Leadership and in Counselor Education enter and compile data on candidate performance assessments in rGrade. The Literacy Education Program and School Psychology maintain their own systems for managing candidate performance assessment data. The M.S. in Education programs in Curriculum and Instruction, Technology Education, and Content Studies: Mathematics are in the process of developing their program assessment systems. School Psychology, School Social Work and Speech/Language Pathology conduct candidate and program assessment plans within their departments and submit reports to the CEHD Dean.

Reporting results of assessments and using results to improve

The results of the program assessments for all initial and advanced programs are reported in the annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports by program coordinators. The Director of College Assessment assists in generating the reports for candidate assessments entered into rGrade. We have adjusted the reporting cycle from May 15 to October 15 in order to provide sufficient time to compile and analyze the results from assessments.

In the Annual Report, in Section IV, the program faculty members analyze the results of individual assessments. In Section V of the Annual Report, faculty summarize the overall results of assessments and their interpretations of the results related to candidates’ content knowledge, professional knowledge and skills, and their impact on student learning in order to plan ways to improve candidate performance, the program, and policies and procedures.

The Dean and the Director of College Assessment met regularly with individual program faculty in developing their Assessment Plans and in reviewing data related to program admission, retention and completion and in using data for program improvement. For example, the Dean’s office and the Assessment Office have conducted studies to assist program faculty in making decisions regarding raising the GPA for admission. They have monitored applicants’ performance on Praxis I, Praxis II, the VCLA and the VRA in order to inform faculty as they worked on curriculum development. The Assessment Office generated a model for predicting VRA scores based on Praxis I and VCLA data that was used to counsel students prior to program admission. The Dean and Director of College Assessment review the annual *Candidate and Program Assessment Reports* and provide feedback on the report (see **Appendix E: Part I and Part II of the Review of Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports).**

The Professional Education Committee, with broad representation for education programs, has served as an advisory board in reviewing the results of unit-wide assessments and in reviewing the overall assessment plan for the unit. For example, the PEC has reviewed Praxis I and Praxis II test-taker data and results of surveys of candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions regarding diversity, impact on student learning, and family involvement.

* + - 1. *Admission to teacher education. What are the requirements related to Praxis I scores? What remediation is provided to candidates who do not pass Praxis I?*

Teacher education applicants in nearly all programs are required to pass Praxis I (or meet equivalent basic proficiency requirements using SAT, ACT, or VCLA scores) in order to be admitted to the Teacher Education Program. Applicants in Middle School, Secondary English and Secondary Mathematics are allowed to be admitted on a provisional basis with scores of Reading (176), Writing (174) and Mathematics (175) and with scores on Praxis II. A proposal will be presented to the PEC in October to require all programs to have passing scores on Praxis I (or meet equivalent basic proficiency requirements) and passing scores on Praxis II and on the VCLA in order to be admitted to the Teacher Education Program.

The unit has taken multiple steps to inform students of the importance of taking Praxis I early and of taking advantage of resources to prepare for Praxis I. Students and families are provided information regarding Praxis I requirements and resources for preparation for the exam prior to enrolling at Radford University through campus orientations and during the New Student Orientation the summer preceding their enrollment in the fall. Advisors address students’ plans to prepare for and take exams at each advising session prior to registration for the next semester. Students complete forms stating when they plan to take the exams.

The College has worked with several offices on campus and off-campus to assist students in preparing for Praxis I:

* Staff in the Learning Assistance Resource Center have taken the exam and provide individual tutoring and workshops for students;
* The dean served as a higher education representative on the ETS Higher Education Advisory committee; ETS restructured the on-line information and resources for test preparation;
* A secondary mathematics faculty member, Dr. Kevin LoPresto, provides individual tutoring for students on the mathematics exam;
* The Teaching Resources Center has purchased test preparation materials;
* The College Recruitment, Advising and Retention Committee provides workshops on Praxis I and Praxis II;
* Advisors in the Advising Center and the Clinical Coordinator review test results with individuals students and provide advice on how to prepare for the tests.
  + - 1. *Unit-wide aggregated data and disaggregated program level data at both the initial teacher and advanced preparation levels. What candidate data are being collected? What data are aggregated at the unit level? What data are disaggregated by each program and off-campus program?*

Initial Teacher Preparation Programs

The following types of data are aggregated and disaggregated by program area at the unit level. Reports are posted on the CEHD Evaluation and Assessment Support web site.

* Applicant data: GPA, Praxis I, Praxis II, VCLA, and VRE or RVA. Reports are generated on applicants.
* Pass rates on Praxis II, the VCLA, and VRE/RVA are also collected for program exiters and completers and reported in Title II and Biennial Reports, and shared with faculty.
* Intern’s Evaluation of Field Experience Placement
* Early field Experience and Student Teaching Intern Survey of Diversity Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions
* Early field Experience and Student Teaching Intern Survey: Impact on Student Learning and Parental Involvement
* Early field Experience and Student Teaching Intern Survey: Student Intern’s Self-Efficacy Survey
* Pre-Employment Survey
* Employer Surveys and Alumni Surveys for Teacher Education (initial and advanced)

Professional Characteristics and Dispositions (PCD): Prior to admission to the Teacher Education Program, students must demonstrate the Professional Characteristics and Dispositions. Faculty members monitor these in courses and if concerns arise, the faculty will complete a form and use the form to discuss the issues with the student. If the concerns remain after the course ends, copies are filed in the Field Experience Office and are accessed by faculty during Departmental Review for each program. These data are not aggregated at this point. There is also a section on Professional Characteristics and Dispositions on the Evaluation of Interns for Early Field Experience and for Student Teaching and data is compiled at the program level.

Each program (Initial and Advanced Teacher Preparation and Preparation for Other School Personnel) is implementing an Assessment Plan which typically includes three to eight program-specific assessments that are aligned with unit, state, NCATE, and SPA standards. The results of the assessments are aggregated at the program level and reported in the annual *Candidate and Program Assessment Reports.*  Hard copies of these reports will be made available to team members during the on-site visit.

1. *Clarification of the Candidate Performance Assessment Framework. How is the framework used? When do assessments occur? How are candidates performing on the assessment?*

There are two *Candidate Performance Assessment Frameworks:* one for Initial Teacher Education Programs and one for Advanced Teacher Education Programs and Programs Preparing Other School Personnel (sample frameworks are found in the *RU IR Addendum Exhibits* under *Standard II: Exhibit 2.1 Sample Candidate Performance Assessment Frameworks*). The *Frameworks* are used to plan and monitor the development of individual program Assessment Plans that are aligned with unit, state, NCATE and SPA standards. Faculty use the *Framework* to identify key decision points (e.g., admission, early field experiences/clinical practice, final internship and program completion) and the key assessments administered at each of these decision points. The Key Assessments are aligned with the unit and NCATE proficiencies.

1. *Candidates’ Impact on Student Learning Assessment self-reports. How does this self-report work? What is the alignment of candidates self-reporting with the findings of the work sample?*

The *Student Intern’s Survey: Impact on Student Learning* is administered at the end of the Early Field Experience and at the end of Student Teaching in the Teacher Education Program. The purposes of the survey are to gather information about the candidates’ involvement in assessment activities in their field placement and their responses to their perceived impact on student learning (e.g., did they reflect on their ability to impact student learning? did they change their teaching as a result of their assessment of student learning?). The goal is to provide information regarding student self-report to the program. We have not attempted to align the results of the survey with assessments of application, such as the work sample. One barrier is that in trying to preserve anonymity on student surveys, we do not request individual student identification information and thus we cannot map results of candidate self-report surveys to performance-based evaluations.

Candidates’ knowledge and skills in assessing student learning and in using the results of such assessments is one of the key goals in the Continuous Improvement Project focusing on Standard III: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice. We plan to expand “opportunities to learn” and assessments of candidate performance in this area. We also see this as a major route for university/school collaboration. New “student growth” measures will be used in teacher evaluation systems in Virginia. Teachers will also need support and resources for providing classroom-based evidence of student growth. Part of our continuous improvement plan is to explore how we can collaborate to meet the needs of our preparation programs and of schools in designing, implementing, and using assessments of student learning to improve schooling and educator preparation.

*(7) Evaluations of unit operations. How is the unit evaluating its effectiveness in its operation of field experiences, faculty evaluation, and assessment of diversity proficiencies?*

Evaluations of Field Experiences

The Field Experience Office conducts evaluations of Teacher Education Field Experiences through students, cooperating professionals, and program faculty. Students completing early field experiences and student teaching complete the “Intern Evaluation of Field Experience” and report on their opportunities to be engaged in ways that promote program competencies; the assistance they receive from the cooperating professional; and the assistance they receive from the university supervisor. Cooperating professionals are surveyed regarding the communication for the placement and expectations for the candidates’ performance, if they received information in a timely manner, their overall assessment of the quality of the candidates’ performance, and their view of weaknesses or strengths in the field experience program and what we could do to improve. Program faculty members provide feedback during meetings of the Professional Preparation Program Faculty and during meetings of the Professional Education Committee.

Most professional education programs hold annual advisory board meetings with the cooperating professionals during which they discuss what is going well in terms of the preparation of candidates, the field placements, and other aspects of the program, and areas which could be improved. Part of the Continuous Improvement Plan is to work with programs to ensure that all programs have advisory boards. Advisory board feedback is used by program faculty members to improve programs. The Task Force III on Improving Field Experiences and Clinical Practice was convened to support the central theme for our continuous improvement project: to review our current progress in providing strong, authentic clinical experiences in partnership with schools and agencies, and to develop a plan to transform clinical and field experiences over the next seven years in light of national reports, revised accreditation and state program approval standards, and internal assessments and our own aspirations.

Faculty Evaluations

The Dean and Leadership Team review the effectiveness of the faculty evaluation process within the college by monitoring the following:

* results of faculty and course evaluations by students (in comparison with college and university results),
* evaluations of teaching and resource faculty by chairs and directors,
* recommendations of the departmental personnel committees regarding reappointment,
* recommendations of personnel committees and chairs and directors regarding promotion and tenure.

As a result of reviewing these processes and identifying issues, the Dean has requested that the departments review current departmental criteria for promotion and tenure and submit revisions to faculty in the department for review and approval. The Leadership Team has also discussed ways to ensure that new faculty members receive mentoring in applying for promotion and tenure through their departments. The chairs and director have also collaboratively developed a rubric to use in discussing evaluations with faculty.

Assessment of Diversity Proficiencies

The unit examines how our candidates demonstrate identified proficiencies as well as how the unit and programs provide experiences for candidates to develop these proficiencies. The knowledge, skills, and dispositions candidates should demonstrate through their preparation programs fall into three categories: 1) understanding the development of one’s own identity regarding diversity (e.g., gender, religion, race/ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender preference, geographic region, language, sexual preference); 2) factors impacting professional practice in a pluralistic society; and 3) applying knowledge, skills, and dispositions for practicing in a pluralistic society. The unit examines how well our candidates demonstrate these expectations through assessing Professional Characteristics and Dispositions; evaluations of candidates within courses and field experiences; and candidates’ self-report surveys.

The unit is continuously evaluating how we articulate, develop, and assess candidates’ ability to practice from diverse perspectives: what types of experiences we provide for candidates; how we can attract and retain faculty who can mentor candidates for practice from diverse perspective; and how we, as an organization, can promote diversity. For example, we have incorporated strategies for attracting more diverse faculty, including faculty with experiences and interests in preparing candidates to practice from diverse perspectives. We have continuously reviewed curriculum to assess how we are addressing the knowledge, skills, and perspectives candidates need to practice. Faculty members have been campus leaders in addressing diversity on campus and in state organizations, primarily in the following areas of diversity: cultural; socio-economic; ability; gender and sexual preference.

**Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

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

*(1) Clarification of the role of the Southwestern Virginia Professional Education Consortium in the placement of candidates in field experiences and clinical practice. Is the Consortium responsible for placement? What is the unit’s role? Is the Consortium also responsible for placements in advanced programs? How are advanced placements made?*

RU’s College of Education is one of four higher education institutions that comprise the Southwestern Virginia Education Consortium with eleven participating school districts (LEA’s). The goals of the Consortium are to:

1. Develop a cadre of clinical faculty who are exemplary models of effective teaching and strong mentors for student teachers (teacher candidates).
2. Develop and nurture leadership abilities and exemplary practice in clinical faculty.
3. Facilitate greater cooperation and communication among consortium members.
4. Create a professional learning community that fosters learning to teach, and the development of school cultures that promote life-long learning for all members of the communities.
5. Support school/university collaboration that involves clinical faculty and pre-service teachers in efforts that impact student learning and well-being.

The Consortium has: developed Clinical Faculty Professional Development workshops and trained teacher leaders to deliver these workshops; maintained a database of teachers who have completed the development workshops and who then qualify for mentoring student teachers; developed a common template Memorandum of Understanding for universities and schools; improved university and school communication regarding field experiences and clinical practice; implemented a mini-grant program to support pre-service and in-service teacher development and to promote inquiry into teaching and learning. Consortium members are also exploring ways to enhance university/school partnerships and to increase our involvement in school improvement initiatives.

The Consortium does not make field placements for program candidates. It provides a structure for coordinating these placements in line with the best interests of school divisions and the institutions. The unit’s Office of Field Experience Programs in conjunction with each teacher education program prepares, qualifies, and places all undergraduate and advanced candidates in their field experiences (early field experience and student teaching).

*(2) Field-based requirements for advanced programs. What are the requirements for advanced teaching candidates? What are the requirements for other school professional programs? Why do administrative field experiences require three experiences rather than five (elementary, middle, high school, central office, and agency)? What are the internship hours for school counseling?*

Basic information regarding field-based requirements for advanced programs is outlined in **Appendix J Description of Field Experiences for Programs.** Additional information regarding field-based requirements is addressed in the handbooks for the programs which are located in the *RU IR Addendum Exhibits* under *Standard III: Field Experience and Clinical Practice, Exhibit 3.5 Examples of Handbooks.* Field-based requirements (hours, roles of interns, competencies to be demonstrated, qualifications of field-based supervisors, etc.) are based on state program approval standards and SPA standards.

The Educational Leadership program requires three experiences rather than five based on state program approval standards. The state of Virginia requires that students complete a minimum of 360 hours of field placement with exposure to “other agencies” which are social services, community counseling etc.   The endorsement on their license is PK-12 Supervision, which in Virginia makes one eligible for an administrative job (e.g., building-level principal, central office) except the superintendent.

Faculty from RU and Virginia Tech led the state by requiring three separate placements rather than a single placement to ensure a broader clinical experience that would include most of the levels of administration in the school division. The Virginia Professors of Educational Leadership also met with Virginia State Department representatives and RU and VT shared their experiences with this process of three separate placements and that became the basis for our current state requirements.

1. *“Partnership agreement” from Virginia Biennium 2009 - 2011.*

The report on the Partnerships for the Virginia Biennium Report 2009-2011 is located in **Appendix R** **Biennial and Title II Reports.**

*(4) Entry requirements into approved teacher education programs. In some cases they appear contradictory (i.e., provisional admission for not passing praxis 1); in some places no*

*requirements are listed for advanced programs. What are the requirements for admission? How many applicants are meeting these requirements?*

Entry Requirements into teacher education programs.

The entry requirements into teacher education programs are outlined in the *Policies and Procedures Governing Admission/readmission, Field placement, Retention, and Program Completion* (**Appendix H**). Programs in Secondary English and Secondary Mathematics and Middle School have a “provisional admission” which allows students to be admitted with the following scores on Praxis I---Reading, 176; Writing, 174; Mathematics, 175---and either scores or confirmation of registration to take Praxis II. The PEC will be reviewing a proposal in October 2011 for all programs to require passing scores on Praxis I and Praxis II for admission to the Teacher Education Program.

How many applicants are meeting these requirements?

The Field Experience Office tracks the qualifications of applicants to the program. The Director of College Assessment completes reports on the qualifications of applicants to the program and on the qualifications of candidates admitted to the Program and admitted to student teaching. A sample of the data regarding the status of applicants regarding minimum eligibility requirements (GPA and exam scores) of those who applied for admission to the Teacher Education Program for Fall 2011 is given here. (P = passing score; NP = not passing; NS = no score submitted). Applicants who have not yet attended Radford would not have an RU GPA (“no score” = 6). The Early Childhood Education/Early Childhood Special Education and Special Education General Curriculum candidate typically would apply to the program in the following year (prior to their fifth year), but the two students reported here were completing their fifth year out of cycle.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **GPA** |  |  | **Praxis I** | |  | **Praxis II** | |  | **VCLA** | |  | **VRA** |  |  |  |
| **PROGRAM** | **P** | **NP** | **NS** | **P** | **NP** | **NS** | **P** | **NP** | **NS** | **P** | **NP** | **NS** | **P** | **NP** | **NS** | **Total Applications** |
| **Deaf and Hard of Hearing** | 3 |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 | 1 |  | 3 |
| **Elementary Education** | 76 |  | 2 | 78 |  |  | 78 |  |  | 78 |  |  | 5 | 1 | 72 | 78 |
| **Middle School Education** | 20 |  | 2 | 21 | 1 |  | 22 |  |  | 22 |  |  |  |  |  | 22 |
| **Secondary English Education** | 15 |  | 1 | 16 |  |  | 11 | 4 | 1 | 14 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 16 |
| **Secondary Mathematics Education** | 9 |  |  | 9 |  |  | 7 | 2 |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |
| **Secondary Social Studies** | 17 | 1 |  | 18 |  |  | 17 | 1 |  | 18 |  |  |  |  |  | 18 |
| **Special Education: High Incidence/**  **General Curriculum** | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| **5 year Early Childhood Special Ed.** | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| **Total** | 141 | 1 | 6 | 146 | 2 |  | 136 | 7 | 1 | 145 |  | 3 | 7 | 2 | 74 | 148 |

Additional reports tracking the qualifications of applicants to the Teacher Education Program are available. These reports are regularly posted on the College Assessment and Evaluation web site.

Admission requirements for advanced teacher education programs and programs for other school personnel

**Appendix H** includes **Admission requirements for Applicants to Teaching Programs and to Programs for Advanced Teacher Preparation and Programs Preparing Other School Personnel.**

How many applicants are meeting these requirements?

As described on page 8, because applicants must have a complete application and are reviewed by Program Coordinators in advanced programs and receive feedback from them regarding the adequacy of their application, individuals who complete the application process meet all admission requirements.

1. *Inter-rater reliability on the student teaching assessment. How does the unit know that the ratings across supervisors are reliable?*

**Appendix M** shows the **Correlations between Ratings of Interns by US and CP**, that is, the correlations between the ratings of early field experience interns’ and student teaching interns’ performance by the University Supervisor and by the Cooperating Professionalfor each program area.

1. *Course syllabus for EDEF 606.*

The official course syllabus for EDEF 606 Educational Research is provided in **APPENDIX I: Course syllabus for EDEF 606.**

1. *Evidence that unit has addressed some components of the target rubrics. What data show that the unit is already at the target level in some areas? What plans does the unit have to move the advanced level to the target level? What is the outcome of Summer 2010 meeting to review and update the professional development workshops curriculum for Goal 1 of “moving to target”?*

**Appendix N Standard III Acceptable and Target Discussion Document** is a chart showing the results of Task Force III Improving Field Experiences and Clinical Practice meetings. University faculty and school-based faculty held workshops in which they discussed examples of current activities within field experience programs which they felt addressed some of the indicators in Standard III at both the acceptable and target levels. This document has been used in subsequent meetings to generate discussions of potential strategies and actions for “continuous improvement” and to begin building a timeline and action plan for 2011-2017.

The SWVA Professional Education Consortium held a professional working session this past summer during which teachers from the SWVA PEC divisions met to update and revise the Professional Development Workshop curriculum. The revised curriculum has been developed and disseminated.

1. *Diversity in field-based placements. How diverse are the clinical faculty and supervisors? How diverse are students in the schools used for clinical practice?*

University Supervisors

University supervisors are primarily full-time teaching and research faculty members in the preparation programs with the assistance of a few part-time adjunct faculty. The demographics for the supervisors are reported in *RU IR Addendum Exhibits*, *Standard IV Diversity Evidence: Exhibit 4.4 Updated Faculty Demographics.* The faculty is comprised of approximately 87% white and 13% other race/ethnicities, compared to the university faculty which is 85% white and 15% from other racial/ethnic backgrounds.

Clinical Faculty

We have not tracked the demographics of the Cooperating Professionals, the teachers, school psychologists, principals, reading specialists, and others who work with our candidates in the field.

PK-12 Student Populations

Information on student demographics is found in the *RU IR Addendum Exhibits* under *Standard IV Diversity Evidence: Exhibit 4.8 P-12 Student Demographics*. The school divisions in which our candidates in teacher preparation and in programs preparing other school personnel are placed can be generally described as follows:

* 12% - 58% student populations from racial/ethnic backgrounds other than white.
* 27% - 68% on free or reduced lunch
* 12% - 22% living below poverty level
* 13% - 16% identified to receive special education services

We have also seen an increase in the population of English Language Learners, particularly in Montgomery County, Roanoke City, and Roanoke County (see *Standard IV Diversity Evidence:* *Exhibit 4.8 Increase in LEP in VA 1995 – 2010*).

*(9) Management of complaints. Where is the complaint file? Are appropriate documents available?*

To be made available during the Onsite Visit.

**Standard 4: Diversity**

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

*(1) Clarification of Radford’s definition of diversity. Special education appears to be well addressed. What other groups are addressed in the curriculum, assessments, and field experiences?*

The unit applies the NCATE definition of diversity for all of our work: “Differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area.” Faculty expect candidates to develop basic knowledge and skills in: understanding their own background and differences and how that might influence their practice; understanding key social factors related to diversity and inclusion in a pluralistic society; and developing the ability to practice from inclusive and multicultural perspectives.

We have actively recruited individuals who have experiences with diversity and who have a commitment toward ensuring that we prepare candidates well in serving all P-12 students. Faculty members regularly teach from multiple perspectives and coach candidates to view education and their own practice from multiple perspectives (see *RU IR Addendum Exhibits, Standard IV: Diversity Evidence, Exhibit 4.10 Faculty Experience Related to Diversity)*.

The curriculum and field experiences have emphasized difference regarding exceptionalities, race and ethnicity, socio-economic status, sexual orientation and gender, geographical region, and language.

In initial teacher education programs, candidates experience a spiraling curriculum in which all pre-field experience classes (HUMD 300, EDEF 320, and program-specific special education courses, such as EDSP 360, 361, 404, etc.) introduce diversity issues (e.g. have readings, assignments, and class discussions and exercises related to students’ developmental needs, learning differences, social class, gender, sexual identity, and race/ethnicity. **Appendix K Courses Supporting Diversity** provides examples of the courses. In these classes, the primary focus is on helping candidates not only develop an understanding of his/her own culture, but also seeing how cultural factors shape students’ and families’ experiences with education. These introductory experiences with diversity are expanded upon in the early field and field experience coursework. In these later courses, the emphasis is on content (readings, assignments, etc.) and experiences in the schools which will further develop candidates’ understandings of cultural differences and how those impact students’ and families’ experiences with education and educational institutions, as well as develop their skills at designing instruction, assessments, and environments that attend to the needs of all learners.

Additional examples of courses and experiences which address diversity in can be found in ***Standard IV: Diversity Evidence:*** *Exhibit 4.2 Curriculum Components that Address Diversity and Exhibit 4.2 EDUC 670 Multicultural Education* and *Exhibit 4.2 Course Syllabi – Diversity highlighted.*

*(2) Clarification of proficiencies related to diversity at the initial and at the initial teacher and advanced preparation levels. What are the expected proficiencies? How are they assessed?*

The expected proficiencies related to diversity for candidates in initial and advanced teacher education programs fall into the following domains: applying an understanding of one’s own culture; applying an understanding of factors related to culture; and engaging in culturally-responsive practice. In teacher preparation programs, the following expectations are embedded into these domains (see *RU IR Addendum Exhibits*: *Standard IV Diversity: Exhibit 4.1 Candidate proficiencies related to diversity*):

1. **Applying an understanding one’s own culture:**
   1. Developing my own interest in learning about cultural diversity and how it impacts my role as an educator
   2. Knowing my own cultural identity and how that has developed
   3. Knowing how my values are similar to or different from the values of others
   4. Recognizing personal cultural biases and “blind spots” and how these might impact me in my profession
2. **Applying an understanding of cultural factors:**
   1. Knowing the effects of poverty on students and families
   2. Understanding the negative impact of stereotyping, prejudice, racism, and bias
   3. Understanding the social and cultural influences shaping one’s point of view
   4. Knowing the dichotomy in values and customs that might exist between home and school
3. **Culturally responsive practice:**
   1. Increasing my initiative to seek out opportunities to be engaged with people whose cultural background differs from my own.
   2. Increased awareness of and ability to identify instances of stereotyping, prejudice, and bias occurring in society and in the schools.
   3. Using an understanding of cultural diversity in making connections with families
   4. Understanding how assessments and evaluations might be biased
   5. Identifying and using a variety of non-biased assessment strategies
   6. Using knowledge of students’ cultures in making connections with content
   7. Discovering and using the diverse abilities and experiences that students bring to school
   8. Designing and implementing culturally relevant curricula, programs, and/or interventions
   9. Creating opportunities and environments that attract and welcome families from diverse cultures into the school

Candidates’ competencies related to the first two domains are evaluated primarily through course work in EDEF 320 Introduction to the Profession; HUMD 300 Child and Adolescent Development; and EDEF 607 Multicultural Education.

The faculty also utilize a professional characteristics and dispositions assessment in which the following diversity-related items are specifically assessed prior to admission to the initial Teacher Education Program and during early field experiences and student teaching.

**Attitude toward clients/learners**

* 1. Lacks interest in or is negative toward students; does not demonstrate an attitude that all students can learn; does not view own responsibility in motivating students; lacks knowledge and skills in establishing rapport motivating students
  2. Makes minimal efforts to establish rapport with students; does not always demonstrate an attitude that all students can learn; makes minimal effort to motivate students
  3. Develops rapport with students; demonstrates an attitude that all students can learn; demonstrates knowledge and skills in motivating students
  4. (Target) Effectively develops professional /personal connections with students which contribute to student development; acts on a strong belief that all students can learn; uses many strategies that effectively motivate students

**Commitment to Diversity and Equity**

1. Ethnocentric; considers only personal perspective
2. Demonstrates awareness of diversity issues and of multiple perspectives
3. Demonstrates emerging commitment to learning more about diversity and how to incorporate multiple perspectives in practice.
4. (Target) Consistently demonstrates a commitment to understanding diversity; incorporates multiple perspectives in practice.

Candidates are also assessed during early field experiences and student teaching on the following competencies related to culturally-responsive practice:

**Category II Applying an understanding of learner development and individual differences:**

#3. Applies knowledge of common student exceptionalities and differences.

#4. Modifies/creates instruction adapted to diverse learners.

#5. Applies an understanding of the interests and cultural heritage of students.

*Standard IV: Diversity Exhibit 4.2 Curriculum Components that Address Diversity* in the *RU IR Addendum Exhibits* includes *Exhibit 4.2 UG Teacher Education Curriculum related to Diversity; Exhibit 4.2 Course Syllabi—Diversity highlighted; and EDUC 670 Principles of Multicultural Education* which is required in the M.S. in Education degree.

1. *Course requirements related to diversity for secondary candidates. What courses address diversity issues? What groups besides exceptionalities are addressed in the curriculum?*

Courses in educational foundations (EDEF 320 Introduction to the Profession and HUMD 300 Child and Adolescent development) lay the foundations for promoting knowledge and skills related to diversity in secondary schooling. These courses address race/ethnicity, language difference, gender, sexual identity, and disabilities. In these classes, the primary focus is on helping candidates not only develop an understanding of his/her own culture, but also seeing how cultural factors shape students’ and families’ experiences with education. (See the *RU IR Addendum Exhibits* *Standard IV: Diversity Exhibit 4.2 Curriculum Components that Address Diversity, Exhibit 4.2 Course Syllabi---Diversity highlighted.)*

These introductory experiences with diversity are expanded upon in the early field and field experience coursework. The course in EDRD 416 Reading in the Content Areas also integrates diversity. Students in EDRD 416 are expected to demonstrate the following competencies related to diversity:

* Able to use language appropriate to students’ ages, gender, race, ethnic background, level of development, and individual need
* Sensitive to socio-cultural and linguistic backgrounds, to diverse learning styles, and modes of expression
* Familiar with principles of curriculum and instruction for integration of special needs students into a regular classroom setting
* Able to teach through diverse modes
* Able to make curricular content relevant to the experiences of students from diverse racial, socio-economic, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds
* Capable of dealing equitably and responsibly with all learners

Additionally, because the secondary science program is only available at the graduate level, all those candidates take the EDUC 670 Multicultural Education course. The syllabus for this course is found in **Appendix Q Syllabi for Core Courses in the M.S. in Education.**

1. *Diversity expectations in rubrics used with key assessments. What rubrics include the assessment of diversity proficiencies?*

Sample assessments related to diversity are included in *Standard IV: Diversity Exhibit 4.3 Sample Assessment Instruments for Diversity.* The unit will provide additional examples of assessments which include evaluations related to diversity expectations during the Onsite visit.

1. *Disaggregated data on candidate performance on assessments by program. What data indicate that candidates across programs are developing diversity proficiencies?*

***Standard IV Diversity Evidence:*** *Exhibit 4.3b* includes files reporting the results of the Intern Survey of Diversity Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions (Diversity KSDs), disaggregated by program for Spring 2009, Spring 2010 and Spring 2011, and an overall comparison for changes from Spring 2008 to Spring 2011. The overall comparison (Exhibit 4.3b1) shows that we have made modest but consistent gains from 2008 to 2011 in terms of candidates’ self-report of the importance of the Diversity KSDs and how well they have been prepared to demonstrate the KSDs. Differences among programs could be characterized as follows, with the strong caveat that low enrollments impact results reported as means: secondary education math and music and dance candidates show more variability over time in terms of how important they believe these KSDs are for teachers and report feeling less well-prepared than candidates report in other programs. The Special Education Department recognized the need for a special education course directed toward specific knowledge, skills, and dispositions for secondary candidates and that has been implemented. An example of how this course seeks to promote candidates’ dispositions toward the importance of diversity issues is the focus upon “images of disability” and how attitudes toward diversity influence school system and teacher practices.

An unexpected program difference which emerged this past Spring 2011 was that candidates in the Deaf and Hard of Hearing program reported lower ratings compared to past DHH candidates (keeping in mind DHH enrollments of 2-4 students) for the importance of “developing my own interest in learning about cultural diversity and how it impacts my role as an educator;” “knowing my own cultural identity and how that has developed;” and “increasing my initiative to seek out opportunities to be engaged with people whose cultural background differs from my own.” Generally, students in special education programs rate the importance of the KDSs highly (2.7 and above). We have an increased number of deaf and hard of hearing candidates in this program.

Most recent data (Spring 2011) show that overall, candidates rate the importance of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions reflected in the survey on the high end of the 0-3 scale: 2.78 to 3.0. Overall, the areas in which they report feeling least prepared (2.18-2.31) are in “understanding the needs of English Language Learners;” “modifying instruction for English Language Learners;” and “preparation in working effectively with school support specialists such as special education teachers and ESL specialists.” Again, there are program differences, with some program candidates feeling well prepared (Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education, English education, Exercise/Sport/Health Education; Special Education, Elementary Education) and other program candidates feeling less prepared (mathematics education, middle education, science education, social studies education, and special education deaf and hard of hearing).

1. *Diversity of candidate population. How diverse is the candidate population? A table with this information would be helpful (a sample report is attached to the NCATE exhibit list). What differences in candidate diversity exists at the different campuses?*

In the 2009-2010 year, the following data on teacher preparation students illustrate the level of candidate diversity.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2009-2010 teacher preparation candidates  (Total N = 1002 enrolled in a major leading to teacher preparation) | % |
| Male | 191 | 19% |
| Female | 811 | 81% |
| White | 895 | 89% |
| Black or African-American | 68 | 6.8% |
| Hispanic of any race | 17 | 1.7% |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 0 | 0% |
| Asian | 10 | 1% |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 3 | .3% |
| Unknown | 7 | .7% |
| Multi-race | 2 | .2% |
| Low SES (as determined by Pell Grant eligibility) | 44 | 4.4% |

**Appendix O Education Candidate Demographics** provides additional information regarding the diversity of candidates formally enrolled in the Teacher Education Program and in programs preparing other school personnel 2009-2010. We keenly recognize the need to enhance the number of candidates from under-represented groups in our programs. University and unit recruitment plans reflect our ongoing commitment to having a more diverse candidate population. The university has been successful this past year in recruiting a more diverse new student population.

1. *Diversity of faculty members in initial and advanced programs. What are the differences in the diversity of faculty at these two levels?*

Faculty members teach at both the initial and advanced levels in all programs except those faculty members teaching in the Counselor Education and Educational Leadership programs. Because there are so few faculty members teaching in these two programs, we will make these data available during the Onsite Visit.

1. *Tracking of candidates’ placement in settings with students from diverse groups. How does the unit ensure that all candidates are placed in settings with diverse populations, including Roanoke and Lynchburg? What is the process for tracking placements?*

We have focused on selecting partner schools with diverse student populations. Though not all candidates have experiences in racial minority-majority schools, they do have experiences in schools with diverse student populations as reflected in our definition of diversity: race/ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender, sexual preference, special learning needs, English language learners, etc. See *RU IR Addendum Exhibits,* ***Standard IV: Diversity*** *Exhibit 4.8 P-12 Student Demographics.*

**Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development**

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

*(1) Recent P-12 school experience of clinical faculty from the university. What recent experiences in schools do university supervisors have?*

Faculty supervisors are generally Teaching and Research faculty members who have contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the level at which they supervise. This involvement includes: their own current teaching experience; special projects working with schools and teachers in promoting student learning and well-being; collaboration with teachers in developing and implementing field experiences and clinical practice for interns; volunteer work in schools; grants supporting student learning, teacher development, and principal development; and other activities which ensure they have current expertise and are connected with the demands of the careers for which interns under their mentorship are preparing. Specific information for individual faculty supervisors will be provided to the Onsite Team.

*(2) Scholarly activities beyond the university and state in which faculty participate. What are examples of scholarly activities at the national and international level?*

**Appendix P Samples of Faculty Scholarly Work** provides information on activities at the state, national, and international level.

*(3) Clarification of the frequency chart detailing the modeling of best professional practices in teaching.*

See # 5 below.

1. *Sample of unit faculty evaluations and a summary report of those evaluations. The form used for faculty evaluation does not match policies and procedures? How do unit faculty compare in their evaluations with faculty across campus?*

Student evaluations of courses and faculty as reported in the *Institutional Report* are one component of RU faculty evaluation related to teaching. These data provide one indication of how unit faculty compare with other faculty across campus based on student evaluations; generally, professional education faculty members receive higher ratings from students.

Regarding the overall evaluation of faculty, the results of student evaluations of courses and instructors are only one part of the evaluation of teaching and faculty are evaluated on teaching, service, and professional contributions. Student evaluation data are the only summary data which are available related to faculty evaluations. The chairs or directors evaluate faculty performance in the three areas, teaching, service, and professional contributions, and assign a numerical rating for each of the areas. The results of these assessments are reported in a memo to the faculty member and to Deans and the Provost. The faculty evaluation system is primarily a system for monitoring faculty performance and not a reporting system. Should a faculty member fall below a rating of 3.0 overall or in the area of teaching, an in-depth post-tenure review procedure is followed. These data are not collected, compiled, and analyzed at the department, unit, or university level. Samples of Faculty Annual Reports and evaluations by chairs/directors will be provided with faculty permission for the Onsite Team.

1. *Use of a variety of instructional strategies by faculty. What evidence exists for faculty members beyond the 19 reported?*

The Professional Preparation Program Faculty Survey was redistributed and 45 of the current 55 faculty responded (81.9%). Exhibit 5.8 ranks the strategies according to the percent of faculty members reporting using the strategy “often” or “regularly” (see *RU IR Addendum Exhibits,*  ***Standard V Faculty Evidence****, Exhibit 5.8 Ranking Instructional Strategies\_Faculty Survey*. The top seven strategies faculty report using the most often are: modeling (93.3%); problem-solving (93.3%); cooperative learning (86.7%); student-led and teacher-led structured class discussions (84.4%); student presentation (82.2%); and inquiry-based in-class activities (77.8%). The least used strategies were: Invited speakers (40%); role plays (37.8%); student debates (31.1%); interviewing (22.2%); expressive arts (20%); oral histories (17.8%) and web-quests (11.1%).

1. *Professional development of faculty. How does professional development in the unit relate to their conceptual framework, performance assessment, diversity, technology, and other emerging practices?*

In addition to the professional development opportunities reported in the Institutional Report and ***Standard V:***  *Exhibit 5.7 Opportunities for Professional Development,* the unit has provided professional development through the following: resources and readings for the Professional Education Committee and PPP Faculty; workshops for PPP Faculty each semester; workshops conducted by the School of Teacher Education and Leadership; the University’s “Culture of Assessment” initiative; supporting faculty involvement in conferences and professional organizations; and regular meetings with faculty from individual programs as they developed and implemented Assessment Plans.

The primary emphasis of workshops for PPP Faculty since 1998 have been on designing and implementing program Assessment Plans (“Candidate Performance Assessment Frameworks”); selecting 6-8 assessments; establishing systems for ensuring fairness, accuracy, and consistency; aligning assessments with unit, state, and national (NCATE and SPA) standards; conducting assessments and compiling, analyzing, and reporting the data; and “closing the loop:” using data to improve candidate performance, programs, and operations. Workshops have included working on tasks related to these topics and having faculty demonstrate examples of practices (e.g., establishing fairness, accuracy and consistency; assessing candidate impact on student learning). The unit has held several workshops through the meetings for PPP Faculty. We have also focused heavily on meeting with faculty in individual programs to assist them in developing and implementing their assessment plans and entering the assessment plans, evaluation tools, and data into the rGrade system, and generating and using reports for program improvement. The Dean, Associate Dean, Director of College Assessment, the College Technology Coordinator, and the chairs or directors of the departments where the programs are housed have been involved in these program-centered meetings.

The Dean has also worked with the Academic Program Review Committee in developing an RU internal program review process which aligns well with NCATE and SACs standards and processes. The SACS review is in progress, and several faculty members from the unit have become involved in the workshops and training for meeting program assessment requirements for SACS (the “Culture of Assessment” initiative).

Faculty development has also focused upon integrating technology. The unit has supported the acquisition of equipment and the Teaching Resources Center staff and the Technology Coordinator have conducted workshops in addition to university opportunities through IT and the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning, and the Faculty Development Center. Importantly, the Teaching Resources Center and Technology Coordinator have provided “just in time” assistance to faculty. The TRC also provides on-going assistance to students and faculty in implementing instructional technology in course assignments.

The third primary emphasis has been to provide opportunities for faculty to explore new models for teaching and learning in a pluralistic society. In addition to the university resources, the School of Teacher Education and Leadership has provided faculty development in Universal Design, Response to Intervention, merging special education and general education, and other models for better ensure that our programs prepare candidates to reach and teach all children. The unit has helped to support university and state initiatives related to diversity in education.

**Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources**

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

*(1) CEHD’s monitoring of advanced programs. What advanced programs are offered through the College of Graduate and Professional Studies? To what extent is the unit monitoring quality of candidate performance, assessments, and other processes in these programs? What is the extent of the unit’s involvement in the management of the advanced programs?*

Advanced programs offered through the College of Graduate and Professional Studies (CGPS) (<http://www.radford.edu/content/grad/home/academics/programs-degrees.html>) in conjunction with the academic colleges are listed below. The CGPS is an administrative and support college. The programs (faculty, instructional resources, etc.) are housed in the academic colleges.

1. Educational Leadership (CEHD)
2. Literacy Education (with licensure as a Reading Specialist) (CEHD)
3. M.S. in Education with concentrations in: Curriculum and Instruction (with licensure and non-licensure options, including an option in Secondary Science Education); Educational Technology; Content Studies: Mathematics; and the Five-Year program in Early Childhood Education/Early Childhood Special Education (CEHD)
4. Counseling and Human Development degree with a concentration in School Counseling (CEHD)
5. School Psychology (Ed.S.) (College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences)
6. Special Education M.S. with options in initial licensure and add-on endorsements in Deaf and Hard of Hearing; General Curriculum; and Early Childhood Special Education (CEHD)
7. School Social Work (Waldron College of Health and Human Services)
8. Speech Language Pathology (Waldron College of Health and Human Services)

The PEC has oversight for these programs. Curriculum proposals and proposals for changes to policies regarding admission, retention, and program completion must be reviewed and approved by the PEC. The PEC Appeals Subcommittee also reviews student appeals to policies for admission, placement, retention, and program completion. Programs submit state program approval reports, data for state and national reports, and NCATE SPA reports through the Dean and Associate Dean and Director of College Assessment, who report the status of program approval and national recognition to the PEC. The PEC has no authority other than recommendations regarding personnel and budgetary decisions. The Dean and the Leadership Team in the College of Education and Human Development have decision-making responsibilities regarding personnel and budgets for those programs housed in the College. The Dean often makes recommendations to other colleges regarding budgets for programs housed in those colleges, and faculty in education often participate as members of faculty search committees for positions related to education in the disciplinary departments.

Educational Leadership and Literacy Education are located in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership. The programs have developed Assessment Plans based on their SPAs. The unit has direct oversight for these programs through the college administrative structure and through the Professional Education Committee (PEC).

The M.S.in Education has undergone major revisions in the core requirements and new concentrations have been added in Technology Education and in Content Studies: Mathematics. The Curriculum and Instruction (C/I) concentration has also been recently revised. These programs are developing Assessment Plans. An M.S. in Education, Curriculum and Instruction concentration option for Secondary Science Education has been approved by the VDOE. The Early Childhood Education/Early Childhood Special Education Program in the M.S. in Education has VDOE approval and has a clear Assessment Plan. The unit has direct oversight for these programs through the college’s administrative structure and through the PEC.

The M.S. in Special Education includes several concentrations or options (General Curriculum, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Early Childhood Special Education). These programs have Assessment Plans and the unit has direct oversight for these programs through the college’s administrative structure and through the PEC.

The M.S. in Counselor Education concentration in School Counseling is going through CACREP review now. The School Counseling program is one of two concentrations in the degree, which has developed and is implementing an Assessment Plan. The unit has direct oversight of this program through the college’s administrative structure and through the PEC..

The unit also supports programs in Adapted Curriculum and Visual Impairment though the George Mason University-led Consortium. Faculty who teach in this program have been involved in curriculum development and in planning the program delivery. Faculty conduct assessments and the results of the assessments are sent to GMU. GMU as the lead institution submitted the NCATE report to the Council for Exceptional Children. RU Faculty worked this past summer to revise the Assessment Plan for the programs.

The School Psychology Program has submitted its program for review by NASP. The Professional Education Committee oversees curriculum matters in this program and the unit Dean and Director of Assessment work directly with faculty on the Assessment Plan. Faculty representatives from School Psychology are included in the PPP Faculty and in the Task Force III: Improving Field Experiences and Clinical Practice. Representatives from the College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences serve on the Professional Education Committee. The unit has oversight of this program through the PEC.

The Speech/Language Pathology program is reviewed through ASHA . The program submits a copy of their annual reports to ASHA and their accrediting report to the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development. Faculty members at Radford are in conversation about possible changes to the curriculum for the RU Speech-Language Pathology Preparation Program, which includes courses in education which are no longer needed for licensure. The master’s degree is sufficient to earn licensure and most candidates now graduate with the degree and pursue licensure through their hiring school divisions.

The School Social Work licensure requires the master’s degree, six hours in education, and documentation of a supervised practicum with a minimum of 400 clock hours in a school setting discharging the duties of a school social worker. Since 2005, faculty members and administrators in the school social work program have worked with the CEHD Dean and Associate Dean in developing and updating the School Social Work program for state program approval. Faculty members in the Social Work program submit a copy of their annual RU program assessment report with special attention to the performance of candidates in the School Social Work concentration to the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development.

Both the Speech Language Pathology and the School Social Work programs are housed in the Waldron College of Health and Human Services which has a representative on the Professional Education Committee. Curriculum changes impacting these programs are submitted to the PEC. Faculty in these programs are involved in the PPP Faculty and in the Task Force III Improving Field Experiences and Clinical Practice. The unit has oversight of these programs through the PEC.

Application and Selection of Candidates

The College of Graduate and Professional Studies (CGPS) accepts applications for graduate programs. When the applications are complete, the CGPS notifies the Program Coordinators for the above programs and sends them the applicant’s materials for their review. Program Coordinators review the applications and often contact applicants directly to discuss their qualifications to ensure that they do meet application requirements and that they understand the program admission policies and procedures. This process generally ensures that applicants to programs meet program admission requirements. Program Coordinators recommend whether or not applicants should be admitted to the CGPS.

Monitoring of Candidate Retention, Admission to Clinical Experiences, and Program Completion

Once students have been admitted into the program, their performance is regularly evaluated through the program’s Assessment Plan. Candidates must continue to meet requirements for graduate candidates (e.g., earn a “B” or better in courses) and must meet performance requirements outlined for two to three decision points in the program’s Assessment Plan in order to progress in the program. The above graduate programs have outlined rigorous Assessment Plans and submit an annual Candidate and Program Assessment Report that describes the assessment plan, the assessments (and alignment with standards), results of the assessments, and plans for improving candidate performance, the program, and operations.

The unit also relies upon external review of programs through other national accrediting agencies to confirm that these programs are monitoring requirements for candidate admission, progression, and completion: Speech/Language Pathology (ASHA), School Counseling (CACREP), and School Psychology (NASP).

*(2) Relationship of the secondary programs to the unit. What is the unit’s role in managing the secondary programs? Is there an organizational chart that clarifies this relationship?*

Secondary education programs preparing candidates to teach mathematics, English, social studies, and science (Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics) are being implemented and reviewed through close collaboration between the faculty in education and the academic departments. Faculty in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership serve as Program Coordinators for the Secondary Mathematics, Secondary Social Studies, and Secondary Science programs. A faculty member in the English Department is the Program Coordinator for the Secondary English program. Faculty members in the academic departments serve as content specialists for elementary, middle, and special education programs as well as for secondary education programs, frequently assisting education faculty in developing and refining courses and programs and collaborating on special projects and grants.

* The Professional Education Committee is the primary governance structure for all professional education preparation programs and it includes representatives from secondary education and from the academic departments supporting education.
* The Secondary Education Committee with representatives from each of these programs serves as an advisory committee to the PEC and to the School of Teacher Education and Leadership and to the supporting academic departments regarding secondary programs.
* Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the social studies secondary education program, the Oversight Committee for Social Studies meets regularly regarding the social science degree and the secondary social studies licensure program.
* The Professional Preparation Program Faculty, which is a key body in planning, implementing, and evaluating professional programs, and in faculty professional development, includes Program Coordinators from secondary English, Social Studies, Mathematics, and Science education programs.

*(3) Clarification of distance education programs. What programs are offered via distance learning (i.e., 50% of the courses can be taken via distance learning)? What resources are available for the distance education program in special education offered collaboratively with Lynchburg College? Are any other programs offered with Lynchburg College?*

The unit offers programs through hybrid, on-line, and other distributed education formats. We have led the university in developing distance-delivery. **Appendix L Distributed Education Programs** provides more detailed information regarding the nature of the distributed education programs and how these programs meet NCATE standards for distance education.

1. *Comparison of unit’s budget with the budgets of other units with clinical components. How does the unit’s budget compare to others?*

Please refer to *RU IR Addendum Exhibits* **Standard VI:** *Exhibit 6.6 Unit Budget and Exhibit 6.7 Budgets of Comparable Units.* Further information comparing budgets will be provided to the Onsite BOV.

1. *Accuracy of documents related to new GPA requirements, etc.*

The Associate Dean and Director of Field Experience Programs and the Clinical Coordinator are reviewing and updating all materials. The catalogs should have been updated appropriately because they are reviewed by the Advising Coordinator, the Dean, and the Director of STEL prior to publication each year. There might be some documents that have not been fully reviewed and updated (e.g., the Basic Field Experience Handbook) because the Associate Dean’s position has just been filled this past July and that is the office that is responsible for reviewing and updating all documents related to teacher education application, admission, etc. The Associate Dean and the Clinical Coordinator began that work this summer. **Appendix H: Admission Requirements for Applicants to Teaching Programs and to Programs for Advanced Teacher Preparation and Programs Preparing Other School Personnel.**

1. *Role of the Professional Education Committee (PEC). What is the committee’s involvement in curriculum and assessment? Who serves on the PEC?*

The PEC membership includes:

* Dean of the College of Education and Human Development, Chair
* Associate Dean of CEHD
* Coordinator of the Center for CEHD Academic Advising and Student Support
* Eight representatives from graduate and undergraduate programs in professional education in CEHD
* Two representatives from the College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences
* One representative from the Waldron College of Health and Human Services
* One representative from the College of Visual and Performing Arts
* One representative from the College of Science and Technology
* One undergraduate and one graduate student
* Two – Four field representatives from PK-12 schools
* One community college representative

The charge of the PEC committee as described in the RU Internal Governance document is:

**Professional Education Committee**

**Function:** Provides input into, assesses and monitors long-range planning

for professional education programs; reviews all curricular changes from all

Colleges that impact professional education programs; reviews and monitors

student admission and retention policies; monitors student assessment

programs (Praxis I and Praxis II); promotes collaboration between the

University, PK-12 schools and external organizations to enhance professional

education programs.

1. *Collaboration across the disciplines on teacher education issues and development of common assessment instruments through PEC or otherwise. What leadership is the unit providing? How does the PEC monitor the quality of its programs and their candidates?*

The College has engaged in extensive interactions with academic departments in the development, implementation, and evaluation of programs preparing candidates for teaching and other school personnel roles. The College has provided leadership in assisting programs in developing their program assessment plans and in developing key assessments such as the evaluation of interns during early field experience and in student teaching. The College has assisted program faculty in aligning the assessment plan and individual assessments with the SPA standards associated with the individual disciplines and programs. The INTASC standards serve as the common base of the standards for candidate proficiencies and serves to link the assessments across programs and disciplines. As an example, the elementary education program held workshops with faculty in all related academic departments (mathematics, science, social studies, English, the arts, physical and health education) to review and update curriculum requirements and candidate proficiencies for elementary education. The Secondary Social Studies Program Coordinator regularly interacts with the Social Science Oversight Committee in ensuring that the major supports best content preparation for the secondary social studies candidates, and that the two departments collaborate on reviewing and recommending candidates for the program and they are “on the same page” with advising potential applicants for the program. These are a few examples of collaboration across the disciplines that we feel stands as a unique strength in professional education at Radford.

The Dean regularly presents information regarding professional education issues to the Professional Education Committee and, at times, to the Council of Deans and the Provost. A current example would be the reports and evidence supplied by the Dean to support the request to not participate in the survey of teacher education programs conducted by the National Council on Teacher Quality and Newsweek. The Dean also kept the PEC updated regarding progress on the development of a student growth model for teacher evaluation in Virginia and on the impact of the Higher Education Opportunity Act on professional education and on higher education. Faculty members in professional programs also play an important role in engaging university faculty in issues impacting not only professional education, but the university in general (e.g., “Diversity Dialogues”).

The PEC reviews and provides feedback regarding the unit’s progress in addressing state and national standards through the self-study process. The PEC especially reviews reports and results of assessments regarding candidates’ subject matter knowledge (Praxis II and reading assessments); the unit assessment plan; candidates’ knowledge, skills and dispositions regarding diversity and their experience with diverse student populations during field experiences; candidates’ impact on student learning; and university/school partnerships. The PEC has a major role in overseeing policies and procedures regarding admission, retention, placement and program completion for professional education programs and in reviewing and approving curriculum proposals. The PEC monitors the system for ensuring the quality of applicants and candidates, and for ensuring the quality of preparation (curriculum and field experiences).

1. *Faculty work load and schedule. What are the faculty work load policies? The academic year includes 5 semesters: Fall, Spring, Maymester, Summer I and Summer II semesters. (Exhibit 6.5). Are there exhibits that specify an outline of the program of study and whether key pedagogy courses are taken during Fall and Spring only? It is mentioned in the IR that the faculty teach year round and that “the unit used data from records of faculty teaching loads and credit-hour generation to request that the university not limit FTE data used in RU Program Review to Fall census date, but to include fall, spring, and summer, since most graduate program faculty teach year-round“.*

Teaching and Research faculty are hired on 9-month contracts and are obligated to an assigned workload for Fall and Spring semesters. Faculty members receive additional compensation for teaching during summer sessions. The university’s policies regarding workloads are defined in the *Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook* in terms of a teaching load of “twelve (adjusted) semester hours per semester.” Faculty members are expected to participate in university service and in professional contributions beyond their teaching assignments. The College of Education and Human Development is in the process of developing guidelines for articulating college-level work-load assignments. The College has advocated that the University develop metrics that track faculty workloads that incorporate year-round assignments, since many graduate programs require year-round teaching, rather than relying upon the common metric of course-load and enrollments captured for undergraduate programs on the Fall census date.

Teaching schedules vary by programs, but most undergraduate programs are predicated on a Fall/Spring semester schedule for four years. Teaching schedules for most graduate programs include summer coursework. Most faculty members in the unit teach in both undergraduate and graduate programs. Department chairs work with faculty to ensure equity in teaching loads, including teaching responsibilities and compensation during required summer courses.

1. *Library resources. What library resources are available to candidates?*

***Standard VI:*** *Exhibits 6.10, 6.11, and 6.12*in *RU IR Addendum Exhibits* provide descriptions of the library resources that are available. In addition to the Radford University McConnell Library resources which include multiple on-line resources and databases, the College of Education and Human Development operates a curriculum resource center, the Patricia Langford Roughton Teaching Resources Center (TRC); an Educational Innovation Lab (EIL); and a computer lab.

*(10) Adequacy of facilities. Are multimedia resources available in every classroom? Are mobile technology carts from the Education Innovation Lab available to every faculty member? How often do faculty members actually use these technology resources? To what extent do they model effective use of technology?*

Multimedia resources are available in every classroom in Peters Hall and in all classrooms across the university. Mobile technology carts are available to all instructors teaching in Peters Hall. These carts are maintained and kept updated through the efforts of the TRC and RU Instructional Technology. The Director and her staff in the TRC, the College Technology Coordinator, the RU Faculty Development Center (FDC), and the RU Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL) provide resources that ensure that faculty are exploring and using current instructional technology. The college has led the campus in implementing distance education and PK-12 and post-secondary use of hand-held mobile devices. A CEHD faculty member developing unique instructional technology applications has pursued the first university patent, setting the stage for more faculty opportunities. The College developed first-use of electronic Faculty Annual Reports; electronic Advising Notes; and other administrative uses of technology which are being adopted across the university. The College Technology Coordinator is frequently asked to develop and implement university-level technology application projects.

The Teaching Resources Center is preparing a report on faculty usage of technology resources to be available to the Onsite Team.