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**A. OVERVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

**Historical Context and Unique Characteristics**

Radford University was established as a State Normal and Industrial School for Women in 1910; was first accredited by NCATE in 1959; became a college and offered its first masters degree in 1964; became coeducational in 1972; obtained university status in 1979; and offered its first doctoral program in 2009. The University was recently recognized by the Council of Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools as a Level V doctoral-degree granting institution with an emphasis upon terminal degrees in applied fields. Radford is a mid-sized comprehensive university located in rural southwest Virginia with 140 undergraduate and graduate degrees serving approximately 8,100 undergraduate and 1,100 graduate students, 89% of whom come from regions across Virginia. The university has seven colleges: Arts and Sciences, Education and Human Development, Humanities and Behavioral Sciences, Business and Economics, Visual and Performing Arts, Waldron College of Health and Human Services, and Graduate and Professional Studies. Radford prides itself in “investing in lifetimes:” we have been a change agent in the lives of students and have built a reputation for student-focused learning and for faculty and student collaboration.

**Mission**

Radford University serves the Commonwealth and the nation through a wide range of academic, cultural, human service, and research programs. First and foremost, the university emphasizes teaching and learning in its commitment to the development of mature, responsible, and well-educated citizens. The university is student-focused and promotes a sense of caring and of meaningful interaction among all members of the university community. Research is viewed as a vital corollary to teaching and learning. Radford University believes in the dynamics of change and has a strong commitment to continuous review, evaluation, and improvement in the curriculum and all aspects of the university so as to meet the changing needs of society.

**Professional Education Unit and Relationship to other Units**

The professional education unit is the collection of individuals and programs involved in arts, sciences, humanities, health sciences, and professional education in five of the seven colleges in collaboration with PK-12 and community college partners. The Professional Education Committee (PEC) serves at the governing body for the unit and is part of the RU internal governance system. The Dean of the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD) is the head of the unit and chairs the PEC. The PEC has representatives from: the College of Visual and Performing Arts, the College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences, the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Education and Human Development, the Waldron College of Health and Human Services; community colleges; graduate and undergraduate students; and administrators and practitioners from PK-12 schools.

Because of Radford University’s focus upon teaching and learning, it attracts pedagogues committed to teaching and to student learning and development. Thus the unit enjoys the benefits of strong alliances and collaboration among faculty in arts, sciences, humanities, health sciences and education. There are multiple avenues of engagement and collaboration across all of these constituencies focused upon refining professional preparation (general education; subject matter; clinical experiences) and upon providing services to schools through professional development, grants, and other projects. Other units preparing professional educators who have their own accrediting agencies (e.g., School Psychology, School Counseling, Speech and Language Pathology, School Social Work, Music Education) have representatives serving in the PEC and program liaisons who work closely with the College of Education and Human Development faculty on program development, program approval and accreditation, and special initiatives to improve professional preparation.

**Basic Tenets of the Conceptual Framework and Changes to the Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework (CF) was developed by RU faculty and administrators in the arts, sciences, humanities, health sciences, and education; PK-12 teachers and administrators; and program candidates. The CF was based upon common expectations regarding the knowledge, skills, and dispositions which all candidates would develop and demonstrate upon completing professional programs. The CF has guided professional program development, implementation and assessment; candidate orientation, advising, and evaluation; and faculty recruitment, hiring, and professional development, and scholarly and creative work. The basic tenets of the Conceptual Framework are:

* Professional development occurs best within professional learning communities that promote the development and well-being of students, families, candidates, and school and university faculty;
* Professional preparation is a career-long process requiring a commitment to life-long learning;
* Professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions emerge from reflected-upon experience—situated learning that takes place in an environment that values and pursues inquiry into professional practice and into student learning and development;
* Programs are designed to help candidates integrate knowledge and skills gained from several areas: prior experiences and beliefs; research; expert counsel from practitioners; guidelines from professional organizations; and their own study and reflected-upon experiences;
* Expectations for candidates are outlined in key domains of knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to Content, Learners, Best Practice, and Professionalism. These expectations incorporate the InTASC standards, unit standards, state standards, and standards from the professional associations.

The Conceptual Framework has been presented to the Professional Education Committee and to the Professional Preparation Program Faculty for updating and revisions. Changes to the conceptual framework since the last visit (2003) include:

* On-going updating of the research basis for and the applications of the concepts of: professional learning communities, career-long process of professional development, the centrality of reflected-upon experience;
* On-going updating of candidate performance expectations and dispositions based upon changes in unit, state, and national standards;
* Faculty added the following statement to the Executive Summary of the Conceptual Framework further detailing “foundations in multicultural and global perspectives, in the socio-cultural contexts of human growth and development, in learning styles, in communication and interaction styles, and in family systems.”
* And faculty added an expectation that candidates “demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and commitment needed to advocate for quality education for all students and to recognize and eliminate structures, assumptions, and practices that restrict access or perpetuate inequities in education.”
* From 2006-2009, the College of Education and Human Development used a process of “appreciative inquiry” to establish common values, goals, and aspirations for individuals, programs, departments, and the college. The outcome of that process included a mission statement and set of values which have been integrated into the Professional Education conceptual framework.

5. Exhibit Links

|  |
| --- |
| **Exhibits** |
| 1. Links to unit catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies.   ***Exhibit 1 Graduate and Undergraduate Catalog links.docx*** |
| 1. Syllabi for professional education courses   ***Exhibit.2 Education Course Syllabi-Spring 2011.*** |
| 1. Conceptual framework(s)   ***Exhibit 3 Conceptual Framework*** |
| 1. Findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, APA, CACREP)   ***Exhibit 4 Findings of other national agencies*** |

**B. STANDARD 1. CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND DISPOSITIONS**

**B.1 Narrative**

**State Program Approval**

Radford completed the program approval process for the state for all programs in 2008-2010 (see *Exhibit 1.1 State program review and state findings)* and all programs have been approved by the Board of Education. During this process, several course syllabi were updated to include documentation of how courses addressed revised state and national professional standards.

**Admission Requirements to Teacher Education**

Applicants must meet either provisional or full admission requirements to be admitted to the Teacher Education Program (TEP) and to early field experiences. The unit worked with program faculty and other offices (e.g., the Learning Assistance Resource Center (LARC); community colleges) to support students in meeting requirements for admission. Since 2003, the percentage of students who met qualifications for admission has increased from 63.7% to about 90%.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **YEAR** | **Applicants meeting admission requirements** |
| 2003 | 67.3% |
| 2004 | 71.0% |
| 2005 | 79.5% |
| 2006 | 85.0% |
| 2007 | 88.9% |
| 2008 | 90.4% |
| 2009 | 89.7% |

**Content Knowledge and Content Pedagogical Knowledge**

TEP candidates take and pass subject matter exams (Praxis II) either prior to admission to the program (elementary, social studies, middle school) or prior to student teaching (ECE/ECSE, English, science, and mathematics). Mean passing scores for RU candidates are slightly below state averages for elementary education, physical and health education, and social studies education; English, art, and music mean passing scores are at or above state averages. All rograms have 100% passing rates on Praxis II. Admissions data for the last three years show 80% or more of all applicants for student teaching pass Praxis II for all programs but one, mathematics, which improved from 60% of student teaching applicants passing Praxis II to 70% passing in 2010..

Candidates meet satisfactory or proficient levels in program assessments for content knowledge (*Exhibit 1.3*). Category I of the early field experience and student teaching intern evaluations includes items related to content and content pedagogy; Category VII outlines specific content knowledge and skills based on SPA standards. See sample forms and sample summaries of data in *Exhibit 1.3 Key assessments and data summaries*. For summary candidate performance data within each program, see the individual reports in *Exhibit 1.3 Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports.* Employers rate TEP candidates’ content knowledge and content pedagogical knowledge as “average” (25%), “above average” (53%) and “outstanding” (20%). Graduates rate their preparation to address key concept and skills in subject areas, enabling students to meet the Standards of Learning, and engaging learners in meaningful learning activities as outstanding (4.5-4.7) (2011 preliminary Alumni Survey) (see *Exhibits 1.6 and 1.7*)

**Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions**

Candidates’ professional knowledge and skills are regularly assessed in both teacher education and in preparation programs for other school personnel (see *Exhibit 1.3*). Teacher education candidates demonstrate competencies based upon the INTASC and SPA standards (see samples in *Exhibit 1.3 Key assessments and summary data.*). Candidates in programs for other school personnel demonstrate proficiencies outlined in IRA and ELCC/ISLCC standards. All programs have intensive clinical and field experiences in which candidates are regularly evaluated by full-time university faculty and by cooperating professionals.

Faculty use formative assessment throughout the program; thus some candidates receive ratings of “needs improvement” or will have improvement plans outlined by the clinical team. With few exceptions, candidates in early experiences are “performing satisfactorily” or “proficient.” Candidates who receive unsatisfactory ratings (approximately 1% or 1-3 students each year) are counseled out of the program. If a candidate receives several ratings of “needs improvement” and if faculty believe he/she has shown improvement and potential for further improvement, the candidate is admitted to the final internship on a provisional basis with an improvement plan. All program completers are consistently rated as progressing satisfactorily or proficient (see sample summary data for evaluations of TEP interns in *Exhibit 1.3 Key assessments and summary data*; data summarizing the progress of other school personnel in meeting performance standards are included in the annual reports (*Exhibit 1.3*).

Teacher education programs have identified “Professional Characteristics and Dispositions” (*Exhibit 1.3 Key assessments and summary data)* which identify work habits, communication skills, and commitments. Up to admission to the TEP, this assessment is used as a developmental advising tool by instructors, who meet with students who demonstrate deficiencies. Such records are reviewed when students apply to the program (see samples of the *Departmental Review* forms in Exhibit 1.3). During early field experience and student teaching, candidates complete self-evaluations and the university supervisor and cooperating professional evaluate candidates (see sample intern evaluations in *Exhibit 1.3*). Programs for other school personnel have identified “Professional Characteristics” and evaluate candidates throughout their programs (see “dispositions” file in *Exhibit 1.3*).

Employers rate TEP candidates’ performance in planning and instruction as “average” (33%); “above average,” (44%) or “outstanding” (17%); (4% reported “insufficient information to judge”). They rate their performance in establishing productive learning environments as “average” (31%); “above average” (51%) and “outstanding” (17%). Employers rate candidates’ professionalism as “average” (17%); “above average” (50%); and “outstanding” (23%); (8% reported insufficient information to judge”). Surveys of TEP graduates indicate they feel well-prepared or very well-prepared in knowledge and skills for planning, instruction, establishing and maintaining a positive learning environment, using assessment, using technology, and maintaining records. Employers and graduates both rated “setting clear standards for behavior and monitoring behavior” comparatively low in light of other ratings (mean of 3.72 for employers and 4.3 for graduates). Twenty-nine percent (29%) of the employers stated that RU graduates perform in the top 10% of teachers at their schools; 54% stated candidates perform in the top 30%; and 17% said candidates perform within the middle range (41-70%) of expertise.

**Impact on Student Learning**

Programs in teacher education and those preparing other school personnel have established specific assessments to evaluate candidates’ impact on student learning. In teacher preparation, assessments typically include pre- and post- assessments of student learning and engagement, case studies, diagnosis and intervention plans, etc. Advanced teacher education programs and programs preparing other school personnel use applied research or classroom projects to study ways that they can apply their specific skills in contributing to the school environment for learning and in helping teachers and students succeed. Examples of program-specific assessments and results of these assessments are found in the annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports in *Exhibit 1.3.*

**Across-Program Studies in Teacher Education Programs**

In response to faculty and the PEC identifying special areas of study of TEP candidate performance, the Dean’s Office and Assessment Office conduct regular studies regarding candidate performance on the state reading licensure exam, parental involvement, impact on student learning, and diversity knowledge, skills, and dispositions. In 2004, Virginia implemented a new reading exam required for elementary, early childhood and general curriculum special education teachers and for reading specialists and required passing scores beginning 2006. Overall pass rates on the Virginia Reading Assessment (VRA) increased from 42.9% in 2006-7 to 78.5% in 2007-8 and to 99% in 2009 and 2010.

**Impact on Student Learning and Parental Involvement**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Competency** | **2008** | **2010**  TEP students completing field experiences complete a Survey on Impact on Student Learning and Parental Involvement (see *Exhibit 1.3 Key assessments and summary data*). Results from the Spring 2005 and Spring 2010 surveys regarding candidates’ perceptions on how well they have been prepared (“0” not at all to “3” prepared very well) are displayed to the right.. |
| Use a variety of formal assessments | 2.34 | 2.50 |
| Use a variety of informal assessments | 2.54 | 2.70 |
| Use assessment tools created by someone else | 2.35 | 2.45 |
| Use assessment tools I created | 2.41 | 2.59 |
| Analyze results of assessments of student learning | 2.41 | 2.53 |

Results vary by program. For example, Early childhood education/early childhood special education felt more prepared to use formal assessments (2008 mean=1.94 to 2010 mean=2.35). Physical and Health Education showed an overall increase in all areas. Student teaching interns rated their preparation on all items higher than that of early field experience candidates in 2010. Candidates’ reports indicate increased efforts and successes from 2008-2010 in the following areas: reflecting impact on student learning (70% - 81%); having a positive impact on students (57%-63%); making changes to practice based on assessment (78%-81%).

The unit initiated an effort to enhance pre-service candidates’ understanding about parental involvement through observing and learning what teachers and schools do to establish productive home-school connections, as opposed to their concept of “parental involvement” meaning that they must be involved in parent-teacher conferences. Survey items are based on the national PTA Standards for School-Family Partnerships. Results of surveys from 2005-2008-2010 indicate modest progress (4 or more percentage points) in the following: looking for ways the cooperating professional provides for communication with the home that is regular, two-way, and meaningful; identifying how schools and teachers set up processes for communicating with parents about (positive and negative) progress of students; learning about the diversity of families within the school communities; understanding how schools establish and manage parent volunteer programs and how they develop business/community partnerships. (See *Exhibit 1.3 Sample key assessments and summary data*.)

**B. 2b. Continued Improvement**

**State Licensure Exam Requirements**

Program faculty and support personnel from the LARC have created study materials, conducted workshops, provided tutoring, and initiated other steps to assist candidates. Tutoring has been particularly effective in mathematics and has increased the number of candidates passing the exams. Social studies faculty have worked with faculty in the social science departments to strengthen the alignment of courses with state exams.

The Assessment Office shared early results (2004-2006) of candidate performance on the Virginia Reading Assessment (VRA) subtests with faculty members who used this to revise curriculum and assessments in programs. Faculty added an exam based on the research and reports of the National Reading Panel. Candidates must pass the exam with 80% or more correct responses. A 2006-2008 report indicates that candidates improved scores on all items associated with seven of the eight objectives (mean scores remained the same on “oral language and communication”). The magnitude of change was higher on constructed responses than on multiple choice items (which was significant since we work hard on writing skills).

**Changes to Admission Requirements**

Program faculty and the unit have instituted several steps to increase selectivity of applicants while at the same time expanding services to help students meet qualifications. Elementary education and social studies increased the GPA requirement for admission from 2.5 to 2.75, and now elementary has increased this to 3.0. Both programs instituted requirements for passing Praxis II for admission, and middle school will follow Fall 2012. Teacher Education programs also began requiring a minimum 2.5 GPA for admission to early courses in the program. Physical and Health Education are instituting this Fall 2012. These changes were based upon studies of candidate qualifications and performance. The Dean’s Offices have worked closely with Key Program Faculty and with the Learning Assistance Resource Center to provide multiple avenues for students to access support for meeting admission requirements. Records indicate temporary declines in the number of students admitted which was quickly recovered in the year or two following the new policies.

The unit instituted a Departmental Review process for departmental faculty to review applicants for admission to the Teacher Education Program (2000) but only a few programs were regularly submitting these reports 2007-2010. This process has been reinstated though the efforts of the Director and faculty in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership. Faculty review individual student academic records, and records of Professional Characteristics and Dispositions, and make specific recommendations for admission to the Teacher Education Program.

**Candidate Performance Assessment**

Faculty have made great strides in systematizing program assessment plans and in developing and implementing candidate assessments aligned with state, national, and unit standards. The unit has moved from a system of collecting, compiling, and reporting the bulk of candidate performance data at the unit level to a system based on program level assessment plans. This is particularly true with programs for other school personnel. There are advantages and disadvantages to this system. Managing candidate performance assessment at the program level enables us to align assessments more clearly with specific program standards (SPA and state). But we cannot easily compile data across programs at the unit level. Candidate and Program Assessment Reports now provide the information on how programs are establishing standards for candidate performance and how they monitor how well candidates meet these standards. The unit oversees how well programs are managing this process through the unit review of annual reports, in addition to specific issues faculty and the PEC present to the unit such as parental involvement, assessment, etc.

As an added note, one of the major recent changes regarding candidate performance assessment is that the elementary education program has instituted grades for early field experiences and for the student teaching experience (previously a Pass/Fail as with all other programs).

**Reading; Parental Involvement; Impact on Student Learning; and Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions regarding Diversity**

As mentioned previously, these have been areas of emphasis for the unit. The literacy education faculty have made curriculum changes and changes to course assignments and instituted a literacy exam, all of which have enabled candidates to better meet new expectations reflected in state licensure exams. A new state exam in reading, the Reading for Virginia Educators, was just instituted this past year, and we await results.

Programs have all integrated specific tasks and assessments that require candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in impacting student learning. Candidates report that they feel more prepared in being able to conduct assessments they develop and in using informal assessments. Candidates in some program feel less prepared in using standardized assessments, and in some cases, e.g., dance, art, and music, this makes sense. The percentage of candidates reporting that they reflect on their performance as it relates to student learning increased from 76% to 81% overall, and from 57% to 85% among Physical and Health Education candidates. Candidates in both years reported that they believed they had a uniformly positive impact on student performance across all ethnic, racial, gender, socio-economic groups (93% to 99.6%). Student teaching candidates evaluated their performance regarding all five categories of impact on student learning higher than that of early field experience candidates with the exception of “using informal assessments” which was similar across these groups.

Due to new policies in Virginia requiring the use of student growth models in teacher evaluation, university and school-based faculty have discussed reviewing and systematizing preparation regarding assessing student learning, and instituting direct measures of candidates’ knowledge in this area. The PP Faculty have, in the past, shared examples of how they are assessing candidates’ impact on student learning. We need to do this regularly, and to involve cooperating professionals more directly in these discussions and in candidates’ classroom-based and school-based projects. As will be seen in Standard III, the unit plans to reinvigorate one of the initial premises of the partner school concept and establish a more collaborative approach of inquiring into teaching and learning across all settings, and to make this a central focus for development of all partners: candidates and university and school faculty.

Results of the Field Experience Student Survey: Diversity Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions (Exhibit 1.3 Key assessments and summary data) indicate that candidates continue to rate the significance of the competencies for all educators higher than their preparation. In 2007, candidates rated knowledge of “their own cultural identity and how it has developed” the lowest (mean of 2.63 on a 0-3 scale) and rated their preparation in understanding the negative impact of stereotyping, prejudice, and bias the highest (2.88). In 2009, candidates continued to rate the significance of the competencies highly (2.52 – 2.88) and also felt best prepared in identifying the negative impact of stereotyping, prejudice and bias Both groups of candidates rated their preparation in creating opportunities and environments that attract and welcome families from diverse cultures into the school comparatively low (2.4 in 2007 and 2.2 in 2009) and both felt relatively prepared to discover and use diverse abilities and experiences students bring to school (2.4 and 2.4). Both groups felt comparatively well-prepared in understanding the effects of poverty upon families and students; using an understanding of cultural diversity in making connections with families and in making connections with the content for students; and in understanding social and cultural influences shaping one’s point of view.

We have not delved into the differences among the responses across programs, and preliminary reports for 2010 reveal that this is a necessary step. We have not conducted statistical analyses, but there appear to be some significant differences between how well candidates in various programs feel prepared in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions described in the competency statements (there are also programs with very low enrollments and so the data will need to be examined carefully). Faculty have included explicit strategies in their teaching to help students develop the ability to practice from a multicultural and inclusive perspective. During the self-study for re-accreditation, faculty felt that we needed to ensure that our programs are preparing candidates to work with the “whole child,” and to be able to differentiate instruction based on students’ abilities, interests, cultural background, and learning needs. As will be seen in Standard III, this has become a central goal in plans for reaching target level in field experience programs.

|  |
| --- |
| **Exhibits** |
| 1. State program review documents and state findings. (Some of these documents may be available in AIMS.)   ***Exhibit 1.1 State program review reports and state findings*** |
| 1. Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years (Beginning with the 2010 annual report (attached to Part C of the annual report and available in AIMS.) |
| 1. Key assessments and scoring guides used by faculty to assess candidate learning against standards and the outcomes identified in the unit’s conceptual framework **for programs not included in the national program review process or a similar state process**   ***Exhibit 1.3 Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports***  ***Exhibit 1.3 Samples of key assessments and summary data*** |
| 1. Data tables and summaries that show how teacher candidates (both initial and advanced) have performed on key assessments over the past three years **for programs not included in the national program review process or a similar state process** |
| 1. Samples of candidate work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels)   ***Exhibit 1.5 Samples of candidate work*** |
| 1. Follow-up studies of graduates and data tables of results   ***Exhibit 1.6 Summaries of alumni surveys*** |
| 1. Employer feedback on graduates and summaries of the results   ***Exhibit 1.7 Summaries of employer surveys*** |
| 1. List of candidate dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn, and related assessments, scoring guides, and data   ***Exhibit 1.8 Candidate dispositions and assessments*** |

**C. STANDARD 2: UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**

**C.1 Narrative**

The unit assessment system has three primary components: (1) Candidate Assessment; (2) Program Evaluation (including evaluations of clinical experiences); and (3) Unit Operations and Governance (including evaluations of the performance of faculty and administrators and of advising and student services, and faculty satisfaction surveys). The unit regularly collects and uses assessment data and information regarding each of the three components in the assessment system. A more detailed description of the assessment system is found in *Exhibit 2.1.*

**Assessing Candidate Performance**

Each preparation program has developed a candidate and program assessment plan and completes a report annually. The candidate assessment plan is outlined in the Candidate Performance Assessment Framework, which identifies the assessments used at each decision point in the program (typically: admission, admission to the capstone internship, and program completion). Teacher preparation programs have developed assessments related to candidates’ content knowledge and professional knowledge and skills, including the ability to plan and the ability to implement plans, candidates’ impact on student learning, and their professional characteristics and dispositions. Programs preparing other school personnel include assessments of candidates’ content knowledge, professional knowledge and skills, impact on student learning, and professional characteristics and dispositions. Assessments and evaluation tools are aligned with national and state standards and include behavioral indicators describing different levels of performance.

The College Assessment Office collects and reports data regarding qualifications of applicants to the program (GPA, scores on exams required for admission and licensure, professional characteristics and dispositions) and the qualifications of candidates admitted to early field experiences and to student teaching (*Exhibit 2.2 Data from key assessments used at entry to programs*). The Assessment Office also compiles data from candidate self-report surveys administered each semester on Assessment Day regarding their preparation for assessing student learning and their impact on student learning; preparation for working with diverse student populations; and preparation for integrating parental involvement in their practice (see Standard1 for a discussion of the results of these assessments).

**Program Evaluation**

Annual Candidate and Program Assessment reports use the national SPA report templates (see *Exhibit 1.3*). Reports covering the data collected the previous academic year are submitted October 15 and are reviewed by the Dean and the Director of College Assessment, and copies are sent to the administrator of the department in which the program is housed (see *Exhibit 1.3* “Reviews of Program Reports”). The reports also are submitted as part of the Radford University Program Review, which requires annual reports. In addition to providing all of the components of a program assessment system, Radford University Program Review includes evaluations based on data such as student enrollment, retention, and graduation; faculty teaching loads; generation of student credit hours. The Candidate and Program Assessment reports are also compiled at the university level as evidence for SACS accreditation.

The unit submits certifications and reports to the Virginia Department of Education and the Board of Education summarizing progress in meeting Biennial Measurable Targets:

* 80% pass rate for program completers on state licensure exams
* Candidate performance on Praxis I and VCLA, basic skills exams
* Structured and integrated field experiences
* Evidence of opportunities for candidates to participate in diverse school settings
* Evidence of contributions to preK-12 student achievement
* Evidence that the education program assesses candidates’ mastery of exit criteria
* Evidence of employer job satisfaction with candidates completing the program
* Partnerships and collaborations based on preK-12 school needs

The Assessment Office collects data from candidate surveys regarding field experiences: opportunities they had during field experiences (e.g., to plan instruction based on the Standards of Learning; to assess student learning; to use technology) and their evaluation of the assistance they received from the university supervisor and from the cooperating professional. Data from the evaluations are compiled and sent to university supervisors. The evaluations of the university supervisors are reported by faculty in their Faculty Annual Reports as evidence of teaching performance. The Associate Dean and the university supervisors monitor the candidates’ evaluation of cooperating teachers and of the field experience and uses the data to ensure quality field experience placements. For samples of forms, see *Exhibit 2.2 Data from key assessments, “Assessment Day forms.”*

Cooperating Professionals are also mailed an evaluation to complete after the field experience has ended. They evaluate the overall quality of the candidate’s performance and the assistance received from the university supervisor and from the Field Experience Office. The College also conducts Employer Surveys and Alumni Surveys every four years (2002, 2006, (2007 was conducted by the university), and 2011).

**Assessing Unit Operations and Governance**

Assessment of candidates and of programs is a critical part of assessing unit operations. As mentioned, candidate performance and program assessment reports are reviewed at the unit level and the results are used to guide the unit’s involvement in ensuring quality professional educator preparation (see “Reviews of Program Reports” in *Exhibit 1.3*).

The Assessment Office assists the Teaching Resources Center and the Center for Academic Advising and Student Success in surveying patrons regarding their use of services and their satisfaction with services. The Personnel Committees in each department implement course evaluations each semester and the results are compiled through the university and disseminated to faculty and to their chairs or directors.

The university implements a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. Faculty complete a Faculty Annual Report (FAR), describing evidence regarding their teaching, professional development, professional contributions, and service, and discussing how they worked to improve their performance in each of these areas. Personnel Committees and chairs and directors review the FARs and submit letters summarizing their evaluations of faculty members each year to the Dean, who reviews the evaluations and submits a letter to the Provost. Administrative faculty and classified staff also submit summary annual reports and are evaluated each year by their supervisors based on the responsibilities outlined in the position description. The chairs and director and dean submit annual reports and are evaluated by the faculty and by their supervisors each year. The unit has developed an electronic system for submitting FARs.

The college and the unit complete other assessments and reports on an as-needed basis to inform decision-making. For example, the college leadership team regularly reviews the profiles of incoming freshmen and information about where applicants go when they do not come to RU as part of annual review and planning; programs recommending changes to admission requirements complete studies to support the change; the Assessment Office conducted studies using Praxis I and VCLA data to provide a model for advisors to use these scores for predicting potential success on the Virginia Reading Assessment when counseling students; admissions data were used to revise the placement process for elementary education candidates. 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.

The Dean has conducted spring open forums with faculty each year to learn about accomplishments, issues faculty face, and aspirations. This was changed to an open forum within the departments this past year. Information from the forums is used to guide planning of the Leadership Team during the summer. Because of the focus upon organizational development within the college, the Dean has also asked that the Faculty Senate provide the college with Faculty Satisfaction Survey data disaggregated for the college to allow the Leadership Team to compare results for the college with university-wide results. A major goal of the LT over the past four years has been ensuring that the college promotes communities of practice while supporting individual faculty, including creating a healthy and inclusive work environment. Results of the Faculty Satisfaction Survey indicate that we have had some success, in that the faculty maintain confidence and support for the college leadership, and they feel their work environment is collegial at the department level (96% compared to university faculty response of 63%); they are given opportunity to participate in decisions at the department level (89% compared to 69%); the chair keeps them well-informed (96% compared to 66%).

**2b. Continuous Improvement**

There have been several activities since 2003 regarding assessment and accountability, including changes to the assessment system.

1. Professional preparation programs in Virginia made a heroic effort to develop a state-wide longitudinal data-system. As part of the Commonwealth’s $13 million grant *Stepping up to the Plate*, CEHD Dean Paul Sales submitted a grant (2004-05) to support a collaborative effort with the Virginia Department of Education (VDE) and the State Council of Higher Education (SCHEV) and an external vendor to develop a state-wide teacher pipeline data management system (VITAL: Virginia Improving Teaching and Learning.) After Phase I, several institutions joined Radford in submitting the grant for three successive phases of development of the system. The system administered end-of-term and end-of program surveys to all teacher education candidates beginning, continuing, and completing programs in the Commonwealth; housed updated descriptions of all programs; and was intended to follow graduates into teaching positions in Virginia and to conduct alumni surveys and surveys of mentor teachers or others regarding the performance of program graduates; and finally, the system would administer school climate surveys built upon the work of Barnett Barry and others. Budget cuts lead to eliminating the positions at SCHEV required to continue the project, and though IHE’s worked with the Attorney General’s office, SCHEV, DOE, and the Virginia Economic Commission to eliminate barriers for sharing information, this was not accomplished until just this past year through legislation. VITAL was abandoned in 2009.

1. 2001-2003. We implemented workshops on two areas that were emerging as problematic: evaluating candidates’ impact on student learning, and conducting studies of fairness, accuracy, and consistency. Programs’ successes in documenting these in the Annual Candidate and Performance Assessment Reports have been examined in subsequent years, and the unit continues to provide support for faculty in meeting these expectations for program review.
2. 2003-2005. The RU assessment system was being revised at the same time the SPA’s were meeting to develop a more common system for national recognition. Early on, RU’s Assessment Office reviewed SPA drafts and realized there would be common categories for assessments focusing on content knowledge, professional knowledge and skills, ability to plan, ability to implement, and impact on student learning. We began working with faculty in developing assessments for each program within these areas.
3. 2003-2005. The new college assessment office devises on-line data management systems for entering candidate assessment data, Faculty Annual Reports, teacher education applications.
4. 2005-2006. When the SPA’s published their templates, RU adopted the templates for the Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Report.
5. 2001-2011. The programs have worked over the years to ensure that evaluations of candidates are aligned with state and national standards; that the evaluation tools differentiate candidate performance at three-four levels, described by behavioral indicators; that data are compiled and reported to show the number and percent of candidates performing at the different levels; that faculty review and discuss the results in terms of candidates content knowledge, professional knowledge and skills, impact on student learning; and that they address plans for improvement of candidate performance and of the program.
6. 2005-2006. Assessments revealed a need to inquire more fully into candidate impact on student learning and candidates’ preparation for working with families. Two new candidate surveys were developed to be administered during Assessment Day, when all teacher education candidates return to campus to complete surveys and submit licensure applications.
7. 2007-2008. The College contracted with Educational Informatics to install and implement rGrade, an integrated assessment system. The Assessment Office has worked diligently from 2008 up to the present to help faculty upload their program assessment plans, with the assessment instruments, scoring guides and rubrics associated with them, and the alignment with SPA and NCATE standards ofall of the assessments used at each decision point, and to assist them in entering data. The Assessment Director and the Technology Coordinator have worked closely with rGrade support to implement and upgrade the system to meet our needs. The Assessment Office has coordinated data-entry for several across-program assessments.
8. 2007-2008. Teacher education faculty members convene a working group to reframe the Professional Characteristics and Dispositions for students in courses and experiences prior to being admitted into the Teacher Education Program. Faculty use this to provide feedback to students prior to admission and to monitor their qualifications for admission. If serious concerns emerge, faculty teaching those courses work together on addressing the issues with the student.
9. 2007-2008. The Educational Leadership Program revises the program’s assessment plan to align with revised national standards.
10. In 2008-2010, RU submitted all programs to the Virginia Department of Education and to the Board of Education for review to ensure that programs have been aligned with newly adopted state program review regulations, recent legislation, and new licensure regulations. All course syllabi were updated and aligned with state and national standards.
11. In 2008-2010, the Dean worked with the Radford University Academic Program Review Committee in developing the RU plan for program review that would align with SACS, NCATE, state, and SPA program review.
12. In 2009, RU faculty served in the Virginia Department of Education work group to review Virginia requirements for program approval and submit requests to the SPA organizations to recognize Virginia’s program review process as appropriate for the NCATE program review process.
13. Each semester, Professional Preparation Program Faculty have met to reviewing unit, national and state requirements regarding candidate and program assessment and have participated in workshops on developing and implementing program assessment plans and in reviewing the results of assessments and using the results to improve candidate performance and programs.

3. Exhibit Links

|  |
| --- |
| **Exhibits** |
| 1. Description of the unit’s assessment **system** in detail including the requirements and key assessments used at transition points.   ***Exhibit 2.1 Description of the unit’s assessment system*** |
| 1. Data from key assessments used at entry to programs   ***Exhibit 2.2 Key assessments data and forms*** |
| 1. Procedures for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and evaluations of unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias   ***Exhibit 2.3 Fairness, accuracy, consistency, and freedom from bias*** |
| 1. Policies and procedures that ensure that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used to make improvements   ***Exhibit 2.4 Procedures for data collection, reporting, and plans for improvement*** |
| 1. Samples of candidate assessment data disaggregated by alternate route, off-campus, and distance learning programs   ***Exhibit 2.5 Sample assessment data for off-campus\_on-campus cohorts*** |
| 1. ***Exhibit 2.6 Policies for handling student complaints*** |
| 1. File of student complaints and the unit’s response (available during the onsite visit.) |
| 1. ***Exhibit 2.8 Examples of changes made in response to assessments*** |

**D. STANDARD 3: FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE**

**D.1. Narrative**

The unit’s work with school partners has focused upon creating professional learning communities, which embrace simultaneous renewal of schools, and preparation programs, collaborate in professional development, engage candidates in authentic roles, and help improve programs and performance through assessment. The unit has a long history of collaborating with faculty across the university and with P-12 colleagues in developing and implementing programs and field experiences. Formal structures which support collaboration include the Southwestern Virginia Professional Education Consortium (SWVA PEC), the Professional Preparation Faculty (PP Faculty) and Key Faculty, Partner School Advisory Boards, and the Professional Education Committee (PEC). There are also multiple examples of collaboration among faculty in education, arts, sciences, and humanities with each other and with P-12 faculty in grants and projects serving P-12 students and schools.

The unit is a strong partner in the Southwestern Virginia Professional Education Consortium: four universities and eleven school divisions that have collaborated in strengthening communication between schools and universities; providing professional development in mentoring and in best practices; and promoting the leadership of clinical faculty in shaping field experiences and professional development. This work has resulted in clearer and more consistent communication, including the development of common policies and procedures (e.g., Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), criteria for selecting clinical faculty, a curriculum for preparing clinical faculty). SWVA PEC develops and sponsors professional development workshops, the first two of which all teachers must complete in order to have an intern or mentee assigned. The Consortium created a mini-grant program designed initially to support professional development for school clinical teams, and later, to promote inquiry into teaching and learning. The Consortium has been successful in many of these endeavors, but evidence indicates it has not been fully successful in meeting its goals for promoting inquiry. Goals for the next grant biennium include: embed more responsibilities related to collaborating on simultaneous renewal into the MOU; structure mini-grant project to more clearly address classroom-based inquiry; and explore the use of a common intern evaluation.

The Professional Preparation Faculty (all faculty teaching and supervising in programs) and Key Faculty (program liaisons) meet once or twice each semester. These faculty are the primary connection with teachers and principals in schools where candidates are placed. The PP Faculty translates state and national policies and emerging best practices into changes in curriculum and experiences. They help shape policies and procedures in field experiences and serve as a key advisory group to the unit. They develop and implement assessment plans and complete the Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports. PP Faculty convene Partner School Advisory Boards at least once a year; these Boards guide the work of specific partnership sites and programs. The Boards include university and school faculty and candidates with the goal of assessing current work and practices and setting short-term and long-term goals.

The Professional Education Committee (PEC) is a university level internal governance committee composed of representatives from preparation programs, arts, sciences, and humanities; community colleges; student government; advising; assessment; and P-12 principals and practitioners. The PEC oversees all professional education programs and approves changes to curriculum, policies and procedures. The PEC reviews assessment data and reports (e.g., licensure exam pass-rates; profiles of Teacher Education applicants). The PEC has standing subcommittees on curriculum and student appeals and has established various ad hoc committees to address such topics as cultural competence, school-university partnerships, and parental/family engagement. PEC serves as an advisory board and collaborative “think tank” for continuous improvement for the unit.

The Taskforce for Improving Teacher Education and Clinical Practice was established this past year; it includes university faculty and LEA teachers and administrators. Participants evaluated the Conceptual Framework and identified what was going well and issues and challenges in field experiences, and helped establish realistic goals for a Continuous Improvement Plan.

In reviewing current structures for collaboration and communication, the PEC, unit leadership and faculty, and the Task Force determined that current structures have helped improve communication and collaboration but there is a need to “move to the next level” and develop models of collaboration that more closely resemble professional development schools or “teaching schools.” PP Faculty recommended that the unit adopt Standard III, Field Experience and Clinical Practice as the standard in which we wished to move toward “target level” for accreditation because such efforts would result in enhancing quality experiences for all: P-12 students, teachers and principals, schools, candidates, and university faculty and programs.

Descriptions of field experiences and requirements are addressed in *Exhibit 3.4 Descriptions of field experiences and clinical practice.* The unit has a system for improving the selection of applicants and for monitoring the performance of candidates and the quality of field experiences. In programs preparing other school personnel, the College of Graduate and Professional Studies and Program Coordinators in the disciplines ensure that applicants meet program admission requirements. The Field Experience Office and the Assessment Office and Key Faculty (program coordinators) monitor the qualifications of applicants to the Teacher Education Program. Several programs in Teacher Education have increased entrance requirements (e.g., 3.0 GPA, passing scores on Praxis I and II and the VCLA). Faculty systematically conduct multiple formative and summative evaluations of interns during early field experiences and clinical practice and internships (see *Exhibit 1.3* for annual reports and *Exhibit 3.6* for sample evaluation forms used during early field experiences and student teaching). In teacher preparation programs, P-12 clinical faculty and university supervisors review lesson plans and work sample units, conduct observations of lessons, complete evaluations at midterm and end of the semester, and meet regularly with candidates to provide on-going feedback. Mid-term and final field evaluations are conducted on site with the candidate, clinical faculty and university supervisor. **Candidates in programs for other school personnel are evaluated periodically over clinical practice and field experiences using evaluation tools with criteria aligned with unit, state, and national standards.** Faculty in all programs work with the Assessment Office in compiling and reporting results of field experience assessments of candidate’s performance in the annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports.

Teacher preparation programs and programs preparing other school personnel also conduct program assessments (*Exhibit 1.3*). In Teacher Education, Assessment Day is held at the end of each semester. Candidates complete evaluations of field experiences (opportunities provided, and the assistance received from university supervisors and cooperating professionals); and surveys regarding particular competency areas being emphasized by programs (e.g., impact on student learning; parental involvement; diversity knowledge, skills, and dispositions; teachers’ self-efficacy; their progress in job searches). Results of assessments are compiled by the Assessment Office, posted on the Assessment web page and some summaries are sent directly to faculty supervisors. The Assessment Office reports to the PEC on these assessments. Results of the assessments are discussed in the section on Standard I in this report.

Examining data from the Intern’s Evaluation of Field Experiences (2008-2010) provides insight into candidates’ perceptions of overall programmatic strengths and areas for improvement (*Exhibit 3.6).* Using a four-point scale, candidates reported frequent opportunities to: work with both individuals (means of 3.79-3.93) and groups of students (means of 3.80-3.87); to plan and teach units of instruction while explicitly addressing the Virginia Standards of Learning (means of 3.44-3.76); develop knowledge and skills for working with students who are falling behind (means of 3.44-3.49); assist in developing and implementing assessments of student learning (means of 3.38-3.56) and analyze assessment results to understand impact on student learning (a mean of 3.23-3.56). Areas rated below 3.0 (2.5 – 2.94) included opportunities to: communicate with parents/family members; participate in professional development activities; use technology to keep student records and to analyze student performance data. Results are disaggregated by program area and made available to faculty.

As mentioned above, on-going evaluations and discussions of collaboration between schools and the university resulted in faculty identifying a need to “move to the next level” of collaboration. In reviewing results of assessments and again through discussions with members of the Task Force, PP Faculty, and the SWVA Professional Education Consortium, the unit has identified a need for more intensive study of using data to inform instruction, including the use of technology to maintain student records and to analyze student performance data. Because of the recent legislation that Virginia would begin using “student growth” models in evaluating teachers, these competencies identified for pre-service teachers might overlap with identified areas for continuing professional development for in-service teachers. The results of other program and candidate assessments, addressed in the section on Standard I, have also fed into discussions of continuous improvement and have helped to inform the plans for the continuous improvement of field experiences and clinical practice which follow.

**2a. Work undertaken to move to the Target Level and plans for continuing to improve.**

In 1997, the College of Education and Human Development began a partner school as a pilot that has resulted in placements of all of our elementary, middle and most of the secondary and special education students in partner schools. This project was cited as an exemplary program in *Reforming Teacher Preparation: The critical clinical component* (AACTE, 2010). Rose and Colley (2011) describe a public school partnership as “an opportunity for public school and university personnel to work together to facilitate high levels of learning for all children of the school, to create and promote a positive learning environment that models high-quality evidence-based practices for teachers candidates, and to create a supportive site for renewal of and inquiry by experienced teachers, administrators, school service personnel and university faculty. Through such collaborative efforts, a partnership promotes an exemplary professional development community.” All partner school sites have Advisory Boards that guide their work and jointly develop Memorandum of Understanding.

MOUs provide partnership sites opportunities to embed inquiry projects into their work. Inquiry into co-teaching is a growing and important component of partnership work. Last year in middle education, a special education faculty member taught a section of a collaboration course on co-teaching for a school wide initiative. Middle education candidates with specific content disciplines were co-placed with special education student teachers at this school. The course served as professional development for the school faculty with some electing to use this course as part of an advanced degree. Candidates placed at the school were provided opportunities to learn side-by-side with cooperating professionals. Most recently, MOUs have been developed to help guide the work in two sites focusing on co-teaching models for regular elementary education and special education candidates. Co-teaching is defined as an instructional approach that involves all teachers working collaboratively to provide evidence-based differentiated instruction for all students. Faculty in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership (STEL), are studying Universal Design for Learning (UDL) in order to better help candidates learn how to differentiate instruction for all learners. Two of the faculty members were funded AY 10-11 to conduct research on the use of UDL and led a book group for faculty spring semester. One outcome from a survey they conducted was a recommendation to embed UDL into all course syllabi and programs in STEL.

At Radford University, the continuous improvement of field experiences and clinical practice will be guided by the following three goals:

1. Strengthen professional relationships with schools in order to create a continuum of professional development for candidates as well as university and school-based faculty through collaboration, a culture of inquiry and mentoring.
2. Focus on evidence-based practices that impact student learning, including the integration of technology and enhancing skills in evaluating student learning and in addressing the diverse needs of students.
3. Integrate preparation across programs to provide authentic engagement of candidates.

***Goal 1: Strengthen professional relationships with schools in order to create a continuum of professional development for candidates as well as university and school-based faculty through collaboration, a culture of inquiry and mentoring.***

*Collaboration*. The Southwestern Virginia Clinical Faculty Consortium, of which Radford University is one of four Higher Education members, has made a commitment, along with its school partners, to collaboratively improve professional education preparation programs. To this end, Memorandum of Understanding governing constituents of the Consortium will be revised to obtain involvement for both school and university renewal. The revised MOUs will include specific attention to how the school and the unit will collaborate on co-developing and co-refining educator preparation and school programs. The College of Education and Human Development’s Conceptual Framework will be discussed and assessed in relation to LEA’s School Improvement philosophies and plans. Discussions will occur with clinical faculty and central office administrators through Consortium meetings, Task force meetings, and by attending principals and superintendents meetings. The Consortium will convey what they are trying to accomplish with educator preparation and seek points of intersection that will be mutually beneficial for the universities and the PK-12 districts. As areas of mutual need are identified, ideas will be taken to the building level through Advisory Boards for those who feel they are ready for this step. MOUs will identify how professional development activities and instructional programs for both the unit and LEAs will benefit both candidates and PK-12 students and share expertise and resources to support PK-12 student and candidate learning. MOUs may address how to work with clinical faculty including the development of the Consortium’s mini-grants.

*A Culture of Inquiry*. The unit is focused on inquiry into teaching and learning across a continuum. For TEP candidates, the beginning of professional development occurs prior to admission to teacher education as students take pre-professional classes focused on inquiry into teaching and learning. In many of their classes, candidates conduct microteaching in which their peers, teams and cohorts evaluate their teaching. For example, in EDUC 310 *Teaching and Learning Elementary Science* candidates plan instruction based on how children learn while demonstrating an understanding of key science concepts. Many candidates and all secondary English education majors take ENGL 402, *Teaching Writing: Theories and Practices*. In this course, candidates work in local schools where they develop units and lesson plans designed to take students through the stages of the writing process concluding with an anthology of student writing. During early field and student teaching, initial licensure candidates engage in a wide variety of structured experiences that demonstrate their ability to integrate theory and practice with content and discipline-specific pedagogy. For example, all programs require work samples and lesson planning with reflections. (*Exhibit 1.3*). Candidates need more work with using data to inform practice which is discussed under Goal 2.

All advanced candidates and candidates in programs for other school professionals take EDEF 606 *Educational Research* in which students develop the first three chapters of a research study related to their disciplines. For example, fifth year early childhood/early childhood special education candidates conduct two action research projects during their semester long clinical practice building on knowledge gained from EDEF 606. Similarly, mathematics content studies candidates complete an extensive teaching or research project as a capstone experience in the masters program. Projects such as these help all candidates connect theory to practice through reflection. **Candidates in both Educational Leadership and Literacy Education, programs for other school professionals, participate in comprehensive courses involving the analysis of data, use of technology, current research and applications to students, families and communities. Candidates studying to become principals and content supervisors, complete a Technology planning/visioning project in which they create a vision statement that addresses proposed utilization and/or integration of technology during their first year as an administrator. Candidates studying to become reading specialists complete a child study intervention report, a literacy coaching report, a diagnostic/remediation case study report and a reading practicum student impact report. (see annual reports in *Exhibit 1.3* for examples of projects).**

*Mentoring and professional development*. Mentoring of candidates occurs regularly ensuring that a candidate meets expectations and progresses satisfactorily in a placement. Mentoring involves observations of cooperating professionals who model best practices. Mentoring also involves observations of candidates. Candidates are observed formally by cooperating professionals and university supervisors but informally by others such as assistant principals and principals. University supervisors meet with candidates and school-based cooperating professionals and observe or conference on a regular basis (i.e., at least every two weeks). These meetings include, but are not limited to, face-to-face meetings, email, blogs, seminars, video observations, reflections and conferences. In addition, the interns and the PK-12 clinical faculty have regular weekly meetings during the internships. Formal evaluations are conducted mid-way in a placement and toward the conclusion of each placement. The mid-way evaluation for TEP candidates is conducted as a three-way conference with the candidate, PK-12 clinical faculty mentor and the university supervisor. With these mid-way evaluation conferences, students self-assess and reflect on their experiences using the field experience evaluation tools. These coaching opportunities provide time for candidates and their supervisors to determine strengths and weaknesses and set short and long term goals for the experience.

In teacher preparation, there is a need to identify students who may need the additional support earlier, and to begin working with them prior to admission to the program. One aspect of this will be to use the Professional Characteristics and Dispositions in a more systematic way. Currently, students complete a self evaluation while taking 300-level courses prior to admission to the program. Course faculty introduce the rubric to the students who then self-report and write a reflection of their perceptions of self. (See *Exhibit 3.6*) When faculty foresee potential problems related to admission to the teacher education program, faculty meet individually with students and discuss both of their assessments using the rubric as a point of discussion. The Director of College Assessment is working on a uniform way to manage these data so they are more accessible to faculty and students as they progress through the program, particularly ensuring that forms from pre-admissions courses are available for faculty review during the departmental reviews for admitting candidates to the program.

Mentoring and the culture of inquiry will also become part of an active professional development program for candidates and university and school faculty. The Task Force on Improving Field Experiences and Clinical Practice will provide guidance in establishing short- and long-term plans and action items. The Task Force has many resources to draw upon, such as the Blue Ribbon Report on *Transforming Teacher Education through Clinical Practice* (2010); *Professional Learning in the Learning Profession* Darling-Hammond, et al, (2009); new *Teacher Leader Model Standards* and the new InTASC *Model Core Teaching Standards*. Clinical faculty partnerships such as the SWWVA PEC and the STEL Clinical Faculty Institutes will be involved in developing and implementing professional development initiatives. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, working on building the culture of inquiry and on mentoring would provide additional support for the change to the use of student growth models in evaluating teachers. One possible outcome would be that pre-service and in-service teachers would begin to regularly use their own assessments of student learning as well as standards test results to guide their practice and help ensure that all students are progressing. We can readily see the potential for incorporating Goal 1 with Goals 2 and 3.

***Goal 2. Focus on evidence-based practices that impact student learning, including the integration of technology and enhancing skills in evaluating student learning and in addressing the diverse needs of students.***

An identified need for both the unit and its school partners is learning to use data to inform instruction for all learners. Candidates in teacher education and other preparation programs have structured opportunities to learn how to assess student learning and development, including specific courses directed toward assessment. For teacher education candidates, instruction on assessment is integrated in methods classes taught concurrently with field experiences and candidates design lesson plans and work sample units that involve collecting pre-and post assessment data. Because of the nature of the assignments, discussions center on how to aggregate and disaggregate the data. Candidates are engaged in systematically collecting, analyzing, reflecting and developing strategies for improving student learning, their own practice, and school practices. Examples follow.

In elementary education for checkpoint # 5 of a work sample (Analysis of Instruction), candidates compare pre-and post assessment results; write daily reflections, the top five lessons learned, and a statement of impact on student learning. In the secondary social studies programs, assessment of student learning is conducted during EDUC 442, a methods class taken in conjunction with student teaching. Candidates conduct an item analysis of questions missed most frequently and write an analysis of why they thought the question was missed and what changes they would make in how they teach. For Special Education – General Curriculum, a five-year program, candidates conduct an action research project on effects on student learning. These candidates identify an instructional need, plan and deliver instruction using research or evidence-based methods, and evaluate the impact on student learning. Candidates in Educational Leadership and in Literacy Education also conduct practice-based inquiry (e.g., the School Improvement Plan, the Reading Practicum Student Impact Report). The goals for improvement would include integrating these assessment projects into a more collaborative culture for inquiry within the schools.

An emphasis on technology integration in schools has been on-going in programs and in outreach that Radford University has contributed to through grants and projects. Two PT3 grants initially placed equipment into the schools and provided training for teachers and teacher candidates. An NSF grant for $1.2 million with Pulaski County and other divisions has resourced schools with materials and equipment for mobile learning. ISTE and Virginia State Technology Standards serve as the foundation for required technology classes and seminars in middle education and all PK-12 programs and are embedded into coursework for the elementary education program. Candidates report that during early field and clinical experiences, they have frequent opportunities to use information technology to teach specific lessons (a mean of 3.29). A long-term goal is the creation of a more comprehensive approach toward using instructional technology with higher levels of impact on student learning. Examples include: creating a continuum of differentiated instruction for all learners including an emphasis on gifted education, second language learners; and creating safe schools for LGBT students; exploring distance education technologies, particularly with secondary candidates; and assisting candidates in using technology to track and study student learning and to manage their work.

Faculty emphasize candidates’ ability to work with diverse student populations in courses and field experiences, and as mentioned in Standards IV and V, our faculty have special commitments to inclusiveness, social justice, culturally responsive and responsible practice, and differentiating instruction to meet students’ needs. Candidates have opportunities to work with students from diverse populations, primarily students from different socio-economic groups, gender preference, and students with exceptional learning needs. Candidates do have opportunities to interact with racially and ethnically diverse populations, but one of our goals would be to expand these opportunities and to explore ways to have more full immersion experiences for students, whether it be through placements in minority-majority schools, service learning projects, semester-long engagement with diverse colleagues through distance technology in courses, after-school programs, study “abroad” experiences within or outside of the US, or other opportunities. A second aspect of seeking to increase candidates’ abilities to work with diverse student populations is the discussion STEL faculty members are having regarding integrating concepts and practices of universal design for learning into preparation programs.

***Goal 3. Integrate preparation across programs to provide authentic engagement of candidates.***

Teacher education programs must prepare their general and special education graduates to collaborate to provide effective services and instruction to improve outcomes for all students. Since its inception, this has been the mission and vision of the five year Early Childhood- Early Childhood Special Education program. **Co-teaching placements and co-supervision for regular and special education are expanding into elementary, middle and secondary social studies placements. Each fall semester in two cohorts, elementary education candidates are paired with special education candidates. These early field candidates take “blocking” methods courses together in mathematics, reading and social studies as well as a seminar in classroom management. The students are paired in the partner schools in their placements with a regular education and a special education mentor teacher. In addition, a regular and a special education faculty member lead each of the two cohorts and co-supervise these candidates. In middle education and secondary social studies regular education, candidates from each of these programs are paired with special education student teachers for a semester long practica. During AY 2011-12, co-placements will be expanded to include secondary mathematics and science. Project MERGE,** *Merging Expertise for Results in the General Education***, a three-year $1.6 M federally funded initiative to develop and integrated teacher education program has successfully helped support and expand these co-teaching efforts.**

Collaboration in working with diverse student populations occurs in other ways, such as tutoring programs, after school programs, and ESHE’s Moving to Learn. Pockets of other collaboration continue to grow, such as the three-year mentoring project between Counselor Education (COED) graduate students and STEL’s undergraduate candidates in early childhood, middle and secondary social studies education. This effort provides the COED students with required opportunities to implement and reflect on real-world strategies. In turn, STEL’s teacher education candidates learn skills for working with peers and paraprofessionals. For the last two summers, candidates from special education, social work, and parks and recreation have worked together to provide holistic teaching and learning experiences for diverse students in the Radford City Public Schools’ summer school program. While a small pilot program, candidates from literacy education will work with communication and science disorders students in a summer 2011 camp for children with autism. Eventually, these efforts can be expanded to conduct cross-disciplinary summer clinics (e.g., reading, special education, counselor education, educational leadership, and parks, recreation and tourism), providing all with integrated real world learning placements. Such efforts will also contribute to short and long range planning for the revision and development of MOUs situating professional development into existing and newly formed learning communities.

3. Exhibit Links

|  |
| --- |
| **Exhibits** |
| 1. Memoranda of understanding, contracts, and/or other documents that demonstrate partnerships with schools   ***Exhibit 3.1 SWVA PEC Memorandum of Understanding basic format*** |
| 1. Criteria for the selection of school faculty (e.g., cooperating teachers, internship supervisors)   ***Exhibit 3.2 Clinical Faculty Qualifications, Roles, and Responsibilities*** |
| 1. Documentation of the preparation of school faculty for their roles (e.g., orientation and other meetings)   ***Exhibit 3.3 Documentation of preparation of clinical faculty for roles*** |
| 1. Descriptions of field experiences and clinical practice requirements in programs for initial and advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals   SANDY is completing.  ***Exhibit 3.4 Description of field experience\_clinical practice requirements*** |
| 1. Guidelines for student teaching and internships   ***Exhibit 3.5 Samples of field experience handbooks.*** |
| 1. Assessments and scoring rubrics/criteria used in field experiences and clinical practice for initial and advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals   ***Exhibit 3.6 Samples of assessments and scoring rubrics used in field experiences; also Exhibit 1.3 Annual Candidate and Program Assessment Reports for all assessments.*** |

**E. STANDARD 4: DIVERSITY**

**E.1. Narrative**

Faculty share a common commitment to preparing candidates to “lead, teach, and help” in a pluralistic society and who serve students with special learning needs and their families. The historical basis for cultural diversity efforts stem from a concept paper commissioned by the PEC in 1997 to identify common performance outcomes for candidates regarding cultural diversity. The authors, Drs. Betty Dore and Barbara Boyd, drew upon the work, among others, Josepha Campinah-Bacota (1994, 1998); James Banks (1995, 1997); G. Pritchy Smith (1998); Lisa Delpit (1995); Geneva Gay (1993), J. McFadden, M.M. Merryfield, and K.R. Barron (1996); and Ken Zeichner (1993). The model presented two major themes: identifying cultural influences upon self and others, and teaching and assessing for diverse learning styles and backgrounds. This was later expanded to: knowledge about one’s own cultural identity and development; knowledge about concepts and issues regarding diversity; and knowledge, skills, and dispositions for practice.

The unit has a long-standing commitment for working with students with special learning needs and to provide services and training in this area. The faculty in teacher education programs has developed program-specific coursework in special education for early childhood, elementary and middle school education, and secondary education programs. They have also expanded programs preparing special educators to include all special education licensure options in Virginia, including the only program in Deaf and Hard of Hearing in the state, and including distance-delivered programs in collaboration with other state institutions for visual impairment, adapted curriculum, and early childhood special education.

The CEHD Curriculum Committee and the Professional Education Committee review all course proposals for approval and review. Proposals in professional education must address diversity or provide a rationale for any exclusion. Curricula and field experiences are rooted in the research literature on multicultural education and on diverse learning styles and learning needs. Coursework is imbued with learning experiences that challenge and expand candidates’ understanding of their own cultural identity, enrich their experiences with a variety of perspectives, and enhance their skills in communicating with students and families from a variety of backgrounds (see Standard 1 for a more detailed discussion). Candidates’ ability to apply “culturally responsive and responsive” practice during clinical practice and field experiences is evaluated using observational forms and evaluations of portfolios.. Candidates in teacher preparation programs also complete a survey regarding preparation for working with diverse students (*Exhibit 4.3. Assessment Instruments Student Survey*).

.

Radford University and the College have engaged in a campus-wide effort to enhance the diversity of the faculty. Steps taken include training for chairs and personnel committees in strategies for enhancing the diversity of the pool of applicants; advertising positions at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and in publications or in organizations with diverse readership or membership; personally contacting potential candidates; including language in the advertisement that invites applicants with ‘background and experiences with diverse student populations and with programs and curriculum serving diverse populations’; and requiring the chair of the search committee to provide a plan that outlines the steps the committee will take to ensure a diverse applicant pool (*Exhibit 4.5 Recruiting diverse faculty*).

Due to these recruiting efforts, RU now has a faculty that is 14% minority (compared with 6.9% minority in the local service area). Several hires in the education unit since 2003 have been minority hires (early childhood education (1), elementary education (2), mathematics education (2), and special education (2)). Of the 57 faculty members teaching in professional preparation programs, 10.5% are from racially/ethnically underrepresented groups (*Exhibit 4.4 Faculty demographics*).

We recognize the need to enhance the number of candidates and faculty from under-represented racial groups in our programs. We do have faculty members from other under-represented groups and faculty with experience teaching in schools with high populations of minority students. Importantly, because of the recruitment strategies focusing on “experience with diverse student populations or programs,” we have been able to attract several faculty whose teaching and research interests are in the areas of social justice, LGBT issues, inclusive practices, and cultural competence. We have expanded candidates’ opportunities to interact with faculty and peers from diverse backgrounds by engaging in more collaborative work in Roanoke City, bringing in guests speakers to address diversity and to dialogue with us and our students about education and teacher preparation. We have also started an international education initiative to provide a wider range of more accessible opportunities for students to study and work in settings with individuals whose culture or background is different from their own.

The region surrounding Radford University is largely rural Appalachia and is somewhat diverse in terms of race/ethnicity, but much more diverse in terms of SES. This would include the school divisions of Radford City, Montgomery County, Pulaski County, Floyd County, Giles County and Carroll County. Radford is relatively close (1-1 ½ hour driving distance) to Roanoke City (58% minority students) and several programs have actively cultivated partner school relationships with schools there, including a 2+2 elementary education program with Virginia Western Community College. According to data collected during the 2009-2010 year, candidates, on average, worked in classrooms or schools with 18% racially diverse students, and with about 14% students with disabilities (many of the local LEAS practice full inclusion), and about 42% lower SES students (as indicated by free/reduced lunch statistics) (see Exhibit 4.8 P-12 student demographics). Faculty teaching in the programs have especially incorporated preparation on working with students and families in poverty. Two of the major placement divisions have strong inclusion programs with 85%-90% of students with disabilities being taught in regular classrooms 80% or more of the time, which provides strong preparation for our candidates in teaching students with disabilities. Four of the divisions have shown growth in the number of LEP students from 1995 to 2010: Salem City: 17 to 80; Roanoke City, 226 to 965; Montgomery County, 64-146; and Roanoke County, 45 – 286.

The unit engages in several practices to provide opportunities for candidates to work with diverse P-12 student populations.

* 50 clock hours. Candidates must complete 50 clock hours of experiences and submit an essay detailing their experiences with students whose culture differs from their own.
* Several students also participate in service-learning programs which
* A faculty member teaching EDUC 410 Teaching Mathematics in the Elementary School has a grant to bring Roanoke City elementary students to campus each year to have a “college day” and to work with interns on problem-solving skills.
* Faculty regularlyinvite P-12 students from diverse student populations into classes to discuss their experiences in schools.
* The unit has actively reached out to establish partner school relationships with schools with diverse P-12 populations. Middle school, secondary education, special education, and early childhood education actively cultivate relationships and placements with Roanoke City Schools. We have established a 2+2 elementary education program with Virginia Western Community College in Roanoke City (58% minority student populations), a “grow your own” effort. The Counseling faculty in CEHD have developed projects with Roanoke City teachers working on Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) and self-care for teachers.
* The unit has especially tried to select schools using full inclusion models for field experiences.

**2b. Continuous Improvement**

Faculty members have continued to build upon the knowledge base and the model of proficiencies. Some of the major changes regarding commitments toward diversity, the knowledge base, and curriculum and experiences in professional preparation include:

* In 2005, the faculty voted to change one of the core requirements for UG teacher preparation programs, EDUC 309 The School and the Student. Faculty observed that students needed more intense preparation in both child and adolescent development and in foundational educational studies, including more attention to knowledge and skills regarding diversity, cultural perspectives, and assessment. EDUC 309 was deleted and two new course requirements were added: HUMD 300 Child and Adolescent Development and EDEF 320 Introduction to Professional Education.
* In 2009, one of the core requirements for the M.S. in Education degree was changed from EDUC 681 International Education to EDUC 670 Principles and Practices of Multicultural Education.
* Faculty recognized the need for age-based preparation in special education and the special education department created special courses for candidates in early childhood education, in elementary and middle education, and in secondary education. EDSP 404 Introduction to Special Education for Secondary Educators was implemented in 2006.
* Special education faculty have demonstrated foresight in taking on the task of creating programs that more closely integrate teacher preparation in general education and in special education. They have also been on the forefront in distance education across the state in providing personnel training programs in critical shortage areas in collaboration with other institutions in the state.
* After realizing how difficult it was for candidates to understand their own cultural identity, the two primary competency strands were separated out to form three primary strands: applying an understanding one’s own cultural identity and development; applying an understanding cultural factors; and knowledge, skills, and dispositions for culturally responsive and responsible practice; assessments indicate candidates have improved in this area (Standard 1). (Galman, S., Pica-Smith, C., & Rosenberger, C. (2011); Young, 2011);
* Several faculty in education and across the university have begun to integrate themes of social justice into their teaching and professional inquiry (Chubbuck, 2011);
* Faculty have coordinated efforts toward preparing candidates to work with students and families from across the diversity spectrum, particularly focusing on the intersection of poverty, race and ethnicity, gender, ability, and social class, power, and how candidates’ knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and perceptions about students and families impact professional practice and student success (Hughes, 2010);
* Faculty in STEL are integrating general education preparation and special education preparation programs. The early childhood education/early childhood special education program is a fully integrated program resulting in licensure for PK-3 and special education birth through age 5. Through the MERGE grant, STEL faculty have revised some methods courses to involve preparation for both special education teachers and general education teachers and have been co-placing students in general education and in special education during early field experiences and student teaching.
* Faculty teaching in general education and special education programs are collaborating on integrating differentiated instruction, response to intervention, positive behavioral interventions and supports, and have been discussing developing a comprehensive approach toward incorporating universal design for learning in programs (National University Design for Learning Task Force, 2011);
* More attention is being placed upon better preparing candidates to work with LGBT students and to deal with issues such as homophobia and bullying in the schools (Jones, J. 2010).

Though we have only been modestly successful in increasing the number of our minority faculty members, we have been able to attract several faculty members who have a special commitment to working with diverse populations and practicing from models of inclusiveness, cultural competence, and social justice, largely due to our recruitment outreach. Having a critical mass of faculty members who explicitly integrate diversity, social justice, and inclusion into their teaching and professional work has changed the dialogue and work of the communities of practice in the unit. These faculty members have the knowledge and skills built from experience that serve us well in preparing candidates to work with diverse student populations, including English Language Learners, culturally diverse students, LGBT students, and students with special learning needs. The scholarly and professional activity of our faculty is frequently connected to issues of diversity. For evidence of faculty’s past and ongoing experiences with diversity and their professional contributions in this area, please see Exhibits 4.4 on Survey of faculty regarding diversity experiences; Faculty publications addressing diversity; and Faculty information chart. Many of our faculty members are actively involved as officers and members in professional organizations addressing diversity, such as the Virginia Association for Multicultural Education and local and state CEC organizations. The unit and University seek to retain faculty by creating a climate that is welcoming and inclusive. Numerous opportunities exist for faculty to present their diversity-related work, and staff development events frequently occur that support growth and development of faculty regarding diversity.

Most schools where we place candidates include diverse school populations: students with disabilities, students from lower SES, LGBT students, and a range of 12%, 15%, 19% to 58% minority students. Many of our partner schools are full inclusion schools. Because of our partner school project, candidates complete both early field experiences and student teaching within a school or set of two-three schools within the same school division. This full-year placement by nature limits their experiences to that school division, but also offers opportunities for more authentic, professional engagement and for faculty to work more closely with schools on long-term projects serving P-12 students and helping us to improve our preparation programs. One of the major goals for the improvement of field experiences and clinical practice is to systematize opportunities for students to work with diverse peers and students across the program through the use of distance technologies to bring those experiences to candidates while in the program. Radford faculty are very engaged in service-learning and has begun to offer an “alternative spring break” experience. We are beginning to explore requiring that all students all engage in a service learning project with individuals who cultural/racial/ethnic background is different from their own as part of the admissions requirements. Such a project would be in line with the university’s Quality Enhancement Plan for SACs, which is focusing upon the “citizen scholar.”

College faculty are primary advocates for, initiators of, and participants in activities related to diversity at RU. When Radford began to receive more deaf and hard of hearing students, the college worked with the Disability Resource Office to research how the university could manage resources to serve RU’s growing DHH population. The college advocated for a Coordinator of Interpreting services to better serve RU students and the public, which was later granted. The University Diversity and Equity Action Committee had not been meeting 2007-2009 because RU lost the position of Social Equity Officer that had the responsibility for convening this committee (no convener, no committee). The Dean intervened to convene the committee and move it forward on developing university goals and action plans for diversity with the assistance of the Director of the Disability Resource Office and other committee members. The Committee is now chaired by the new Director for the Center for Diversity and Inclusion. Faculty in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership (STEL) worked with the Director to implement cross-campus “Diversity Dialogues.” The college worked with the Director in exploring whether or not the Center or the college should establish a “Safe Zone” center, and the college is in the process of doing so. The college has recently adopted the Appalachian Studies Center and the faculty and projects which have engaged in place-based education projects and publications over the years. Most of the faculty teaching in the RU Peace Studies program are education faculty in the college. All of these activities are central to our mission to educate students for a pluralistic society. The college plays a vital role in promoting programs, dialogue and development on issues of diversity, equity, and social justice at Radford.

3. Exhibit Links

|  |
| --- |
| **Exhibits** |
| 1. Proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to develop   ***Exhibit 4.1 Candidate Proficiencies Related to Diversity*** |
| 1. Curriculum components that address diversity proficiencies (This might be a matrix that shows diversity components in required courses.)   ***Exhibit 4.2 Curriculum components that address diversity*** |
| 1. Assessment instruments, scoring guides, and data related to diversity (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.)   ***Exhibit 4.3 Assessment instrument: Student Survey.*** |
| 1. Data table on faculty demographics (see example attached to NCATE’s list of exhibits)   ***Exhibit 4.4 Faculty demographics*** |
| 1. Policies and practices for recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty   ***Exhibit 4.5 Recruiting diversity faculty*** |
| 1. Data table on student demographics (see example attached to NCATE’s list of exhibits)   ***Exhibit 4.6 Candidate demographics*** |
| 1. Policies and practices for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates   ***Exhibit 4.7 Policies and practices for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates*** |
| 1. Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice (see example attached to NCATE’s list of exhibits)   ***Exhibit 4.8 P-12 student demographics*** |
| 1. Policies, practices, and/or procedures that facilitate candidate experiences with students from diverse groups   ***Exhibit 4.9 Policies, practices, and procedures facilitating diverse experiences*** |

F. **STANDARD 5: FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE, AND DEVELOPMENT**

**F.1 Narrative**

The faculty in the unit consists of individuals who advise, teach and supervise either full time or part-time in professional preparation programs across several colleges (CEHD, CVPA, CHBS, CSAT) (see Exhibit 5.1 Faculty Information Chart). There are 57 faculty, 33 of whom teach full time in educational programs and are housed in CEHD. Seven faculty teach full time in CVPA and part time in educational programs in Art, Dance, and Music; seven faculty teach full time in CHBS and part time in school psychology and secondary English; and three faculty teach full time in CSAT and part time in mathematics education. Three faculty in CHHS in the Social Work Program and in the Speech Language program in the Waldron College of Health and Human Services also are regularly involved in unit activities such as the PEC and the Task Force on Improving Field Experiences and Clinical Practice. Many of these faculty members (44 of 57: 77%) have been hired since the 2003 visit: we have a young and engaged faculty. All faculty have earned doctorates with the exception of two who are ABD and two who have master’s degrees and are serving as special purpose or sponsored professionals. The Leadership Team has established a hiring policy (Exhibit 5.5 CEHD Policies for determining faculty qualifications for hiring) based on SACS guidelines for ensuring that faculty are qualified for the positions for which they are hired, including part-time faculty. Faculty hired into part time (adjunct) positions often possess the Master’s degree together with significant expertise and/or experience in the area(s) they are assigned to teach. In some cases expertise comes from many years of experience, in other cases it comes from having pursued professional education, and perhaps credentialing, through means other than the terminal degree. Faculty teaching in graduate programs have advanced degrees related to the specific concentrations in the masters programs.

The faculty are active in publishing and presenting in professional venues and in deepening the knowledge in their professions (See *Exhibit 5.3 Samples of faculty scholarly activities*). Several have been invited to teach, conduct training, or to present or perform internationally (e.g., China, Malawi, Russia, Thailand, Costa Rica, Australia, England, Kazakhstan; see Exhibit 5.1 Faculty Information Chart). Faculty are on editorial review boards, accreditation teams, state advisory committees, and serve as advisors for student groups as well as mentors for new faculty. Radford especially has a long tradition of having faculty serve in leadership roles in professional organizations, particularly at the state level (see Exhibit 5.3 Examples of faculty professional affiliations).

Faculty use a variety of instructional strategies to engage students in activities to enable them to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions outlined in unit, state and national standards. The following are examples of instructional practices which typify the content and styles of the faculty teaching education courses in education (see Exhibit 5.1 Survey of faculty instructional methods used). Over fifty percent of the faculty reported using the following strategies “often” or “regularly,” (listed in order of higher percentage to lowest (94.8% to 52.6%): cooperative learning, modeling, problem-solving, student-led and teacher-led structured discussions, student presentations, inquiry-based in-class activities, case studies, oral histories, structured viewing of videos, lecture and questioning, peer teaching/micro-teaching, interactive journals and notebooks, web-quests, and individual student research projects. Fewer than fifty percent (47.4% to 42.1% report using the following strategies “regularly” or “often:” simulations, peer evaluation and self-evaluation as part of the assessment, group projects, expressive arts, and student debates. About a third reported using interviews and role plays “regularly” or “often.” Additional strategies reported by faculty included: applying Universal Design for Learning; using “morning meeting” as part of class; video-taping of teaching and counseling; taking candidates on “instructional rounds” in the school to observe and discuss teaching practices; and integrating multicultural children’s literature into the course. Particular emphasis is placed on the integration of instructional technology. All classrooms on campus are outfitted with interactive Smartboards, projectors, and DVD/VCR units and faculty model and actively use the provided technologies in the classrooms. Faculty and students have access to multiple technology resources in the Teaching Resource Center and in the Educational Innovation Lab. Faculty use a variety of instructional technologies and expect candidates to do the same in course assignments and in field experiences (see *Exhibit 5.1 Survey of faculty instructional methods*). Several faculty teach classes using distributed education and have collaborated with other institutions in providing collaborative personnel preparation in high-need, low enrollment areas such as early childhood special education, special education adapted curriculum, and visual impairment.

Faculty in the unit and across the university are regularly involved in collaborative grants, projects, professional development, evaluations, service projects, and other partnership activities with the schools. Faculty in CEHD have led the way in grant-development at RU, with several faculty being recognized in the $10 million- and $5 million-circle awards and with 59 grants awarded worth approximately $8 million dollars 2008-2010. Grants support extensive outreach and service to schools, students, and families through the Training and Technical Assistance Center (with ten major projects); the King Foundation mental health grants; Adult Literacy Volunteers; Infant and Toddler Connection; On Campus Transition Program; and several personnel training grants for teachers in deaf and hard of hearing, early childhood special education, visual impairment, special education adapted curriculum, and advanced mathematics for high school teachers. Dr. Matt Dunleavy has received several state and national grants supporting the development of cutting edge instructional technologies using hand-held devices and has obtained the university’s first patent for products of the Games Lab. His grants have provided over $2 million of technology equipment for local schools. The elementary education program has established a “book buddies” program in which interns tutor elementary students struggling with reading; assessment results indicate all students make one to three years of improvement in their reading skills. The middle school program conducts an after school program in their partner schools. The Counseling Education program provides counseling services to students and faculty in clinical labs on or near the schools. Radford has partnered with three other local universities and established the SWVA Professional Education Consortium, which has provided clinical faculty and mentor training and on-going professional development opportunities for 1,800 teachers and principals in the region. The CEHD Professional Development Center (PDC) has formed a number of partnerships with the Western Virginia Public Education Consortium (WVPEC), the Virginia Association of School Superintendents, the Virginia Association for Supervision of Curriculum Development (VASCD) and the Appalachian Educational Laboratory/Edvantia and provides opportunities for development for teachers, principals, and university faculty.

Radford University has a very comprehensive faculty evaluation system based on three areas of performance: teaching, service, and professional contributions. Tenure-track faculty members submit a Faculty Annual Report summarizing their activities in each of the three areas. The FAR is an extensive personal review of one’s own growth and effectiveness in teaching, service, and professional contributions, of their participation in faculty development to improve practice, and plans for improvement. The FARS are reviewed by the chair who submits annual evaluations of faculty for review by the Dean who submits to the Provost. (See *Exhibit 5.5 Faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure policies*.) The Personnel Committee also reviews faculty performance during the process of reappointing faculty, and often offers recommendations for improvement in the areas of teaching, service, or professional contributions. Students evaluate courses and the faculty member teaching the course each semester and this information is included as one source of evidence in the FAR. With the exception of two course evaluations (one in EDET for 09-10, and one in HLTH for 08-09) all evaluation results for both the instructors and the courses for the past two years were above the University average. A sample of the form used in faculty/course evaluations and a numerical summary of the results are included in*Exhibit 5.6*. Candidates in field experiences complete an evaluation of the field experience which includes an evaluation of their opportunities for engagement and evaluations of the assistance they received from the university supervisor and the cooperating professional. The results of the field experience evaluations are distributed to faculty supervisors and to their chairs; faculty members discuss the results in the Faculty Annual Report. Data show that faculty supervisors are consistently rated by interns as fully meeting the responsibilities of supervision “very often” and “regularly.” If a faculty supervisor falls below those ratings, the chair meets with the faculty member as part of the annual review process to discuss ways to improve. The results of interns’ evaluations of the assistance they received from cooperating professionals are reviewed by the Associate Dean. If a pattern of poor mentoring emerges, the Associate Dean discusses ways to address this with the university supervisor for that partner school or with the chair/director. University and school faculty are highly involved in assessing candidates and preparation programs. Program faculty submit an annual Report on Candidate and Program Assessment, which are evaluated by the Dean and the Director of College Assessment with reports sent to the Key Contact Faculty member for programs and the chair. The results of these evaluations are discussed in Standard II: Assessment System.

The faculty continues to receive support for research and professional development. Due to the economic downturn, the university withdrew professional travel monies in 2008-2009, but has since reinstated those funds as part of regular departmental budgets ($900 per faculty member). The university also “hard-wired” money to support faculty research into the colleges’ budgets (approximately $60,000 for CEHD) and $100,000 for cross-disciplinary research at the university level. The university provides excellent faculty development opportunities through the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL); the Faculty Development Center; “Our Turn” (week-long faculty development institutes at the beginning of each semester); and through instructional technology. The unit provides professional development primarily through workshops conducted with PP Faculty and Key Faculty on such topics as assessing candidates’ impact on student learning; aligning assessments with national and state standards; improving policies and procedures for field experiences and clinical practice; etc. In line with the “Leading from the Future” strategic plan, the Mind, Body, Spirit Committee has also implemented several mini-sessions throughout the past two years. STEL incorporates professional development into each of its school meetings. (Exhibit 5.7

.

**2b. Continuous Improvement**

Expanding faculty and student experiences with diversity

With the understanding that diversity is more than ethnicity and race, and because of the geographical location of Radford University, CEHD has worked diligently to provide diverse opportunities for both faculty and students. Not only have six minority faculty been hired, the unit has experienced success from its drive to hire more faculty who are deeply involved in issues related to diversity. Faculty hired since 2003 form a “critical mass” who have tipped the balance toward opening dialogue about and professional inquiry into social justice, promoting models of inclusion, practicing from multiple perspectives, ensuring that schools are safe places, and integrating teacher preparation in special education and general education. Faculty have several publications (Exhibit 5.3 Samples of faculty scholarly activities) relating to diverse issues such as:

* *Writing strategies for inclusive classrooms*
* *Educating everyone: The challenge of diversity*
* *Diversity and young adolescents: More than color*
* *Learning through service in a global context: The Malawi study abroad*
* *Making safe places work*
* *Rural rehabilitative services provided via technology to individuals living with brain injury*
* *Children of the coal fields: Neuropsychological consequences*
* *Transition success through co-teaching and collaboration*
* *Operationalizing culturally relevant pedagogy: A synthesis of classroom based research*
* *Different families, different dancers: Helping children of substance abusers*
* *Investigating an infused approach to diversity in pre-service teacher education*

Increased emphasis upon service-learning, cross-cultural and international experiences

The college and the university have as part of their strategic plan moved to increase opportunities for service learning and international experiences for faculty and students. As examples, faculty in education have presented art shows in Shanghai University, China; masters classes to Russian choral conductors at conservatories and pedagogical universities in Ryazan, Izhevsk, and Ekaterinburg, as well as the United Kingdom; studied education systems and presented to the Thai Ministry of Education and the university community of King Mongkhut School of Tech Thonburi in Bangkok, Thailand; presented to the College Music Society International Conference in Seoul, South Korea; worked with a village and with its schools in Malawi to increase resources in literacy education; and participated in the Peace Studies program in Costa Rica (Exhibit 5.1 Faculty Information Chart). The college, through the work of the Advising Center, STEL, and the Office of International Programs, has made cross-cultural experiences a part of all early recruitment and orientation programs for students and families and has held an annual CEHD International Night where students can learn how to pursue study abroad experiences; the college has actively pursued “piggy-back” projects by collaborating with already established study abroad programs to provide additional support, including having CEHD faculty teach in programs; and the college has sought additional research and foundation funding to support faculty and students pursuing cross-cultural experiences. Several faculty across the university have established service learning opportunities for students, including the “alternative spring break.” The Appalachian Studies Center has recently received university approval to move to CEHD, and will bring additional interdisciplinary opportunities to inquire into the impact of culture, language, SES, and other diversity issues upon schooling. Several faculty members in the center have published widely on the connections between community, environment, politics, and schooling.

Enhancing clinical experiences through faculty assignments and clinical faculty training and support

The unit has made a commitment to ensure all internships are supervised by full time tenure-track faculty and to increase the number of placements in partner schools. Nearly all faculty supervisors are now tenure-track faculty and in many cases these faculty are program leaders who have the opportunity to observe the performance of candidates throughout their progress in the program. All of the university faculty supervisors have had extensive PK-12 experience in the schools. As of Fall 2008, all early childhood/early childhood special education, elementary education, and middle school education candidates and some secondary education candidates were placed in partner schools. As of Fall of 2009, school faculty (cooperating professionals) are required to complete Clinical Faculty workshops in order to serve as cooperating teachers/mentors for PK-12 interns and student teachers (Exhibit 5.2 Clinical faculty qualifications, roles, and responsibilities).

Faculty assessment of candidate performance and of programs

The responsibilities of individual faculty members in candidate and performance assessment have grown considerably since the last review. This has been even more challenging and often frustrating due to the adoption of a new “pilot” data management system requiring extensive involvement of faculty in designing the “shell” for program assessment which often involved more than a hundred data points, identifying course and program rosters each semester, entering evaluation tools and rubrics into the system, entering and checking data, etc. Most of the faculty development workshops for the Professional Preparation Program (PPP) Faculty and for PPP Key Faculty Contacts (program liaisons) over the past seven years have focused on increasing knowledge, skills, and practice in candidate and program assessment. Faculty have invested extensive time and labor in aligning courses, field experiences, and assessments with national, state, and unit standards; ensuring evaluation tools described behavioral indicators for differentiating performance levels; administering assessments and entering data; conducting studies to establish fairness, accuracy and consistency for the assessments; and compiling, reporting, reviewing data and using assessment results to improve candidate performance and programs and unit operations. Education faculty were “ahead of the curve” since most programs now at the university must develop and implement similar systems for assessing student learning and programs for SACS.

3. Exhibit Links

|  |
| --- |
| **Exhibits** |
| 1. ***Exhibit 5.1 Faculty Information*** |
| 1. ***Exhibit 5.2 Clinical faculty qualifications, roles, and responsibilities***. |
| 1. ***Exhibit 5.3 Examples of faculty scholarly and professional activities*** |
| 1. ***Exhibit 5.4 Summary of service and collaborative activities*** |
| 1. ***Exhibit 5.5 CEHD Faculty Review Policies and Procedures*** |
| 1. ***Exhibit 5.6 Faculty evaluation forms and summaries*** |
| 1. ***Exhibit 5.7 Sample professional development opportunities*** |

**G. STANDARD 6: UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES**

**G. 1 Narrative**

**Unit Leadership and Authority**

The University as a whole honors its history as a teacher training institution and continues to be committed to preparing highly qualified school professionals and to serving P-12 schools as part of its mission. Because Radford University is a teaching institution, it attracts pedagogues, and several faculty and departments across the university are very involved in professional education programs within the university and in projects serving the schools. The governance system has been developed to ensure that we can maximize the opportunities for communication and collaboration among university and P-12 colleagues.

The Professional Education Committee (PEC) is the major internal governance committee for coordinating programs and policies and procedures regarding the preparation of PK-12 educators. The Dean of the College of Education and Human Development chairs the PEC. The PEC has wide representation from across the university and is the only university standing committee with external representatives. The PEC includes representatives from arts, sciences, humanities; PK-12 teachers and administrators; the College Advising Coordinator; the Director of College Assessment; and faculty and students from graduate and undergraduate professional education programs. The PEC has subcommittees on curriculum and student appeals and has established various ad hoc committees to address such topics as cultural competency, preparing candidates in parental/family engagement and studying candidate impact on student learning. This governance structure, which complements other university internal governance structures, allows for continual review of curriculum and policies and procedures related to professional education and serves as an advisory board and collaborative “think tank” for continuous improvement.

The College has established structures which are not part of internal governance but which play an integral part in governance and development of policies, procedures, and programs. The Professional Preparation Program Faculty (faculty who teach and supervise in P-12 professional programs) and the key Program Liaisons meet at least once a semester as a group to deliberate and make recommendations regarding policies and procedures. They also meet frequently on an individual basis with the Dean, Associate Dean, and Director of College Assessment in carrying out responsibilities for candidate and program development and improvement. Individual programs have established PK-12 advisory boards which collaborate with university faculty in implementing, evaluating, and refining programs and clinical experiences.

**Unit Budget**

Over the past few years, the state E&G funding for the university has been reduced by 35%. The university managed the reductions without having to eliminate current positions or programs, though we did implement several work transition options for faculty and staff which lead to reductions in faculty and staff positions which remain unfilled. The unit receives sufficient resources from university budget allocations and from external funding to support faculty in teaching, scholarship, and service. The college’s total budget has increased since 2009 from $6,085,751 to $6,709,178 in 2010 and $6,927,109 in 2011. However, the college adopted two additional departments in 2010: Foods and Nutrition and Recreation, Parks and Tourism. The college received $3,209,895 from external funding for 2009-2010, which is a slight drop from the average of $3,395,957 over the past three years. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, the university allocates $60,000 to support faculty research in the college each year and also provides $900 to each department for each faculty member for professional travel. The College of Graduate and Professional Studies also assigns approximately 13 graduate assistants (G.A.’s) ($104,000) to STEL; eight or nine G.A.’s to Counselor Education, four of whom are assigned as graduate advisors to the Center for Academic Advising and Student Support ($72,000). The graduate assistants have provided excellent support to faculty in their teaching and research. In comparison to other units, the unit is adequately funded. One of the budgetary issues facing the university as a whole is salary compression and inversion. Since the university adopted a new peer group three years ago, and because of the lack of faculty raises for the past four years, approximately 25% of faculty salaries fall below the 10th percentile of the new peer group. The President, CFO, Provost, Board of Visitors, and the Deans have made resolving these inequities a top priority.

Support for technology, assessment, and professional development

The unit is a leader on campus and in the community in exploring the cutting edge of instructional technologies for P-12 and postsecondary education. Faculty and the administration have been aggressive in seeking resources to support exemplary practice for faculty and candidates. The unit has invested its own resources in ensuring that our candidates have instructional technology available in schools. The college has been able to purchase many high-end systems which drives up the level of faculty and candidates’ use of technological applications in their disciplines. The Technology Coordinator and others have worked with faculty and administrators in data management systems and other applications which are being adopted across the university (e.g., on-line advising notes; on-line Faculty Annual Report; data management systems for documenting students’ participation in out-of-class assignments). Dr. Matt Dunleavy and his students in the Games Lab have been major contributors at state, national, and international levels toward new applications of hand-held devices in education.

Faculty in the unit have also been first-generation adopters of distributed education at Radford, with the first fully on-line programs (Library Media and Educational Leadership) and with many of the college’s faculty participating in the training and implementation of on-line courses early on in the development process at RU. Through faculty involvement in delivering high-need, low enrollment preparation in special education with other state institutions, we have helped refine the support for on-line education at Radford. Resources for distributed education exist at the university level. The university provides support for establishing off-campus sites, installing necessary equipment, and for technology assistance needed during course delivery. After an early period of experiencing issues with connectivity, most course delivery has been very smooth and reliable over the past five or more years. (See *Exhibit 6.12 Resources for distance education*.)

The university provides $900 per full time teaching faculty member for professional development. In addition, several grants provide additional funding to support professional travel and faculty development. The departments are able to fully or partially support all of the faculty requests for professional travel. The university also provides extensive faculty development opportunities in instructional technology, teaching, and grant writing through the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning, the Faculty Development Center, and the College of Graduate and Professional Studies. The college and its offices and departments provide workshops for faculty on developing program assessment systems; aligning assessments with national and state standards; establishing fairness, accuracy and consistency; student advising and using Advising Notes; and technology workshops. The college’s Mind, Body, Spirit Committee scheduled several “self-care” and wellness experiences across the year and conducted a 2-day institute with Linda Lantieri on social emotional learning.

The college was able to hire a Director for College Assessment in 2005. The Dean receives a stand-along budget for accreditation and program approval efforts (~$8,000-$10,000 per year). The university has provided funding to acquire and retain the services of Educational Informatics to implement the rGrade system, purchase licenses, and maintain technological support (approximately $70,000 for four years). At various times, the university and the college has provided stipends for faculty who are working on program assessments ($500 - $3,000).

Additional information can be found in *Exhibit 6.6 Budget and Resources for assessment, technology and professional development.*

Unit Personnel

Faculty workloads allow faculty to be engaged in professional activities, teaching, scholarship, assessment, advising, and work in the schools. The CEHD Leadership Team has not codified a set of policies regarding assigning faculty workloads, but we began exploring various models, including differentiated staffing models in 2009. At this time, the CEHD leadership has a description of workload assignment practices, including supervision (Exhibit 6.8 CEHD Description of workload assignment).

The unit has taken several steps to include clinical faculty as colleagues and “expert” resources in implementing, evaluating, and refining clinical preparation. Clinical faculty are part of the “clinical team,”---the intern, university supervisor, and cooperating professional work together to plan the internship and to continuously evaluate progress. The work of the SWVA Professional Education Consortium, involving four universities and 11 school divisions and over 1800 clinical faculty has engaged clinical faculty in developing training and support programs for clinical faculty built upon their experiences of “best practices.” Most RU programs have established advisory boards comprised of clinical faculty. University supervisors meet with the advisory boards at least once a year to discuss what went well, what issues emerged, and next steps for improvement. The unit has also established a Task Force on the Improvement of Field Experiences and Clinical Faculty with P-12 and university representatives from all programs. The Task Force is in the process of finalizing goals and developing action plans for the continuous improvement initiative for Standard III. The unit also has involved clinical faculty in several grants and service projects.

Unit Facilities

The college moved into Peters Hall in 2003. The classroomswere outfitted with the most advanced instructional technology and this has been upgraded on a regular basis every three-four years. Several rooms have polycom equipment for distance delivery. Peters Hall includes 11 classrooms, a computer room, the Educational Innovation Lab and Games Lab, the Teaching Resources Center, the Center for Academic Advising and Student Support, Counseling labs, faculty offices and departmental conference rooms, a gym, and several activity and lab spaces for exercise, sport, and health education. Other classrooms used by faculty across campus have similar technological support. As mentioned above, the support for on-line and distributed education courses and programs is equal to or exceeds the support at other professional education units in the state.

**2b. Continuous Improvement**

Major changes at the university level that have impacted the unit since the last visit are:

* Continuous reductions in state E & G funding which required budget reversions in some years and budget reductions in other years (overall 35% reduction in E&G funding to the University since 2003); overall budgets increased for the college but we also inherited two departments (Foods and Nutrition and Recreation, Parks, and Tourism);
* Changes in upper administrative structure, in positions/roles, and in individuals filling upper administrative positions;
* Hiring of faculty and staff has been either frozen or extremely limited university-wide, 2006-2010;
* Faculty professional development was eliminated and then replaced as part of the regular departmental budgets ($900 per capita) in 2010-2011;
* $500,000 for faculty research was added to university and departmental budgets;
* Most recently, major progress has been made toward melding university/college/departmental/program goals and initiatives with strategic planning and budget planning at the university level;
* Academic Affairs (the Provost and the Deans’ Council) haas become much more directly involved in determining strategic planning and direction for the university.

The College of Education and Human Development’s response to reductions in state funding have been:

* Reducing non-personnel services by 25%-40%
* Increasing office efficiencies
* Seeking additional external funding
* Not replacing all vacated faculty positions (reinstated for 2010-2011)
* Eliminating or reducing professional travel in the dean’s office 2007-2009 (reinstated 2010-2011)

The most significant changes related to governance and resources for the unit that have led to continuous improvement are:

* Renovating Peters Hall and bringing all academic and resource divisions for the College of Education and Human Development “under one roof” in 2003;
* Establishing the School of Teacher Education and Leadership (combining the former Departments of Educational Studies and Special Education in 2006;
* Further development of the Partner Schools project, which culminated in all elementary and middle school students being placed in Partner Schools for their full-year internship and professional studies programs beginning Fall 2008.
* Implementation of the “MERGE” grant which is seeking to integrate curriculum and clinical experiences for general education teachers and special education teachers beginning 2009.

Since 2005, the College has received university resources to support a Director of College Assessment, a full time Assistant Director of Advising, a full-time Associate Dean (hired 5/25/2011), a Technology Assistant in the Teaching Resources Center, and an additional .5 administrative assistant for the School of Teacher Education Leadership and an additional .5 administrative assistant for the Department of Exercise, Sport and Health Education.

Faculty in the College continue to do well in accessing external funding for: tuition support for students in high-need professional development programs; developing new instructional technologies to help students and teachers increase student engagement and learning in PK-12 schools; collaborative projects to promote literacy learning.

The two departments with graduate programs, STEL and COED began in 2009 to explore ways to reduce teaching assignments for faculty teaching full-time or part-time in graduate programs. This is also a budget initiative developed by Dr. Dennis Grady, Dean of the College of Graduate and Professional Studies, which has been adopted by the deans as a top priority in the 5-7 year budget plan for Academic Affairs.

As mentioned above, a key shift has occurred over the past two years in that we have instituted procedures which more directly link departmental and college initiatives with budget planning within Academic Affairs and the university. The departments and school and the CEHD Leadership Team has established 5-7 year plans for initiatives and for personnel and non-personnel budgets. The Deans’ Council used the college plans to develop a 6-year plan for Academic Affairs. The university will submit its plan to the State Council of Higher Education in July, 2011.

3. Exhibit Links

|  |
| --- |
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| 1. ***Exhibit 6.6. Unit budget*** |
| 1. ***Exhibit 6.7 Budgets of comparable units*** |
| 1. ***Exhibit 6.8 Faculty workload descriptions*** |
| 1. ***Exhibit 6.9 Summary of faculty workloads*** |
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| 1. ***Exhibit 6.12 Description of resources for distance learning*** |