



The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

Brescia University
717 Frederica St.
Owensboro, KY 42301
February 14–17, 2016

Type of Visit:

Continuing Accreditation—State Only

Table of Contents

Overview..... 1
Standard 1.....11
Standard 2..... 36
Standard 3.....56
Standard 4.....76
Standard 5.....92
Standard 6.....133
Appendices
 Appendix A: Linked EDU Form Numbers and Titles.....151
 Appendix B: Source of Evidence.....152
 Appendix C: Areas for Improvement (AFI).....164

OVERVIEW

This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel.

A. Institution

A.1. What is the institution's historical context?

Brescia University originated in 1925 with Mount Saint Joseph Junior College for Women in Maple Mount, Ky., a teachers' college that provided both professional opportunities for women and qualified teachers for many area rural schools. Situated in rural western Daviess County, the College was approximately 15 miles from the nearby city of Owensboro. In 1920, less than half the county population lived in Owensboro, but by 1930 that statistic had reversed itself, with more than half the population living in the city. As the population continued to grow, the percentage of county residents living in Owensboro continued to rise. In response to this shifting population and requests from business and civic leaders, between 1925 and 1950 coeducational extension courses offered in Owensboro by the Ursuline Sisters of Mount Saint Joseph led to the creation of a second campus. After 1949, propelled by World War II veterans seeking higher education as a result of the GI Bill, the two campuses were consolidated at the present site of Brescia University. In 1950 Brescia College began operating as a four-year coeducational college and, in 1998, became Brescia University, an independently supported Catholic institution offering both undergraduate and graduate degrees. Still sponsored by the Ursuline Sisters of Mount Saint Joseph, Brescia strives to embody the educational and personal ideals of Ursuline founder, St. Angela Merici, a 16th-century Italian woman. Merici gathered women together for mutual spiritual support and to do good works as an expression of their love for God. Within a few decades this work became primarily that of education, first of young girls only, but eventually of all young people and adults. Across Europe and the United States (and eventually all over the world), "Ursuline" became synonymous with the highest quality of education, embodying a legacy of teaching and learning. [BU Catalog—History and Mission, p.7](#); [The Campaign for Brescia University publication p. 1](#); [Owensboro Messenger-Inquirer Brescia's Bright Future article](#)

A.2. What is the institution's mission?

Brescia University is a Catholic, liberal arts institution founded in the [Ursuline tradition](#) of personal and social transformation through education. Directed to academic and moral excellence in a student-centered environment, Brescia offers undergraduate and graduate programs that serve students who seek success through rewarding careers and service to others. Contained within this mission statement are four key areas, which are detailed below:

1. **CATHOLIC:** Brescia seeks to preserve and enrich the dialogue between faith and reason, respecting all faith traditions; promotes respect for the sacred, especially human dignity; and encourages growth in moral virtue. Brescia strives to embody Ursuline values and the Ursuline Educational Tradition, especially in emphasizing community, justice/care for others, attention to individual needs, and adaptability.
2. **LIBERAL ARTS:** A Brescia education shapes the whole person, encouraging an independent spirit, creative adaptability to change, and openness to lifelong learning.
3. **CAREER PREPARATION:** Brescia prepares students for careers through academic programs, advising, the liberal arts that enhance critical thinking and problem-solving skills, and a framework for ethical decision-making.

4. SERVICE TO OTHERS: Brescia invites students to find ways to serve others in their professional, personal, and social lives as part of their character development.

[\(BU Catalog – History and Mission, pp. 7–9; 2015–2020 Strategic Plan](#)

A.3. What are the institution's characteristics [e.g., control (e.g., public or private) and type of institution such as private, land grant, or HBI; location (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban area)]?

Brescia University is a Catholic private liberal arts college owned and operated by the University's Board of Trustees. Initially founded in rural Daviess County, Ky., the school moved to the city of Owensboro in 1950. However, it continues to serve large rural populations in several surrounding counties and beyond this immediate geographic region. Brescia University is situated on nine acres in the heart of downtown Owensboro, Kentucky. Among the facilities on campus can be found a well-equipped science building with newly renovated labs; a campus center that houses dining, study, and recreational facilities; a chapel; an administration building that houses offices and classrooms; a welcoming library ideal for group or independent study and research; and apartment-style residential housing accommodations. The campus arts facilities include the 57-seat Little Theatre, the Anna Eaton Stout Gallery, a ceramics lab, art studios, and music rooms. Recreational facilities include a gymnasium, racquetball court, weight room, aerobics room, walking track, and tennis courts. Various other offices, small classrooms, and meeting spaces are located in other formerly-residential buildings on campus. Student gathering areas abound on campus and University buildings are accessible to persons with disabilities. Kamuf Park, a newly developed sports complex, is located approximately five miles from Brescia's campus and serves as a home field for the baseball, softball, and soccer teams.

A.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the institutional context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

[BU Catalog-History and Mission, p.7,](#)

[The Campaign for Brescia University publication p. 1,](#)

[Owensboro Messenger-Inquirer Brescia's Bright Future article](#)

[BU Catalog – History and Mission, pp. 7–9,](#)

[2015–2020 Strategic Plan, approved by Board of Trustees, 06-26-2015\)](#)

B. The unit

B.1. What is the professional education unit at your institution and what is its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators?

The professional education unit at Brescia University is the School of Education (SOE), one of six units within Brescia's academic structure alongside the School of Business and the Divisions of Fine Arts, Humanities, Mathematics/Natural Sciences, and Social/Behavioral Sciences. The SOE unit includes 10 initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate level: IECE; Elementary; Middle School; Special Education plus Elementary or Middle School; P–12 Art Education; P–12 Spanish Education; and Secondary 8–12 in the content areas of Biology, English, Mathematics, and Social Studies. At the graduate and/or advanced level, the SOE offers a Master of Science in Teacher Leadership, a Teacher Leader Endorsement, and a P–12 ESL Endorsement. The SOE collaborates with University faculty across the curriculum in General Education courses, and especially with the English, Science, and Mathematics faculty for teacher education candidate content areas. The SOE also works with the Fine Arts Division for Art Education, with the Humanities Division for both the P–12 English and P–12 Spanish Education majors, and with the Mathematics and Natural Sciences Division for the Secondary 8–12 Biology and 8–12 Mathematics majors. These cross-campus partners

have division representatives who serve on the Teacher Education Advisor Committee, which sets School of Education Policy and approves students for Admission into the SOE and candidates for Admission to Clinical Practice. Each Division provides input regarding alignment of course offerings with Teacher Ed competencies in SPAs and KCAS.

B.2. How many professional education faculty members support the professional education unit? Please complete Table 1 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

**Table 1
Professional Education Faculty**

Professional Education Faculty	Full-Time in the Unit	Full-Time in the Institution, but Part-Time in the Unit	Part-Time at the Institution and the Unit (e.g., Adjunct Faculty)	Graduate Teaching Assistants Teaching or Supervising Clinical Practice	Total # of Professional Education Faculty
Number of Faculty	4	32	13	0	49

B.3. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare candidates for their first license to teach? Please complete Table 2 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

**Table 2
Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status**

Program	Award Level (e.g., Bachelor's or Master's)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. of Regents)	Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)	State Approval Status (e.g., Approved or Provisional)	Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE
IECE Birth–5	Bachelor's	1	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A
Elementary P–5	Bachelor's	18	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A
*Middle School English 5–9	Bachelor's	1	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A
*Middle School Mathematics 5–9	Bachelor's	5	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A
*Middle School Science 5–9	Bachelor's	1	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A
*Middle School Social Studies 5–9	Bachelor's	0	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A

Biology 8–12	Bachelor's	3	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A
English 8–12	Bachelor's	2	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A
Mathematics 8–12	Bachelor's	1	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A
Social Studies 8–12	Bachelor's	0	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A
**Special Education: LBD P–12	Bachelor's	7	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A
P–12 Art Education	Bachelor's	0	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A
P–12 Spanish Education	Bachelor's	1	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A

***NOTE: Candidates earning Middle School degree have an emphasis in two content areas.**

****NOTE: Candidates earning Special Education: LBD degree earn dual certification with either Elementary or Middle School Education.**

B.4. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals? Please complete Table 3 or upload your own table at Prompt B.7 below.

**Table 3
Advanced Preparation Programs and Their Review Status**

Program	Award Level (e.g., Bachelor's or Master's)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs (e.g., State, NAEYC, or Bd. Of Regents)	Program Report Submitted for National Review (Yes/No)	State Approval Status (e.g., Approved or Provisional)	Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE
Teacher Leadership	Master's	10	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A
Teacher Leader Endorsement	Master's Advanced	0	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A
ESL P–12 Endorsement	Post Bachelor's	3	EPSB of Kentucky	No	Approved	N/A

B.5. Which of the above initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are offered? [In addition to this response, please review the "Institutional Information" in AIMS and, if updating is needed, contact NCATE with details about these programs.]

No program is offered in an off-campus format and none is fully online. However, to meet both student need and demand, some of the Master of Science in Teacher Leadership (MSTL) courses are offered online and some offered on-ground. Currently, all but these three MSTL courses are offered online:

- EDL 600 Leadership Seminar
- EDL 650 Effective Practices for Coaching and Mentoring
- MTH 513 Mathematical Models and Methods

In collaboration with online service-provider Learning House (LH), the SOE offers other MSTL courses online, with a weekly mandatory synchronous video chat, discussion questions, and assignments that fit the SOE Conceptual Framework as well as motivate and engage students.

B.6. (Continuing Visit Only) What substantive changes have taken place in the unit since the last visit (e.g., added/dropped programs/degrees; significant increase/decrease in enrollment; major reorganization of the unit, etc.)? [These changes could be compiled from those reported in Part C of the AACTE/NCATE annual reports since the last visit.]

The following changes have occurred within the current accreditation cycle:

1. Responding to state directives to redesign master's programs in education, Brescia's Master of Science in Curriculum and Instruction (MSCI) was eliminated and the Master of Science in Teacher Leadership degree was created and approved in 2011. (See [BU Catalog](#) MSTL description, pp. 197–202.) Though the program began in 2011 with two candidates admitted in Spring 2011, enrollment numbers have not yet returned to MSCI levels, in part because of increasing demand for online programs already available elsewhere in the state.
2. Since 2011, the newly-approved MSTL program has itself undergone some changes. MSTL candidates admitted beginning in fall 2014 are now required to take the technology (EDL 530) and diversity (EDL 655) courses (see [Y1](#): MSTL program Change Proposal); these courses had previously been optional choices for electives. The curriculum change was approved by the School of Education (see [Y2](#): Minutes School of Education Approval of MSTL curriculum change) and Brescia University's Curriculum Committee (see [Y3](#): Minutes of Curriculum Committee Approval of MSTL Program Change).
3. In June 2012, a 13-credit-hour post-baccalaureate Endorsement in ESL was approved. This program, consisting of five courses, better prepares teacher education candidates to serve a more diverse student population in numerous school systems. Courses that make up this Endorsement include a) Eng. 306: Linguistics; b) Edu 401: Language and Culture; c) Edu 402: Acquisition and Skill Set for Teaching ESL Students; d) Edu 403: Methods and Materials Teaching P–12 ESL Students; and e) Edu 404: Practicum.

B.7. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit context may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

[BU Catalog](#) MSTL description, pp. 197–202

[Y1: MSTL Program Change Proposal](#)

[Y2: Minutes School of Education Approval of MSTL curriculum change](#)

[Y3: Minutes of Curriculum Committee Approval of MSTL Program Change](#)

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This section provides an overview of the unit's conceptual framework(s). The overview should include a brief description of the framework(s) and its development.

C.1. How does the unit's conceptual framework address the following structural elements? [Please provide a summary here. A more complete description of the conceptual framework should be available as an electronic exhibit.]

- the vision and mission of the unit
- philosophy, purposes, goals, and institutional standards of the unit
- knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and educational policies that drive the work of the unit
- candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, including proficiencies associated with diversity and technology, that are aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards
- summarized description of the unit's assessment system

VISION AND MISSION

The Conceptual Framework, which provides the vision and direction for the SOE, is as follows: *Brescia University School of Education candidates are challenged to become professional educators committed to ethics, advocacy, service, and lifelong learning.* In other words, the School of Education strives to graduate professional educators proficient in the necessary content and pedagogical knowledge and skills who also demonstrate dispositions of ethics, advocacy, service, and lifelong learning. (See [Conceptual Framework](#), pp 16–17: SOE Philosophy and Purposes)

The [image](#) used to depict this vision is that of a teacher candidate as a home — a professional educator — rising on the foundation or “floor” of academic content and pedagogical knowledge and skills demonstrated by the various proficiencies articulated in all relevant teacher standards, whether they be those of the KTS, appropriate SPAs, or EPSB themes. Rising from this knowledge-and-skills foundation are the dispositional pillars of ethics, advocacy, service, and lifelong learning that help create the uniquely “Brescian” education major. This “home” of the professional educator — the overall outcome of the SOE — like all other majors offered at the University, rises from the soil of Brescia’s Educational Outcomes and the University mission, and is entered by means of the four steps of “the Brescia Difference.” Upon completion of the degree, symbolized by the arched window at the image’s top, Brescia’s SOE graduates leave as career-ready “Professional Educators,” entering their teaching careers through that archway. Though not depicted, the image of a home carries implicit connections to others: neighbors, colleagues, and the larger society within which the professional educator will live and work. Both the collaboration required in a neighborhood community and the diversity of residents and workers within modern neighborhoods give additional depth to the image. Finally, the need for continuous assessment — especially in identifying problems and finding solutions — ensures that the “home” of the professional educator will not only endure but also increase in value both to the educator and to the entire network of relationships implied in the image.

The same image functions as a symbol of the graduate program with two slightly different nuances: The University Educational Outcomes are less explicit in the master’s program (MSTL), though they remain part of the expectations of a Brescia graduate at whatever level the degree is granted. Secondly, the Kentucky Teacher Standards target the “Advanced” rather than the “Initial” level of proficiency. Regardless of the level, both remain the foundation stones of the structure upon which the professional educator builds the appropriate level of competence.

PHILOSOPHY

The philosophy of the SOE reflects the Ursuline heritage of teaching and learning. (See “Ursuline Educational Tradition” in [BU Catalog](#), p. 9.) Ursuline founder St. Angela Merici and her philosophy of and approach to the mission of education have been explored by Ledochowska and Mahoney (1967). Ursuline ideals birthed a system of education that provides much of the pedagogical knowledge base in Ursuline institutions (Martin, 1946). Furthermore, the Brescia University SOE content and delivery modes of professional course work, as well as the direction of the master’s teacher leader program, are all based on other peer-reviewed research. Likewise, the knowledge bases are informed by scholarly research as well as by the University’s Educational Outcomes, its religious tradition, and the content or emphasis areas.

UNIT KNOWLEDGE BASES and CANDIDATE PROFICIENCIES

Because of their focus on meeting individual needs within specific contexts — which is at the heart of Ursuline education — the work of Lev Vygotsky and Howard Gardner undergirds Brescia’s SOE teaching philosophy. From Vygotsky (1978) SOE faculty understand that the human mind is known within the context of the surrounding society, that students learn best in an active teaching/learning relationship with others who help them move beyond their current level. Gardner’s theory of Multiple Intelligences (1993) is embedded in the SOE’s focus on the unique learning needs of individual students, attending to their linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, naturalist, and existential development. Rooted in these philosophical foundations the SOE has developed five inter-related goals for the Unit as its Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):

1. Candidates apply Content, Professional, and Pedagogical Knowledge to develop student knowledge and performance.
2. Candidates apply Technology to positively impact P–12 student performance.
3. Candidates Assess P–12 student learning and communicate learning results to partners.
4. Candidates demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to Diverse student performance.
5. Candidates demonstrate Professional Dispositions of Ethics, Advocacy, Service, and Lifelong Learning.

These goals provide an umbrella under which related outcomes and proficiencies are assessed.

1. Candidates apply Content, Professional, and Pedagogical Knowledge to develop student knowledge and performance.

The Unit Assessment system integrates several sets of professional standards, including KTS, SPAs, and Institutional Education Outcomes ([BU Catalog](#), p. 41) and the [2015–2020 Strategic Plan](#), all of which address Content, Professional, and Pedagogical knowledge and skill development. To track and assess candidate progress, the Unit utilizes multiple assessments that include formative and summative assessments and Signature Assignments with Related Assessments, all of which occur at specific levels.

The undergraduate program assesses knowledge acquisition and skill development at four Levels: the Application to the School of Education; Completion of Course Work and Field; Application to Clinical Practice, and Completion of Clinical Practice. The Data Manager enters the data from these assessments each semester. Data are used to generate reports on individual candidate performance based on Application to School of Education and Application to Clinical Practice criteria. These data are reviewed during the Fall, Spring, and sometimes Summer by the faculty, Sub-TEAC (SOE full-time faculty), TEAC, and cross-campus partners who serve on the TEAC. Data are also reviewed by the Unit and Programs annually at the opening of each school year in order to complete annual University assessment grids that document data and provide a summary of changes/improvements to be made in the next academic year based on analysis of assessment results. Throughout the year, the Unit has “data days” to review data, evaluate and develop forms, and make recommendations.

The systems used in data management from 2011–2014 included Access, Excel spreadsheets, and pivot tables. Data are stored on the shared “I” drive of the University’s server to allow faculty access. Hard copies of some forms are kept in candidates’ files housed in the Data Manager’s office. Since the beginning of 2014–2015, SOE has used Taskstream as its data collection/assessment software program. Taskstream has already begun to facilitate access for data alignment, collection, and collating information about candidate progress toward degree completion.

Brescia University has three advanced programs namely: English as a Second Language (ESL) Endorsement for primary through 12th grades; a Master of Science in Teacher Leadership (MSTL); and the Teacher Leader (TL) Endorsement. The ESL P–12 endorsement is accessible via concurrent enrollment to Initial-Level candidates; however, the candidates are assessed with Advanced-Level KTS and are only eligible to apply for an addition of the endorsement after successfully obtaining a baccalaureate degree in an approved teacher certification program and a teaching license. Those already holding a license also enroll in the same five course sequence.

Both MSTL and TL candidates find inspiration and guidance from contemporary professional research. MSTL candidates receive education to extend their content knowledge, skills, and dispositions throughout their graduate program. “Teacher leaders are educators who use their expertise to improve student learning by working outside the classroom in formal and informal ways to augment the professional skills of colleagues, to strengthen the culture of the school, and to improve the quality of instruction” (Five-State Leadership Consortium [2009]. *Teacher Leadership*, p. IV). MSTL candidates’ research papers and assignments are based on current research, professional best practice, Kentucky Teacher Standards; Kentucky Academic Core Standards (KACS); and the College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Listening. In courses where lesson plans are being designed, candidates are required to use the SPA standards of their various content areas.

Assessment of Content, Professional, and Pedagogical knowledge and skill development in advanced programs occurs through use of Signature Assignments and Related Assessments in each course, plus assessment of field experiences and Practicum; candidate portfolios must use KCAS/KYECS, KTS Advanced level, and TESOL standards. However, at Brescia University the ESL (P–12) Endorsement is only available via the undergraduate curriculum. ESL (P–12) candidates enroll in undergraduate courses and are therefore assessed with the undergraduate assessment plan.

2. Candidates apply Technology to positively impact P–12 student performance.

SOE undergraduate candidates are expected to apply technology skills and knowledge in their own work. They are also expected to facilitate P–12 student learning through student use of technology.

SOE undergraduate candidates demonstrate technology proficiency through successful completion of Edu 246: Technology Application and Integration in Education as measured by a signature assignment. Candidates also demonstrate their technology proficiency in SOE coursework, KTIP lesson plans, and portfolio presentations for admission to Clinical Practice (CP) and exit from program. Technology proficiency is evaluated by cooperating teachers and Brescia faculty supervisors in both the Practicum and in Clinical Practice. (See [Conceptual Framework](#), pp. 28–29, 48.)

Candidates in the English as a Second Language (ESL) Endorsement for primary through 12th grades are required to take the Edu 246 to fulfil the technology requirements for the undergraduate program. MSTL candidates explore and use instructional media to design and implement technology-integrated lessons in their classrooms to further enhance technology skills in EDL 530 (see signature assignment [Integrated Technology Lesson and Rubric](#)). Technology is integrated throughout the MSTL courses

and the *Technology for Teacher Leaders* (EDL 530) is a required course. Post-baccalaureate candidates pursuing only the TL Endorsement also explore and use instructional media to design and implement technology-integrated lessons in their classrooms to further enhance technology skills within the course-embedded assignments of the four required courses for this endorsement.

3. Candidates apply content, professional, and pedagogical knowledge to develop student knowledge and performance.

SOE professional educators not only master content knowledge but also demonstrate proficiency in various teaching skills including lesson plan preparation; classroom organization and management; student assessment; various professional behaviors; and the interpersonal skills needed to relate positively with students, colleagues, administrators, parents, and local communities. Candidates are evaluated on their skills proficiency at each of the four Levels in their major for the undergraduate programs and three transitional points for the MSTL graduate program. Standards used for these evaluations are based on KTS, relevant national and SPA standards, and SOE program-specific requirements. To enhance skill development, the “wisdom of practice” has guided the SOE to increase the number of field hours required in various education degrees and to add a 50-hour pre-clinical-practice practicum to all programs. (See [Conceptual Framework](#), p. 60: Table #2 Integration of Conceptual Framework.)

4. Candidates demonstrate satisfactory growth in Professional Dispositions of Ethics, Advocacy, Service, and Lifelong Learning to positively impact P–12 student performance.

Brescia SOE professional educators will not only be proficient in content/pedagogical knowledge and skills but also be committed to the following four dispositions:

A. Ethics: The SOE considers student moral development essential. Candidates learn the ethical requirements of the teaching profession, including the ethical use of technology. They assume responsibility for treating students, colleagues, parents, and others with respect; they demonstrate mindfulness of diverse needs and are fair and confidential in their assessment of student learning; and they take seriously the need to assess their own performance and plan ongoing professional development. In addition, ethics for an SOE professional educator guides the process of research.

B. Advocacy: Roberts and Siegle (2012) insist that teachers become better advocates for students. SOE candidates learn from coursework and extracurricular activities what kinds of advocacy are needed and the processes or agencies to accomplish it. Candidates attend to very different individual needs as they design, plan, implement, and assess instruction in classrooms with diverse populations, including appropriate use of technology. In assessing both student learning and their own teaching practice, candidates are also attentive to issues of Literacy and Reading as well as Closing the Gap in P–12 student learning. As they discover needs, they collaborate with students, parents, colleagues, school/community officials, and other agencies to ensure improvements are made. In this way, they become effective advocates for their students’ diverse needs.

C. Service: McNeal (2000) claims that effective leaders reveal “servant attitudes.” SOE professional educators are aware of service needs and opportunities within the local school and community, and they give evidence that they view their work itself as a service. In the opportunities available through the SOE and its partner schools, candidates provide books, tutoring, and other services to area elementary, middle and high school students. As they research local needs and ways to address them, every candidate must define, implement, and assess a leadership project where they display leadership in their schools and communities. In this way they practice the SOE belief that teaching itself is a service.

D. Lifelong Learning: Thomas and Brown (2011) claim that a “lifelong ability to learn has given human beings all kinds of evolutionary advantages over other animals. It is our killer app.” This SOE disposition of attention to lifelong learning not only prepares initial teachers well but also serves to keep teachers current in their content areas, in the ever-changing world of technology, in the diverse needs of various student populations (as the ethnic and cultural character of the country continues to

grow), in the ever-deepening understanding of pedagogical theory and practice, and in current research. Research activities and use of research is required in many upper-division undergraduate courses. Research is so central to the MSTL that the “wisdom of practice” resulted in expanding the research class into two courses to allow candidates additional time for their Action Research Projects. Regular professional reading provides both initial and advanced candidates with differing points of view within the profession and encourages further reading and discussion. In their commitment to lifelong learning, candidates assume personal responsibility, but also collaborate with others to become ever more proficient professional educators. (See [Conceptual Framework](#), pp. 33–44, 60–66: Dispositions)

5. Candidates demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity to positively impact student performance.

The heart of the Brescia Ursuline teaching tradition is to treat each student as a unique individual, meeting them where they are and addressing their needs accordingly. (See Table [Alignment of Diversity with Ursuline Values](#).) The University considers diversity a key value, as evident throughout the [2015–2020 Strategic Plan](#). According to the third of four University Educational Outcomes, Brescia graduates are expected to “possess the capacity to adapt to diverse environments.” All courses in the curriculum and all facet of the co-curriculum together support all four educational outcomes ([BU Catalog](#), p. 41) As an integral part of the University, the SOE has always valued diversity and considers attention to diversity synonymous with the conceptual framework disposition of advocacy that it seeks to cultivate in teacher education candidates. The proficiencies related to diversity and advocacy that candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate are reflected in KTS and are embedded throughout the SOE programs:

- Plans for learning and cultural diversity
- Engages students at all levels
- Fosters a positive learning climate with effective classroom management
- Collaborates to design, implement, and support learning
- Assesses and analyzes results to meet diverse learning needs and situations
- Integrates technology to address diverse student

(See [Conceptual Framework](#), pp. 35–39: Diversity.)

As noted in the CF, candidates in Brescia’s MSTL bring the benefit of diverse educational experiences and cultural backgrounds. The MSTL has brought together candidates from inner city primary programs, suburban art classes, self-contained and resource special education settings, alternative school settings, regular education, and collaborative education in intermediate and middle grades, and a variety of rural poverty settings. The MSTL elective course on Multicultural and Diversity Issues in the Curriculum addresses diversity on multiple levels. The Master Teacher course provides participants with practical strategies for teaching in heterogeneous settings.

ASSESSMENT

Both formative and summative candidate assessments are done regularly to ensure appropriate progress in meeting college and career readiness standards, University proficiencies, and KTS and SPA standards. These assessments occur as candidates move through the four levels of their initial programs from Admission to the SOE, through their SOE professional coursework into Admission into Clinical Practice, and graduation. In the MSTL program, candidates are assessed at three levels: entry, mid-point, and completion. The Continuous Assessment Plan outlines criteria that must be met at each checkpoint for each of the levels and provides data for documenting candidate competence in content pedagogical knowledge and skills, technology, diversity, dispositions, and assessment for the Unit and programs. (See [Conceptual Framework](#), pp 68–75 and [Continuous Assessment Plan](#))

C.2. (Continuing Visits Only) What changes have been made to the conceptual framework since the last visit?

From the 2000 version (*Brescia University teacher education students are challenged to become ethical professionals committed to advocacy for their students and to instilling in their students a dedication to service for others and a thirst for knowledge*), through the 2008 slight alteration (*Brescia University SOE students are challenged to become ethical professionals committed to advocacy for their students and dedicated to instilling in their students a commitment to service for others and to lifelong learning*), to its September 2012 changed graphic symbol and further refinement: *Brescia University SOE candidates are challenged to become professional educators committed to ethics, advocacy, service, and lifelong learning*, focus groups of current students, SOE faculty, and SOE teacher education alumni have created, affirmed, revised, and implemented the Conceptual Framework (CF). The SOE's Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC) made additional suggestions that were incorporated into the graphic symbol. TEAC ratified the current version of the CF and its visual symbol on November 7, 2012. For well over a decade, both the mission of Brescia's teacher education program and its Conceptual Framework have demonstrated consistency and deepened its emphases and clarity.

In its current form, the CF retains the four dispositions: ethics, advocacy, service, and lifelong learning. However, in order to give greater emphasis to competency in the necessary academic content and pedagogical skill development, the CF has been reworded to include an overall "professional educator" element, which is then characterized by the four dispositions or attitudes, resulting in the uniquely Brescian teacher preparation candidate. To highlight the change, Brescia art professor David Stratton created a new graphic to show the relationship of the five elements of the CF more clearly. (See BU [CF Symbol](#).)

During a presentation to the October, 2015 Faculty Assembly, Father Larry, President of Brescia University requested the aspects of the Brescia Difference: Respect for the Sacred, Devotion to Learning, Commitment to Growth and Virtue, and Promotion of Servant Leadership be reorder as they appear on the "steps". His request was based on the practice that these aspects build in a sequential manner. The Conceptual Framework Model was redesigned to address this request.

C.3. (First Visits Only) How was the conceptual framework developed and who was involved in its development?

Not applicable

C.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the conceptual framework may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should attached.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution

offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1a.1. What are the pass rates of teacher candidates in initial teacher preparation programs on state tests of content knowledge for each program and across all programs (i.e., overall pass rate)? Please complete Table 4 or upload your own table at Prompt 1a.5 below. [This information could be compiled from Title II data submitted to the state or from program reports prepared for national review.]

Table 4
Pass Rates on Content Licensure Tests for Initial Teacher Preparation

For Period:

9/01/2011 — 8/31/2015

Program	Name of Licensure Test	# of Test Takers	% Passing State Licensure Test
IECE	Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education	1	100%
Elementary	Elem Ed: Content Knowledge (paper)	7	86%
	Elem Ed: MS Reading Lang Arts Subtest	12	100%
	Elem Ed: MS Mathematics Subtest	13	65%
	Elem Ed: MS Social Studies Subtest	13	84%
	Elem Ed: MS Science Subtest	13	77.5%
Middle School	English	1	100%
	Math	6	100%
	Science	2	100%
	Social Studies	0	NA
Secondary	English LLC: Content and Analysis	1	100%
	Math	1	0%
	Biology: Content Knowledge	2	100%
	5086 Social Studies: Content and Interpretation	0	NA
	0081 Social Studies: Content	1	100%
	0083 Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials	1	100%
Special Education	Content	11	91%
	Mild/Moderate	7	91.5%
Spanish P-12	World Language	2	50%

1a.2 (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from other key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]

The School of Education (SOE) has Key Assessments of Content Knowledge. These Content Knowledge assessments include candidate GPA; Clinical Practice (CP) Evaluations; Portfolios at Application to Clinical Practice and at the conclusion of CP; P-12 KTS 1: The Teacher Demonstrates Applied Content Knowledge; and Field Experience Evaluations. Data on each of these Key Assessments are provided here:

GPA:

[Table 1a.2.1](#) Average Overall GPA at Application to SOE was 3.43 for the Unit. The Overall Average GPA for each program were ≥ 3.0 , demonstrating solid content ability across all programs.

[Table 1a.2.2](#) Average Overall GPA at Application to CP was 3.53 for the Unit. The Overall Average GPA for each program were > 3.0 , demonstrating solid content knowledge.

Clinical Practice Observation Evaluations:

Clinical Practice (CP) bi-weekly ([Edu #12](#) CP Formative CT) and summative ([Edu #14](#) CP Final Evaluation CT) evaluations completed by Cooperating Teacher (CT) and a minimum of four (4) targeted observations ([Edu #13](#) CP Formative US) completed by University Supervisor (US) during placement provide content knowledge evidence. The exemplars aligned with KTS 1 include: *Communicates accurate knowledge of content; Oral/Written expression; Identifies (student's/own) misconceptions; Guides student understanding from various perspectives.* [Table 1a.2.3](#) – “Content Knowledge in Clinical Practice by CT and US Observations” – finds 100% of candidates perform ≥ 3.0 on 4 point scale for the Unit and Programs. This data shows candidates have strong content knowledge as evidenced during their clinical practice.

Portfolios:

Candidates’ portfolios at the point of Application to CP and summative of CP provide evidence of content knowledge by alignment with the KTS 1. [Table 1a.2.4a](#) – “Content Knowledge Evidence in Application to SOE and CP Portfolios KTS 1” – illustrates the content knowledge scores. ([Edu #24 A](#) TEAC Portfolio Preview, [Edu #25 A/B](#) CT Review of CP Portfolio, [Edu #29 A/B](#) US Review of CP Portfolio, [Edu #30](#) Portfolio Teacher Standards Rubric). This Table shows Unit and Program data at two (2) key assessment levels:

1. The column labeled TEAC lists portfolio scores as rated by alumni and/or members of the [Teacher Education Advisory Committee \(TEAC\)](#) at Application to CP.
2. The columns labeled CT and US list portfolio scores as rated by the Cooperating Teacher (CT) and the University Supervisor (US) at the culmination of CP.

A requirement that candidates score an Accomplished (≥ 3 on 4-point scale) to meet Admission to CP criteria was implemented in Fall 2012. During 2011–2012, one Middle School candidate scored 2.75 at TEAC, which was lower than ≥ 3.0 . Note that this Middle School candidate’s CT and US scores were significantly improved. Across the Unit and all Programs, candidates consistently meet or exceed 3.0. From this data it can be concluded that candidates have achieved and exceeded expectations in the area of content knowledge. IECE is not included because there is not a KTS Content Knowledge standard.

An indicator level Portfolio rubric (Edu #24A/B TEAC Portfolio Assessment P–12/IECE and Edu #25A/B CT Review of CP Portfolio, EDU #29A/B US review of CP Portfolio) was implemented in 2014–2015 to provide indicator-based data. [Table 1a.2.4b](#) – Portfolio Scoring per Indicator 2014–2015 evidences indicator-based data utilized to support Unit and Program portfolio KTS data. IECE and Middle School candidates only made application to CP in 2014–2015.

Field Experience:

Field Evaluations ([Edu #16](#) Field Supervisor Evaluation) are used when candidates completes ≥ 10 hours with one field supervisor. [Table 1a.2.5](#) – “Content Knowledge Field Experience” – shows exemplar: *17 Understanding of Core Content*. Data show candidates have achieved and exceeded 3.0 on a 4-point scale for the Unit and Programs; these averages provide evidence for candidates’ content knowledge as viewed by practitioners. The IECE candidate who was rated 2.5 for 2012–2013 and the Special Ed candidate whose behavior was not observed (NO) did not complete the program.

1a.3. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below.]

Brescia University has three advanced programs: an English as a Second Language (ESL) Endorsement for primary through 12th grades; a Master of Science in Teacher Leadership (MSTL); and the Teacher Leader Endorsement. Brescia has not yet had an independent Teacher Leader Endorsement candidate apart from the MSTL. For admission to the ESL P–12 Endorsement program, both teachers at the post-baccalaureate level with teaching licenses and Initial-level candidates meeting stated requirements may apply. The average undergraduate GPA at entry point for the ESL candidates admitted in 2013–2014 was 3.69 and at midpoint the ESL candidates’ GPA was 3.33 in 2014–2015 (see [Table G6b](#) for ESL GPA data). All candidates met the required GPA of 2.75 at the point of entry and at midpoint.

For admission into the MSTL graduate education program, a candidate must present credentials that ensure an appropriate level of content knowledge. This includes an undergraduate degree with a minimum GPA of 2.75 and a passing PRAXIS score in the Content Licensure Tests. The average undergraduate GPA at entry point for the candidates admitted in 2011–2012 was 3.12; for those admitted in 2012–2013, 3.5; for those admitted in 2013–2014, 2.9; and for those admitted in 2014–2015, 3.1 (see [Table G6](#) for MSTL GPA data at entry point). All candidates at the point of admission met the state-mandated passing score in the content in which they are certified. The data are evident in [Table G7: MSTL PRAXIS Score](#). Within the MSTL program, development of content knowledge is an important part of candidates’ ongoing professional development. Although the MSTL is not an initial certification program, the curriculum provides opportunities for candidates to explore and further develop expertise within their content areas. For example, in EDL 570 candidates develop a unit in a content area (see EDL 570 [Lesson Unit Assignment](#) and [Rubric](#)) using the appropriate Specialty Professional Association (SPA) standards for their content area. Candidates’ level of performance in content knowledge within these courses are shown in [Table G1](#). The table shows a minimum of 3.5 on a 4.0 scale. In addition, candidates are required to complete a capstone Action Research Project (ARP). While not all projects are a direct measure of content knowledge, some of the projects are based on candidates’ content areas and do demonstrate evidence of professional growth. [Table S3](#) shows examples of content areas addressed in the final ARPs. The final check guide (see [ARP Form 4](#)) for these projects is aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Standards and SPAs (see [Exhibit F4](#)). The content

areas researched during the 2011–2015 years include writing, mathematics, reading, technology, foreign language, and music (see [Table S3](#)). It should be noted that candidates with LBD certification research a range of subject areas.

1a.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in the content area? If survey data are being reported, what was the response rate? [A table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to content knowledge could be attached at Prompt 1a.5 below. The attached table could include all of the responses to your follow-up survey to which you could refer the reader in responses on follow-up studies in other elements of Standard 1.]

INITIAL PROGRAMS

For Initial Teacher Education Programs a [Graduate Exit Survey](#) was sent using Survey Monkey to 28 graduates, with 61% responding or 17 graduates. Graduate Exit Survey items are aligned to the [KTS](#). [Table 1a.4.1](#) – “Graduate Exit Survey Content Knowledge” – summarizes the responses by Unit and Program. Question #26: *The School of Education prepared me in the area of content knowledge and skills* received an overall average response of 3.44 on a 4-point scale. Middle school had an average rating of 2.75, with 3 out of the 4 respondents rating content knowledge at 3. From these data, it can be concluded that graduates believed the program prepared them adequately in content area knowledge.

[Table 1a.4.2](#) – “Content Knowledge New Teacher Survey 2011–2012” – presents the data available for this review period. Based on alignment with KTS 1, CTs rated candidates with a mean score of 3.29; the total mean was 3.28. From this survey it can be concluded that CTs and other responders believed the program prepared the candidates adequately in content area knowledge. There are no results available for the 2013–2014 survey, due to less than 10 responders.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

There are no ESL or Teacher Leader Endorsement Only graduates at this time. The MSTL program was approved by EPSB in December 2010 and began in January 2011. The MSTL program saw its first graduate in 2013. One candidate graduated in 2013–2014 and two in 2014–2015. In 2014–2015, a candidate who completed requirements for rank change through Brescia also completed an exit survey. All four candidates completed the [MSTL Program Exit Survey](#). The questions below addressed content knowledge:

As a result of your graduate education degree, please rate how the program prepared you in the area of content Knowledge:

58. *Demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the subject that is being taught.*

59. *Use relevant materials to promote student learning.*

60. *Demonstrate knowledge of Kentucky Core Academic Standards in the subject area.*

61. *Demonstrate how knowledge can be applied to real-world settings.*

The results of the [2013](#) and [2015](#) exit surveys are accessible through Survey Monkey. An analysis of the content knowledge questions is discussed in this section. Of the four students who completed the exit survey, on the first question (#58) about how the program helped them “*demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the subject that is being taught*,” 50% (two graduates) said the program prepared them “*very well*” and the other 50% said the program prepared them “*well*” (see [Chart GS1](#)). On the second question (#59) about how the program helped them “*use relevant materials to promote student learning*,” 50% (two graduates) said the program prepared them “*very well*” and the other 50% said the program prepared them “*well*” (see [Chart GS1](#), question 59). On the third question (#60): “*demonstrate knowledge of Kentucky Core Academic Standards in the subject area*,” 75% (3 graduates) said the program prepared them “*very well*” and the other 25% (1 graduate) said the program

prepared him/her “well” (see [Chart GS1](#), question 60). On the final question (#61): “demonstrate how knowledge can be applied to real-world settings,” 50% (2 graduates) said the program prepared them “very well” and the other 50% said the program prepared them “well” (see [Chart GS1](#), Question 61). It can therefore be concluded that overall candidates believe the program prepared them more than adequately in the area of content knowledge.

1a.5 (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

- [Table G1](#): MSTL Candidate Demonstration of Content Knowledge
- [Table G6](#): MSTL Candidates’ GPA Data
- [Table G7](#): MSTL Praxis Score Data
- [MSTL Exit Survey](#)
- [MSTL 2013 Exit Survey](#)
- [MSTL 2015 Exit Survey](#)
- [MSTL 2013 Exit Survey Results](#)
- [MSTL 2015 Exit Survey Results](#)
- [Chart GS1](#): MSTL Exit Survey Results: Content Preparation
- [ARP FORM 4](#): Action Research Project Paper and Presentation Final Check

1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1b.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs demonstrate the pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

The SOE has key assessments of pedagogical content knowledge which occur across Unit Levels. These pedagogical content knowledge and skills assessments include Professional GPA; KTIP Lesson Plans; CP Evaluations; Portfolios at Application to CP and at the conclusion of CP; and Principles of Teaching and Learning (PLT).

GPA

Candidates’ pedagogical content knowledge and skills are assessed through the GPA of their major content coursework ([Table 1b.1.1](#)). The GPA of the Unit at Application to CP was 3.57. The average pedagogical content knowledge per program was at ≥ 2.91 , demonstrating solid content ability across all programs.

KTIP Lesson Plans

Candidates grow in pedagogical content knowledge through development and implementation of KTIP lesson plans in 200–400 level course work and related field experiences. Progress is embedded within the course grades and in Portfolio evidence. The Unit [KTIP rubric](#) was piloted in 2014–2015. During this time period, the Unit average was 8.63. The average pedagogical content knowledge per program was ≥ 5.5 . The [Table 1b.1.6](#) – “Pedagogical Content Knowledge Data from KTIP Lesson

Plan Rubric” also shows the growth in candidate competencies in pedagogical content knowledge from a 200-level course to a 400-level course.

CP Evaluations

CP bi-weekly ([Edu #12](#)) and summative ([Edu #14](#)) evaluations completed by the Cooperating Teacher (CT) and a minimum of 4 targeted observations ([Edu #13](#)) completed by the University Supervisor (US) during placement provide pedagogical content knowledge and skills evidence. The exemplars in the Designs/Plans and Implements/Manages Instruction section of evaluation instruments are: *Aligned with KCAS; Planned for learning and cultural diversity; Multiple levels and higher order thinking tasks; Integration of multimedia and electronic technologies; Connection with real-life situations; Inter-disciplinary connections; and Engages students at all levels.* [Table 1b.1.2](#) – “Pedagogical Content Knowledge in Clinical Practice by CT and US Observations” – data shows the Unit consistently rated ≥ 3.0 from CT bi weekly and summative and US targeted observations. Elementary and Special Education 2013–2014 CT biweekly observations were slightly below 3.0. However, the CT summative in both programs rated candidates >3.0 , showing growth and competent pedagogical content knowledge. This data provide evidence for candidates’ strong pedagogical content knowledge for the unit and across all programs.

Portfolios

Candidates’ portfolios at the point of Application to CP and summative of CP attest to pedagogical content knowledge by alignment with KTS P–12: 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and IECE: 1, 3, 5. [Table 1b.1.3](#) – “Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skill Evidence in Application to CP and CP” – illustrates the pedagogical content knowledge and skills data for the Unit and Programs. The overall Unit average data of ≥ 3.0 on 4.0 scale across KTS 1, 4, 6, and 7 demonstrates solid pedagogical content knowledge. Data averages per KTS reflect consistent performance and consistency of scoring. Each program demonstrates the same solid candidate performance overall and per standard. From these data, it can be concluded that candidates have achieved and exceeded expectations in the area of pedagogical content knowledge and skills.

An indicator level Portfolio rubric (Edu [#24A/B](#) TEAC Portfolio Assessment P–12/IECE and Edu [#25A/B](#) CT Review of CP Portfolio, EDU [#29A/B](#) US review of CP Portfolio) was implemented in 2014–2015 to provide indicator-based data. [Table 1a.2.4b](#) – Portfolio Scoring per Indicator 2014–2015 evidences indicator-based data utilized to support Unit and Program portfolio KTS data. IECE and Middle School candidates only made application to CP in 2014-2015.

PRAXIS II PLT

[Table 1b.1.5](#) – “Pass Rates on Principles of Learning and Teaching Exams for Initial Teacher Preparation” – shows that the Unit has a 94.3% pass rate. Elementary candidates are at 87% pass rate, with Middle School and Secondary at 100%. From these data, it can be concluded that candidates are prepared in the area of the principles of learning and teaching.

1b.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates know and apply theories related to pedagogy and learning, are able to use a range of instructional strategies and technologies, and can explain the choices they make in their practice. [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

Brescia University has three advanced programs: the English as a Second Language (ESL) Endorsement for primary through 12th grades; a Master of Science in Teacher Leadership (MSTL); and the Teacher Leader (TL) Endorsement. To date, there have been no TL candidates apart from those pur-

suing the MSTL. At Brescia University the ESL (P–12) Endorsement is a post-baccalaureate program available via the undergraduate curriculum to candidates concurrently enrolled in an initial certification program or to teachers who hold a teaching certificate. Each course in the five-course ESL (P–12) Endorsement sequence has a Signature Assignment and Related Assessment which targets various aspects of content and pedagogical skills related to KCAS/KYECS, KTS and TESOL standards. The ESL Practicum also requires the submission of a standards-based portfolio.

MSTL candidates complete a core of pedagogy-related classes that are designed to offer them multiple opportunities to further develop their content and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Candidates research innovative teaching strategies and prepare a unit in *EDL 570: Master Teacher*. Candidates use the Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS) and the College Readiness Standards and the Special Professional Associations (SPAs) Standards to prepare instruction appropriate for their content area and grade level(s) (See EDL 570 [Lesson Unit Assignment](#) and [Rubric](#)). Competency is demonstrated through assignments, reflections, and unit plans. Advanced-level assessment results indicate that candidates in EDL 570 develop curricula and implement them using various cognitive strategies that enhance student understanding of content, with a class average of 3.9 on a 4.0 scale as shown in [Table G1](#).

The MSTL program is guided by ISTE Standards for Teachers and KTS as they relate to technology. All courses require technology use for class assignments, lesson plan design, class presentations, and/or data analysis. Integration of technology use by P–12 students is expected in candidates’ planning and implementation of instruction. For example, *Technology for Teacher Leaders (EDL 530)* goes beyond basic technology literacy by requiring candidates to create technology products for classroom use, evaluate the acceptable technology use policy of their school or district, examine best practices for technology integration to enhance P–12 students’ achievement, explore the relationship of learning styles with educational technology, and develop technology leadership skills. This course requires a job-embedded application of a technology lesson in P–12 classrooms. Candidates create an instructional design plan delivered through a technology-based medium (see Exhibit S2: [Technology Integrated Lesson Assessment](#) and rubric). Advanced-level assessment of candidates’ competency is done through assignments, reflections, journals, unit plans, and exams in EDL 530, with the resulting average GPA of 3.5 on a 4.0 scale (see [Table G1](#)). Therefore, candidates demonstrate competency in technology.

1b.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in pedagogical content knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1b.4 below.]

INITIAL PROGRAMS

For Initial Teacher Education Program a Graduate Exit Survey was sent using Survey Monkey. [Table 1b.3.1](#) – “Graduate Exit Survey Pedagogical Content Knowledge”– summarized the responses by Unit and Program.

Questions aligned with pedagogical content knowledge were: The School of Education prepared me:

7. *by providing me an understanding and knowledge to collaborate and communicate with students*

8. *by providing me an understanding and knowledge to collaborate and communicate with families*

9. *by providing me an understanding and knowledge to collaborate and communicate with colleagues*

10. *by providing me an understanding and knowledge to collaborate and communicate with communities*

12. *in the area of appropriate strategies*

An average Unit response of ≥ 3.26 on 4.0 scale overall and for questions aligned with pedagogical content knowledge and skills shows candidates think they are prepared in these areas. Program-specific responses finds Middle School at 2.75 on the question of appropriate strategies, with all other questions and programs at ≥ 3.2 . From these data, it can be concluded that graduates believe the program prepared them adequately in pedagogical content knowledge and skills.

[Table 1b.3.2](#) – “Pedagogical Content Knowledge New Teacher Survey 2011–2012” – presents the data available for this review period. Based on alignment with KTS 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7, CTs rated candidates with a mean score of 3.18. The total mean was 3.19. An area of less than the mean was *Using time effectively* at 2.79, yet the overall mean was at 3.0. These data indicate that CTs and other responders think the program prepares the candidates adequately in content-area knowledge. There are no results available for 2013–2014 survey, due less than 10 responders.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

To date, the Unit has not graduated an ESL candidate. The MSTL program began in January 2011. The [MSTL Exit Survey](#) is designed to collect feedback from the MSTL graduates. The first candidate graduated in December 2013. Therefore, no survey results available for the 2011–2012 and 2012–2013 academic years. One candidate graduated in 2013–2014. In 2014–2015, two candidates graduated, one graduate exited the program after taking the two courses she needed to update her certification. Therefore, three students completed the 2015 survey (see [Table SG1](#)). A total of four students have completed exit surveys during this accreditation cycle. The [2013](#) and [2015](#) exit survey results show that candidates’ thought the program prepared them for content development. Overall, candidates felt adequately prepared in pedagogical content knowledge and skills (see [Chart GS1](#)). Seventy five percent of graduates expressed that the program prepared them to use student data to individualize instruction (see [Chart SG4](#), Question 63). Graduates also shared that the program prepared them “very well” in using technology tools to assist with student learning (see [Chart SG6](#), Question 72) and to integrate different technologies to support diverse learning processes (see [Chart SG6](#), Question 74). In addition, advanced graduates shared that the field and job-embedded assignments/activities provided them with adequate opportunities to practice new teaching strategies in a P–12 environment (see [Chart SG7](#), Question 77). The data are disaggregated by pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical assessment knowledge, and pedagogical technological knowledge. Responses of graduates by year are provided in Tables [SG1](#), [SG3](#), and [SG5](#); summary responses are provided in [Table SG2](#) (Content); [Table SG4](#) (Assessment); and [Table SG6](#) (Technology). From these data, it can be concluded that graduates responded that the program prepared them adequately in pedagogical content knowledge and skills.

1b.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the pedagogical content knowledge of teacher candidates may be attached here. (Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.)

- [Table G1: MSTL Candidate Demonstration of Content Knowledge](#)
- [Exhibit S2: Technology Integrated Lesson Assessment](#)
- [MSTL 2013 Exit Survey](#)
- [MSTL 2015 Exit Survey](#)

- [MSTL 2013 Exit Survey Results](#)
- [MSTL 2015 Exit Survey Results](#)
- [Table GS1: Exit Survey Results – Content Preparation](#)
- [Chart GS1: MSTL Exit Survey – Content knowledge](#)
- [Chart SG4: MSTL Exit Survey – Assessment Results](#)
- [Chart SG6: MSTL Exit Survey – Technology Use](#)
- [Chart SG7: MSTL Exit Survey – Job-Embedded and Field](#)
- [Table SG1: MSTL Exit Survey Yearly Results – Content Knowledge](#)
- [Table SG2: MSTL Exit Survey Summary 2011–2015 – Content Knowledge](#)
- [Table SG3: MSTL Exit Survey Yearly Results – Assessment Preparation](#)
- [Table SG4: MSTL Exit Survey Summary 2011–2015 – Assessment Preparation](#)
- [Table SG5: Exit Survey Yearly Results – Technology Use](#)
- [Table SG6: MSTL Exit Survey Summary 2011–2015 – Technology Use](#)

1c. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1c.1. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced teacher preparation programs demonstrate the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

INITIAL PROGRAMS

The SOE has key assessments of professional and pedagogical knowledge which occur across Unit Levels. These professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills assessments include GPA; Professional Skills at Application to SOE and via Core Courses; Field evaluations of Professional Skills; KTIP Lesson Plans; CP Evaluations; and Portfolios at Application to CP and at the conclusion of CP.

GPA

Professional and pedagogic knowledge is developed through the professional education course work. [Table 1c.1.1](#) – “Average Professional and Pedagogical GPA at Application to SOE”– shows a 3.67 GPA for the Unit and >3.0 across all programs, indicating strong foundational pedagogical content knowledge. One candidate with dual certification in Elementary and Special Ed: LBD had a 2.50 GPA and was not admitted to the Program. The Unit had an average professional and pedagogical GPA of 3.85 at the point of Application to CP ([Table 1c.1.2](#)). The average content GPA per program was 3.58 or better, indicating solid professional and pedagogical skills.

Professional Skills at Application to SOE and in Core Courses

The Faculty Recommendation form regarding Professional Dispositions and Skills (Edu #4A) measures the candidates’ professional skills and dispositions at the point of Application to the SOE through faculty references; a second Professional Disposition form (Edu #4B) measures skills and dispositions as rated by instructors of Core Common Course (Edu 204/108, 246, 255, 301 and Psy 300). The exemplars measuring professional skills are: *Intellectual ability; Competence in oral communication, Promptness in assignments, Attendance; and Ability to deal with stress.* [Table 1c.1.3](#) – “Professional Disposition”– summarizes data for the Unit and each program; the ≥ 3.0 scores indicate that initial candidates’ strong professional skills and dispositions lay the foundation for great pedagogical knowledge as they progress through the program.

KTIP Lesson Plan

Candidates' pedagogical skills are evidenced through the development, implementation, and post-reflection of the KTIP lesson plan. Progress is embedded within the course grades and Portfolio evidence. The Unit [KTIP rubric](#) was piloted in 2014–2015. During this time period, the Unit average was 5.38. The average pedagogical content knowledge per program was ≥ 3.0 . The [Table 1c.1.7](#) – “Pedagogical Knowledge Data from KTIP Lesson Plan Rubric” also shows the growth in candidate competencies in pedagogical knowledge from a 200-level course to a 400-level course.

CP Evaluations

CP bi-weekly ([Edu #12](#)) and summative ([Edu #14](#)) evaluations completed by Cooperating Teacher (CT) and a minimum of 4 targeted observations ([Edu #13](#)) completed by University Supervisor (US) during placement provide professional and pedagogical skills evidence. The exemplars are *Aligned with KCAS; Formative and Summative Assessments; Multiple levels and higher order thinking tasks; Integration of multimedia and electronic technologies; Connection with real-life situations; Interdisciplinary connections; Engages students at all levels; Communicates accurate knowledge of content; Oral/written expression; Summarizes, review, assesses; Identifies (students'/own) misconceptions; Guides student understanding from various perspective; and Uses multiple assessments/data sources.* [Table 1c.1.4](#) – “Professional and Pedagogical Evidence in Clinical Practice by CT and US Observations” – data show Unit and Program averages to be ≥ 3.0 . Elementary and Special Ed for 2013–2014 and Spanish for 2014–2015 CT biweekly observations rated candidates < 3.0 , but the CT summative evaluations were > 3.0 , evidencing satisfactory growth. These data provide evidence that candidates for the Unit and across all programs have strong professional pedagogical knowledge.

Portfolios

Candidates' portfolios at the point of application to CP and summative of CP indicate an appropriate level of professional and pedagogical knowledge by alignment with KTS P–12: 3, 7, 8, 9, and 10, and IECE 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10. [Table 1c.1.5](#) – “Professional and Pedagogical Evidence in Application to SOE and CP Portfolios” – illustrates the professional and pedagogical data for the Unit and Programs. The Unit overall average of > 3.0 on 4.0 scale and across KTS-related standards demonstrates solid professional and pedagogical knowledge. Each program demonstrates the same solid candidate performance overall and per standard. Data averages per KTS reflect consistent performance and consistency among evaluators. These data indicate that candidates have achieved and exceeded expectations in the area of professional and pedagogical knowledge.

An indicator-level Portfolio rubric (Edu [#24A/B](#) TEAC Portfolio Assessment P–12/IECE and Edu [#25A/B](#) CT Review of CP Portfolio, EDU [#29A/B](#) US review of CP Portfolio) was implemented in 2014–2015 to provide indicator-based data. The [Table 1a.2.4b](#) – “Portfolio Scoring per Indicator 2014–2015” – evidences indicator-based data that is utilized to support Unit and Program portfolio KTS data. IECE and Middle School candidates made application to CP only in 2014–2015.

Field

Field Supervisor Evaluation ([Edu #16](#)) exemplars aligned with Professional Knowledge and Skills are *Poise, self-control; Understanding of Core Content; Quality of preparation/planning; Use of diverse strategies; and Classroom/Behavior management.* [Table 1c.1.6](#) – “Professional Skills Field Experiences” – shows average ratings for the Unit exceeding 3.0 for all indicators. Program averages per exemplar exceed 3.0 on a 4-point scale with the exception of Spanish for *Quality of preparation/planning* average of 2.75. Even with this one exception, the data support that candidates have solid professional skills across the Unit and Programs as rated by practitioners. One IECE candidate was rated at 2.5 or “behavior was not observed.” This candidate did not complete the program.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

All candidates in the MSTL program are assessed in core courses on competencies in the Kentucky Teacher Standards at the advanced level (see [KTS Assessments within the MSTL Program](#)). [Table 4](#) shows how the MSTL courses are linked to the KTS. Each MSTL course syllabus outlines how the course objectives and course activities meet each of the KTS; for samples see [EDL 620 Course syllabus](#), [EDL 655 Course Syllabus](#), and [EDL 671 course syllabus](#). The Signature Assignments within the MSTL courses are tagged to the KTS in the Taskstream assessment program used by the School of Education; for example, see [EDL 570 Signature Assignment Rubric](#). To ensure that all 10 standards are assessed in the capstone project, candidates are required to attain a “Satisfactory” score in each of the 10 KTS standards on the [ARP Form 4](#) capstone assessment tool. Candidates are also required to identify the Kentucky Core Academic Standards and the College Readiness Standards they are targeting for their lesson plans. Finally, the institutional standards are aligned to course requirements and Signature Assignments. [Table 4.2](#) displays the assessment descriptions and rubrics; and [Exhibit IG22](#) shows the performance of all MSTL candidates on these assessments. As the data show, in all content areas except EDL 580, all MSTL candidates display “*Accomplished*.”

English as a Second Language (ESL) Endorsement for primary through 12th grades: Data for the ESL (P–12) candidates are disaggregated from the five courses at the 300–400 level in the undergraduate program.

Teacher Leader Endorsement: No candidate is currently enrolled in the Teacher Leader Endorsement Only program.

1c.2. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs consider the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings? If a licensure test is required in this area, how are candidates performing on it? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

Candidates demonstrate awareness of the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students; reflect on their own practice; know major schools of thought about schooling, teaching, and learning; and can analyze educational research findings through a variety of formal and informal assessments:

Course design and Signature Assignments

1. The chart [Signature Assignments](#) for 2014–2015 provides evidence of course-embedded assignments, which in many courses give evidence of the above-noted skills. This [chart](#) reflects the progress of the implementation of data collection in Taskstream for course Signature Assignments, including the average score on the assessment.
2. Three of the five SOE core courses – Edu 204/108, Edu 255, and Psy 300 – provide the foundation for contextual awareness of school, family, and community, along with identifying a student’s prior experiences and predicted developmental abilities. Application to the SOE requires completion of two out of the three of these core courses with a > 2.75 GPA and C grade or higher as criteria.
3. In Edu 301: Growth, Development, and Learning Theories; and in Edu 411: History and Philosophy of Education, students learn about key learning theories (including Piaget and Vygotsky); in the latter course secondary candidates have an intense study of major schools of thought in the field of education.
4. Upper-division courses build on this foundation and require candidates to apply major schools of thought to case studies and discussions.
5. Many courses require candidates to research course related topics and critique as part of the course grade.

6. As part of Practicum and CP, candidates reflect on their teaching based on KTS P-12: 1, 2, and 3, and IECE:1 and 2, using the [Edu #35](#) Digital Recording Observation Form. This document provides informal feedback and is discussed with the US.

KTIP Lesson Plans

The methods courses, Practicum, and Clinical Practice all require lesson/unit plans. The development of all KTIP-designed lesson plans is included in [Task A1](#) Teaching and Learning Context (Critical Student Characters or Attributes) and KTIP [Task A2](#) (c: *Describe students' prior knowledge*, and e: *Describe the characteristics of your students....who will require differentiated instruction to meet their diverse needs...*) and the Post Observation [Task C](#): Lesson Analysis and Reflection. Data from lesson plans are embedded in course grades and/or portfolio evidence. The Unit [KTIP rubric](#) was piloted in 2014–2015. During this time period, the Unit average was 28.17. Average overall lesson plan scores according to the piloted rubric per program was ≥ 14.0 . The [Table 1c.2.4](#) – “Overall Averages from KTIP Lesson Plan Rubric” – also shows the growth in candidate competencies from an average of 16.5 in a 200-level course to a 40 in a 400-level course.

Field Experience

Candidates are required to complete field reflections with every placement. The content of the reflection is based upon course expectations and embedded within course grade. The [Field Handbook](#) Table 2 – “Nature of Field Experiences by Course” (pp. 11–19) – provides examples of course expectations, many of which are directly related to lesson context, pedagogy, and reflection.

CP Evaluations

CP bi-weekly ([Edu #12](#)) and summative ([Edu #14](#)) evaluations completed by the Cooperating Teacher (CT) and a minimum of 4 targeted observations ([Edu #13](#)) completed by the University Supervisor (US) during placement provide pedagogical skills evidence. The section Designs/Plans and Implements/Manages Instruction exemplars are *Preplanned/Prepared; Aligned with Kentucky's Core Academic Standards; Planned for learning and cultural diversity; Formative and Summative Assessments; Multiple levels and higher order thinking tasks; Integrates technology to address diverse student needs; Connections with real-life situations; Inter-disciplinary connections; and Engages students at all levels*. [Table 1c.2.2](#) – “Pedagogical Evidence in Application to CP and CP Portfolios” – presents data for the Unit and Programs per CT and US ratings on pedagogical exemplars as well as overall averages for the CTs and USs. The Unit averages show candidates achieve or exceed 3.0 on 4.0 scale for all exemplars. Formative bi-weekly data 2011–2012 Art and 2014–2015 Spanish average < 3.0 . In both programs the summative data indicates growth to > 3.0 . Based on the data, candidates have solid pedagogical knowledge as evidenced during clinical practice as this knowledge is rated by the CTs and the USs.

Portfolios

Candidates' portfolios at the point of application to CP and summative of CP provide evidence of pedagogical knowledge by alignment with KTS P-12: 2, 3, 7, 9, and 10; and IECE 1, 2, 5, 7, and 10. [Table 1c.2.3](#) – “Pedagogical Knowledge Evidence in Application to CP and CP” – presents data for the Unit and by Program per KTS. The Unit overall average of > 3.0 on 4.0 scale and across KTS-related standards demonstrates solid pedagogical knowledge. Each Program demonstrates the same solid candidate performance overall and per standard. Data averaged per KTS reflect consistent performance and consistency among evaluators. These data demonstrate that candidates have achieved and exceeded the expectation in the area of pedagogical knowledge through portfolio evidence. An indicator level Portfolio rubric ([Edu #24A/B](#) TEAC Portfolio Assessment P-12/IECE and [Edu #25A/B](#) CT Review of CP Portfolio, [EDU #29A/B](#) US review of CP Portfolio) was implemented in 2014–2015 to provide indicator-based data. [Table 1a.2.4b](#) – Portfolio Scoring per Indicator 2014–2015 evidences indicator-based data utilized to support Unit and Program portfolio KTS data. IECE and Middle School candidates only made application to CP in 2014-2015.

Professional Growth Plans:

Candidates give evidence of attention to school, family, and community, reflection on their own practice, content knowledge about major educational schools of thought, and analysis of educational research through their Professional Growth Plans (PGPs). Candidates meet with their major advisor at the midpoint of the semester both for advising for the following semester's coursework and to review all assessment data from the previous and current semesters. These data are then integrated into the candidate's PGP for the remaining current and following semesters.

1c.3. What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates reflect on their practice; engage in professional activities; have a thorough understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work; collaborate with the professional community; are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices; and can analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their own practice and the profession? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

Various assessments provide evidence that advanced teacher candidates engage in the following:

Reflect on practice

Candidates work with a mentor in EDL 500, keeping a journal of their experiences and noting how they learned from their mentors (see [Exhibit S3](#) sample candidates' journals). Candidates scored consistently high with an average of 97.3% on these journal reflections. In EDL 640 candidates reflect on the reliability and validity of classroom assessments. Reflections in this course include how they would assess P–12 students' differently when they teach the job-embedded topic again. Candidates also reflect on how they would improve learning based on the results of the test administered in their classrooms. Candidates scored an average of 90% on these assignments. In the job-embedded application assessment in EDL 530, candidates reflect on possibilities for professional development based on integrated lessons implemented in their classrooms (see [Integrated Technology Lesson and Rubric](#)). They also discuss plans for subsequent lessons to reinforce and extend understanding particularly for their P–12 students who did not make satisfactory progress. The reflective journal is 15% of the overall grade of the EDL 530 course. [Exhibit 1G1](#) displays the courses from which assessments are collected for reflections. The outcome assessment data shows that students have a mean score of 4 in EDL 500, a mean score of 3 in EDL 530, and a 4 in EDL 640, resulting in an average of 3.6 (B Grade) in all three courses. [Exhibit 1G2](#) displays the performance on signature assessments on in these courses. The performance of all MSTL candidates show *Accomplished* in candidates' reflection on practice. [Exhibit S3](#) provides an example of a candidate's reflection.

Engage in professional activities

Candidates engage in professional activities in EDL 600 and EDL 672 by completing an original action research project. The outcome assessment data shows that students have a mean score of 3.35 from a total of 4 students in EDL 672, and a mean of 4 based on a total of 2 students from EDL 600 (see [Exhibit IG3](#)). [Exhibit 1G4](#) displays the performance on signature assessments in EDL 672. The performance of MSTL candidates display *Accomplished* in the engagement of professional activities. [Exhibit 1G5](#) provides an example of a candidate's professional activity in completing an original action research project.

Understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which candidates work

MSTL candidates are provided opportunities to understand the school, family, and community contexts in which they work. For example, candidates explore multiple attributes of multicultural populations influencing instructional decisions in EDL 570. In EDL 550, candidates examine the challenges faced by students and their families. One element of course work in the EDL 550 is raising candidate awareness of critical multicultural issues. In EDL 655 candidates complete a multicultural unit. In

courses where candidates complete a job-embedded activity, they are required to share the characteristics of their students, school, and community in which they work, using [Diversity Form #20Graduate](#). These requirements are summarized in [Exhibit 1G6](#), which lists the courses from which assessments are collected for understanding the school, family, and community. The outcome assessment data shows that students have a mean score of 4 in EDL 550 and a mean score of 4 in EDL 570, which results in an average of 4 on a 4-point scale for both courses. [Exhibit 1G7](#) displays the performance on signature assessments in these courses. The performances of all MSTL candidates display *Exemplary* for both EDL 570 and EDL 655. [Exhibit 1G8](#) provides examples of candidate's understanding of the school, family, and community.

Collaborate with the professional community

Opportunities where MSTL candidates collaborate with the professional community include EDL 500, EDL 630, and EDL 581 courses. In EDL 500, candidates work with a mentor within the school systems. The *School Wide Discipline Management Systems* assessment in EDL 630 requires candidates to collaborate in teams to research best practices for classroom management. In EDL 581, candidates collaborate with the education community to collect data for action research projects. [Exhibit 1G9](#) displays the courses from which assessments are collected to demonstrate such collaboration. The outcome assessment data shows a mean score of 4 in EDL 500 and a mean score of 4 in EDL 581, resulting in an average of 4 on a 4-point scale for both courses. [Exhibit 1G10](#) displays the performance on signature assessments on in these courses. The performances of all MSTL candidates display *Exemplary* for both EDL 500 and EDL 630.

Awareness of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices

Current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices are made available to candidates, primarily through journal article reviews. For example, in EDL 640 candidates review at least five journal articles dealing with P–12 assessment in order to stay current in research findings relating to assessment; this includes differentiating assessments for students with special needs. In EDL 580, candidates complete a Literature Review based on their research interests. Research in EDL 570 requires candidates to search and use specific instructional strategies. [Exhibit 1G12](#) displays the courses from which assessments are collected for candidates' awareness of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices. The outcome assessment data shows that students have a mean score of 4 in EDL 570, a mean score of 2.3 in EDL 580, and a mean of 3.75 in EDL 640, resulting in an average of 3.35 in the three courses. [Exhibit 1G13](#) displays the performance on signature assessments related to awareness of current research and polices related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices within these courses. The performance of all MSTL candidates display *Exemplary* for both EDL 570, *Accomplished* for EDL 640, and *Developing* for EDL 580. It should be noted that EDL 580 is the introduction to graduate research and only two students were enrolled in the course; one did not meet the requirements of the course. [Exhibit 1G14a](#) and [Exhibit 1G14b](#) provide examples of candidate's current research and policies related to schooling.

Analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for candidates' own practice and the profession

Candidates analyze educational research and policies and explain the implications for their own practice and the profession. In EDL 580, candidates plan observations, then gather and analyze data. Candidates in the EDL 630 analyze P–12 assessment data to determine teaching strategies that improves performance. Effective coaching qualities are emphasized in EDL 650. Teacher Leader candidates collect data based upon the proposal designed in EDL 580, analyze that data in EDL 671, and then present their findings. [Exhibit 1G16](#) display the courses from which assessments are collected for candidates' ability to analyze educational research and policies and then explain the implications for their own practice and the profession. The outcome assessment data shows that candidates have a mean score of 2.3 in EDL 580, a mean score of 3.8 in EDL 630, a mean of 4 in EDL 650, and a 3.35

for EDL 671, resulting in an average of 3.36 on a 4.0 scale in the four courses. [Exhibit 1G17](#) displays the performance on signature assessments in these courses (EDL 580, 630, 650, and 671). Apart from the EDL 580 course, the performance of MSTL candidates in the other courses display *Exemplary* and *Accomplished*. EDL 580 shows *Developing*, not surprising, given that this is a beginning graduate research course. The low scores in the EDL 580 course are also due to the low score of one candidate enrolled in the course (n=2). While one of the two candidates had an *Exemplary* score, the other failed the course because he/she did not complete course requirements and had to retake the course. [Exhibit 1G18a](#) and [Exhibit 1G18b](#) provide examples of candidate's work on data analysis.

1c.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills could be attached at Prompt 1c.5 below.]

INITIAL PROGRAMS

For Initial Teacher Education Programs, a Graduate Exit Survey was sent using Survey Monkey. Questions aligned with professional and pedagogical knowledge were: The School of Education prepared me:

- 6. *by providing me with variety of teaching strategies that address learning objectives for all students*
- 11. *in the area of classroom discipline*
- 15. *to manage time and the demands of the teaching profession*
- 17. *to create positive environments for student learning*
- 18. *to make appropriate adjustments to instruction*

[Table 1c.4.1](#) – “Graduate Exit Survey Results for Professional Pedagogical Knowledge” – shows the average response for the Unit was 3.21 on 4-point scale. The Middle School Program had 50% of questions at 2.75, which resulted in overall program average of 2.9. Other programs had an overall average of ≥ 3.28 . From these data, it can be concluded that graduates indicated that the program prepared them adequately in Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills.

[Table 1a.4.2](#) – “Professional Pedagogical Knowledge New Teacher Survey 2011–2012” – presents the data available for this review period. Based on alignment with KTS 3, 7, 8, 9, and 10, CTs rated candidates with a mean score of 3.22. The total mean was 3.23. An area of less than the mean was *Analyzing data to evaluate the results of planned and executed leadership efforts* at 2.86, yet the overall mean was at 3.0. These data demonstrate that CTs and other responders believe the program prepares the candidates adequately in Professional Pedagogical Knowledge. There are no results available for 2013–2014 survey, due less than 10 responders.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

One candidate graduated in December 2013 and two in May 2015. Follow-up studies related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills were collected from graduates via exit surveys. The [MSTL Exit Survey](#), items #27–57 and #62–79, provide data on professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. In particular, all four (4) graduates reported that the program prepared them to “*plan instruction that is aligned with the Kentucky State Standards (Q33)*.” The [2013](#) and [2015](#) exit surveys results show that candidates thought the MSTL program prepared them in the area of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

There have been no ESL P–12 endorsement completers. The first completer is on track to graduate in December 2016.

1c.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of teacher candidates may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

- [MSTL 2013 Exit Survey](#)
- [MSTL 2015 Exit Survey](#)
- [MSTL 2013 Exit Survey Results](#)
- [MSTL 2015 Exit Survey Results](#)

1d. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates. [In this section the unit must address (1) initial teacher preparation programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and, if the institution offers them, (2) licensure and non-licensure graduate programs for teachers who already hold a teaching license.]

1d.1. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that candidates in initial teacher preparation programs can assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn? [Data for initial teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

Candidates are expected to develop a variety of formative and summative assessments as well as to interpret, communicate, and utilize assessment data to drive instruction. Key assessments include the following: 1) KTIP lesson plan assessment section(s) and Task C post observation; 2) CP Evaluations; 3) Portfolios at Application to CP and at the conclusion of CP; and 4) Field Experience.

KTIP lesson plans

The KTIP lesson plan Task C post-observation section focuses on candidates' ability to interpret assessment results and differentiate teaching as a result. Candidate progress is embedded within the course grades and Portfolio evidence. The Unit [KTIP rubric](#) was piloted in 2014–2015. The Unit average for student learning was 10.38. Average student learning scores according to the piloted rubric per Program were ≥ 6.0 . The [Table 1d.1.4](#) – “Student Learning Averages from KTIP Lesson Plan Rubric” – also shows the growth in candidate competencies, from an average of 7.5 in a 200-level course to an 18.5 in a 400-level course. Advocacy was also an indicator of the candidates' abilities to differentiate instruction and assessment, with the Unit average for advocacy at 12.38. [Table 1d.1.5](#) – “Advocacy Averages from KTIP Lesson Plan Rubric” – shows a growth in candidates' competencies from an 8 in a 200-level course to a 23 in a 400-level course.

CP Evaluations

CP bi-weekly ([Edu #12](#)) and summative ([Edu #14](#)) evaluations completed by the Cooperating Teacher (CT) and a minimum of 4 targeted observations ([Edu #13](#)) completed by the University Supervisor (US) during placement provide evidence through the following exemplars: *Formative and Summative Assessments; Summarizes, review, assesses; Uses multiple assessments/data sources; Uses/Analyzes assessment to improve instruction; Communicates assessment results to students; and Promotes self-assessment.* [Table 1d.1.1](#) – “Student Learning in Clinical Practice by CT and US Observations” – data shows ≥ 3.0 average for the Unit and all Programs. The Unit, Elementary, and Special Education in

2013–2014 and Spanish 2014–2015 are slightly below the expected 3.0 in the CT biweekly formative observation evaluations, but the summative data does achieve a ≥ 3.0 level. Across the Unit and overall averages for Programs, candidates have achieved or exceeded expectations in the area of assessment and analysis of student learning.

Portfolios

Candidates' portfolios at the point of application to CP and summative of CP provide evidence of student learning by alignment with KTS P–12: 2, 4, and 5; and IECE: 1, 3, and 4. The [Table 1d.1.2](#) – “Student Learning Skill Evidence in Application to CP and CP Portfolios” – presents the student learning data for the Unit and Programs. The Unit overall average was ≥ 3.0 on a 4.0 scale; this score across KTS-related standards demonstrates solid candidates' abilities to assess student learning. Each Program demonstrates the same solid candidate performance overall and per standard. Data averages per KTS reflect consistent performance and consistency of scoring. From these data it can be concluded that candidates have achieved and exceeded expectations in the area of student learning. An indicator-level Portfolio rubric (Edu [#24A/B](#) – TEAC Portfolio Assessment P–12/IECE, Edu [#25A/B](#) – CT Review of CP Portfolio, and EDU [#29A/B](#) – US Review of CP Portfolio) was implemented in 2014–2015 to provide indicator-based data. The [Table 1a.2.4b](#) – Portfolio Scoring per Indicator 2014–2015 evidences indicator-based data that is utilized to support Unit and Program portfolio KTS data. IECE and Middle School candidates made application to CP only in 2014–2015.

Field Experiences

[Table 1d.1.3](#) – “Supervisor Evaluations of Student Learning Field Experiences” – collates data from the [Edu #16](#) exemplars *Quality of preparation/planning* and *Use of diverse strategies*, showing average ratings for the Unit and per Program. These data show the Unit and Programs at ≥ 3.0 on a 4-point scale except in P–12 Spanish for *Quality of preparation/planning*. Given the small sample size, the data support candidates' solid skills in student learning as rated by practitioners. Within the IECE and Special Education programs, single candidates were either rated at < 3.0 or behaviors were not observed (NO). In both instances the candidates did not complete the program.

1d.2. (Programs Not Nationally Reviewed) What data from key assessments indicate that advanced teacher candidates demonstrate a thorough understanding of the major concepts and theories related to assessing student learning; regularly apply them in their practice; analyze student, classroom, and school performance data; make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning; and are aware of and utilize school and community resources that support student learning? [Data for advanced teacher preparation programs that have been nationally reviewed or reviewed through a similar state review do not have to be reported here. Summarize data here only for programs not already reviewed. A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

These five MSTL courses provide opportunities for candidates to make impacts on P–12 students' learning: EDL 530: *Technology for Teacher Leaders*, EDL 570: *Master Teacher*; EDL 640: *Assessment of Students' Learning*, EDL 671: *Action Research*, and EDL 672: *Documenting Professional Growth 2—Capstone Project*. In EDL 530, MSTL candidates implement a technology lesson in their content areas in a school setting. In addition, candidates analyze P–12 students' performance using charts and graphs; and reflect on how to impact student learning positively. In EDL 570, candidates use differentiated strategies in their various content area and videotape themselves teaching in P–12 classrooms using formative assessments. In EDL 640, candidates select a two-to-three week unit of instruction and develop a test to assess P-12 learning. The test items target specific P-12 learning outcomes with appropriate scoring rubrics. Finally, the EDL 671 and EDL 672 Capstone Projects measure the advanced teacher candidate's ability to measure P–12 students' performance by evaluating and understanding students' learning through the application of Action Research. [Exhibit 1G19](#) dis-

plays the outcome data from the courses from which candidates demonstrate their understanding of the concepts and theories related to assessing student learning. Candidates indicated competency with an average of 3.49 in the five courses. Candidates have a mean score of 3 in EDL 530; a mean score of 4 in EDL 570, a mean of 4 in EDL 640, and a mean of 3.35 in EDL 671 and 672; this produces an average of 3.49 (B Grade) in the five courses. [Exhibit 1G20](#) displays the performance on signature assessments in these courses. The performance of all MSTL candidates display *Accomplished*. Therefore, Brescia MSTL candidates can analyze P–12 students’ performance and make students learning decisions. [Exhibit 1G21a](#) and [Exhibit 1G21b](#) provide examples of candidates work on assessment for learning.

The first cohort in the ESL P–12 Endorsement program began in Fall 2013 with Edu 402 – ESL: Acquisition and Skill Set; Edu 306 – Linguistics was offered in Spring 2014. The process of identification of Signature Assignments and Related Assessments also began at that time. Course grades and activities/assignment grades were the only available data for AY 2013–2014. Four candidates enrolled in Edu 402 in Fall 2013 averaged a grade of A on the Signature Assignment and an A 4.0 grade average overall for the course. This cohort was also enrolled in Eng 306 in Spring 2014, with two candidates earning grades of B and two earning grades of C for an average course grade of 2.5 on a 4 point scale.

1d.3. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' ability to help all students learn? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to the ability to help all students learn could be attached at Prompt 1d.4 below.]

INITIAL PROGRAMS

For Initial Teacher Education Programs a Graduate Exit Survey was sent using Survey Monkey. [Table 1d.3.1](#) – “Graduate Exit Survey Student Learning”– summarizes the responses by Unit and Program.

Questions aligned with impact on student learning were: The School of Education prepared me:

13. *to be fair to all students*
14. *to believe that all students can learn*
16. *to assess and analyze students’ learning*
19. *to monitor student learning*
20. *to develop and implement meaningful learning experiences to help all students learn*

The Unit average was 3.38, with each Program ≥ 3.0 . The overall Program average is ≥ 3.2 . These data demonstrate that graduates believed the program prepared them adequately to help all students learn.

[Table 1d.3.2](#) – “Student Learning New Teacher Survey 2011–2012”– presents the data available for this review period. Based on alignment with KTS 2, 4, and 5, CTs rated candidates with a mean score of 3.07. The total mean was 3.10. The items *Using time effectively and communicating learning results to students and parents* were rated below 3.0 by CTs, yet the overall average was 3.0. The item *Allowing opportunity for student self-assessment* was rated by CTs below 3.0; the overall average was also below the 3.0 level. From these data it can be concluded that CTs and other responders thought the program prepares the candidates adequately in assessing and analyzing student learning, with the exception of student self-assessment. There are no results available for a 2013–2014 survey, due less than 10 responders.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

To date there are no ESL endorsement or Teacher Leader Endorsement only program completers. A SOE survey shows that MSTL graduates responded that the program prepared them to help students learn. [Exhibit SG17](#) shows questions that inquired about graduates' ability to help students learn. Seventy five (75) percent of graduates reported that the program prepared them to use student data to individualize instruction (Question 63). Three of the four graduates also shared that the program prepared them "very well" to use technology tools to assist with student learning (Question 72). Similarly, three of four students (75%) felt equipped to integrate different technologies to support diverse learning processes (Question 74). Two particularly strong areas are questions 39 and 40, where 100% of candidates claimed that the program prepared them to "treat diverse students equitably" (Question 39) and "Use a variety of teaching techniques and strategies to effectively instruct students" (Question 40). All items show an "Adequate" or higher-level response. Therefore, graduates rating the MSTL show that the program prepared them to help all students to learn.

1d.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to student learning may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

- [Table SG3](#): MSTL Exit Survey Yearly Results **Assessment** Preparation
- [Table SG4](#): MSTL Exit Survey Summary 2011–2015 **Assessment** Preparation

1g. Professional Dispositions for All Candidates. [Indicate when the responses refer to the preparation of initial teacher candidates, advanced teacher candidates, and other school professionals, noting differences when they occur.]

1g.1. What professional dispositions are candidates expected to demonstrate by completion of programs?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

There are four dispositions every Brescia SOE initial and advanced teacher preparation candidate is expected to acquire and become committed to as a Professional Educator: to be ethical, to advocate for students, to provide service as an educator, and to continue to grow professionally as a lifelong learner.

Evidence for the disposition of Ethics is documented as candidates engage in professional practice with dignity and integrity, implement evidence-based best practice, respect diverse characteristics and needs of students and their families, maintain high expectations, practice confidentiality, and focus on moral qualities. Some other candidates' behaviors further illustrate ethics are their ability to demonstrate a professional attitude, to preplan/prepare, to have enthusiasm, to use/analyze assessment to improve instruction, and to communicate assessment results to students.

Evidence for the disposition of Advocacy is documented as candidates become proactive in supporting/promoting others' interests, work to engage in collaborative partnerships, and become more inclusive and student-centered. Some other candidates' behaviors that further illustrate advocacy are their ability to plan for learning and cultural diversity; to collaborate in designing, implementing, and supporting learning; to engage students at all levels; to foster a positive learning climate with effective classroom management; to assess and analyze results to meet diverse learning needs and situations; and to integrate technology to address diverse student needs.

Evidence for the disposition of Service is documented as candidates demonstrate that they are caring; supportive; passionate about and engaged in making a real difference for students, families, schools,

and communities; and that they use community/student/other resources. Candidates also demonstrate Service through their Leadership project for KTS 10.

Evidence for the disposition of Lifelong Learning is documented as candidates continue professional growth and development throughout their collegiate career and into their career and strive for continued daily excellence. Candidates also give evidence of a commitment to lifelong learning through reflection on teaching, planning, and implementation of changes based on reflection; and the ability to accept critical comments by supervisors.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

The above dispositions are also embedded in the three programs at the Advanced level. The candidates enrolled in the ESL course sequence of Edu 401-404 acquire or deepen their understanding and their abilities to demonstrate these four dispositions. In addition to the above, within the MSTL and Teacher Leader endorsement programs, candidates acquire or deepen these dispositions as explained below.

Ethics: Candidates reflect upon the philosophical assumptions, ethical principles, standards, and rationales that guide education. They also develop and refine the skills necessary to analyze and integrate constructive ethics into practices that lead to success. The research courses provide opportunities to deal with professional ethical standards of research typically not addressed in the undergraduate program.

Advocacy: Candidates advocate for and promote equity for diverse populations; they also demonstrate respect for individuals. In the job-embedded projects, MSTL candidates identify opportunities to advocate for students. They also work with their school and district for safe technology use. Commitment to advocacy moves advanced candidates to attend to individual needs as they design, plan, and implement instruction for classrooms with diverse populations, including appropriate use of technology.

Service: Candidates look for opportunities to serve the community. As future teacher leaders, the MSTL candidates develop servant leader skills in the leadership courses. Servant leadership emphasizes service to others over self-interest and self-promotion.

Lifelong Learning: Candidates learn to understand themselves as learners and value learning as a core to professional growth. In ongoing action research projects, they collaborate with graduate faculty and reflect on interests and issues of concern to educators, then carry out action research projects for continued professional development.

1g.2. How do candidates demonstrate that they are developing professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

Candidates are expected to develop the disposition of advocacy, which for Brescia University's SOE is related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn. This professional disposition is measured by 1) Interview at Application to SOE; 2) Common core courses and faculty references to SOE; 3) Field Experiences; 4) CP observation evaluations; and 5) Portfolios at Application to CP and CP.

Dispositional Skills Interview

Professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all student can learn are directly related to the SOE dispositions of ethics, advocacy, service and lifelong learning. As part of the application to the SOE, candidates are interviewed regarding their dispositions. A sampling of demonstrators from Interview Presentation Rating Form ([Edu #5](#)) that are aligned with fairness and the belief that all

student can learn include: *honest, ethical awareness, caring awareness of others' needs, differentiating approaches to instruction, perceives own role as advocate, serves others, belief in ability of students to help one another, and shoots for the stars.* [Table 1g.2.1](#) – “Oral and Dispositional Skills Interview 2011–2015” presents scores for the Unit and per Program. Across all years a minimum score of ≥ 3 on Oral Presentation is required for competency. When the form changed in 2014 to have consistent 5.0 scale and in 2015 to be consistent with 4 point scale of Unit, a minimum score of 80% of possible score was required for Dispositional Skills. The Oral and a Dispositional score for the Unit and per Program met or exceeded the competency. Thus candidates at the entry level demonstrate competency in oral and dispositional skills in the Unit and across programs. A Secondary English candidate who did not meet the required Dispositional score was advised out of the Program. An Elementary/Special Education candidate did not reapply and left the University.

Advocacy Skills at Core Courses and Application to SOE

Faculty Recommendation Professional Disposition and Skill ([Edu #4A](#)) and Professional Disposition and Skill ([Edu #4B](#)) Evaluations measure the candidates' dispositional advocacy skill at the point of application to the SOE and by instructors of Core Common Course (Edu 204/108, 246, 255, 301, and Psy 300). The exemplar measuring advocacy skills is *Awareness of the needs of others*, which relates directly to fairness and the belief that all students can learn. [Table 1g.2.2](#) – “Advocacy Disposition at Core Courses and Application to SOE”– shows yearly data by Unit and Program. These data show candidates' scores of ≥ 2.41 on a 5-point scale for the Advocacy disposition, thus providing evidence that candidates' advocacy skills are solid at the point of application to the SOE and in SOE core courses.

Field Experience

[Table 1g.2.3](#) – “Field Supervisor Evaluations of Advocacy”– provides data based on exhibitors: *Vitality/enthusiasm; Awareness of student/participant needs; Interaction with students/participants; and Positive/caring attitude.* This data from the [Edu #16](#) Field Supervisor's Evaluation shows the Unit and Program averages > 3.0 on a 4-point scale. With the exception of IECE in *Vitality/Enthusiasm and Awareness of student/participant needs*, all Programs have met or exceeded a 3.0 average. Within IECE and Special Education, individual candidates scored < 3.0 or candidate behavior was not observed (NO). Even with this exception, the data averages support candidates' solid dispositional skill of advocacy as rated by field supervisors. The IECE and Special Education candidates did not complete the program.

CP Evaluations

CP bi-weekly ([Edu #12](#)) and summative ([Edu #14](#)) evaluations completed by the Cooperating Teacher (CT) and a minimum of 4 targeted observations ([Edu #13](#)) completed by the University Supervisor (US) during placement provide evidence of Advocacy through the following exemplars: *Collaboration, Facilitates mutual respect; Communicates high expectations; Positive classroom management/fosters self-control; Creative/flexible use of time, space, materials; uses/Analyzes assessment to improve instruction; and Promotes self-assessment.* [Table 1g.2.4](#) – “Professional Disposition Advocacy in Clinical Practice by CT and US Observations”– shows Unit and all Program averages exceed the expected 3.0. These data provide evidence that candidates' advocacy skills are solid for the Unit and across Programs.

Portfolios

The SOE identifies KTS P–12: 1.4, 2.4, 3.3, 4.2, and 5.5; and IECE: 1.3, 6.5, 7.7, and 8.2 as aligned with Advocacy, fairness and the belief that students can learn. The SOE for 2011–2014 holistically evaluated portfolios according to KTS. [Table 1g.2.5](#) – “Advocacy Evidence in Application to CP and CP Portfolios”– provides yearly data per KTS and an overall average for the Unit and per Program. These data show that candidates achieve and exceed the expected 3.0 level. This portfolio evidence implies candidates' advocacy is solid for the Unit and across Programs.

An indicator-level Portfolio rubric (Edu #24A/B – TEAC Portfolio Assessment P–12/IECE, Edu #25A/B – CT Review of CP Portfolio, and EDU #29A/B – US review of CP Portfolio) was implemented in 2014–2015 to provide indicator-based data. The [Table 1a.2.4b](#) – Portfolio Scoring per Indicator 2014–2015 evidences indicator-based data that is utilized to support Unit and Program portfolio KTS data. IECE and Middle School candidates made application to CP only in 2014–2015.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Starting with the [interview](#) that is part of entering the MSTL program, advanced candidates are asked about professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn (see [Interview Rating Guide](#)). As candidates progress through the program, within their courses they are exposed to opportunities to develop professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn (see *Ethics and Advocacy* column in [Table 5D](#)). The assignments linked to *Ethics* and *Advocacy* are displayed in the [MSTL Performance Assessment of Unit’s CF](#). In addition, candidates evaluate their degree of attainment of program goals and disposition using the [Midpoint Evaluation](#) and the [Exit Evaluation Form](#). These various sources of data are shown in [Table IG3](#). On the average, at entry point, Brescia MSTL candidates average 2.4 on a 4.0 scale. At midpoint, the data indicate an average of 3.3; and at exit-point, candidates average 3.9. The increase from 2.4 to 3.9 shows candidates’ ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and acting in an ethical manner upon completion of the program.

1g.3. What data from key assessments indicate that candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions listed in 1.g.1 as they work with students, families, colleagues, and communities? [A table summarizing these data could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

INITIAL PROGRAMS

Evidence to support candidates’ level of performance on the five elements of dispositions in the Unit’s CF is interwoven with assessment of the ten KTS. SOE faculty believe that in field placements candidates have opportunities to provide: *service* to schools and the community, *advocacy* by supporting and promoting all students in their learning, a model of *ethical* practice, and a demonstration of their willingness to engage in *lifelong learning*.

Field Experience

[Table 1g.3.1](#) – “Field Supervisor Evaluations of Professional Dispositions” – presents professional competencies, and the dispositions of ethics, advocacy, service, and lifelong learning as rated by Field Supervisors. The data show the average Unit performance exceeds 3.0 out of 4.0, which demonstrates strong dispositional skill for the Unit. All Programs, with the exception of IECE in 2012–2013 and IECE, Elementary, and Special Education in 2014–2015, met or exceeded 3.0 expectations. Neither the IECE candidates nor the Special Education candidate completed the program. The Elementary average was lower because of the inclusion of the Special Ed candidate’s dual certification data within Elementary.

Clinical Practice

The following tables present data of candidates’ ability to demonstrate the dispositions of Ethics [Table 1g.3.2](#), Advocacy [Table 1g.2.4](#), Service [Table 1g.3.4](#), and Lifelong Learning [Table 1g.3.5](#) in clinical practice as they work with students, families, colleagues, and the communities as rated by CTs and USs. Averages across the Unit and Programs are rated ≥ 3.0 for all dispositions, providing evidence of a solid ability to incorporate professional dispositions during clinical practice.

Portfolio

KTS P–12: 8 Collaborates, and IECE: 6 Collaborates and 8 Supports Families offer evidence of candidates’ ability to work with students, families, colleagues, and community. [Table 1g.3.6](#) – “Collaboration Evidence in Application to CP and CP Portfolios” – provides data for the Unit and Programs for

p-12 KTS 8 and IECE KTS 6 & 8. The data for the Unit and Programs reveals scores that exceed 3.0 on a 4.0 scale. This table supports that candidates have demonstrated strong skill in the area of collaboration as rated at the point of application and CP.

An indicator-level Portfolio rubric (Edu #24A/B –TEAC Portfolio Assessment P-12/IECE, Edu #25A/B – CT Review of CP Portfolio, and EDU #29A/B –US review of CP Portfolio) was implemented in 2014–2015 to provide indicator-based data. The [Table 1a.2.4b](#) – Portfolio Scoring per Indicator 2014–2015 evidences indicator-based data that is utilized to support Unit and Program portfolio KTS data. IECE and Middle School candidates made application to CP only in 2014–2015.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Upon admission, MSTL candidates interview with the Graduate Program Director and a representative from the School of Education. The [interview questions](#) are designed to give each applicant an opportunity to establish his or her own teacher dispositions, and to allow the Program Director an opportunity to make an initial determination of the potential “fit” between the candidate and the program’s conceptual framework and desired dispositions listed in [Table 5D](#). Candidates integrate concepts to advocate for student learning in *EDL 550*. Opportunities for candidates to visit families with special needs children are also provided in *EDL 550*. The *EDL 620* coursework includes issues of professional ethical responsibilities, and the course urges candidates to consider their role as ethical educators as they relate to students, families, colleagues, and the community. Candidates develop and refine the skills necessary to analyze and integrate constructive ethics into practices that lead to success in *EDL 672*. An understanding of the policy and procedures required by school districts are addressed in *EDL 620*. Also in *EDL 620* candidates analyze policy and ethical issues in P-12 settings. Emphasis is placed on decision-making, professional conduct (*EDL 650*), research, and learning (*EDL 672*). At mid-point in the program, candidates complete the [Mid-Program Evaluation Form](#), designed to identify candidates’ reflections on the extent to which they have acquired the dispositions and attitudes to work with students, families, colleagues, and communities. At the end of the program, candidates also complete an [Exit Program Evaluation Form](#). A summary of professional disposition data is presented in [Table IG2](#). Analysis of the results shows that at exit point, candidates scored a 3.5 (2012–2013), 4.0 (2013–2014), and 4.0 (2014–2015) on a 4.0 scale. Data show that most advanced candidates generally enter the program demonstrating professional disposition on a scale of 2.5, move to 3.1 by the time they’re midway through the program, then keep growing through program completion to culminate with an average of 3.8 (see Dispositions Average for 2011–2015 in [Table IG2](#)).

Field Supervisors of ESL candidates did not complete and return Edu#16 forms between fall term 2014 and spring term 2015 for Edu 402, 401 or 403. During the spring term of 2015, Edu #16 was revised and was piloted as [Edu#17](#): ESL Field Experience and Practicum Formative Evaluation.

1g.4. What do follow-up studies of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' demonstration of professional dispositions? If survey data have not already been reported, what was the response rate? [If these survey data are included in a previously attached table, refer the reader to that attachment; otherwise, a table summarizing the results of follow-up studies related to professional dispositions could be attached at Prompt 1g.5 below.]

INITIAL PROGRAMS

For Initial Teacher Education Programs a Graduate Exit Survey was sent using Survey Monkey. [Table 1g.4.1](#) – “Graduate Exit Survey Dispositions”– summarized the responses by Unit and Program. Questions aligned with professional dispositions were: The School of Education prepared me:

22. *by providing clarity, understanding, and the value of SOE’s Conceptual Framework in the area of Ethics*

23. *by providing clarity, understanding, and the value of SOE's Conceptual Framework in the area of Advocacy*

24. *by providing clarity, understanding, and the value of SOE's Conceptual Framework in the area of Service*

25. *by providing clarity, understanding, and the value of SOE's Conceptual Framework in the area of Lifelong Learning.*

The Unit average for each disposition was ≥ 3.5 , resulting in an overall average of 3.65. Each Program achieved ≥ 3.4 for each disposition, with overall averages of ≥ 3.5 . From these data, it can be concluded that graduates believed the program prepared them adequately in professional dispositions. [Table 1g.4.2](#) – “Professional Dispositions New Teacher Survey 2011–2012” – presents the data available for this review period. This table presents data for each of the SOE dispositions: Ethics, Advocacy, Service, and Lifelong Learning. ETHICS is aligned with all KTS; according to the data, the CT average on all items was 3.16, and the overall average from responders was 3.17. ADVOCACY is aligned with KTS #s 1.4, 2.4, 3.3, 4.2, 5.5 and items # 47 and 48; the data indicate that the CT average on all items was 3.09 and overall from responders was 3.09. An area of concern is the rating on *effectiveness of the educator preparation program in preparing the student teacher/intern to effectively teach students who are limited English proficient*, which was rated by CTs at 2.86, with the overall responders at 2.67. SERVICE is aligned with KTS #10; according to the data, the CT average on all items was 3.05 and overall from responders was 3.12. LIFELONG LEARNING is aligned with KTS #9; the data indicate that the CT average on all items was 3.05 and overall from responders was 3.12. From these data it can be concluded that CTs and other responders see that the program prepared the candidates adequately in the area of professional dispositions, with the exception of the focused ESL question.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

The [MSTL Exit Survey](#) collects data on graduates' demonstration of Ethics, Advocacy, Service, and Life-long Learning. In the area of ETHICS, graduates thought the program helped them develop ethically (see [Table SG7](#)). The following three questions scored very high marks: Question 5–*Adhere to ethical standards in the classroom* (4 of 4 students responded “very well”); Question 6–*Recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice* (3 of 4 students responded “very well”); and Question 7–*Make ethical decisions by applying professional Code of Ethics* (3 of 4 students responded “very well”). [Chart SG8](#) provides a summary of the responses of all graduates about the disposition of Ethics.

Questions 11–14 of the MSTL Survey address ADVOCACY. Results show that all candidates thought the program adequately prepared them in this area (see [Table SG8](#)). Three of the four candidates thought the program prepared them “very well” and one indicated that the program prepared him/her “well.” [Chart SG9](#) provides a summary of responses regarding the disposition of Advocacy.

In the area of SERVICE (Questions 15–17), graduates indicated that they felt called to serve (see [Table SG9](#)). The chart, [Chart SG10](#), provides a summary of responses of all graduates regarding the disposition of Service.

Finally, the survey asked graduates about LIFELONG LEARNING (questions 18–26). The survey results show high ratings for this disposition (see [Table SG10](#)), with the following two questions scoring very high: Question 18–*Engage in continuing education and lifelong learning* (3 of 4 students responded “very well”) and Question 20–*Continually discover, appraise and attend to changing research . . . to provide relevant service to students* (3 of 4 students responded “very well”). [Chart SG11](#) provides a summary of the responses of all graduates in the area of Lifelong Learning.

Items # 5–26 on the survey provided data that the program assisted candidates positively in developing and/or strengthening these four SOE professional dispositions. The results indicate that graduates demonstrate the professional dispositions of ethics, advocacy, service, and lifelong learning. In addition, all four graduates believed the program prepared them to “*plan instruction that is aligned with the Kentucky State Standards (Q33).*”

To date there have been no graduates from the ESL P–12 or the (free-standing) Teacher Leader Endorsement programs.

1g.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to professional dispositions may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 1?

The unit tracks candidates’ progress continually throughout the levels and throughout all programs. The data are strong and used by programs annually for evaluation purposes. Advisors use individual candidate’s data to support growth as teacher education candidates progress through the program.

2. What research related to Standard 1 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

STANDARD 2. ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

2a. Assessment System

2a.1. How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards?

The Unit and each Program collects data on candidate proficiencies outlined in the SOE Conceptual Framework, in state standards, and in professional standards from multiple sources at each of the four levels within the continuous assessment system: Level 1 – Admission to SOE; Level 2 – Successful Completion of Coursework and Field Experience Hours; Level 3 – Admission to Clinical Practice; and Level 4 – Program Completion. During the current accreditation cycle, the SOE has been in transition regarding its assessment process: For part of the cycle a manual data input system was used; beginning in Fall 2014, Taskstream as an internet-based data collection and analysis software system is now used to collect program, course, candidate, faculty, field, unit operations, and graduate data.

While Taskstream is now the e-data foundation for the SOE assessment process, it is augmented by data available through other on-campus data sources, including NetClassroom, Blackbaud, FAWeb,

Moodle and Adobe Connect (both available through BU online service provider Learning House), *Compliance Assist* from Campus Labs, the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE), and the First Year Experience (FYE) ETS pre- and post-assessments for freshmen and seniors.

INITIAL PROGRAMS

During AY 2013–2014 the Unit identified seven Key Assessments ([Table 2a.1.1](#)) for the Unit and all initial-level SOE Programs: GPA, dispositions, portfolios, KTIP lesson/unit plans, Field/Practicum, PRAXIS I/II, and Clinical Practice. The Unit uses the system to compile data on the Conceptual Framework obtained at the four assessment levels. Each level includes the following:

1) data that are monitored by the SOE Data Manager, the Director of Field Experience, and the Program Coordinators/Advisors to meet state, BU, and Unit requirements for progression through the approved programs for Initial teacher certification; and

2) data designed to track the development of candidate growth across the four levels of the programs. Target performance at the levels is indicated by the following scale: Beginning – 1, Developing – 2, Accomplished – 3 and Exemplary – 4.

Data obtained from the Key Assessments, other common assessments utilized for all candidates in the Unit, and assessments in specific courses (including Related Assessments (RA) for Signature Assignments – SA) all track candidates' progression through the levels. At each of the four levels the Unit collects data from both formative and summative assessments and from internal (Unit and cross-campus faculty) and external evaluators (P–12 and community partners).

These data are aggregated at the Unit level and disaggregated by Programs, then used in analyses that support current practice or identify where changes for improvement should be explored. Utilizing data from objectives/activities and SA + RA within all Edu-course syllabi, the third column of [Table 2a.1.2](#) – “Continuous Assessment System Aligned with Program Levels 1–4 and Kentucky Teacher Standards P–12 and IECE” – demonstrates this alignment. Note that column two also indicates alignment with the elements of the SOE Conceptual Framework and EPSB themes: content/ professional/pedagogy, technology, assessment, dispositions, and diversity. In this way candidate performance is tracked over time to demonstrate progression from *Beginning* to *Developing* to *Accomplished* to *Exemplary*. [Table 2a.1.3](#) demonstrates how all initial-level SOE programs are aligned with the Specialized Professional Associations for assessments. [Table 2a.1.4](#) offers an example of how program assessments are aligned with the KTS. [Table 1g.2.1](#) demonstrates ways in which the Unit's assessment system integrates the SOE Conceptual Framework into the KTS and SPA standards, and the BU Educational Outcomes, assessing the former through the lenses of the latter. This particular assessment also includes NCATE standards, ISTE standards, and EPSB theme integration as well.

The embedding of Signature Assignments and Related Assessments in Professional and Common Core courses is specifically designed to ensure that all candidates enrolled in any of the approved programs at the Initial level have targeted proficiencies assessed in each of the five courses: Edu 204/108, Edu 246, Edu 255, Psy 300, and Edu 301. Each Signature Assignment and its Related Assessment for these courses has been aligned to the [BU Mission](#) and to the [SOE Conceptual Framework and Mission](#). In addition the five elements of the SOE Conceptual Framework have been integrated with the performance standards of KTS for P–12 and IECE, the Brescia Mission, and the (prior to Fall 2014) BU Educational Outcomes; this integration is reflected in [Table 2a.1.8](#).

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Brescia University's School of Education has three programs at the Advanced level: English as a Second Language (ESL) Endorsement P–12; Master of Science in Teacher Leadership (MSTL); and the Teacher Leader (TL) Endorsement. However, at Brescia the ESL (P–12) Endorsement is available both to undergraduate candidates who have attained Admission into the SOE and who enroll in the

specific 300- or 400-level courses concurrently with coursework in their area(s) of initial certification *and* to post-baccalaureate candidates who already hold a teaching certificate.

Candidates enrolled in the two endorsement programs are assessed through the Signature Assignments (SA) with their Related Assessments (RA) identified in the syllabi, and through required Field and Practicum experiences or embedded job-related assignments.

Candidates enrolled in the MSTL program are assessed according to the following graduate assessment plan: The Conceptual Framework provides the vision that shapes the Brescia University School of Education. As articulated there, the SOE forms graduates are ready to become professional educators shaped by the four dispositions of ethics, advocacy, service, and lifelong learning (see [MSTL Performance Assessment of Unit's CF](#)). Data on these dispositions are collected from [Signature Assignments](#) embedded within coursework, since these assignments are linked to SOE dispositions (see [Table 5D](#)). Field Practicum Evaluations also have the elements of the School of Education's professional dispositions. The SOE expectation is that mentor ratings on the [Coaching/Mentoring Form](#) for graduate candidate performance in professional skills, ethics, advocacy, service, and lifelong learning is at least at the *Accomplished* level on each of these elements. Field requirements are structured across candidates' courses in the MSTL program, and include job-embedded Practica in Core Courses and 30 hours of mentoring Practicum in the Leadership courses. Candidates engage in self-assessment of their skills, knowledge, and dispositions; they reflect on their experiences; and they receive evaluative feedback from their mentors and University faculty.

Self-evaluation is another way the advanced program measures candidate dispositions. Academic background, experience, and professional dispositions are measured at entry point using the [Interview Questionnaire Rating Guide](#). The data from the initial interview are used to guide candidates during advising sessions. The following professional educator skills and dispositions of the candidate are rated during the process of Admission to the MSTL program: professional skills, ethics, advocacy, and lifelong learning. Upon admission, candidates interview with the Graduate Program Director and another full-time faculty member from the School of Education. The [interview questions](#) are designed to give the applicants an opportunity to state what they currently believe and what they think our dispositions are; this allows the Program Director to make an initial determination of the potential match between the applicant and the MSTL program's Conceptual Framework and desired dispositions.

These entry-point data are compared with data obtained from candidates' self-assessment mid-way through the Program. Candidates assess their Program progress at midpoint, reporting on their academic and GPA status and rating where they believe they are in developing/deepening the required School of Education dispositions needed for successful completion of the Program. This [Mid-Program Evaluation Form](#) is also intended to help candidates identify areas for continuing professional growth and define steps they might take to promote that growth. Candidates are expected to show understanding of the School of Education Dispositions with a score of ≥ 2 out of a possible 4 on each disposition. Data from this self-assessment are used by the Program Director to consider ways in which the Program can assist candidates to develop and/or strengthen positive professional dispositions. Dispositions are also measured at the conclusion of the degree program, using the [Exit Program Evaluation Form](#). At the exit point, candidates are expected to show understanding/adoption of the School of Education Dispositions with at least a score of ≥ 3 out of a possible 4 on each disposition.

Information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the Unit's state and professional standards are collected via Signature Assignments. All candidates in the MSTL Program are assessed in core courses on competencies in the Kentucky Teacher Standards at the Advanced level (see [KTS Assessments within the MSTL Program](#)). The linkage between MSTL courses and the KTS is seen in [Table 4](#). Each MSTL course syllabus outlines how the course objectives and course activities meet each of the KTS

at the Advanced level; for samples, see [EDL 620 Course Syllabus](#), [EDL 655 Course Syllabus](#), and [EDL 671 Course Syllabus](#). The Signature Assignments within the MSTL courses are tagged to KTS Advanced standards in the Taskstream assessment program used by the School of Education; for an example, see [EDL 570 Signature Assignment Rubric](#). To ensure that all 10 KTS Advanced standards are assessed in the capstone project, candidates are required to attain a *Satisfactory* score in each of the 10 KTS Advanced standards on the [ARP Form 4](#) capstone assessment tool. Candidates are also required to identify the Kentucky Core Academic Standards and the College Readiness Standards they are targeting for their lesson plans.

2a.2. What are the key assessments used by the unit and its programs to monitor and make decisions about candidate performance at transition points such as those listed in Table 6? Please complete Table 6 or upload your own table at Prompt 2a.6 below.

Table 6
Unit Assessment System: Transition Point Assessments

Program	Admission	Entry to Clinical Practice	Exit from Clinical Practice	Program Completion	After Program Completion
Initial	See 2a.2 Table 6	See 2a.2 Table 6	See 2a.2 Table 6	See 2a.2 Table 6	Graduate Exit Survey
Program	Admission	Mid-Point in Program		Program Completion	After Program Completion
MSTL	See Table 8B	See Table 8B		See Table 8B	Exit Survey

2a.3. How is the unit assessment system evaluated? Who is involved and how?

The evaluation of the Unit’s assessment system within the SOE is both a continuous process and an annual one. Multiple assessments, both internal and external ([Table 2a.5.1](#)), provide information used by the SOE to evaluate candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions, as well as Program effectiveness and the effectiveness of the Unit and its operations.

INITIAL PROGRAMS

As may be seen in the [Unit Assessment System Visual](#), **Phase 1** of the Unit Assessment System begins with the **Design and Implementation of Assessments**, targeted to produce and collect performance data at candidate, Program, or Unit level. **Phase 2** involves **Analysis** of the data collected and a determination of whether the data are useful in applying a data-informed approach to decision-making. This analysis involves three possible options: 1) a need for assessments to be reviewed; 2) a need for review of the evidence that is assessed; or 3) data are appropriate for informed decision-making. **Phase 3** is **Planning** for improvement based on data analyses. **Phase 4** is **Implementation of revisions** based on improvement plans. **Phase 5** is collection of **Evidence** as data, reflecting the impact of changes implemented and whether or not the desired effect(s) have been attained.

The cyclical process for the current assessment system began in AY 2013–2014, and includes the following progression of events:

1. Full-time Unit faculty and staff engaged in revision of the SOE Conceptual Framework and Mission Statement, with input from candidates, the BU campus community, and TEAC;
2. Full-time Unit faculty and staff identified the seven Key Assessments forming the framework of the system; and

3. Full-time Unit faculty and staff clarified the required knowledge (content, professional and pedagogical), technology skills, assessment skills, professional dispositions, and diversity/Advocacy proficiencies that define the uniquely “Brescian” teacher education candidate.

These significant actions have been the driving force behind continuous efforts in each of the five phases of the cycle. Full- and part-time Unit faculty and staff have since engaged in ongoing informal evaluation of the assessment system through small group discussions, weekly SOE meetings, and scheduled “Data Days.” Minutes ([Data Day Minutes](#)) and calendars provide information on the topics discussed, identification of successes, and areas for improvement, as well as proposed changes and pilot efforts. Changes in faculty and staff, the introduction of KFETS, the offering of the new IECE program and the new ESL Endorsement, and the adoption of Taskstream at the Unit level have also occurred. These changes have provided additional opportunities for evaluation of how the system is impacted by new data, personnel, requirements, and technologies; faculty and staff continue to monitor what’s working and where improvements should be made.

Cross-campus content-area faculty in disciplines with teacher certification options have also been involved in the assessment process in the following ways:

- the design and implementation of the Signature Assignment and Related Assessment for their courses
- the transmission of data pertinent to Edu majors to the SOE Data manager at the end of every semester
- annual review of the assessment and data and alignment with Program/Unit/BU goals and objectives through the “assessment grids”
- the periodic review of the alignment of the assessment with KTS/KCAS/SPA standards when changes occur.

Through the involvement of some of these cross-campus partners as members of TEAC, representative content-area faculty also participate each term in a review of the Unit’s assessment system, planning for improvement, and implementation of approved changes proposed by the SOE advisory committee.

External involvement in the evaluation of the Unit assessment system occurs through scheduled input from four bodies, each with membership representing P–12 and community partners and/or BU faculty and administration: the Office of **Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE)**, the **Academic Program Review Committee (APRC)**, the **Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC)**, and the **SOE Graduate Committee (MSTL Committee)**.

IRE: Effective in Fall 2015, Brescia is utilizing a new format for the University-wide **annual** program review process; data are now being uploaded into *Compliance Assist*, an electronic software program through *Campus Labs*. Prior to this inauguration, the Director of the IRE and the SOE faculty worked collaboratively on the University-wide assessment process (annual assessment grids compiled and assessed manually) to articulate and assess the goals and objectives of the Unit and its various Programs. This process has focused on trying to integrate state-mandated SOE assessment requirements and terminology into the more generic University assessment grids so that creating parallel and unconnected assessments is avoided. The Director of IRE and the Academic Dean (VPAA) review the data and the summary of changes/improvements indicated at the Unit and Program levels, then discuss any proposed follow-up efforts needed for system improvement with the Chair of the SOE.

APRC: As required by Brescia University (see [Faculty Handbook Appendix A](#)), all academic programs are **reviewed every five years** by this University administrative committee. The last review was completed in 2010. One of the purposes of this review cycle is to examine the assessment system

and data reports to ensure the maintenance of quality programs. Progress on addressing recommendations is reported in each successive annual assessment grid submitted to the Director of IRE and to VPAA; since 2014 progress is also now reported to the APRC at mid-point in the scheduled review cycle. All SOE programs are scheduled for another APRC review in late Spring 2016 ([APRC Calendar 2015–2016](#)).

TEAC: This SOE advisory committee meets **two or three times per academic year**. TEAC serves in an advisory capacity to the SOE by reviewing, approving, and submitting recommendations for program and policy development and modification; and by reviewing the assessment system and assessment data during each meeting when decisions are being made concerning formal processes at Admission to the SOE and Admission to Clinical Practice, as well as decisions impacting policies and programs at the Unit and Program levels. The TEAC has decision-making power over candidate acceptance into the SOE and into Clinical Practice.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS:

The Advanced programs also utilize the SOE [Unit Assessment System Visual](#) as described above. Information on advanced candidate proficiencies outlined in the Unit's Conceptual Framework and state and professional standards are entered into this system for the three approved advanced programs: MSTL, Teacher Leader Endorsement, and the ESL P–12 Endorsement. The advanced [Program-wide Assessments](#) provide regular and comprehensive data on Program quality, Unit operations, and candidates' performance. The system is designed to a) support the assessment requirements of professional organizations and the Unit's Conceptual Framework, and b) to provide comprehensive information for data-informed decision-making and continuous improvement at Program and Unit levels.

The people involved in the evaluation of the Unit Assessment System at the Advanced level include: graduate faculty, the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE), the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC), the Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC), and the SOE Graduate Committee (MSTL Committee, which consists of the Director of the Graduate Program, full-time faculty who teach in the program, the SOE Chair, and up to two graduate candidates).

The [SOE Graduate Committee](#) meets once a semester and provides ongoing assessment of the MSTL and the two endorsements (Teacher Leader and ESL P–12); it does so by establishing communication among all stakeholders (candidates, faculty, the SOE, and the University) regarding the efficacy of Advanced level programs.

[TEAC](#) provides ongoing and valuable assessment to the MSTL program, in that its members include faculty members responsible for the General Education core and for the academic content areas relative to the SOE. Brescia's TEAC also includes members who are principals and teachers from collaborating schools in local school systems and other community partners. As such, these local educators provided input in the initial development of the Master of Science in Teacher Leader degree. TEAC members also help determine future directions for the MSTL program and advise the SOE on specific areas of interest and concern.

The [Director of IRE](#) meets at least annually with the Graduate Director to prepare the annual assessment reports which the University requires for all academic programs across campus. Over the past three years, meetings have occurred much more frequently in order to facilitate the integration of state- and University-mandated assessment processes and reports.

The process for [APRC](#) review of the assessment system for the advanced programs is the same as noted above for initial programs.

Data from all these sources are used for continuous Program review both by the Director of the Graduate Programs, who meets regularly with the SOE Chair to review and analyze data pertaining to the three advanced programs, and the entire SOE through Unit faculty and staff assessment once each semester and annually in the preparation and submission of the Advanced Programs section of the Unit's Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment Document.

2a.4. How does the unit ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias?

The Unit (Initial and Advanced Programs) ensures that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias in several ways, as may be seen below.

Fairness

SOE full- and part-time faculty are required by the Unit to use a **common syllabus template** composed of sections that have been **specifically designed to orient candidates at the outset of any Edu or EDL course to SOE expectations**. These include:

1. The knowledge, skills and dispositions targeted for evaluation in the course
2. The **Signature Assignment (SA)** and **Related Assessment (RA)** and the link to Taskstream
3. The course objectives/activities and the Means of Evaluation, including alignment to:
 - A. Conceptual Framework components
 - B. KTS P-12 or IECE and relevant SPA standards
4. The proposed calendar with due dates for all assignments
5. The common grading scale utilized within the SOE.

These elements of a common syllabus template demonstrate several aspects of fairness:

- early identification of the assessment and how it will be assessed
- indication of when the assessments will occur, and when it is to be uploaded and submitted
- a discussion of how the assessment and its elements relate to the course content, objectives, activities, KTS and SPA standards, EPSB themes, and the Unit's Conceptual Framework through the process of "tagging".

Another example of fairness occurs when faculty teaching coursework at the *Initial level* use a **common rubric throughout the candidates' experiences across Levels 1-4**, e.g. [lesson plan rubric](#) or [portfolio rubric \(P-12, IECE\)](#). These rubrics were designed to provide consistent indicators as evidence of a candidate's growth over time, based on experienced faculty input about the **clearly identified performance targets** that should be evident in each level: *Beginning*, *Developing*, *Accomplished*, or *Exemplary*. By applying and evaluating the same performance targets at the appropriate benchmarks for the candidate's progression through their specific coursework in their desired area(s) of certification, SOE faculty are demonstrating FAIRNESS as they measure candidate performance.

Accuracy

In its initial programs, the SOE utilizes seven [Key Assessments](#): GPA, Praxis I-II (content/ professional/pedagogical), KTS standards-based portfolios, KTIP Lesson/Unit Plans, measures of professional dispositions, and measures of performance in Field experiences (including a Practicum of 50 hours P-12 or 150 hours in the IECE) and performance in Clinical Practice. The revised lesson plan rubric used with all Edu candidates (P-12/IECE) is aligned with the KTIP process, including the Kentucky Framework for Teaching and its embedded alignment of the components with Kentucky Teacher Standards. The revised portfolio scoring assessment is now a rubric and assesses each indicator of each KTS P-12 and IECE standard. The design of each [Signature Assignment and Related Assessment](#) (SA+RA) is determined by identifying the evidence required for demonstrating specific

knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions targeted in a course and then constructing a tool for their measurement. Individual course syllabi provide the description and the supporting explanation of how the RA relates candidate performance or level of proficiency to the expected learning outcomes based on “tagging” elements of the RA. Tagging allows candidates to understand the target(s) as behaviors demonstrating one or more of the following:

1. BU and SOE Educational Outcomes
2. EPSB Initial or Advanced Standards and the relevant SPA Standards for each Program
3. Unit and Program goals: content/professional/pedagogical knowledge, professional skills, assessment skills, technology skills, professional dispositions (the four pillars), and diversity/ advocacy proficiencies, all of which constitute the uniquely “Brescian” teacher education candidate.

Since performance expectations around all the elements of SOE Programs are clearly and consistently outlined in every course syllabus, the SOE is demonstrating ACCURACY.

Consistency

The calculation of GPA and the qualifying scores set by Kentucky’s EPSB produce one demonstration of consistency in two of the seven SOE Key Assessments. The use of the KTIP lesson plan format and the recent adoption of a common rubric for use by faculty across SOE Program levels 1–4 are also showing some consistency among raters regarding acquisition of the performance targets at a given level in the initial programs. Assessment of candidate portfolios is in transition; however, multiple internal and external raters are involved in the process: SOE full- and part-time faculty, content-area faculty, BU SOE alumnae, P–12 community partners, and TEAC members. The use of the “old” rubric for holistically scoring candidate portfolios at program Levels 3 and 4 demonstrated consistency among internal and external scorers. Data on the consistency in the use of the “new” rubrics that provide scores for each KTS standard (P–12/IECE) upon evaluation at the indicator level are not yet available; however, internal and external scorers did receive face-to-face or digitally recorded training on the use of the tool in an effort to address the issue of consistency in scoring. During the face-to-face training using Smartboard technology in combination with individual copies of the new tool, the presenter engaged the reviewers in facilitated discussion of the key factors that would result in assigning a rating of 1–4 for each piece of evidence in candidates’ portfolios presented as part of their request for Admission to Clinical Practice. Reviewers then paired up; they scored evidence individually and then compared their ratings; after that ratings were compared as an overall group. This presentation was digitally recorded and used for a second round of training: again individual scorers had access to the paper copy of the tool and the same presenter discussed the key factors that would result in assigning a rating of 1–4 for each piece of evidence from a candidate’s Clinical Practice portfolio. Through these efforts the scope of trained evaluators has broadened from the Unit to Brescia’s cross-campus faculty, portfolio previewers, TEAC members, and Cooperating Teachers. In all this training a concerted attempt has been made to promote consistency in scoring, impact inter-rater reliability, reduce potential for bias, and provide more accurate data on candidate proficiency over time.

Regarding assessment in Field placements at Levels 1–3, the same form, Edu #16, has been utilized for some time by multiple external individuals serving as Field experience supervisors for all applicants or candidates observing/ participating in a single placement for ≥ 10 hours in a term. New Field observation tools, Edu #17, and Edu #17A have recently been designed and are being piloted for use in the ESL P–12 Endorsement Program. The assessment tools for Clinical Practice at Level 4 (also utilized during Practicum Level 3) are Edu #12 (formative) and Edu #14 (summative). These forms are completed by Cooperating Teachers; the Edu #13 (on-site visit observation) is completed by University Supervisors. All three of these forms are identical for every candidate and have been in use for some time. The assessment of candidate dispositions, however, has undergone revision. Utilized primarily at Program Level 1, the “old” Edu #4A and #4B used a rating scale completed by

multiple evaluators when applicants were enrolled in the SOE Common Core courses (Edu 204/108, Edu 246, Edu 255, and Psy 300). The same form was utilized by both SOE and cross-campus faculty when providing recommendations for applicants seeking Admission to SOE. Now, instead of a rating scale, the “[new](#)” [Edu #4A](#) and [#4B](#) forms use a rubric. Professional consultants facilitated SOE faculty efforts in creating the rubric and guiding faculty to a common understanding of key aspects of each cell. When cross-campus faculty were later introduced to the rubric, a SOE faculty member provided guidance and emphasis was placed on the “common language” as well as the key elements of each cell. These efforts promote CONSISTENCY among both internal and external reviewers.

Based on the current enrollment in the SOE, there are no multiple sections of course offerings during any given term. For a number of courses, however, the faculty assigned to teach the course has remained constant over time. Both the consistency of instructor and the common syllabus template strengthen Program CONSISTENCY.

The SOE faculty look for evidence of consistency at several times during the course of an academic year. When acting as a subcommittee of TEAC, faculty compare data from multiple assessments and monitoring tools and from multiple evaluators. This review occurs as SOE faculty prepare recommendations for TEAC regarding applicants seeking Admission into the SOE during a specific term in comparison to prior applicant performance; SOE faculty also compare data from candidates seeking Admission to Clinical Practice to prior candidates. Through the preparation of the “assessment grids” for submission annually to the Director of IRE, SOE faculty also engage in comparison and utilization of the next steps/use of results that also informs determination of consistency.

By engaging in all these practices, the SOE ensures assessment procedures that are CONSISTENT.

Free of Bias

The SOE works in a number of ways to ensure an environment where assessment is free of bias. The physical facilities utilized for the delivery of on-ground courses are spaces that are contextually appropriate. Candidates have input on factors such as amount of lighting, use of fans, amount of work-space, access to technology, and temperature variation in learning spaces. Assessments may be in paper format, e-documents, or accessed through Taskstream or other systems such as Campus Labs or textbook student resource sites. Faculty are required to submit copies of all final examinations each term and an analysis of this sample can provide evidence of attention to avoiding other factors of bias, such as missing or vague instructions, poorly worded questions/tasks, poor readability, or cultural insensitivity. Faculty are also sensitized to the necessity of avoiding bias whenever they are individually or collectively engaged in the revision or creation of any assessments, but with special attention focused on the Related Assessment of each Signature Assignment. Consultants also recently modeled and facilitated discussion of potential issues of bias when facilitating the revision of the disposition rating forms; one consultant provided written feedback when reviewing samples of faculty efforts to revise other tools or to develop Signature Assignments and Related Assessments.

As a result of these efforts and policies, as well as those noted earlier in the sections on “fairness,” “accuracy,” and “consistency,” the SOE ensures assessment procedures that are FREE OF BIAS.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Because the SOE is a Unit comprised of approved programs at both Initial and Advanced levels, the common elements of the ways the Unit ensures that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias have been addressed above. Related Assessments (rubrics) are also provided for Signature Assignments in the advanced programs (see sample assessments and rubrics in [Table 4.2](#)). To ensure validity, the rubrics identify all assessment elements to be measured. Results of assessments are consistent across raters and across scoring occasions. Because of the small numbers of

candidates enrolled in the courses in the three programs at the Advanced level, there have not been incidences of multiple raters for any Related Assessment for a Signature Assignment. At present, the MSTL program only has four active students, the ESL P-12 had three in cohort one and has four in cohort two, and there are no candidates pursuing the “stand alone” Teacher Leader Endorsement, so the same rater (course instructor) grades the Related Assessment for each Signature Assignment. However, for the Field mentoring Practicum, where there are multiple raters, a mentor training is provided. Mentors are selected from those who have already completed the KTIP Training. In addition, mentor training is provided to ensure that different raters understand the rubric used by Brescia University. Training helps to ensure the consistency of ratings when using the Unit’s assessment instruments.

2a.5. What assessments and evaluation measures are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit?

The SOE [Unit Assessment System](#) process requires the use of multiple assessments and evaluation measures from both internal and external sources to promote data-informed decision-making. This variety has been helpful in order to measure efficacy and efficiency in how the system functions and how the operations of the Unit and its approved Initial and Advanced level programs can be improved. Data collection on candidate proficiencies and performance comprise one set of assessment measures. When aggregated these measures provide indicators of strength and areas for growth within the SOE as a Unit. When disaggregated the data inform faculty of strengths and areas for improvement at the Program level. As part of its regular responsibilities for data assessment for SACSCOC, annual state reports, and this accreditation cycle, SOE faculty determined that its long-time methods of data collection and analysis (primarily manual and labor-intensive) were no longer viable. As a result, in early 2014 the former SOE Chair researched available online electronic software programs, made a recommendation to the VPAA that Taskstream be adopted, and launched the use of this more efficient data collection and assessment tool.

It is crucial that multiple assessments and measures result from both internal and external sources ([Table 2a.5.1](#)). Each fall the SOE submits a University-mandated assessment document (“assessment grid”). The Director of IRE has recently revised this form in light of the institutional purchase of *Compliance Assist* as an electronic SACSCOC assessment tool. She has assisted SOE faculty in initial work to customize the University’s “assessment grid” so that it contains (and thus assesses) SOE Unit goals/objectives and Program goals for each Initial and Advanced level certification Program. The customized document ([Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment](#)) summarizes and reports all major assessment data related to BU Educational Outcomes, SOE Unit and Program goals, and the KTS and SPA standards for candidates at each of the four levels as they progress toward degree completion and/or eligibility for KY EPSB certification within any approved SOE program. Additional work will be completed on this revised form in preparation for the late-Spring APRC evaluation of SOE programs. The assessment grid contains a component at the end of each section for an identified Unit or Program Goal titled “Summary of Changes/Improvements to be made in the Next Academic Year Based on Analysis of Assessment Results.” When preparing these documents for annual submission in October, the SOE can identify not only issues related to candidates and Programs, but also issues related to Unit operations such as governance, budget, personnel, facilities, recruitment and retention (through Admissions), advising, and other needed student support services.

After a review of current EPSB and SACSCOC assessment requirements, the SOE identified seven components as sources of [Key Assessment](#) data for all Initial level programs: GPA (cumulative, professional education, and Program area); dispositional assessments (connected to SOE CF and Mission); KTS and SPA-based portfolios; KTIP lesson/unit planning aligned to KTS/KCAS – KYECS;

Field experience and Practicum measures; Praxis I and II standardized examinations; and Clinical Practice measures. The specificity and the variety of these assessment requirements are now judged by the SOE to be appropriate in order both to ensure that its teacher education candidates receive the quality education they seek and to meet state and regional reporting expectations.

During AY 2012–2013 the SOE faculty committed to the creation of Signature Assignments (SA) and their Related Assessments (RA) for each Edu and EDL prefix course at Initial and Advanced levels. Phase 1 involved the identification and implementation of these measures for the SOE Common Core Courses at the Initial level ([Table 2a.5.2](#)). EDL courses offered also included SA + RA measures. Since then the use of SA + RA measures has extended to all professional Edu/EDL courses in each of the Initial and Advanced level programs and to all content area courses in disciplines where teacher certification options are available ([Table 2a.5.3](#) Edu SA +RA and [MSTL SA+RA](#)). Because these SA + RA are specifically designed to align with the BU Mission and the SOE CF and Mission, as well as with the KTS and SPA standards including KCAS/KYECS, the multiple measures allow for validation of operations and programs and provide specific indications of where there are issues of ineffectiveness, inappropriateness and/or “gaps” that need to be addressed.

2a.6. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's assessment system may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Table M8: MSTL Program-wide Assessment

2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

2b.1. What are the processes and timelines used by the unit to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, unit operations, and program quality?

- How are the data collected?**
- From whom (e.g., applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty) are data collected?**
- How often are the data summarized and analyzed?**
- Whose responsibility is it to summarize and analyze the data? (dean, assistant dean, data coordinator, etc.)**
- In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? (reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)**
- What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?**

Currently the Unit is in transition from a data entry system that has been paper- and Excel/Access-based to an electronic online approach that provides easier access and greater flexibility within the Unit's overall assessment system. This shift involves the use of several information technologies and systems, including Taskstream, *Compliance Assist*/Campus Labs, Blackbaud/NetClassroom/FAWeb, Pearson or other text publisher instructor course labs, EPSB, KFETS, Taskstream, Access, Excel, and both Moodle and Adobe Connect available through Learning House as the University's online service provider. The Unit also has two shared drives “I” and “S” on the BU campus server for easy access to additional electronic files.

All data specific to candidate performance, Unit operations, and Program quality are being transitioned from paper, Access, and Excel formats into direct entry in Taskstream each term by the SOE Data Manager and the Director of Field Experiences. Sources for data that are now being uploaded, stored, accessed, and analyzed in Taskstream include the following: Blackbaud/ Netclassroom/

FAWeb; ETS; local/state/federal law enforcement; SOE and cross-campus faculty; candidates; and TEAC. By uploading TEAC meeting minutes, Taskstream is also now used to maintain a record of TEAC actions taken on applicant and candidate admission/progression at Initial Levels 1 and 3, as well as for TEAC suggestions and recommendations regarding areas of concern or options for improvement.

SOE faculty have direct entry access to Taskstream and access to data from multiple other access points including: SOE office files, the University's Archives (in A345), individual faculty grade books or online gradebooks, CRC Resource Mate, the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE), the First Year Experience (FYE) entrance/exit proficiency tests through ETS, ETS – PRAXIS, and Program Coordinator assessments. Cross-campus faculty also can acquire data from many of those multiple access data points; they may use Taskstream or an alternate format for submission of data to the SOE Data Manager.

[Table 2b.1.1](#) is a visual display providing specific details regarding the seven key assessments, the target of each assessment, when it is administered, the format in which it is administered, who summarizes the data, and who reviews the data. [Table 2b.1.2](#) provides a visual display of data that are monitored and who is responsible, as well as what assessments produce data related to the five performance areas of the Conceptual Framework, who is responsible for the data, and when and by whom the data are collected and reviewed.

In summary, initial program data is collected in multiple ways, though increasingly through Taskstream, from multiple sources (candidates, SOE Data Manager and Director of Field Experiences, SOE faculty, cross-campus faculty, TEAC members, Field Supervisors, CTs and US). Much of the data is assessed and summarized each semester as part of candidate advising; such assessment is done by SOE instructors, the SOE as a Unit (for the sake of scheduling classes and application materials for TEAC), and by TEAC. This data may be presented in chart or table formats, or simply data lists based on the specifics needed by the assigned reviewers. Other data are reviewed and assessed annually by the SOE Chair and entire Unit as part of state- and University-mandated assessment reports. This annual data, presented in both written reports and accompanying charts and tables, is reviewed not only by the SOE but also by the VPAA and the Director of IRE.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

As noted above for initial programs, the process of advanced program data submission, collection, and summarization is in transition from a paper-based, Access/Excel format to primarily a technologies-based process using Taskstream and augmented by additional technologies that include [Survey-Monkey](#) for Exit survey results and Moodle Gradebook available through [Learning House](#). The SOE Data Manager and the Director of Field Experiences are involved in the continuous collection and monitoring of data (such as GPA, admission, progression, and course or program completion requirements) in concert with the Director of Graduate Programs. The majority of candidate data is collected from [Blackbaud](#) for course grades. The SOE adopted [Taskstream](#) in October 2014 and the process of data collection has transitioned to candidates uploading course and program assignments through this system. Faculty scoring of Signature Assignments and their Related Assessments began during the 2014–2015 academic year. Each subsequent term, as additional courses in each of the three graduate programs are offered (including those specific to the two endorsements: ESL: P–12 and Teacher Leader), those SA + RA are entered into Taskstream.

For this accreditation cycle, summaries of data and information for analysis utilize Access and Excel formats, now augmented by Taskstream, which allows the SOE Data Manager, the Director of Field Experiences, and the Program Coordinators (Director of Graduate Programs and Program Coordinators of the two endorsement programs) to run reports for their own analyses. Sharing of data occurs at

monthly SOE faculty meetings, once a term at Graduate Committee and TEAC meetings, and annually through the preparation of the Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment Document. Taskstream is used to aggregate the data from Signature Assignments and Related Assessments (SA + RA) by the content required in each line of a specific rubric. Each line of the rubric on an assessment is tagged to the Kentucky Teacher Standards at the Advanced level.

Taskstream is used to generate reports on graduate candidates' performance aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Standards – Advanced and related SPAs (e.g. TESOL for ESL). The data collected are reported in tables, charts, and graphs for Program review. [Table 8C](#) shows the process and [Table 9](#) shows the *Program Review Timeline Summary*. SOE faculty use these data to modify teaching strategies and course assessment.

Graduate data that become part of the University's annual assessment report from the SOE are reviewed and analyzed by the Director of IRE and the VPAA.

2b.2 How does the unit disaggregate candidate assessment data for candidates on the main campus, at off-campus sites, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs?

The SOE has a main campus only; there are no off-campus sites. Classes for the MSTL and the Teacher Leader Endorsement are offered in both online and face-to-face formats (some classes in each format; neither program is available exclusively in either format). Because of the small class size, the same course is not offered in both formats at the same time. The ESL P–12 Endorsement is offered in on-ground, face-to-face format only.

The SOE has no alternate route programs.

2b.3. How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?

The Unit follows the University policies and procedures for dealing with student complaints. The process for managing student complaints and grievances is outlined in the current [Student Handbook](#) “Grievance” Procedure. The types of grievances addressed are Academic Issues, Administrative Issues, and Discrimination Issues. Harassment issues are considered a special case and have their own (though similar) process. Academic Issues, including Grade Reviews and Academic infractions, follow a standard procedure:

- 1) first step is an attempt to resolve the issue with the instructor; if that is unsuccessful,
- 2) an attempt is made to resolve the issue with the School/Division Chair; if that is unsuccessful,
- 3) an attempt is made to resolve the issue by an appeal to the Academic Dean; if that is unsuccessful,
- 4) a Review Board is convened and the case is heard. The Review Board issues a non-binding opinion; faculty cannot be compelled to change a grade.

Administrative issues related to academics are primarily about faculty behavior, and – if the complaint is formal, that is, written – the complaint policy follows the process noted above. Informal (verbal) complaints are referred to the Division/Department Chair, who will determine whether to take further action. A file containing any records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions is kept in a locked file in the SOE office and, if complaints get this far, in a file in the Office of the VPAA. In September 2015, the members of TEAC voted to approve a revised version of a new SOE policy regarding [Probation/Termination Policy](#) from the School of Education (the policy was first presented on May 13, 2015). This policy also includes the option for an appeal or grievance by following the grievance procedure as found in the Brescia University [Student Handbook](#), pp. 128–130.

2b.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's data collection, analysis, and evaluation may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement

2c.1. In what ways does the unit regularly and systematically use data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences?

The Unit regularly and systematically uses data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences. First, the SOE begins each academic year (AY) by reviewing internal and external data summarized by the Data Manager and the Director of Field Experiences for the previous AY in preparation for the submission of the [Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment](#) document (“assessment grids”). Preparation of the grids requires, at a minimum, the comparison of data on identified Unit and Program goals between the prior AY and the just-completed AY. A comparison of data over a period of several years can provide helpful trend data as well. The final column of the grid for each identified goal/objective at Unit and Program level is titled “Next Steps/Use of Results.” The final section for any goal/objective is titled “Summary of Changes/ Improvements to be Made in the Next Academic Year Based on Analysis of Assessment Results.” Responses for these sections come directly from the analyses and interpretation of the data and indicate whether the identified next steps were taken and/or the ways in which those results were utilized to sustain practices or to drive needed changes. (For 2013–2014 samples, see [Secondary, Art/Spanish P–12](#), [Special Ed LBD P–12](#), [Elementary Education](#), and [Middle Grades 5–9](#).)

Data analyses by course instructors based on candidate course evaluations, evidence related to candidate performance, and review of course function/alignment with Programs occurs after end of term and provides information shared with the appropriate Program Coordinator(s). All SOE full- and part-time faculty regularly and systematically use data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to their courses. All faculty teaching in the SOE (both full- and part-time) are required to participate in the BU Faculty Course Evaluation process for every course they teach. Faculty also often engage in collecting candidate feedback at the course level through exit slips and informal inquiries/surveys within the term of a course; both are recognized ways to monitor and make course adjustments, either immediately or the next time the course is taught. With the recent inclusion of Signature Assignments and their Related Assessments (SA + RA), faculty use data to determine whether the assignment and assessment are providing data on the desired candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions targeted in that course and whether candidates are performing at the appropriate “target level” (*Beginning, Developing, Accomplished, or Exemplary*).

Faculty in tenure-track positions are observed annually by the SOE Chair and the VPAA/Academic Dean and provided feedback in verbal and written format; such feedback is designed to validate performance and practices and/or suggest avenues for improvement of performance and/or practices. These data can be incorporated into annual faculty reports, third-year tenure review, and tenure application to demonstrate how data from multiple sources have impacted courses they are teaching.

Full-time faculty are expected to include course evaluation analysis, interpretation, and goal setting within their [Annual Faculty Activity Summary](#) submitted to the Chair of the SOE and included in the [Unit’s Annual Report](#) to the VPAA/Academic Dean. Responses to Part 1, Section A – Professional Development Activities – and to Part II, Section A – Success in meeting goals set last year – and Sec-

tion B – List goals for the coming academic year – are predicated on faculty use of data from this process and often make specific reference to instructional practice, assessment, text and resources, and field experiences at the course level.

The SOE Data Manager and the Director of Field Experiences use continuous, end of term, and end of AY data entry processes and report on any issues with the current system and/or updates by technology providers to the system that may require additional training for users.

At the conclusion of each AY, each Program Coordinator analyzes and summarizes Key Assessments per SOE Program Levels related to their certification area(s) as well as the Unit as a whole. Some of the data include GPA, PRAXIS results, disposition scores, performance on Signature Assignment assessments, Field hour completion rate, portfolio passing rates, and candidate performance in field/Practicum and Clinical Practice. Coordinators individually engage in review of the data, interact in more depth with course faculty as needed, and bring data to the SOE for informal and formal analyses at unit meetings or Data Days.

A similar process is followed for analyses of data regarding Field Experiences and Clinical Practice placements. Course instructors receive data in two ways: on forms submitted directly by candidates or by Field Supervisor/ Practicum Supervisor or Cooperating Teacher, or from analyses submitted by the SOE Data Manager and/or Director of Field Experiences. Course instructors share analyses with Program Coordinator(s), which then are taken to the SOE for informal and formal analyses at Unit meetings or Data Days. With regard to Field Experiences, course instructors and Program Coordinators at end of term and annually engage in data analysis. Two areas currently under investigation are an analysis of how many and which specific elements on Edu #16A receive “Not Applicable” or no rating indicator and sources of the consistently low rates of return by evaluators.

This analytical process is also part of the Unit faculty’s regular and systematic use of data at the end of term and annually to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to the Clinical Practice experiences; this is done primarily through candidate ratings of Cooperating Teachers ([Edu #31](#)) and through onsite observations while acting in the role of University Supervisor to determine whether to continue the partnership. Program Coordinators (also University Supervisors) use analysis of portfolio scoring data to determine at indicator level within each KTS P-12/IECE standard where an individual candidate or where candidates within a Program or across Programs are achieving target level for Level 3 – Admission to Clinical Practice and for Level 4 – Program Completion. Analyses of formative and summative evaluation data during Clinical Practice are now focusing on two areas: no ratings entered for certain elements by Cooperating Teachers or University Supervisors and elements where ratings of candidate performance are below the target level of 3 *Accomplished* and targets are established in the “Action Plan” section. Informal analysis of Clinical Practice candidates’ self-assessments can be viewed as an additional indicator of how prepared and effective candidates perceive themselves in the sections and elements of the evaluations, as can analysis of the “Action Plan” section, where short-term targets are established for concentrated emphasis through analysis of reflective journal daily dialog content with University Supervisor.

A review of many of these analyses is also available to TEAC for their input.

Ultimately, the loop (completion of the five phases of the [Unit Assessment System](#)) is closed when the identification of new targets to be achieved and a determination of whether the assessments and evidence currently in place will continue to prove useful in determining the efficacy of the Unit and its approved Programs has been formalized in the submission of the annual “assessment grids.”

2c.2. What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years?

During the AY 2012–2013, 2013–2014, and 2014–2015, data-driven changes have occurred in Unit Operations, Assessment System, Programs/Courses, and Field Experiences. Examples of such data-driven changes in *Unit Operations* include the following:

1. Changes were made in the job descriptions and in the job advertisements when the positions of SOE Administrative Assistant and Data Manager and the CRC Coordinator were vacant. Both positions added emphasis on data entry and analysis skills. The CRC Coordinator position was expanded to include the Director of Field Experiences' role and responsibilities.
2. An analysis of Resource Mate data and a manual system of item circulation provided data that resulted in three actions: completion of entry of all holdings in the CRC into Resource Mate, a purging of holdings that were outdated or not aligned with current KCAS/KYECS and KTS or SPA standards, the identification of content areas or programs with inadequate resources (e.g. the most recently approved programs – IECE and ESL P–12) and in topical areas such as differentiated instruction/assessment and teaching tolerance.
3. A separate line item was allocated in the Unit's budget for the CRC, allowing tracking of maintenance and new acquisitions.
4. The Unit adopted Taskstream as the centralized electronic system for collecting and reporting data.
5. Phase one of the Unit's efforts to play a more active role in the recruitment of incoming students began on two fronts: with a collaboration with Office of Admissions to identify those high schools where Brescia is currently recruiting which are engaged in [Future Educators](#) activities and/or with active peer tutoring processes and to have counselors prepared to discuss the SOE when recruiting and with the addition on the SOE's [Minority Recruitment](#) webpage.
6. Data on staff and faculty turnover indicated a need for additional training for the SOE Data Manager, the Director of Field Experiences, and SOE full-time faculty on access and usage of Taskstream; a consultant was brought to campus for two full days of training in August 2015.
7. An analysis of candidates' PPST/CASE test results and the increased number of "deferred acceptance pending passage of tests" has led to a collaborative effort between the SOE and the former Student Support Services (now The Compass Center) to offer test prep workshops and practice test sessions. The Chair of the SOE and the Coordinator of the CRC have identified, purchased, and alerted SOE faculty and candidates to the new resources available in the CRC that support candidates in preparing for these tests. Every 90 days (or after 10 candidates access) the CRC Coordinator is authorized to re-purchase the access rights to PRAXIS CASE practice tests, and access rights to specific practice tests for PRAXIS II are also available by candidate request.

Examples of data-driven changes in *Unit Assessment System* include the following:

As the SOE faculty engaged in the five phases of the cycle of the Unit Assessment System, it was evident that the transition from the paper- and Access/Excel-based data collection, analyses, and review process to the Taskstream process involved greater depth of understanding of the functions of the Key Assessments, including whether the resulting evidence was viable for identifying areas of success, areas for improvement, and "gaps."

Key Assessment 2: Assessment of Dispositions.

1. During both informal data analysis sessions and Data Days, SOE faculty noted that data from Edu #4A and #4B were not providing the specific types of information needed about applicants for Admission to the SOE. With assistance from two consultants, the elements were changed and the forms were redesigned from rating scales to rubrics utilizing descriptors.
2. The number of reported incidences of alleged or actual violations of academic integrity policies for candidates seeking Admission to the SOE and candidates already admitted increased. Due to the critical nature of Ethics as one of the four dispositions of the SOE Conceptual Frame-

work, Unit faculty, and TEAC determined the need to explore development of a policy specific to the SOE. SOE faculty presented a proposed policy to TEAC in May 2015, and it was adopted in August 2015.

3. Lack of evidence that the Unit had engaged in recent efforts to ensure consistency in ratings by internal and external evaluators at Level 1 Admission to SOE resulted in 1:1 mentoring when the re-designed Edu #4A rubrics were piloted. A member of the SOE faculty consulted with each cross-campus faculty who was asked by an applicant to submit a content area recommendation for Admission into the SOE.

Key Assessment 3: Portfolios

1. External feedback from EPSB indicated that holistic scoring of candidate portfolios at Levels 3–4 through the use of a rating scale was ineffective; SOE faculty developed a new evaluation tool in rubric format that assesses at the indicator level within each KTS for P–12 and IECE.
2. Lack of evidence that the Unit had engaged in recent efforts to ensure consistency in ratings by internal and external evaluators at Levels 3–4 for portfolio assessment and the creation of a new assessment tool in rubric format resulted in two types of training aimed at addressing issues of inter-rater reliability: face-to-face group mentoring for the use of the revised portfolio assessment tool by multiple internal and external evaluators at Portfolio Preview and Admission to Clinical Practice, and a digitally recorded module for mentoring individual Cooperating Teachers scoring Clinical Practice portfolios.

Key Assessment 5: Field Experiences

Examples of data-driven changes in *Field Experiences/Clinical Practice* include the following:

1. The addition of KFETS and the transition in the tools for data collection and analyses have resulted in changes to processes used for tracking and reporting applicant and candidate requirements based on 16 KAR 5:040.
2. [Table 2c.2.1](#) identifies specific Edu courses have been designated as courses with such Field requirements as: School Board meeting, YSC/FRC, site-based council, professional learning community, etc. Such charting helps ensure that all components are completed prior to Admission to Clinical Practice. This is designed to address issues of candidates receiving TEAC decisions of Action 2 – Deferred Admission to Clinical Practice because these requirements had not yet been met.
3. As the first cohort of candidates was completing Field experiences and Practicum in the ESL P–12 Endorsement, it was determined that the use of Edu #16 Field Evaluation form and Edu #12 Clinical Practice Formative Evaluation did not contain critical performance elements related to evidence-based practices in ESL instruction and assessment. The form was revised and has been piloted as [Edu #17](#) for use by candidates and Field and Practicum Supervisors and as [Edu #17A](#) for use by University Supervisors.

Examples of data-driven changes in *Programs and Courses* include the following:

1. All initial candidates must participate in Clinical Practice Seminar during the term they are enrolled in Clinical Practice. While data indicate Brescia SOE graduates seeking employment as teachers immediately upon attaining Level 4 – Program Completion – have a high rate of success, SOE faculty and TEAC noted that a successful first interview was a critical dimension of the hiring process. As a result, a new [Clinical Practice Seminar session](#) was added to provide candidates with an opportunity to participate in a Mock Interview. SOE Faculty, the BU Director of Career Services, TEAC members, and other members of the professional community have collaborated to arrange for practitioners/administrators to serve as the interviewers. Immediately following the interview and as a way of closing a feedback loop, candidates also receive verbal critique from their interviewer(s). The interview is digitally recorded to allow each candidate to view and self-assess before meeting with the Director of Career Services for further debriefing and additional support in securing that first teaching job.
2. The decision to design and implement [Signature Assignments and Related Assessments in all](#)

[Edu and EDL courses at Initial and Advanced Levels](#) and in all content area coursework in disciplines with teacher certification options resulted from a need to provide better evidence of candidates' attainment of KTS and SPA standards at both course and Program levels.

3. Pursuant to KY Senate Bill 163 and EPSB requirements, the SOE determined that Initial level Programs in Biology 8–12, Social Studies 8–12, Mathematics 8–12, and Art P–12 did not meet the requirement for the preparation of candidates in that no candidates were receiving instruction and assessment content from a qualified instructor for their literacy preparation in BU coursework. The Secondary and P–12 Program Coordinators and qualified faculty met and created a “Rationale and Proposal for Adding a Literacy Component to Secondary Certification Students,” which was presented first to the SOE and then to TEAC for approval. Edu 327 – Teaching Reading: Secondary Schools – already a requirement for English 8–12 – was extended as a requirement for the above mentioned Programs. This change to curriculum guidesheets for these Programs is scheduled for presentation to the BU Curriculum and Standards Committee (CSC) in February 2016.
4. Proposed changes to programs at the baccalaureate level at BU must be considered in relation to the established policy of completion of 128 credit hours for the awarding of a bachelor's degree. The addition of Edu 327 to four of the Unit's certification programs caused these programs to require 132 hours for completion. The proposal regarding the addition of the literacy requirement also contains a second element to address the credit hour issue. During the SOE annual review of courses, Programs and clinical experiences, faculty teaching Edu 407 – Teaching Secondary School Subjects – and Edu 410 – Methods and Materials: Secondary Curriculum – presented data to the SOE faculty indicating their analysis of significant content overlap as well as candidate feedback on course evaluations, evidencing a similar concern; faculty proposed that the two courses be merged. With SOE and TEAC approval, this element of the proposal also is scheduled for presentation to the CSC in February 2016.

2c.3. What access do faculty members have to candidate assessment data and/or data systems?

Faculty members have access to candidates' assessment data and/or data systems as needed. Data on candidates are maintained in secured file locations in the SOE Office and in A345. Full-time SOE faculty have key access to both locations and to the keys for locked file cabinets. Full-time faculty in their roles as Program Coordinators also have hard copies of data within their advisees' candidate advising files. The University has acquired online record access through NetClassroom (an online extension of the Blackbaud data management system), which allows both candidate and faculty equal access to transcripts, progress toward degree completion, and class schedules. IT has created shared “I” and “S” drives where Unit data is uploaded for easier SOE faculty access. With the acquisition of Taskstream in Fall 2014, the faculty have begun using this technology software to support the full cycle of assessment in the SOE. Faculty can access data on candidates in courses they teach, including the new Signature Assignment and Related Assessment data for those courses. Full-time faculty are also afforded TS Coordinator status within Taskstream, which allows access to DRF Program Reports, Field Placement, Survey, Resources and Collaborative Programs data involving assessment data on any SOE candidate or group of candidates at course, Program, and Unit level. They also have access to the Analytics function and the Faculty Dashboard where candidate performance can be tracked, as well as overall Program evaluation status. As an institution, Brescia uses Learning House as its online service provider; as of Fall 2015 all University faculty have the option for an online MOODLE course page. Faculty are able to access data from this sources as well. Program Coordinators also have access to data that has been inputted into *Compliance Assist*. In addition, SOE faculty have the ability to access candidate assessment data through the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE). A campus-wide assessment process comparing candidate “General Education” performance as freshmen and then again as seniors through ETS's Proficiency Profile test was first begun in Spring 2009. During Fall 2015, for the first time data were collected upon candidate exit as

seniors. SOE faculty can now access this data regarding Initial level candidates' writing, reading, math, critical thinking, humanities, natural science, and social science benchmarks; entry scores for the 2011–2012 class and their exit scores as graduates in 2014–2015. This data is accessed through the faculty Co-Director of First Year Experience. The expectation is that over time, freshmen scores might serve as predictors of SOE candidate success.

The Data Manager's office houses copies of the individual MSTL candidate's University admission information; letters of acceptance to the MSTL; résumé; signed Curriculum Guide Sheet, Standards Assessment Checklist (obtained at the end of each course), Mid-Program Evaluation Form, and any other information deemed appropriate or necessary. These are in Microsoft Excel format and made available via a shared access to all faculty on the Brescia internal network "I" drive. Candidates' formative assessments are discussed with MSTL candidates by the individual faculty member teaching each course. The MSTL Graduate Director's office houses the MSTL candidates' advising folders. Assessment data from the previous and current semesters are discussed with the candidates during the mid-term advising conference. The MSTL adviser can also access candidates' grades for all courses via Blackbaud at <http://faweb.brescia.edu>.

2c.4. How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders to help them reflect on and improve their performance and programs?

During the transition phase from the previous data system to the utilization of multiple e-data sources (primarily Taskstream, NetClassroom/Blackbaud, KFETS, Campus Labs' *Compliance Assist*, and Learning House's Moodle and Adobe Connect), the sharing of data involves information presented in paper format as well as data accessible via technology.

Candidates: The SOE's assessment process has been designed and developed to provide a continuum of formative and summative review and assessment of candidates (both in an ongoing fashion and at the three key checkpoints during the program). New primary sources of data include access to NetClassroom; Learning House course pages; KFETS; and Taskstream for course attendance, assignments, Signature Assignments and Related Assessments, grades, and progress toward degree completion. Some data are shared with candidates in face-to-face conferencing and advising sessions, electronically through various forms available to candidates, and in written hard copies as in official letters from the Chair. Candidate self-assessment data is shared with advisors when a PGP plan is created annually prior to one of the semester advising sessions after a candidate has been formally admitted to the SOE. At this same advising conference, any assessment data not yet distributed to candidates is made available so it can be integrated into the PGP. In addition, candidate self-assessment data may be submitted as a requirement within a course or as part of a Signature Assignment. Self-assessment data are also regularly shared with the Practicum Supervisor, University and content area Supervisors, and Cooperating Teachers during Practicum and Clinical Practice semesters through formative evaluations with analyses of identified areas of strength and areas for growth (aka "Action Plan" with targets for specific emphasis before the next evaluation). During courses with Field-experience-hours requirements, candidates have received data from Edu #16 – Field Supervisor Evaluation Form – shared directly in paper format by some Field Supervisors or through meetings with course instructors or SOE advisors. A new process instituted in Fall 2015 uses a carbonless form to provide copies for SOE and for candidates. [Table 2c.4.1](#) – "Feedback Loops for P–12 and IECE Candidates at Initial Program Levels 1–4" – summarizes how assessment data are shared with candidates.

Faculty: Assessment data are shared with faculty at the beginning of each AY during the SOE retreat, where the proposed SOE Annual Report is discussed and current Unit and Program goals are set. Data are continually shared with faculty at SOE meetings and through emails from faculty, Chair, and/or the Data Manager and Director of Field Placement. Faculty advisors receive Edu #4B data from Edu

Professional Core and Common Core course instructors, and Edu #16 data from Field Supervisors; SOE faculty serving as University Supervisors receive Edu #12, #14 and #15 data from Cooperating Teachers and the Edu #12 self-assessment data from candidates. The processes and formats for accessing this data are in transition from paper- and Access/Excel-based format to an e-format using Taskstream and additional technologies now available.

Other Stakeholders: Assessment about individual SOE certification programs is shared with other University personnel in two primary ways: through the Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment Document process (aka “assessment grids”) submitted to the Director of IRE, and through the five-year review prepared for the APRC about each of the Initial and Advanced programs that comprise the SOE as a Unit/Division at Brescia University.

IRE: The Program Coordinators submit the required Assessment Grids for their certification program(s) for review in Department/Division meeting for peer review, then to Chair of SOE for review, and finally to the Director of IRE, who reviews in collaboration with VPAA (Academic Dean). This annual process had a June 1 deadline, which has now become October 1 effective AY 2015-16.

APRC: Program Coordinators submit and present a review every five years of each of their SOE Programs according to the process outlined in [Faculty Handbook Appendix A](#). The last review occurred during 2010–2011, and all SOE programs are scheduled for review during Spring 2016.

TEAC stakeholders review data and are updated on Programs and the Unit at the Fall, Spring, and, if needed, the Summer meetings. [TEAC Minutes](#)

The MSTL Director annually evaluates the graduate program. The evaluation (using an assessment grid) tracks all major assessment data for each of the MSTL Program goals. Each goal emphasis is identified, linked to the University Mission, and the annual assessment results summarized and reported to the SOE Chair. The data analysis (see [Table M2.3](#)) is used to make changes or improvements the following academic year. The data report is shared at the University level within the annual School report to the Director of IRE and the VPAA, and within the SOE at the annual Fall Retreat. At the University level, program modifications are discussed following review of assessment within the Dean’s Council and the President’s Cabinet. The MSTL modifications are made at the Program level as a result of annual analysis discussed within MSTL Committee meetings, within the Unit Fall Retreat, and through data analysis and discussions among faculty during weekly faculty meetings in the School of Education. MSTL Assessment Grids for 2012–2012 ([S2.4](#)), 2012–2013 ([S2.5](#)), [Grid 2013–2014](#), and [Grid 2014–2015](#) are examples of data shared with candidates, faculty, and stakeholders.

2c.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the use of data for program improvement may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 2?

2. What research related to Standard 2 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

STANDARD 3. FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

3a.1. Who are the unit's partners in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

The Unit's primary partner in the design of the Field and Clinical Practice is the [Teacher Education Advisory Committee](#) (TEAC). The TEAC includes community partner representatives from the area school systems (Daviess County, Owensboro Public, Owensboro Catholic, and Ohio County), with members who are central office personnel, building administrators, and classroom teachers; community-related service providers representing ARC of Owensboro and Brey's Early Learning Center; Brescia administration representation, including the President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Registrar and Certification Officer; Brescia faculty representatives from the content areas of art, biology, English, math, social studies, and Spanish; candidate representatives from each certification Program and the MSTL; and the full-time and part-time faculty of the School of Education (SOE).

The Unit's partners in the delivery and evaluation of Field and Clinical experiences are the local and surrounding school districts and agencies. The SOE establishes collaboration annually with local school systems through [Letters of Agreement](#) with Superintendents. The partner school systems include Daviess County Public Schools, Muhlenberg County Public Schools, Owensboro Independent Public Schools, Henderson County Public Schools, Hancock County Public Schools, Breckenridge County Public Schools, Grayson County Public Schools, Tell City Troy Township School Corporation, Cannelton City Schools, Perry County Community School System, North Spencer County School Corporation, Owensboro Catholic Schools, Ohio County Public Schools, Warrick County School Corporation, Christian County Public Schools, McLean County Public Schools, and South Spencer County School Corporation. [Letters of Agreement](#) are also signed with local agencies such as Puzzle Pieces, Wendell Foster Campus for Developmental Disabilities, ARC of Owensboro, Audubon Area Head Start – Daviess County, and First Steps – Daviess County.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Brescia University has three advanced programs: an English as a Second Language (ESL) Endorsement for primary through 12th grades; a Master of Science in Teacher Leadership (MSTL); and the Teacher Leader (TL) Endorsement-only. The MSTL program is not an initial teacher certification program; however, candidates in the MSTL and Teacher Leader Endorsement-only programs collaborate with school districts to design courses, professional development, and job-embedded professional experiences that involve teachers at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels (see MSTL [Memo-randa of Understanding](#)). Field partners were involved with the design of the MSTL and Teacher Leader Endorsement-only programs, including the Field components of the programs (see [Redesign Committee Members](#)). MSTL and TL candidates are placed in mentorship settings in partner schools. School district partners work with Brescia faculty to provide teacher leader candidates with coaching

practica experiences. The Unit partners observe, mentor, and provide feedback to advanced candidates during Field placements.

The ESL Endorsement program was designed in partnership with local school teachers and faculty representatives from the Brescia University Humanities Department. The Unit partners with the local and surrounding P–12 schools to deliver and evaluate Field experiences for ESL candidates. The School of Education establishes collaboration with local school systems through [Letters of Agreement](#) with Superintendents. Partner school systems include Daviess County Public Schools, Muhlenberg County Public Schools, Owensboro Independent Public Schools, Henderson County Public Schools, Hancock County Public Schools, Breckenridge County Public Schools, Grayson County Public Schools, Tell City Troy Township School Corporation, Cannelton City Schools, Perry County Community School System, North Spencer County School Corporation, Owensboro Catholic Schools, Ohio County Public Schools, Warrick County School Corporation, Christian County Public Schools, McLean County Public Schools, and South Spencer County School Corporation. Candidates are placed in classrooms with ESL students in the school systems using the [field placement sheet](#).

3a.2. In what ways have the unit's partners contributed to the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

As the unit's partner, TEAC serves in an advisory capacity (with some decision-making authority) to the School of Education; as such it reviews, approves, and submits recommendations for program and policy development and modification, reviews data for each applicant for admission to the School of Education or Clinical Practice, reviews portfolios for Clinical Practice ([Edu # 24A](#) TEAC Portfolio Assessment P–12/[Edu # 24B](#) TEAC Portfolio Assessment IECE), and makes final determination of each applicant's status for Admission to the School of Education and Admission to Clinical Practice. Specific contributions include input into and acceptance of the Conceptual Framework and input into and acceptance of the new School of Education Mission Statement, both of which have implications for the design and the evaluation of Field and Clinical Practice; approval of retaining the current SOE policy CT requirements instead of adopting those of EPSB; establishment of minimum competency of 3.0 per KTS in application of CP portfolio and a request for benchmark portfolio examples (see [TEAC minutes](#)).

School system partners work collaboratively with the Unit faculty to identify qualified and willing Field supervisors and Cooperating Teachers. These practitioners provide mentorship and evaluative feedback through formative and summative assessments, both critical for candidate and Unit evaluation. Field placements of ≥ 10 hours require an evaluation ([Edu #16](#) Field Supervisor Evaluation). During Clinical Practice candidates complete self-evaluations and receive evaluations from their CTs on a bi-weekly schedule (see [Edu #12](#) CP Formative CT and Candidate). Formative evaluations from US are completed four times during a CP placement ([Edu #13](#) CP Formative US). Summative evaluations are completed at the end of CP by the CT ([Edu #14](#) CP Final Evaluation CT and [Edu #15](#) Final Evaluation CT Narrative). Evaluations of the CP portfolio are completed by the CT ([Edu # 25A/ B](#) CT Review Portfolio P–12/IECE) and US ([Edu #29A/B](#) US Review of Portfolio P–12/IECE).

Supportive agencies have provided specialized field locations for IECE through First Steps and Audubon Area Head Start. Likewise, the Wendell Foster Center, Kelly Autism Program, and Puzzle Pieces provide uniquely diverse settings.

Alumni also contribute to the program by serving as Field Supervisors and CTs. In addition, they take an active part by previewing CP application portfolios and providing formative feedback.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Partners contribute to the design, delivery and evaluation of the MSTL field experiences. For example, Brescia collaborated with partners in local school systems to design the MSTL program, which includes Field and job-embedded experiences. The [Master's Redesign Committee](#) was comprised of P–12 school-based faculty and administrators. Collaboration with school districts has continued to function after the program design (see [Samples Graduate Committee minutes](#)). Local school partners cooperate with the University to provide MSTL teacher leaders the opportunity to examine students' assessment data so they can design and implement job-embedded assignments. These local school systems work with the Brescia University placement officer to assign mentors to MSTL and TL candidates. Mentors assist with Field evaluation of the mentoring Practicum using [Form P3A](#), [Form P4](#), and [Form P2](#). Field mentors monitor and evaluate the performance of candidates in the field and provide another layer of feedback for MSTL candidates' Field performance.

School system partners work collaboratively with the Unit faculty to identify qualified and willing Field Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers to work with ESL (P–12) candidates. These practitioners provide guidance and mentor candidates. The mentors (Field Supervisors) also provide feedback to the University using [EDU #17A](#) Field Supervisor Evaluation, a modification of the Edu #16 used with P–12 programs to include additional elements critical for assessing the performance of candidates engaged with ESL populations. The revision of this form included input from full- and part-time faculty affiliated with the program. Two part-time faculty currently teach P–12 and adult populations of ESL. Two BU faculty have extensive background in ESL and one is a reviewer of ESL P–12 program reviews for EPSB.

3a.3. What are the roles of the unit and its school partners in determining how and where candidates are placed for field experiences, student teaching, and internships?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

The CRC Coordinator also serves as the Director of Field Experiences and is responsible for contacting school partners to arrange Field placements. Field experience placements are based on the course focus ([Field Handbook](#) Table 2 – Nature of Field Experience by Course, pp.10–19), faculty recommendations, diversity requirements, and candidate/supervising teacher availability. Candidates fill out an availability form to facilitate this process. The CRC Coordinator contacts the appropriate [school contact](#) to make the initial arrangement. After receiving follow-up from the school with the specific teacher, candidates are provided the teacher contact information. Candidates then make contact with the teacher supervising the field experience (FS). The FS receives a [letter of introduction](#) from course faculty that outlines the expectations of the placement, a link to the SOE [Field Handbook](#), and evaluation information. The school partners support the Unit by facilitating the placement process according to parameters provided by the CRC Coordinator. FSs are expected to provide experiences described in the letter of introduction and complete an evaluation when appropriate.

Because of different expectations and requirements, Practicum placements are determined more purposefully. Often the SOE faculty will request that the CRC Coordinator confirm a specific teacher for a Practicum. A Fall placement is made during the previous Spring. This enables the candidate to begin their placement at the start of the P–12 calendar year, thus experiencing the opening (or semester return) of students along with the support of their FS. An onsite orientation explains the expectations and methods of evaluation for Practica.

For Clinical Practice, candidates state their School Preference on [Edu#7](#) Application for Admission into CP. The University Supervisor carefully considers this data in light of candidate needs: diversity,

strengths, areas for growth, and potential employment. Informal discussions with teachers and administrators (partners) identify suitable “matches” prior to placement. Letters are sent to the Board Office, building principal, CT, US, and candidate. By accepting this mentorship, the CT agrees to complete the EPSB training requirements and the expectations of the Unit as stated in the [CP Handbook](#), p. 8. An orientation is held at Brescia to acquaint the CT with the SOE Mission, expectations, and evaluation procedures; this orientation also allows CTs to get to know their candidate.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

With the MSTL advanced program and the Teacher Leader Endorsement-only, candidates’ field experience starts with completing a Field placement form, the [Form P1](#) (Teacher Leader Field Placement Form). The University Director of Field Experiences [contacts the school](#) to make arrangements for placement in one of the partner schools. The mentor (field supervisor) ensures that there is a good fit in terms of subject areas, certification, and exposure to diverse candidates. When placement is finalized, then the Director of Field Experiences notifies the course instructor and the candidate. The candidate and instructor discuss how the placement meets the professional growth of the student (in terms of diversity) as compared to previous placements. At the master’s level, candidate input on where field placement occurs is especially important because of their previous undergraduate experiences. The *Brescia University School of Education Field Experience/Job Embedded Accountability Form* (also known as [Diversity Form #20G](#)) is used to determine diversity of placement, depending on the professional growth needs of the teacher leader candidate.

ESL (P–12) candidates complete an availability form to facilitate the Field placement process. The CRC Coordinator acting as Director of Field Experiences contacts the appropriate [school contact](#) to make the initial arrangement. After receiving follow-up from the school with the specific teacher serving ESL students, candidates are provided the teacher’s contact information. Candidates then make contact with the teacher supervising the Field experience. The teacher receives a [letter of introduction](#) from course faculty that outlines the expectations of the placement (see [Field Handbook](#)), and evaluation information. The school partners support the Unit by facilitating the placement process according to parameters provided by the CRC Coordinator/Director of Field Experiences. Field Supervisors are expected to provide experiences described in the letter of introduction and to complete an evaluation when all requirements of the Field experience have been accomplished.

3a.4. How do the unit and its school partners share expertise and resources to support candidates' learning in field experiences and clinical practice?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

As described in 3a.2, through Field experience evaluation tools, candidate formative and summative information is gathered based on P–12 practitioner expertise. During these placements, candidates have access to practical applications of school and classroom resources, including electronic data management systems (CIITS/Infinite Campus), computer-based learning programs (Read-180), Accelerated Reader, iPads, Laptops, and assistive technology. Candidates attend PLC meetings, team planning sessions, faculty meetings, and school-based PD. School/agency personnel often say that a benefit of partnering with the SOE is gaining new ideas and information from candidates and USs during placements.

Education alumni often review CP application portfolios. Their expertise and knowledge of the program provide a valuable perspective on the candidates and their preparation. The TEAC, by way of its composition and purpose, provides a vital direction for the Unit as they make decisions based on their expertise in administration, teaching, community service, and candidate perspectives.

Professional Development (PD) is another area in which the Unit and its school partners share their expertise and resources. In the summer of 2013 OPS and DCPS invited BU faculty to take part in a multiple-day workshop by Marilyn Friend, [Sustaining Co-Teaching](#). At the OPS Board Office, P–12 partners have provided PD on The Daily 5, effective use of manipulatives, and current technology application in the classroom; they have also given classroom tours to demonstrate the organization and structure so key to classroom management. Candidates have attended [Leadership Days](#) at local elementary schools. River Region Cooperative conducted a training on [KCAS math](#) for candidates. The Western Kentucky Assistive Technology Center provides hands-on experience with a wide variety of assistive tech. The Wendell Foster Center and ARC of Owensboro have allowed candidates to teach mini-lessons to residents and clients. The clients from ARC of Owensboro came to the Brescia campus for science classes collaboratively taught by BU biology faculty and BU SOE Special Ed majors. School partners also facilitate several [CP Seminars](#) to further bridge theory with practice.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

For its three advanced programs (ESL P–12 Endorsement, MSTL, and TL Endorsement), the CRC Coordinator/Director of Field Experiences and the Program Coordinator of the ESL P–12 Endorsement program engage in discussions with administrators and personnel delivering ESL services in the OPS and DCPS to identify Field and Practicum sites and Field Supervisors. Candidates engage in three 10-hour Field experiences attached as requirements of Edu 401 (Secondary), Edu 402 (Middle Grades) and Edu 403 (Preschool – Elementary). The Practicum is a 30-hour experience which can be arranged at one level or split and completed at two levels for 15 hours each. Classroom teachers share materials and allow candidates to participate in team meetings and trainings. The Program Coordinator and the CRC Coordinator/Director of Field Experiences have focused on expanding the CRC collection of materials in ESL; a generous donation from a BU faculty member has also added valuable resources. Candidates may check out and share these resources with practitioners as well. With the MSTL program and the Teacher Leader Endorsement-only advanced programs, candidates share resources with partners as agreed upon in the MSTL [Memoranda of Understanding](#). Mentoring practices are an important part of the Practicum in initial teacher certification preparation. However, for the MSTL graduate level, the *Mentoring Practicum I* is considerably expanded: it pairs candidates with teachers who explain school policies, regulations, and procedures; share advanced methods, materials and other resources; help solve problems in teaching and learning; provide personal and professional support; and guide the growth of the teacher leader candidates. As mentioned in the undergraduate section, Brescia shares training and conducts evaluations with school partners. Candidates have access to the multimedia facilities in the schools to implement job-embedded assignments in the field. Unit partner schools assist with Field evaluation of the mentoring practicum using [Form P3A](#), [Form P4](#), and [Form P2](#). The progress of MSTL candidates, including field experiences, is reported to TEAC for recommendations or improvement. TEAC meets at least once every semester; as is the case for initial Programs, members share expertise and resources regarding Field placements for candidates in advanced programs.

3a.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to collaboration between unit and school partners may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

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

3b.1. What are the entry and exit requirements for clinical practice?

Admission to Clinical Practice (CP) Requirements:

1. Acceptance into the SOE no later than the semester prior to application for admission to CP
2. Completion of a minimum of 90 semester hours of college/university course work by application date
3. Completion of at least two semesters of University course work at Brescia (certain exceptions for post-graduates seeking certification only)
4. Completion of 200 hours of Field experience meeting requirements in SOE [Field Handbook](#) in accordance with 16 KAR 5:040
5. Cumulative GPA of 2.75 (4.0 scale) on all University work attempted, on all professional courses attempted, and in the teaching major or academic emphasis area, OR a 3.0 GPA on the last thirty hours of credit completed. Candidate must maintain this minimum GPA until beginning CP; failure to do so will result in withdrawal of permission to enroll in CP
6. Recommendation of advisor(s) within certification area(s) and recommendation of advisor in major field or academic emphasis area
7. Post-baccalaureate or advanced content degree candidates seeking initial certification who have passing scores on the relevant PRAXIS II Specialty Exams are considered to have demonstrated adequate content knowledge for CP
8. Licensure exam or PRAXIS II specialty exam(s) and relevant PLT exams already taken
9. Rating of 3 or 4 in each of 10 KTS in the Admission to CP Portfolio, demonstrating *Accomplished* or *Exemplary* performance
10. Completion of or in process of completing curriculum course and/or methods course(s) required for certification
11. BU Health Form submitted to SOE with application that includes TB test clearance
12. At time of filing for CP admission, completion (or in process) of at least 75% of course work for the teaching major; prior to the CP semester, completion of all work (including professional courses) through junior level
13. Completion of recent (within six months of CP) fingerprint and background check by federal government, Kentucky State Police, and local police department
14. Have read and adhere to the Professional Code of Ethics

Exit CP Requirements:

1. Successful completion of SOE [Clinical Practice Handbook](#) requirements: submission of required lesson plans and implementation of teaching units
2. Successful mastery of content knowledge, skills, and dispositions as evidenced on Edu [#12](#), [#13](#), [#14](#), and [#15](#) forms
3. Rating of 3 or 4 in each of 10 KTS in the CP Portfolio, demonstrating *Accomplished* or *Exemplary* performance
4. Receive a PASS recommendation by the Cooperating Teacher and the University Supervisor.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Clinical Practice is not a program requirement of any of the three advanced SOE Programs.

3b.2. What field experiences are required for each program or categories of programs (e.g., secondary) at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels, including graduate programs for licensed teachers and other school professionals? What clinical practice is required for each program or categories of programs in initial teacher preparation programs and programs for the preparation of other school professionals? Please complete Table 7 or upload your own table at Prompt 3b.9 below.

**Table 7
Field Experiences and Clinical Practice by Program**

Program	Field Experiences	Clinical Practice (Student Teaching or Internship)	Total Number of Hours
IECE: Birth–5	354	16 weeks = 560	914
Elementary: P–5	270	14 weeks = 490	760
Middle School: 5–9	210–215	14 weeks = 490	700–705
Secondary: 8–12	205–225	14 weeks = 490	695–715
Art: P–12	220	14 weeks = 490	710
Spanish: P–12	220	14 weeks = 490	710
Special Ed LBD: P–12 and Elementary: P–5	395	18 weeks = 630	1025
Special Ed LBD: P–12 and Middle: 5–9 (single content area)	310–315	18 weeks = 630	940–945
ESL Endorsement: P–12	60	0	60
MSTL: (See Table 7B)	Also, uploaded at Prompt 3b.9 below.		
Teacher Leader Endorsement: (See Table 7C)	Also, uploaded at Prompt 3b.9 below.		

3b.3. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards through field and clinical experiences in initial and advanced preparation programs?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

Each EDU course has a unique Field experience and set of outcomes designed to ensure that candidates develop proficiencies through Field/Clinical experiences. [Table 3b.3.1](#) – Assessment Alignments for Field and Clinical Experience – details field expectations and assessments that coincide with course levels.

Within Core Courses (Edu 204/108, 255, 246, 301, and Psy 300) early assessment occurs, based on the alignment of CF dispositions and KTS. The [Table 3b.3.2](#) demonstrates this alignment using the “Faculty Recommendation” [#4A](#) and the “Professional Disposition Evaluation” [#4B](#) forms. A cumulative score of 20/40 is required for Acceptance into the SOE.

Field Supervisors (using [Edu #16](#)) also rate candidates’ performance aligned with dispositions and KTS. ([Table 3c.4](#) Field Supervisor Evaluation) This process and format occur repeatedly throughout all Programs. Course Instructors and Advisors review these evaluations with the candidate to ensure ongoing development.

Concurrent with some of their Field hours, candidates apply to the SOE. They provide faculty references to assess potential success; these references provide additional data on CF dispositions and the KTS ([Table 3b.3.2](#)). Faculty recommendations indicate whether they support, support with reservation, or do not support pre-candidate continuance in the SOE ([Edu #4A](#)). During the application process, candidates’ oral skills and dispositions are evaluated through the interview component, with a minimum required competency score of 3/4 oral and 20/28 Dispositional ([Edu #5](#)).

SOE syllabi align course objectives and activities with the Conceptual Framework (CF), KTS, and SPAs to further ensure candidate development of content and pedagogical knowledge that is to be

applied during Field experiences. Candidates provide informal evidence of course-specific Field expectations through reflective journals, a required component in all Field experiences.

The Practicum experience is design to be a focused 50-hour placement to develop proficiencies more fully, including lesson plan implementation resulting in authentic assessment data and reflections. Practicum Supervisors, candidate, and course faculty (using [Edu #12](#) and [#13](#)) assess candidate knowledge, skills, diversity, and professional dispositions in the midterm and final Practicum Evaluations; growth to ≥ 3 on a 4-point scale is the expectation. The Application to Clinical Practice Portfolio, which is directly aligned with the KTS, is completed during practicum (see [Table 3b.3.4 Clinical Practice Evaluations](#)). The portfolio requires evidence throughout the candidate's Program that is supported with reflective rationales. A score of ≥ 3.0 on a 4-point scale is required, using the TEAC Portfolio Rubric Edu [#24A](#) / [#24B](#).

At Clinical Practice candidates are to demonstrate dispositional, state, and professional proficiencies. Evaluation data ([Edu #12](#), [#13](#)) aligned with dispositions and the KTS ([Table 3b.3.5 Clinical Practice Evaluations by CT and US](#)) are expected to show growth to ≥ 3 on a 4-point scale. Summative assessment of the CP Portfolio directly aligned to KTS requires evidence from the CP with reflective rationales. [Table 1a.2.4b Portfolio Scoring per indicator](#) demonstrates the connection to KTS standards and candidates' scores. Scores of >3.0 on 4 point scale are required, using the CP Portfolio Rubric Edu [#25A / B](#), [#29A/B](#).

Candidates self-assess using [Edu # 32A/B](#) and develop a PGP ([Edu #27](#)) based on the KTS; initiated in Edu 204/108, the PGPs are continued throughout the Program, with regular review and updating during each mid-semester's advising conference with candidate's Program Advisor. The PGPs are included in the Application to CP and CP with final implementation at CP.

All these assessment forms and processes provide continuous feedback to candidates from initial before Admission to the SOE through the point of graduation.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Brescia has three advanced programs: ESL P–12 Endorsement, the MSTL, and the Teacher Leader Endorsement. Candidates enrolled in the ESL P–12 Endorsement take the five 300–400-level courses in the sequence that has been specifically designed to ensure that candidates systematically develop proficiencies outlined in the Unit's Conceptual Framework, state standards, and professional standards through field and clinical experiences.

The unit systematically ensures that candidates in the MSTL graduate program and Teacher Leader Endorsement-only program develop proficiencies outlined in the Unit's Conceptual Framework, state standards, and professional standards through the way Field experiences are designed and assessed. [Table 6](#) describes field expectations and assessments that coincide with course work. [Table 7B](#) lists the type of field experiences within specified courses of the MSTL program. [Table 7C](#) lists the same information within the TL Endorsement program. MSTL candidates are required to prepare content and implement them in the field as job-embedded projects. The job-embedded projects are the [signature assignments](#) (SA) within the courses. The SAs are linked with the School of Education (SOE) dispositions (see [Table 5D](#)) and the KTS (see [KTS Assessments with the MSTL Program](#)). Advanced candidates are required to use their content-area SPAs for content they implement in the field. Brescia MSTL and TL Field experiences are evaluated by their course instructors and by their field mentors (in the mentoring practica). The mentoring evaluation forms ([P3A](#) and [Form P4](#),) reflect elements of Unit's Conceptual Framework, state standards, and professional standards (see [Alignment of Forms P3A disposition and the KTS](#)). These multiple sources ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the Unit's Conceptual Framework, state standards, and professional standards through

Field experiences in the MSTL and TL programs. [Table 3.1](#) and [Table 3.4](#) display the results of Field evaluation. The mean score of all indicators show scores equal to or higher than 3, which indicates the *Accomplished* level. Candidates also attained *Accomplished* for all advanced Kentucky Teacher Standards, with a range of 3.0 (KTS 6 and KTS 7) to 4.0 for KTS 2 and 9 (see [Form P3A results – Table 3.2](#)). [Form P4 Evaluation Results](#) also shows scores ranging from 3.5 to 4 on the advanced Kentucky Teacher Standards (see [Table 3.5](#)). Candidates also exhibit and attain SOE Conceptual Framework (dispositions) in the Field as shown in [Table 3.3](#) and [Table 3.6](#). [Table 3.3](#) shows mean scores ranging from 3.57 (for professional skills) to 3.95 (Ethics). [Table 3.6](#) shows mean scores ranging from 3.3 (Advocacy) to 3.9 (Lifelong Learning). These results shows that MSTL candidates are successfully developing proficiencies outlined in the Unit's Conceptual Framework, state standards, and professional standards through Field experiences. Course instructors and advisors review all evaluations with candidate to ensure ongoing development.

Three of the ESL courses have Field experience components and outcomes designed to ensure that candidates develop proficiencies through these experiences. Candidates enrolled in the ESL Endorsement program have three Field experience placements and one Practicum within the courses below:

Field experiences for candidates in ESL include:

1. Edu 401 10 hours at Secondary 8–12
2. Edu 402 10 hours at Middle level 5–9
3. Edu 403 10 hours at Elementary

Practicum

Edu 404 requires 30 hours in a single placement at one certification level or 15 hours each in two settings in two different certification levels. Field Supervisors rate candidates' performance aligned with dispositions and the KTS using Form [Edu #17](#). An alignment of KTS (P-12/IECE), Disposition, Diversity, Professional and Pedagogical with ESL Field and Practicum experiences is assessed through the use of [Edu #17](#) and [Edu #17A](#) forms and demonstrates how the Unit ensures ESL candidates develop the required proficiencies. Course instructors and the ESL advisors review evaluations with candidates to ensure their ongoing development. In addition, SOE syllabi align course objectives and activities with the Conceptual Framework (CF), KTS, and SPAs, further ensuring candidate development of content and pedagogical knowledge to be applied during Field experiences. Candidates provide informal evidence of course-specific Field expectations through reflective journal entries, which are required as a component in all Field experiences.

An [alignment of KTS \(P-12/IECE\)](#), Disposition, Diversity, Professional and Pedagogical with ESL Field and Practicum experiences as assessed through [Edu #17](#) and [Edu #17A](#) indicates how the Unit ensures ESL candidates develop the required proficiencies.

3b.4. How does the unit systematically ensure that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences and clinical practice?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

One of the SOE Core Courses, [Edu 246](#) – Technology Application and Integration in Education – is required for all teacher candidates and occurs early in the program as one of the core classes. The course provides a solid foundation and demonstrates BU-required computer competency for SOE candidates. Candidates utilize this as a base for developing additional computer expertise, as they are expected to use and continue growth in their technological knowledge in all other professional and content area courses. Candidates are also expected to demonstrate their abilities to apply technology to enhance P–12 student learning and to promote P–12 student use of technology to support and enhance their own learning. The Field hours required for this core course focus on observing and gaining experience in a P–12 setting (lab or classroom) where technology is routinely used by teacher

and/or students. The Key Competency/Assessment or Signature Assignment and Rubric for the course is a Product Task which measures initial technology competencies.

The KTS Standard – Demonstrates the Implementation of Technology – is routinely evaluated by SOE candidates as part of the PGP process.

Beginning in Edu 204/108, candidates become familiar with the KTIP lesson plan format. Throughout their SOE program, anytime a lesson or unit plan is required, Task A2 prompts the candidate to consider how media/technology/resources will be incorporated to impact P–12 student learning. These forms are utilized in upper-division course work, Practicum, and Clinical Practice (CP). The Lesson Plan Rubric has a section designed to assess effective use of technology which is used in all courses requiring LP development. Portfolios both for Application to CP and for CP completion must evidence KTS 6 proficiency through exhibits. On [Edu # 12](#), [#13](#), and [#14](#) forms the section “Designs/Plans and Implements/Manages Instruction” assesses how well and how effectively a candidate in the P–12 class setting uses technology.

All candidates become familiar with assistive technology (AT) in the Core Course Edu 255 – Teaching Diverse Populations of Children and Youth Candidates. IECE and Special Education further develops AT in Edu 430 – Adaptive and Assistive Technology: Communication and Curricular Issues, which requires development from the awareness level to application by observing and by actively incorporating assistive technologies into instruction.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

The ESL P–12 Endorsement is a post-baccalaureate program and does not contain a Clinical Practice experience. Field supervisors for the three 10-hour Field experiences and the Practicum Supervisor both support candidates in all four of the experiences that total 60 hours of onsite direct instruction and interactions with ESL professionals. On the [Edu#17](#) form, the section “Designs/Plans and Implements/Manages Instruction” assesses how well and how effectively a candidate in the P–12 ESL class settings uses technology to meet the needs of diverse learners.

The MSTL program is committed to teaching candidates to use technology as a personal and professional tool both in the classroom and in the field. All courses require some form of technology use. For example, candidates in the *Master Teacher* (EDL 570) course are required to record themselves digitally as they deliver content to in the field (both MSTL and TL Endorsement). Candidates also take the required *Technology for Teacher Leaders* (EDL 530) course, where they implement a technology lesson in the field. This course is guided by ISTE Teacher Standards and EPSB Teacher Standards related to technology. Since Teacher Leader candidates are required to take EDL 570, they are using technology in the field. Advanced candidates use technology in field and mentoring Practicum. Field evaluation forms provide field data. [Technology Assessment from the field](#) based on [Form P3A](#) shows a mean of 3.6 on a scale of 4. [Form P4 Technology results](#) shows a mean of 3.5 on a scale of 4.0. Therefore, the MSTL program systematically ensures that candidates use technology as an instructional tool during Field experiences and that data are collected and analyzed. The data demonstrate the *Accomplished* level in the area of technology.

3b.5. What criteria are used in the selection of school-based clinical faculty? How are the criteria implemented? What evidence suggests that school-based clinical faculty members are accomplished school professionals?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

The Cooperating Teacher (CT) must have a Master's degree, hold valid certification in the area being taught/ supervised, have a minimum of five years of teaching experience, have successfully completed Co-Teaching training A and B, and attend an orientation meeting. Though not required, many also hold certification as KTIP Resource Teachers ([Clinical Practice Handbook](#) , p. 8).

The selection of CTs involves input from various partners involved with CP. Principals are queried about which faculty members meeting SOE criteria they would recommend; they also volunteer recommendations to the SOE. SOE faculty actively seek information about and often have opportunities to observe firsthand the performance of alumni; if they meet SOE criteria, they offer added benefit to CP candidates, as they have knowledge and experience with program expectations and requirements. Alumni also are an excellent source of recommendations for potential CTs. CP candidates offer feedback on potential CTs as they work with them during Field experience and Practica.

Evidence that school-based clinical faculty are accomplished school professionals is presented in [Table 5.2 Cooperating Teacher Qualifications](#). The choice of CTs is based on established criteria and the recommendations of multiple partners involved in the selection process, all of whom bring a variety of perspectives to the quality of practitioners serving in the role of CT.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Candidates enrolled in the ESL P-12 Endorsement enroll in a five course sequence at the 300- 400-level. The Program Director and the CRC Coordinator have collaborated with local school partners to identify ESL personnel qualified to serve as Field and Practicum supervisors. Since the MSTL is not an initial teacher education program, there is no clinical practice. However, with the Field and mentoring Practicum, as earlier discussed in 3a.3, Field experience starts with completing a Field placement form, the [Form P1](#) (Teacher Leader Field Placement Form). The University Director of Field Experiences [contacts the school](#) to make arrangements for placement in one of the school partners. The Director of Field Experiences ensures that there is a good fit in terms of subject areas, certification, and exposure to diverse candidates. When placement is finalized, then the Director of Field Experiences notifies the course instructor and the candidate. The candidate and instructor discuss how the placement meets the professional growth of the student (in terms of diversity) as compared to previous placements. In the practicum (EDL 500 and EDL 650), a coach or mentor is assigned to the MSTL or TL candidate. The coach or mentor is integral to the success of the teacher leader experience. He or she serves as a role model for the candidate. The Field mentor is selected in consultation with collaborating schools, the central office and/or building administrator, based upon educational background (at least a National Certified Teacher or 12 hours above a Master's). The mentor is required to have at least ten years of teaching experience and be at least four years in the school system in which he or she is teaching and express willingness to assume the responsibility of a coach/mentor. Completion of KTIP Resource Teacher training is also required.

3b.6. What preparation do school-based faculty members receive for their roles as clinical supervisors?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

Prior to the beginning of CP, the SOE hosts an orientation meeting with USs, CP candidates (CPCs), and their CTs. CTs receives a packet of information with candidate information ([Edu #11](#)) and a copy of the [Clinical Practice Handbook](#), which provides detailed information about the SOE Conceptual Framework and Mission Statement; General Guidelines, Policies, Procedures and Requirements; the CPC's responsibilities, a description of the evaluation of CPCs; and evaluation forms and supporting documents. [Ice Breaker](#) activities provide a starting point for CTs and CPCs to become acquainted. Training is provided on the evaluation forms ([Edu #12](#) CP Formative CT and Candidate, [Edu #14](#)

CP Final Evaluation CT, [Edu #15](#) CP Final Evaluation CT Narrative). A brief overview of the Portfolio Rubric Edu [#25A/B](#) – CT review of CP Portfolio P–12/IECE – is introduced, with online support through Camtasia videos ([CT Formative/Summative Training](#), [CT Portfolio Training](#)). Within the first two weeks of placement, the US meets with the CT and candidate at the placement site to review the *Handbook*, review evaluation forms and procedures, schedule upcoming observations, answer questions, provide contact information, and address any concerns. (See [Clinical Practice Orientation Agenda](#).)

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

As one of the three advanced programs, the ESL P–12 Endorsement is only awarded post-baccalaureate and involves Field experiences and a Practicum, but not Clinical Practice. Since the MSTL program is not an initial teacher education program, no Clinical Practice is required. The TL endorsement program is also not an initial level program and has no Clinical Practice component. However, the MSTL program hosts seminars with partners to generate support and create an information-sharing network such as the BU graduate [Mentoring Seminar](#) in February 2013.

3b.7. What evidence demonstrates that clinical faculty members provide regular and continuous support for student teachers, licensed teachers completing graduate programs, and other school professionals?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

Clinical faculty (Cooperating Teacher–CT and University Supervisor–US) provide continuous support for the Clinical Practice candidate (CPC). Prior to the CP placement, USs require CPCs to attend an orientation meeting to review the [Clinical Practice Handbook](#). The US and CPC develop a PGP based on CPC’s self-assessment and evaluations from the Practicum.

Once placement begins, support for CPCs is evident:

- Daily discussion/weekly planning with CT
- Daily journaling from CPC to US, resulting in ongoing dialog
- Discussions after CPCs’ two-week CT and self-evaluations first with the CT, then with the US ([Edu #12](#)), which includes development of focused growth plan
 - Seminars throughout the CP placement covering such topics such as the Ursuline Mission; Legal Aspects; EPSB; Co-Teaching Strategies; Mock Interviews recorded and shared with BU Career Placement Coordinator; Teacher Perceiver facilitated by local school district Personnel Director; Alumni Panel (recent grads address “What I Didn’t Learn at BU”); and job pointers from professionals (local school administrators)
 - 4 onsite US observations and conferencing with CPC on the application of pedagogical/content knowledge and feedback on KTIP documentation ([Edu #13](#))
 - CT and US feedback on the CP Portfolio ([Edu #25](#), [#29](#))

CPCs with two placements meet with the US after the first to debrief and develop a PGP to target areas for growth and potential opportunities during the second placement.

CPCs who experience difficulties have increased support, including a changed and/or extended placement; increased dialog between the CT and the US; an increased number of US observations with more conferencing; supplemental US instruction in needed growth areas; additional digital recordings and self-assessments with US consultation; or termination of clinical practice to allow for more intense remediation or advisement into another BU program.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

As one of the three advanced SOE Programs at Brescia, the ESL P–12 post-baccalaureate Endorsement program includes both Field experience placements and a Practicum. Candidates enrolled in the ESL Endorsement receive feedback from course instructors through via electronic journal reflections submitted after each onsite visit. Field Supervisors/University Supervisor and ESL candidates use [Edu#17](#) and [Edu#17A](#) forms that promote dialog around areas of strength and areas for growth. The Program Director also reviews candidates’ progress and dialogs with course instructors, candidates and Field/University supervisors to support them when concerns arise. Since the MSTL program is not an initial teacher education program, there is no Clinical Practice. However, the program works jointly with the mentor to support advanced candidates. Support starts with the [mentorship training](#) and continues through Field using the mentoring evaluation forms ([P3A](#), [P3B](#), and [P4](#)). The University instructor and advisor for the MSTL candidates conferences with the graduate candidate on a regular basis (class, advising sessions, mid-evaluation, and exit conference). Routine feedback is also provided for the journals maintained by the graduate candidate when engaging in the Field experiences.

3b.8. What structured activities involving the analysis of data and current research are required in programs for other school professionals?

N/A

3b.9. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

[Table 7B](#): Nature of Field Experiences within the MSTL Program

[Table 7C](#): Nature of Field Experiences within the Teacher Leader Endorsement Only Program

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

3c.1. On average, how many candidates are eligible for clinical practice each semester or year? What percent, on average, complete clinical practice successfully?

Admission to Clinical Practice Fall 2011 through Summer 2015

Program	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014	2014–2015
IECE	0	0	0	1
Elementary Education	3	7	1	4
Middle School	1	2	0	1
Art Education (P–12)	0	0	0	0
Biology – Secondary	1	0	1	0
English – Secondary	0	1	0	0
Mathematics – Secondary	0	0	0	1
Social Studies – Secondary	1	0	0	0
Spanish Education (P–12)	0	0	0	1
Special Education: LBD*	3	4	1	1
Completed/ TOTAL	6/6	10/10	2/2	8/8

***Special Education is dual certification and not duplicated in number of completers.**

3c.2. What are the roles of candidates, university supervisors, and school-based faculty in assessing candidate performance and reviewing the results during clinical practice?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

Candidates, University Supervisors (US, who are SOE faculty), and Cooperating Teachers (CTs) are all partners in the Clinical Practice experience. All three people engage in ongoing and regular assessment that is both formative and summative. Each of the partners brings a different perspective to the experience and has a unique though overlapping role.

The role of the Clinical Practice Candidate (CPC) in self-assessment of performance includes:

1. Submitting daily journaling reflections to the US and engaging in professional dialog
2. Developing LPs and reflecting on student learning through Task C of KTIP
3. Submitting a digital recording self-reflection and engaging in dialog with the CT and later with the US on ways to improve elements of instructional practice
4. Completing [Edu #12](#) as a self-assessment in preparation for bi-weekly formative evaluation conferencing with the CT and later with the US
5. Preparing for and engaging in professional dialog with the US after each onsite observation and evaluation
6. Creating a Clinical Practice portfolio that presents evidence of appropriate level of performance attained in Kentucky Teacher Standards, SPA standards, Kentucky Core Academic Standards
7. Developing and evidencing Professional Growth Plan (PGP).

The role of the University Supervisor (US) in assessing candidate performance includes:

1. Monitoring and probing daily reflections submitted by the CPC
2. Observing the CPC onsite as he/she engages in evidence-based best practice and providing written evaluation ([Edu #13](#)) with post conferencing
3. Reviewing KTIP lesson development and Task C analysis
4. Utilizing digital recording analysis to provide guided feedback
5. Conferencing with the CT
6. Providing additional resources as indicated by the CPC or the CT
7. Providing evaluation/feedback on portfolio, ([Edu #25](#) or [#29](#))
8. Collaborating on PGP development and evidence.

The role of the Cooperating Teacher (CT) in assessing the candidate performance includes:

1. Providing continuous daily feedback targeting observed strengths and targeting areas for growth (e.g., KCAS lesson alignment, planning for and development of lessons, utilization of evidence-based best practices and Co-Teaching models, usage of student assessment data to impact P–12 student learning, effective integration of available technology)
2. Providing biweekly formative evaluations ([Edu #12](#)) targeting observed strengths and targeting areas for growth, and summative evaluations ([Edu #14](#) and [#15](#)) facilitating implementation of Co-Teaching strategies
3. Providing evaluation/feedback on the Clinical Practice portfolio ([Edu #25](#)).

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

As one of the three advanced SOE Programs, the ESL P–12 Endorsement is awarded post-baccalaureate and has no Clinical Practice requirement. However, Field and Practicum components are evaluated. Course instructors and candidates engage in electronic dialog after each onsite visit is completed. Candidates engage in self-assessment using the [Edu#17](#) form while Field/Practicum Supervisors use the [Edu#17](#) form and the University Supervisors use the [Edu#17A](#) form. Candidates also complete a portfolio that is evaluated by at least two members of the TEAC who have ESL experience.

Since the MSTL program is not an initial teacher education program, there is no Clinical Practice. However, Field and Practicum components are evaluated. Brescia MSTL Field experiences are evaluated by their course instructors and mentors (in the case of the mentoring Practica). The mentors evaluate candidates based upon both performance and potential for success as a teacher leader using the mentoring evaluation forms ([P3A](#) and [P4](#)). Summary results of these evaluations are shared with the candidates and prove to be invaluable in facilitating candidates' professional growth. The MSTL candidate is responsible for providing the evaluation forms to the mentor and assumes the responsibility for returning the completed form to his/her course instructor. The mentor is also free to either mail the completed evaluation(s) or request an electronic version, which could be submitted as an email attachment. Field faculty periodically evaluate the progress of the graduate student through informal and planned formal conferences, observations, and at the conclusion of the Field assignments they send their final evaluation to the Chairperson of the School of Education (see [Samples of completed evaluation forms](#)). The University instructor/advisor for the MSTL candidate conferences with the graduate student on a regular basis (class, advising sessions, mid-evaluation, and exit conference). They also give routine feedback for the journals maintained by the graduate student.

3c.3. How is time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty incorporated into field experiences and clinical practice?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

Time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty is incorporated into Field experiences and Clinical Practice in several ways:

1. Reflective journaling is a constant, which provides dialog between the candidate and SOE faculty throughout Field, Practicum, and Clinical Practice experiences.
2. Conferencing regarding the Field Supervisor's evaluation ([Edu # 16A](#)) between candidate and their faculty/advisor is part of course design, and provides both formative and summative feedback, upon which the candidate is invited to reflect.
3. Conferencing is also a vital part of CP feedback at the completion of the CT's and CPC bi-weekly evaluation and after the US onsite observations. These conferences cite strengths and growth areas to target development and suggest remediation as needed.
4. Many classes incorporate class time for candidates to share Field experiences, resulting in a shared awareness of how course content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge flow into practice through actual Field application.
5. Conferencing between candidate and advisor explores the development and review of annual PGPs helps set realistic growth goals and action plan. The Clinical Practice PGP is a holistic look at skills based on their application during placement
6. The Practicum course time provides opportunity for candidates to share their experiences and digital recordings and get feedback from peers and faculty.
7. The Application to CP Portfolio provides formative evaluation at the preview prior to summative TEAC evaluation.
8. The CT and US offer regular feedback to push candidate toward a deeper understanding of pedagogy/content knowledge as applied to reflections.
9. Seminars provide opportunity for CPCs to share concerns to gain peer feedback.
10. The CP Portfolio evaluation provides both formative and summative feedback for CPCs completing two placements within their certification area(s).

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

As one of the three advanced SOE Programs, the ESL P-12 Endorsement is awarded post-baccalaureate and has no Clinical Practice requirement. However, Field and Practicum components require reflective journaling, conferencing, and feedback from portfolio reviewers, all of which pro-

vide opportunities for dialog among, faculty, candidates and P–12 supervisors. Since the MSTL program is not an initial teacher education program, there is no Clinical Practice. However, since Field is embedded into both MSTL courses (see [Table 7B](#)) and TL programs (see [Table 7C](#)), candidates’ reflections and evaluation collected at the end of one Field experience are incorporated into the next Field experience. The reflective journals ([Candidates’ Sample Reflections](#)) provide dialog between the candidates and faculty throughout Field and Practicum experiences. The Field evaluation forms ([P3A](#) and [P3B](#)) results are discussed with candidate by their faculty/advisor (see [Samples of completed evaluation forms](#)). The strength and growth areas are discussed to target areas of improvement during the next Field opportunity.

3c.4. What data from multiple assessments provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in field experiences and clinical practice?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

The Unit has multiple assessments that provide evidence of candidates’ knowledge, skills and professional dispositions throughout Field experiences and Clinical Practice. Candidates’ professional dispositions at entry to the SOE lay the foundation; then, using [Edu #4B](#) course instructors further assess the candidates’ dispositions in the core professional courses: Edu 204/108, 246, 255, 301, and Psy 300; other faculty assess these same dispositions at candidate Application to the SOE by using [Edu #4A](#). [Table 3c.4](#) – “Unit Dispositions at Core Course and Application to SOE” – provides annual data from core course instructors across at least 2 semesters and from faculty recommendations at the point of Application to the School of Ed. An average score of ≥ 3.0 (or ≥ 20 pts) is required for Edu #4B. Faculty make a recommendations to accept/accept with reservations/not accept into the SOE for Edu #4A. This Table shows that the Unit exceeds 3.0 for all years assessed. Using assessment results from these two forms (Edu #4A and #4B), a series of five tables have been created for the Unit and across all Programs for three separate years for each of the five SOE professional dispositions; these tables summarize annual assessment data generated at pre-candidate Application to the SOE and within core courses (see [1c.1.3](#) – Professional Dispositions/Skills; [3c.4.3](#) – Ethics; [Table 1g.2.2](#) – Advocacy; [3c.4.2](#) – Service; and [3c.4.4](#) – Lifelong Learning. These tables show ratings of > 2.08 on a 5-point scale across the Unit and all Programs. The Special Education candidates’ data are included in their dual certification area (Elementary or Middle School) as well as Special Education. These findings show a strong foundation of dispositions for helping all students learn.

Professional dispositions related to helping all student learning in field and CP are directly related to the SOE dispositions of ethics, advocacy, service and lifelong learning. As part of the application to the SOE, candidates are interviewed regarding their dispositions. A sampling of demonstrators from Interview Presentation Rating Form (Edu #5) that are aligned with fairness and the belief that all student can learn include: honest, ethical awareness, caring awareness of others’ needs, differentiating approaches to instruction, perceives own role as advocate, serves others, belief in ability of students to help one another, and shoots for the stars. The [Table 1g.1.1](#) – “Oral and Dispositional Skills Interview 2011–2015” – presents scores for the Unit and per Program. Across all years a minimum score of > 3 on Oral Presentation is required for competency. When the form changed in 2014 to have consistent 5.0 scale and in 2015 to be consistent with 4 point scale of Unit, a minimum score of 80% of possible score was required for Dispositional Skills. The Oral and a Dispositional score for the Unit and per Program met or exceeded the competency. Thus candidates at the entry level demonstrate competency in oral and dispositional skills in the Unit and across programs. A Secondary English candidate who did not meet the required Dispositional score was advised out of the Program. An Elementary/Special Education candidate did not reapply and left the University.

Data in [Table 3c.4a](#) – “Field Supervisor Evaluations 2011–2015”– show Field Supervisor overall ratings for the Unit and per Program, based on data gathered through [Edu #16](#). The data provide evidence of the strong development of candidates’ skill related to student learning, with average scores > 3.0 on a 4-point scale, with the exception of an IECE candidate in 2012–2013 and Special Ed candidate in 2014–2015. Both candidates did not complete the Program. Key to Field experiences is the requirement of [reflective journaling](#). This informal assessment is embedded in course requirements and allows for dialog with faculty to further evaluate candidates.

CP bi-weekly (Edu #12 CP Formative CT) and summative (Edu #14 CP Final Evaluation CT) evaluations completed by Cooperating Teacher (CT) and a minimum of 4 targeted observations (Edu #13 CP Formative US) completed by the University Supervisor (US) during placement provide data aligned to the KTS. [Table 3c.4b](#) – “Clinical Practice Evaluations by CT and US 2011–2015”– presents data for the Unit and per Programs. Based on this data, Unit averages for CT and US ratings per KTS are ≥ 3.0 on a 4.0 scale. The same is reflected for each program.

Portfolios at the Application to CP and Summative of CP show evidence of candidates’ competencies necessary to impact student learning. [Table 1d.1.2](#) – “Student Learning Skill Evidence in Application to CP and CP Portfolios”– is aligned with KTS 2, 4, and 5; this Table provides data for the Unit and per Program, revealing both Unit and Program scores ≥ 3 on a 4.0 scale in the areas of *designing and planning instruction, implementing and managing instruction* as well as *assessing and communication learning results*; all of these contribute to student learning in Field and Clinical Practice. [Table 1d.1.4](#) – “Student Learning Averages from KTIP Lesson Plan Rubric” also shows the growth in candidate competencies from an average of 7.5 in a 200 level course to an 18.5 in a 400 level course. Advocacy was also an indicator of the candidates’ abilities to differentiate instruction and assessment.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Brescia University has three advanced programs: the ESL P–12 post-baccalaureate Endorsement, the MSTL, and a free-standing Teacher Leader Endorsement. Each of the five courses that make up the ESL Endorsement has a unique Signature Assignment with an accompanying assessment, as well as other course assignments/activities that are aligned with the Advanced level of KTS and TESOL standards. Data obtained from these sources is combined with data from Field/Practicum evaluations and portfolio ratings to provide evidence that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn in their Field experiences and Practicum.

The MSTL program is not an initial teacher education program, so there is no clinical practice. However, the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn are measured in the Field experiences from the mentoring evaluation forms ([P3A](#) and [P4](#)). The [form P3A is aligned to SOE’s dispositions](#). Candidates exhibit the ability to help all students learn, based on the SOE’s measure of ethics and advocacy in the field as shown in [Table 3.3](#) and [Table 3.6](#). The former, [Table 3.3](#), shows a mean score of 3.95 on a scale of 4.0 for Ethics and a score of 3.8 for Advocacy. The latter, [Table 3.6](#), shows a mean score of 3.73 for Ethics and 3.3 for Advocacy. As candidates progress through the program, they are exposed to other opportunities to develop professional dispositions related to fairness and the belief that all students can learn within the courses that include job-embedded assignments (see *Ethics and Advocacy* column in [Table 5D](#)). The assignments linked to *Ethics and Advocacy* are displayed in the [MSTL performance Assessment of Unit’s CF](#). In addition, candidates evaluate their own degree of attainment of program goals and dispositions using the [Midpoint Evaluation](#) and the [Exit Evaluation Form](#). These various sources of data are shown in [Table IG3](#). On the average, at entry point Brescia MSTL candidates average a 2.4 on a 4.0 scale. At midpoint, the data show an average of 3.3. Then at the exit-point, candidates average 3.9. The increase from 2.4 to 3.9

shows candidates' expanded ability to promote the success of all students. These results show that MSTL candidates are developing proficiencies to help all students learn.

3c.5. What process is used to ensure that candidates collect and analyze data on student learning, reflect on those data, and improve student learning during clinical practice?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

The process used to ensure that CP candidates collect and analyze data on student learning, reflect on the data, and improve student learning during Clinical Practice is evident in placement expectations. The [Clinical Practice Handbook](#) (p. 5) addresses assessment components in Objectives #2, 6, and 7; these require candidates to analyze and assess P–12 students' performance. Candidates are expected to design and implement KTIP lesson plans, and units inclusive of [Task C](#): Lesson Analysis and Reflection must be completed. Use of pre- and post-assessments are evidenced in the [A2 Lesson Plan](#) section f) "Pre-Assessment and Assessment" sections. Candidates are required to develop and interpret data from various assessments and complete Task C's Post Observations. Components of Task C require each candidate to present data, analyze data, reflect on students' strengths/learning needs, and formulate a plan to diversify instruction based on identified student need. Analysis of student progress is frequently addressed through the reflective journaling process. As CP candidates implement instruction, the Task C requirement provides the guide for determining assessment of data and ways to address results for improved learning. The [KTIP Lesson Plan Rubric](#) was piloted in 2014-2015 allowing faculty to compare candidate growth from a 200 level education course to a 400 level education course. The KTIP Lesson Plan and Rubric is currently being implemented after a yearlong pilot along with the ability to generate data using Taskstream. ([Table 3c.5](#))

The CT evaluates candidate's ability to use and analyze assessments and to communicate results to students; they promote the candidate's self-assessment formatively on the bi-weekly form [Edu #12](#), and summatively on [Edu #14](#). At each of four onsite observations, the US completes [Edu #13](#), which mirrors the assessment components of the CT. Candidates must provide evidence of their competence in collection and analysis of student data in their CP Portfolios, based on indicators for KTS # 5. All candidates must also self-assess on KTS # 5 through the PGP process. Discussion of the PGP relative to candidate assessment and ongoing progress in meeting various standards is part of each mid-semester advising conference with the program advisor. If KTS #5 is shown as a growth area, the candidate and advisor work out a plan to address this area.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

In three of its five required courses, candidates enrolled in the ESL P–12 post-baccalaureate endorsement program are required to successfully complete lesson plans. In four of the five courses reflective journaling is required. Practicum requires sequential lesson planning. In all instances candidates must collect, analyze, and reflect on students' performance and progress and then determine how best to differentiate instruction to incorporate areas of strength and meet individual student needs. Evidence of competency is determined through the use of Field Experience/ Practicum evaluation and portfolio ratings by candidates, supervisors, and TEAC portfolio raters.

Since the MSTL program is not an initial teacher education program, there is no clinical practice; however, Field is embedded into MSTL courses (see [Table 7B](#)) and in the TL Endorsement program (see [Table 7C](#)). For example, in EDL 530, MSTL candidates implement a technology lesson in their content areas in a school setting. In addition, candidates analyze P–12 students' performance using charts and graphs; and reflect on how to impact students learning positively. In EDL 570, candidates use differentiated strategies in their various content areas. In EDL 640, candidates select a two-to-

three week unit of instruction and develop a test to assess P–12 learning. The test items target specific P–12 learning outcomes with appropriate scoring rubrics.

Candidates work with a mentor in EDL 500, keeping journals of their experiences and noting how they learned from their mentors ([Exhibit S3](#) offers sample candidates’ journal entries). Candidates scored consistently high with an average of 97.3% on these journal reflections. EDL 640 candidates reflect on the reliability and validity of classroom assessments. Reflections in this course include how they would assess P–12 students’ differently when they teach the job-embedded topic again. Candidates also reflect on how they would improve learning based on the results of the test administered in the field. Candidates scored an average of 90%. In the job-embedded application assessment in EDL 530, candidates reflect on possibilities for professional development based on integrated lessons implemented in their classrooms (see [Integrated Technology Lesson and Rubric](#)). They also discuss plans for subsequent lessons to reinforce and extend understanding for P–12 students who did not make satisfactory progress. The reflective journal is 15% of the overall grade of the EDL 530 course. [Exhibit 1G1](#) displays the courses from which assessments are collected for reflections. The outcome assessment data show that students have a mean score of 4 in EDL 500, a mean score of 3 in EDL 530, and a 4 in EDL 640, which shows an average of 3.6 (B Grade) in the three courses. [Exhibit 1G2](#) displays the performance on signature assessments in these courses. The performance of all MSTL candidates show *Accomplished* in candidates’ reflection on practice.

3c.6. How does the unit ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice that includes students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

The Unit ensures that all candidates have Field experiences or Clinical Practice that includes students with exceptionalities and diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups by following the Policies and Practices in the [Field Handbook](#). According to SOE policy, candidates must serve in the following diverse placements:

1. At least 80% of the 200-hour Field experience requirement must be in schools or settings with a greater than 20% minority population (greater than 11% in middle or secondary settings), or with a greater than 15% migrant population.
2. At least 20 hours must involve direct contact with students from a minimum of two (2) different ethnic or cultural groups of which the candidate would not be considered a member.
3. At least 30 hours of the basic 200-hour requirement must be with students from different socioeconomic groups; at least 15% of the 200 hours must be in schools with a Title I designation; for IECE candidates, in a Head Start setting.
4. At least five (5) hours must involve direct contact in a program or setting serving English language learners.
5. At least 20 hours must involve direct contact in a program or setting serving children with disability or exceptional needs.
6. At least 20 hours must involve direct contact in a program or setting serving students at all grade levels: elementary, middle school, and secondary.

In order to ensure and then track this broad level of diversity, SOE faculty communicate with the Coordinator of the CRC, who as the Director of Field Experiences procures placements for candidates according to the number of hours required, the typical sites appropriate, the course content focus, and the field experience expectations (e.g., Edu 255 ensures 20 field hours of direct experiences with students with exceptionalities). The CRC Coordinator also monitors where and what types of placements each candidate has completed to ensure required diversity. Since Brescia is a Catholic institution, the

SOE believes it is important for all candidates to have at least one field experience in a parochial setting, enabling them to compare/ contrast elements of public and religiously-affiliated approaches to educational practice. All candidates must also complete one field experience in a Title I school. IECE requires a Head Start placement.

Implementation of the Field Accountability Form [Edu #20](#) will further track candidate's experiences in settings where ethnic/racial and linguistic diversity can be attained. The Coordinator of the CRC also oversees KFETS usage by candidates and monitors their progress on 16 KAR 5:040 requirements.

The candidates are also tracked by the SOE Data Manager (Edu #18) to ensure that at Level III, the point of Admission to Clinical Practice, they have met the diversity requirements. KFETS will not oversee diversity components.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Within the advanced ESL Endorsement, Edu 401 has a 10-hour Field placement at the Secondary level. In Edu 402 the 10-hour Field experience is at the Middle Grades level. The Elementary level is targeted in the 10 hour field experience of Edu 403. The 30-hour Practicum, Edu 404, may be completed at a single level or split equally between two levels. This ensures all candidates have experiences across P–12 levels with students who are culturally and linguistically diverse.

The Field experiences within the MSTL program are in two unique categories: Mentoring Practicum and classroom-embedded applications. Every course (with a few content course exceptions) has a job-embedded application. The MSTL program thus provides opportunities for students to work directly in the field, providing professional development activities that result in teacher leadership skills. Teacher leader candidates' complete placements in urban, suburban, and rural settings across a variety of socioeconomic bases, including on occasion a social service agency. See columns titled "Expectations" and "Typical field sites" in [Table 6](#). The *Record of Field* ([Form P5](#)), the [Diversity Form #20G](#), and the Field Accountability [Form P2](#) provide data to track candidates' experiences in settings where ethnic/racial and linguistic diversity can be attained. The Coordinator of the CRC oversees and monitors candidates' progress on field diversity using Taskstream technology. [Table 10b](#) shows the demographics on sites for MSTL Field Experiences, and [Table 4.5](#) shows school systems demographics. Ample opportunity for diverse experiences is thus demonstrated.

3c.7. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

[Table 6](#): Nature of Field Experiences by Course

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 3?

The process of Field/Practicum/Clinical placements is systematic and arranged according to the unique requests of each school/agency. The SOE has a positive relationship with schools/agencies and receives great support from alumni who frequently serve as Field/Practicum/Clinical Practice supervisors. The SOE communicates effectively with supervisors to ensure the placements meet course requirements and candidates' needs.

STANDARD 4. DIVERSITY

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

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

4a.1. What proficiencies related to diversity are candidates expected to develop and demonstrate?

The heart of the Brescia Ursuline teaching tradition is to treat each student as a unique individual, meeting them where they are and addressing their needs accordingly. ([Alignment of Diversity with Ursuline Values](#)) The University considers diversity a key value, as evident in throughout the [2015–2020 Strategic Plan](#). For over two decades, the University articulated commitment to this value in various elements of its Educational Outcomes, according to which Brescia graduates are expected to “respect individual differences” and “appreciate diversity of culture.” (See the [Educational Outcome of Human Welfare Value](#).) To facilitate improved assessment, in the spring of 2014 Brescia faculty revised the Education Outcomes, reducing the number from 10 to four. The revised Outcomes continue to embrace the individual and promote development of the whole person. All courses in the curriculum and all facets of the co-curriculum together support these Educational Outcomes ([BU Catalog](#), p. 41). Since Brescia began in 1925 as a teachers’ college, its teacher education programs from the beginning have embraced this value of diversity as part of the legacy of the Ursuline educational tradition. The current School of Education considers attention to diversity synonymous with the Conceptual Framework disposition of advocacy that it seeks to cultivate in teacher education candidates.

INITIAL PROGRAMS

The proficiencies related to diversity and advocacy that candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate are reflected in KTS and with IECE KTS ([Table 4a.1.1](#) – “Alignment of Diversity Competencies with KTS at Initial Level” and [Table 4.a.1.2](#) – “Alignment of Diversity Competencies with IECE KTS at Initial Level”), and they are embedded throughout the SOE initial programs in their attention to the following:

- Plans for learning and cultural diversity
- Engages students at all levels
- Fosters a positive learning climate with effective classroom management
- Collaborates to design, implement, and support learning
- Assesses and analyzes results to meet diverse learning needs and situations
- Integrates technology to address diverse student needs

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Similar to the undergraduate programs, the proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate in the advanced programs are listed below.

- Plans for learning and cultural diversity
- Engages students at all levels

- Fosters a positive learning climate with effective classroom management
- Collaborates to design, implement, and support learning
- Assesses and analyzes results to meet diverse learning needs and situations
- Integrates technology to address diverse student needs

Commitment to these six proficiencies has resulted in MSTL program objectives that have become part of the annual assessment grids prepared for the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness (see [Diversity Proficiencies Aligned to MSTL](#)).

Advanced Program candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate the same proficiencies related to diversity and advocacy as those in Initial Programs, except at the Advanced level (as seen in [Table 4a.1.2](#) – “Alignment of Diversity Competencies with KTS”) for candidates in TL Endorsements and the MSTL

ESL candidates enrolled concurrently in the endorsement and an initial certification program are assessed on the proficiency assessments that are contained within the Initial Programs. However, because the program is post-baccalaureate, they are also assessed in Field/Practicum experiences using Edu #17 and [Edu #17A](#) which include the following twelve ESL diversity proficiencies:

- Collaboration
- Cultural sensitivity
- Planned for learning and cultural diversity
- Multiple language proficiency levels/language system deficiencies
- Addresses and implements multiple language domains
- Integrates technology to address diverse student needs
- Incorporates vocabulary from content areas
- Addresses students’ cognitive/emotional/social/behavioral status
- Positive classroom management/Fosters self-control
- Uses/Analyzes assessment to improve instruction
- Creates/Uses assessments that are bias-free and culturally sensitive
- Uses data from cumulative record to validate or critique programs and services

The [alignment](#) for the sections and elements of these forms indicates which KTS (P-12/IECE), Disposition, Diversity, Professional and Pedagogical proficiencies are being assessed.

4a.2. What required coursework and experiences enable teacher candidates and candidates for other school professional roles to develop:

- awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning; and
- the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to adapt instruction and/or services for diverse populations, including linguistically and culturally diverse students and students with exceptionalities?

As noted above, awareness of the importance of advocacy and diversity is part of Brescia’s Ursuline “DNA,” as seen in this articulation of part of the “Ursuline Educational Tradition” (BU *Catalog*, p. 9): *The concern for the marginalized, inspiring Ursulines to attend to those excluded by the cultural morés of the time, whether they be the girls of 16th-century Europe; the Native Americans of 17th-century Canada; the African Americans of 18th-century New Orleans; the 19th- and 20th-century rural poor throughout the United States; the “underachievers” upon whom education was thought to be wasted, and the physically or mentally disabled across all centuries; or the working adults today unable to access traditional higher education.* Situated at the heart of Brescia as an Ursuline institution,

the SOE is thus imbued with this awareness of diversity in its teaching and learning, and gives evidenced to this commitment in a number of ways in both initial and advanced programs:

INITIAL PROGRAMS

Awareness of diversity is evident in the following ways throughout all initial teacher education programs:

SOE Course Syllabi

Each SOE course syllabus includes the alignment of course objectives/goals and activities to the disposition of Advocacy/Diversity. [Table 4a.2](#) – “Course Alignment with Advocacy and Diversity Proficiencies” – provides evidence of addressing advocacy/diversity across all programs through course work.

Candidate Lesson Plans

The development of lesson plans is required in all methods courses. Candidates must consider P–12 students’ learning characteristics in the context, lesson plan, and post observation using the KTIP lesson plan. Candidates document in Task A1 – “Context” their understanding of diversity elements impacting the learner. Candidates as evidenced in Task A2 – “Lesson Plan” – differentiate instructional strategies, assessment, and materials to engage and enhance all students’ learning based on the context. Technology selection is purposeful to enhance learning for all students. Candidates in the Task C “Post Observation” reflection utilize assessment data to differentiate future instruction. (See [Rubric for lesson plan](#).)

Field Placements

As noted in Section 3c.6 above, the SOE requires diverse field placements in order to provide experiences that bring knowledge and skills related to working with different ages, genders, races, ethnicities, socioeconomic groups, physically or mentally disabled groups, and linguistically and culturally diverse groups (*Field Handbook*, p. 25). According to SOE policy outlined in the *Handbook*, candidates must serve in the following diverse placements; these diverse experiences both prepare them to grow in understanding the value of diversity as well as to develop greater knowledge and skills needed to meet diverse needs:

1. At least 80% of the 200-hour Field experience requirement must be in schools or settings with a greater than 20% minority population (greater than 11% in middle or secondary settings), or with a greater than 15% migrant population.
2. At least 20 hours must involve direct contact with students from a minimum of two (2) different ethnic or cultural groups of which the candidate would not be considered a member.
3. At least 30 hours of the basic 200-hour requirement must be with students from different socioeconomic groups; at least 15% of the 200 hours must be in schools with a Title I designation; for IECE candidates, in a Head Start setting.
4. At least five (5) hours must involve direct contact in a program or setting serving English language learners.
5. At least 20 hours must involve direct contact in a program or setting serving children with disability or exceptional needs.
6. At least 20 hours must involve direct contact in a program or setting serving students at all grade levels: elementary, middle school, and secondary.

As candidates continue their professional preparation, their field experiences become more participative and interactive, and thus require greater responsibilities and more careful preparation on the part of the candidates. Growth toward mastery of KTS and an integrated understanding of Kentucky’s curricular expectations, together with awareness of and development in the SOE dispositions (including advocacy/diversity), increase throughout the field experiences. Candidates examine their own devel-

opment in skills, knowledge, and dispositions. They reflect on their experiences, and they receive evaluative feedback from their field supervisors and University faculty.

Clinical Practice (CP)

Candidates develop KTS-aligned portfolios at the Application to CP and at the completion of their CP; these give evidence of candidate competence across the KTS. Diversity is central to KTS P–12 in Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8; and in KTS IECE Standards 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Utilization of the portfolio rubric measures candidate’s competence from *Developing* to *Exemplary*, as may be seen in the following forms: [Edu # 24A/Edu #24B](#), [Edu #25 A/Edu #25B](#).

Professional Growth Plans (PGP)

Candidates self-assess and plan for their professional growth in KTS through the PGP process. These plans track the candidate’s growth from Acceptance to the SOE through completion of CP. They are developed and reviewed by each candidate and her/his academic advisor during semester advising sessions and by US of the Practicum and the CP. (See [Edu # 27](#), [Edu #32A/Edu #32B](#).)

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Attention to diversity permeates the MSTL program (see [Table 5C](#)). Specifically, the following [required coursework and experiences](#) enable MSTL candidates develop awareness, knowledge, skills, and professional disposition to adapt instruction to diverse learners. For example, EDL 530 candidates develop multimedia applications that can support a diverse population of students. MSTL candidates review, analyze, discuss, and apply research from diverse perspectives in education, professional scholarship, and practitioner inquiry. These include job-embedded assignments in order to reflect on and then improve as necessary their own practices as classroom teachers (see [EDL 530 Syllabus](#)). In similar ways, [EDL 570](#) candidates explore how to understand and respond to individual students’ learning styles and needs. This course provides participants with practical, hands-on strategies for teaching in heterogeneous settings. Participants learn how to engage and support struggling learners while challenging advanced learners, and strategies for differentiating content, process, and products are addressed. In [EDL 630](#), candidates examine strategies used in managing a positive classroom environment within the framework of today’s diverse population. As part of [EDL 655](#), candidates design a unit that embodies a culturally relevant curriculum; this unit must include self-examination of potential bias and stereotypes that must be addressed to assist all students to succeed in school and understand their responsibilities within a global society. MSTL candidates must also analyze ideology represented in school curriculum; explore and discuss the growing cultural and linguistic diversity in P–12 schools; and evaluate research literature on diversity, multiculturalism, and changes in curriculum. Among the attributes of diversity addressed in this course are age, disability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, geographic region, giftedness, language, race, religion, and socioeconomic status. Additionally, an emphasis on cognitive style differences provides a background for the consideration of cultural context. In [EDL 550](#), candidates demonstrate understanding of social problem contributing to learning challenges. The EDL 550 course further expands candidate awareness of other critical multicultural issues. They explore how multiple attributes of multicultural populations influence decisions in employing specific methods and materials for every student. The MSTL program is therefore rich in diversity.

The Teacher Leader endorsement-only candidates are required to take the [EDL 570](#). This course is part of the required four courses in this program. As noted above, candidates explore how to understand and respond to individual students’ learning styles and needs. This course provides participants with practical, hands-on strategies for teaching in heterogeneous settings. Participants learn how to engage and support struggling learners while challenging advanced learners, and strategies for differentiating content, process, and products are addressed.

The rationale for the implementation of the ESL program is that teachers are prepared more effectively to teach in a global environment. The following five courses make up the program:

[EDU 401 Language and Culture](#)

[EDU 402 Acquisition and Skill Set](#)

[EDU 403 Methods and Materials for P–12 Teaching](#)

[EDU 404 Practicum in ESL](#)

[ENG 306 Linguistics](#)

All five courses address diversity issues. For example, candidates are introduced to diversity in [EDU 401](#), a course that assists the candidates in understanding the diversity in foundational belief systems, world views, and how language is used to express those systems and worldviews. The course introduces candidates to the idea of universal beliefs and the particular beliefs of various cultures. [EDU 402](#) emphasizes the impact of the theories and research of second-language acquisition on ESL pedagogy. The [EDU 403](#) course uses knowledge derived from the linguistic sciences about the nature of language and how it is learned to assist candidates in the exploration and evaluation of the various techniques for teaching ESL students. The [ENG 306](#) Linguistics course provides an overview of the study of language, including such topics as the nature of human language, its grammatical aspects (phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, writing), its social and historical aspects (dialect, slang, sexism, etc.), and its biological aspects (language acquisition, language and the brain). The ESL program curriculum is therefore also rich in its awareness and appreciation of diversity.

4a.3. What key assessments provide evidence about candidates' proficiencies related to diversity? How are candidates performing on these assessments?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

The SOE initial programs utilize a number of assessment by which SOE faculty determine the level of proficiency regarding diversity. These assessments to measure candidates' ability in the area of Diversity throughout the four levels of the programs are identified in [Table 4a.3.1](#) – “Diversity Proficiency Assessments.” This table presents a comprehensive listing of form-driven assessments, noting at which level they occur. The first column provides the assessment; the second column lists the specific item that aligns with advocacy/diversity; the third column identifies when the assessment is utilized (within each of the four levels); and the last column lists the evaluators responsible for the various assessments.

The [Table 4a.3.2](#) – “Diversity Proficiency Assessment Data 2011–2015” – presents average data across all years for each diversity proficiency (from both the “advocacy/diversity” SOE requirements and the relevant KTS); the table also includes the item(s) from each assessment tool for the Unit and each Program. A “NA” response indicates that no candidates participated in the activity that would have generated data. This summary data for the unit shows scores >3.0 on 4.0 scale, and ≥3.0 on 5.0 scale for the first two items on the chart, 4A/B. Data summaries per Program reveal evidence of strong candidate diversity competency across multiple assessments, with the exception of the following three occurrences of data with a <3.0 score:

1. Middle School Program on form completed by US in *Planning for learning and cultural diversity*, *Uses/analyzes assessment to improve instruction*, and *Promotes self-assessment*. In each case the number was not significantly lower, and CT evaluations showed growth from a formative score of 3.36 to a 3.40 summative score:
2. Art on form completed by CT in *Integration of multimedia and electronic technologies*. The score improved from a 2.50 on the formative to a 4.0 on the CT summative rating:
3. Spanish on formative evaluations completed by CT in *Engages students at all levels* and *Uses/analyzes assessment to improve instruction* scored a 2.75: these scores improved to a 3.50 rating on CT summative evaluations:

[Table 4a.3.3](#) – “Unit Diversity Proficiency Assessment Data” – presents yearly averages for each diversity proficiency (from both the “advocacy/diversity” SOE requirements and the relevant KTS), along with the Unit assessment tool used to measure each diversity proficiency. Ratings of ≥ 3.0 occur annually, giving evidence of candidates’ solid diversity proficiency. Additional data disaggregated by Program may be seen in [Table 4a.3.4](#) – “Program Diversity Proficiency Assessment Data,” which presents yearly averages for each diversity proficiency, along with the Unit assessment tool used to measure each proficiency within each SOE Program. Analysis of these data reveals the following:

IECE Program data provides evidence of several areas where scores are < 3.0 on the course instructor dispositional evaluation and the Field rating forms. This (one) candidate did not complete the program. A score of “NA” represents no candidates having reached application to clinical practice.

Elementary Program data shows one area in 2013–2014 where candidates scored 2.93 on the CT formative evaluation for *Promotes self-assessment*. However, ratings on the CT summative form showed growth to 3.50. Candidates in the elementary program thus demonstrate strong skill across all diversity proficiencies.

Middle School Program data shows scores ≥ 3.0 in all areas, with the exception of a < 3.0 in the previously cited areas found in 2012–2013. As noted above, candidates were able to show growth by the time of their summative CP evaluations. Thus data supports Middle School candidates’ strong skill across all diversity proficiencies.

Secondary Program data indicates scores in all areas ≥ 3.0 across all years for diversity proficiencies. These data support strong diversity skills for secondary candidates across the Program.

Special Ed: LBD Program data shows annual scores in all areas > 3.0 , with the exception of *Promotes self-assessment* each year. Candidates demonstrate growth from the CT and the US formative evaluations to a > 3.0 summative CP evaluation. Thus, overall, candidates in the Special Education: LBD Program reveal strong skills in diversity proficiencies.

Art Program data shows annual data scores in all areas at > 3.0 , with the exception of the previously cited areas. This one candidate demonstrated growth to a 4.00 in the CT summative evaluation of CP. Overall, the data support strong diversity skills for art candidates.

Spanish Program data shows annual scores in all areas ≥ 3.0 , with the exception of the previously cited area. The candidate evidenced growth to a > 3.0 score on the summative CP evaluation by the CT. Overall, the data support strong diversity skills for Spanish candidates.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Diversity Proficiencies are assessed within the [signature assessment](#). For example, all MSTL candidates complete signature assignments in the following courses:

- EDL 655 Multicultural and Diversity Issues Curriculum
- EDL 570 Master Teacher
- EDL 630 Interaction of Classroom Management & Inst
- EDL 650 Effective Practices Coaching Mentoring
- EDL 640 Assessment for Students’ Learning
- EDL 530 Technology for Teacher Leaders

The results of these signature assignment are displayed in the [Diversity Proficiencies Performance](#) chart that includes the proficiencies, MSTL courses in which each is addressed, the assessment instrument, the rubric used, the data collected across several semesters, and the overall “score.” Some points from the chart to note include the following:

- Candidates design a unit that embodies a culturally relevant curriculum in EDL 655; this unit was assessed with a mean score of 4.0.

- EDL 630 participants implement discipline plans and share reflections on the effectiveness of the plan when used for students with different learning needs and styles; this assignment earned an average grade of 3.0.
- EDL 640 candidates develop and implement assessments for diverse P–12 classrooms; the average grade was 3.0.
- EDL 570 participants developed curriculum for diverse learning needs in accordance with Advanced Teacher’s Standards. In this course, instructional competencies were demonstrated by planning and implementing lessons for special needs; the class average score was 4.0.

The specific assessment instruments used to measure candidate proficiency in diversity include the following:

- The SOE diversity proficiency “*Plans for learning and cultural diversity*” is assessed in EDL 655 using the [Multicultural Lesson Rubric](#) (lines 1, 2, 4, and 5) and in EDL 620 using the [Ethical Case Scenario and Classroom Embedded Ethical/Policy Issue Rubric](#) (lines 7 and 8).
- The proficiency “*Engages students at all levels*” is assessed in EDL 570 using the [Rubric for Model Lesson Unit](#) (line 1) and EDL 500 [Mentoring Practicum 1 Rubric](#) (lines 1, 2, 3, and 4).
- The diversity proficiency “*Fosters a positive learning climate with effective classroom management*” is assessed in EDL 630 [Discipline Plan Rubric](#) (lines 4 and 8).
- The “*Collaborates to design, implement, and support learning*” proficiency is measured in EDL 650 using the [Coaching/Mentoring Practicum 2/Achievement Gap Assignment and Rubric](#) (under Design section – d, f, and j; and Knowledge section f).
- The proficiency “*Assesses and analyzes results to meet diverse learning needs and situations*” is assessed in EDL 640 [Unit Assessment Rubric](#) (lines 5 and 6).
- The final proficiency “*Integrates technology to address diverse student needs*” is assessed in EDL 530 [Integrated Technology Lesson and Rubric](#) (lines 7, 8, and 9).

Data from these assignments show a mean score of 3.7 for [Diversity Proficiencies Performance](#). Data therefore show that advanced candidates met or exceeded expected diversity competencies, with particular strengths in their *Ability plan for learning and cultural diversity*, *Engage students at all levels*, and *Collaborate to design, implement and support learning*

The ESL endorsement involves coursework at the 300- and 400 levels. Therefore, diversity proficiencies for ESL candidates are embedded within the undergraduate data in [Table 4a.3.3](#) above. Candidates’ performance in the area of diversity on the average is greater than 3.0 on a 4.0 scale.

4a.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to diversity proficiencies and assessments may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-5) should be uploaded.]

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

4b.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with higher education and/or school-based faculty from diverse groups?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

Initial teacher education program candidates have consistent opportunities to interact with higher education faculty and school-based faculty from diverse groups. All candidates are required to take Intro to Psychology as a prerequisite for the SOE-required Developmental Psychology course; Psy 105 has

been taught for many years by Dr. Jubemi Ogisis from Nigeria. To meet their Physical Science General Education Requirement (GER), candidates choose from courses taught by Dr. Dmitry Uskov, and English-Language Learner (ELL) from the Soviet Union. As the modern language GER requirement, candidates are strongly urged to choose Spanish, which is taught by either Dr. Iris Moreno-Brown from Belize or Dr. Martin Velez from Peru, both ELLs. SOE candidates also have the opportunity to take a political science class in American Government from Dr. Anna Kuthy, another ELL originally from Poland. Secondary candidates have Dr. Patricia Akojie from Nigeria for one or more of their Edu courses. Dr. Patricia Akojie also guest lectures on the “Philosophy” chapter in the Edu 204 course, a required Core Course. CRC Coordinator/Director of Field Experiences Britton Hibbot, an African American, teaches the section of BU 101 (Intro to Brescia University) for incoming freshmen interested in Education majors. Matthew Lindsey, a local high school French teacher with double Master’s degrees in French and in TESOL who teaches the ESL Practicum (Edu 404), is legally blind. In order to ensure that all SOE candidates have the opportunity to interact with these diverse faculty, the SOE Data Manager has begun to track candidates taking these various courses to ensure that, by the time they complete their individual Program, they will have had opportunities to interact with diverse faculty in at least one and preferably two formal classroom face-to-face settings. (See [SOE Candidate Checklist – Diversity](#).)

Other examples of providing teacher education candidates with exposure to professionals of diverse backgrounds includes the following:

- Edu 204 has Dr. Akojie guest lecture on Philosophy of Education &/or incorporates a Ted Talk by black educator Rita Pierson;
- [Edu 325/326](#): Teaching Language Arts in Elementary/Content Area requires candidates to design a center with books on cultural diversity;
- [Edu 321/322](#): Teaching Reading in Elementary/Content Area utilizes a Shawna Moore video presentation, “Guided Groups,” from Teaching Channel” (Moore is of Hispanic ethnicity);
- [Edu 314/315](#): Children/Adolescent Literature requires candidates to evaluate literature representing diverse perspectives, selecting from a large group of African American authors including Walter Dean Myers, Julius Lester, Toni Morrison, and Mildred Taylor

Professional Development opportunities during the current accreditation review cycle include both Ruby Payne’s presentation on the Framework of Poverty on November 21, 2014 and [Temple Grandin](#)’s public lecture and SOE meeting with students on meeting diverse learning needs, given on April 9, 2015.

SOE candidates also have available to them experience with diverse school-based faculty. These include Beth Ewing, bi-racial special education alumna, who serves as field and practicum supervisor in Special Education; Bob O’Brien, African American, who has served as field placement supervisor in Social Studies; and Karen Ellis, another African American who is currently working with Elementary candidates doing field hours as part of a BU partnership with Cravens Elementary School.

Thus it is evident that Brescia’s SOE has a system in place to ensure that all SOE candidates not only have opportunities to interact with diverse faculty but also other diversity professionals across the nation.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Within the MSTL Program, there are three full time faculty members. One is an African American, who teaches the majority of the MSTL courses. In addition, there are other opportunities for interaction with diverse professionals within the Program. For example, candidates were required to interview school based faculty from diverse groups in EDL 655 (see [Exhibit 4b.1e](#)). Professional Devel-

opment and graduate seminars provide more opportunities for candidates to interact with higher education and school-based faculty from diverse groups (see [Exhibit 4b.1a](#), [Exhibit 4b.1b](#), [Exhibit 4b.1c](#), and [Exhibit 4b.1d](#)). In addition, presenters from diverse backgrounds like [Dr Mary Temple Grandin](#), a college professor who is autistic, spoke this past year at Brescia.

Outsiders from the larger community who are diverse are invited to speak to candidates in the ESL program in both the Edu 402 and 403 courses. The Cultural Traveler Interview in Edu 401 is also designed to facilitate candidates' interaction with individuals from diverse groups.

Thus Brescia's Advanced Programs also ensure that their candidates have opportunities to interact both with faculty and with other diverse professionals.

4b.2. What knowledge and experiences do faculty have related to preparing candidates to work with students from diverse groups?

Interacting with diverse faculty at Brescia contributes essentially to the Unit's core values of inclusiveness and equity. Candidates in both initial and advanced programs interact with faculty from diverse groups in field-based experiences and in General Education, discipline-specific, and/or professional education course work.

INITIAL PROGRAMS

The diverse experiences and commonalities of the faculty enable the SOE to prepare candidates to work with students from diverse groups. All SOE full-time education faculty and staff (except the Coordinator of the Curriculum and Resource Center Library) are certified teachers who have completed a traditional teacher education program; they have also taught in a K–12 classroom. The majority of the faculty has either international teaching experiences or extensive experiences working with children and youth with disabilities. The following illustrates some of the wealth of their experiences available to SOE candidates during this accreditation cycle:

- Dr. Marlaine Chase, whose background is in Special Education that includes the hearing-impaired and learning/neurological disabilities, has experience teaching on the island of Trinidad for Teacher Support Services, teaching teachers how to use the “5 Easy Pieces” format for direct instruction to complement the heavy emphasis on the use of the inquiry approach in order to improve their students' national examination scores.
- Dr. Tom Payne taught grade levels 3–12 in a psychiatric hospital and serves on the Board of Directors of Wendell Foster Center and the Board of Directors of Camp MARC, both of which serve persons with disabilities.
- Ms. Tina Wolken taught Special Education for much of her professional career, and serves on the ARC Board.
- Ms. Lakshmi O'Bryan taught in Chinese, Malays, and Tamil K–12-setting schools in Malaysia, where she was the head of the Department for English and Music. She also was their state resource teacher for English and Music.
- Dr. Ashley Holland, whose background is in Elementary Education, worked seven years in primary grades, where she was responsible for both regular and special education students; in this role she facilitated multiple RTI (Response to Intervention) and IEP accommodations.
- Though not a formal member of the SOE faculty, Britton Hibbitt, an African American, serves as Coordinator of the CRC Library and tracks SOE candidate Field placements. In both capacities he has varied opportunities to aid SOE candidates in their work with diverse students. He also serves as a BU 101 (Intro to Brescia University) instructor for the Fall section each year that includes all freshmen students who've expressed interest in pursuing an Education major.

- Also not a faculty member, current Data Manager, Sr. Betsy Moyer, an elementary education principal and certified teacher, has served in both Kentucky and Missouri rural schools with large populations of students from low socio-economic backgrounds, and in New Mexico schools with a significant population of Native American students. These experiences enable her to offer informal advice to SOE candidates as they work with diverse students.

As a result of their training and varied experiences, the SOE Initial Program faculty are more than qualified to assist SOE candidates to work with diverse students.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Dr. Marlaine Chase and Dr. Tom Payne teach in the Advanced as well as the Initial Programs; their knowledge and experiences have been cited above.

In addition to these two qualified faculty, Dr. Patricia Akojie, Director of the MSTL Program, taught in a P–12 setting in Nigeria (in West Africa) for 15 years, where she was a classroom teacher and then an assistant principal (the latter for 5 years). For 12 years she served as the head of the Department of Social Studies in Nigeria. Through the Talent Search federal program out of Lexington Community College, Dr. Akojie also worked with low-income and prospective first-generation college students in middle and high schools in six school systems in Kentucky. In addition, Dr. Akojie has presented papers in various venues on diversity, social, and equity issues, as seen in these two examples:

- *Culture and education*. Presented at the annual Calling All Colors event at Paducah, Kentucky
- *Nigeria – People, culture, and education*. Presented at the Lexington Community College Upward Bound Summer Program, Lexington, Kentucky.

Michael Meece, a part-time adjunct faculty who teaches in the ESL program, conducts ESL teacher’s training on a regular basis for the New Teacher Academy and Lost River Elementary School. He has also conducted teacher training in ESL for Cabrini Ministries and presented ESL techniques to public school teachers, both in Swaziland, Africa. His teaching experience includes teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Finally, Matthew Lindsey, another part-time adjunct in the ESL program, has Teacher Certification in French K–12, English 9–12, and Rank I: TESOL. He is legally blind.

As a result of their training and varied experiences, the SOE Advanced Program faculty are more than qualified to assist SOE candidates to work with diverse students.

4b.3. How diverse are the faculty members who work with education candidates? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 8 can also be presented and/or discussed, if data are available, in response to other prompts for this element.] Please complete Table 8 or upload your own table at Prompt 4b.5 below.

**Table 8
Faculty Demographics**

	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Advanced Programs (%)	Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach in Both Initial Teacher Preparation and Advanced Programs	All Faculty in the Institution (%)	School-Based Faculty (%)

	n (%)		n (%)		
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-	-	-	3 (.09%)
Asian	-	-	-	-	4 (.1%)
Black or African American, non-Hispanic		-	1 (33%)	4 (9%)	144 (4.2%)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	
Hispanic or Latino		-	-	2 (4%)	12 (.4%)
White, non-Hispanic	14 (100%)	-	2 (67%)	40 (87%)	3274 (95.61%)
Two or more races		-	-	-	
Other		-	-	-	
Race/ethnicity unknown		-	-	-	
Total	14 (100%)	-	3 (100%)	46 (100%)	3437 (100%)
Female	11 (79%)	-	2 (67%)	23 (50%)	2745 (80%)
Male	3 (21%)	-	1 (33%)	23 (50%)	692 (20%)
Total	14 (100%)		3 (100%)	46 (100%)	3437 (100%)

4b.4. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain a diverse faculty?

The School of Education, in support of BU Strategic Plan Academic Goal Objective #4: *Recruit, shape, develop and support a diverse faculty core whose members strive to be scholars in their field and who provide engaging educational and supportive experiences to their students*, has made concerted efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty. Faculty positions are advertised in professional journals, websites, or other publications For the most recent hire in the School of Education, the job was posted at <http://academiccareers.com>; this site includes “The Diversity Package” that actively sought candidates from a variety of diversity sites. The phrase DIVERSITY CANDIDATES URGED TO APPLY is included in all job postings for faculty positions in any academic discipline (see [Academic – Education Professor 14](#)). African American Britton Hibbitt now serves as Coordinator of the SSS Curriculum Resource Center (CRC) and has direct contact with candidates as he arranges Field Placements and oversees KFETS; he also teaches the freshman section of BU 101 (Intro to Brescia University) course for incoming students interested in an Education major. Nigerian Dr. Patricia Akojie, hired in 2005, remains on the SOE faculty. Lakshmi O’Bryan, a native of Malaysia with ESL teaching experience, served as Coordinator of the CRC from 2008–2014 (with responsibilities noted above for Hibbitt), but has since left to pursue a full-time teaching position. Since she was a vital diversity staff member, every effort was made (successfully) to replace her with another diversity CRC Coordinator, Britton Hibbitt.

4b.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty diversity may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

4c.1. What opportunities do candidates (including candidates at off-campus sites and/or in distance learning or alternate route programs) have to interact with candidates from diverse groups?

Based on [BU Student Population Demographics](#), in Fall 2014 Brescia had 22.05% minority students, if the 10 “Non-Resident Aliens” are counted as minority in terms of ethnicity and/or culture.

INITIAL PROGRAMS

SOE candidates interact with these diverse students and group through activities such as athletic events, social gatherings, and University Game Nights. Likewise, Brescia has accepted the challenge to make its primarily-older campus not only accessible but welcoming for students with physical and sensory disabilities, and has included such efforts as a priority in its [2015–2020 Strategic Plan](#). An increasingly significant number of students with physical, academic, and sensory disabilities are joining the student body at Brescia.

SOE candidates also interact with diverse candidates from other universities when they attend NEA and KEA conferences. In some instances, candidates also attend state and national SPA conventions, providing further diversity exposure. In addition, during this accreditation review cycle, Brescia and Kentucky Wesleyan College offered a combined Ethics seminar to CP candidates, allowing BU candidates further opportunities to interact with diverse students.

The University frequently offers [Culturally Diverse Activities](#) that provide opportunities for candidates to expand their multicultural awareness in both formal and informal settings.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Opportunities are also provided for MSTL candidates to interact with diverse candidates through the content courses. For example, BIO 501, BIO 502, MTH 513, and BAd 610 courses are offered to other candidates at Brescia University. Candidates also are encouraged to take content courses not offered through Brescia and transfer credits into their programs. For example, during this current year, candidates took classes at WKU and Murray and transferred the credits to Brescia. Both these two institutions have a quite diverse student base. Professional Development and graduate seminars are additional opportunities for candidates to interact with other diverse candidates (see [Exhibit 4b.1a](#), [Exhibit 4b.1b](#), [Exhibit 4b.1c](#), and [Exhibit 4b.1d](#)).

The ESL candidates are enrolled in 300- and 400-level courses offered through the undergraduate curriculum. This creates an opportunity for them to interact with other candidates in their content area, some of whom are diversity candidates. In addition, the ESL candidates interact with diverse groups through activities such as athletic events, social gatherings, and Game Nights. The University frequently offers [Culturally Diverse Activities](#) that provide opportunities for local candidates to expand their multicultural awareness in both formal and informal settings.

4c.2. How diverse are the candidates in initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs? [Diversity characteristics in addition to those in Table 9 can also be presented and discussed, if data are available, in other prompts of this element.] Please complete Table 9 or upload your own table at Prompt 4c.4 below.

**Table 9
Candidate Demographics**

	Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)	Candidates in Advanced Preparation Programs n (%)	All Students in the Institution n (%)	Diversity of Geographical Area Served by Institution (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native		1 (8%)	12	155 (0.13%); (DC unknown; 0.2% for KY)
Asian		-	6	838 (0.72%); (DC 0.7%; 1.1% KY)
Black or African American, non-Hispanic		-	142	4,891 (4.2%); (DC 4.8%; 7.8% KY)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		-		[included in Asian; (0.1% KY)]
Hispanic or Latino	1 (2%)	-	61	2,863 (2.5%); (DC 2.6%; 3.1% KY)
White, non-Hispanic	40 (95%)	12 (92%)	703	105,477 (90.9%); (DC 91.2%; 86.3% KY)
Two or more races	1 (2%)	-		1,806 (1.6%); [unknown]; [unknown]
Other		-	9	
Race/ethnicity unknown		-	130	
Total	42 (100%)	13 (100%)	1063	116,030 (metropolitan area); 4,380,415 (KY)
Female	35 (83%)	10 (77%)	782	51%; (DC 51.46%; 50.8% KY)
Male	7 (17%)	3 (23%)	281	49%; (DC 48.54%; 49.2% KY)
Total	42 (100%)	13 (100%)	1063	116,030 (metropolitan area); 4,380,415 (KY)

4c.3. What efforts does the unit make to recruit and retain candidates from diverse groups?

The Unit has made focused efforts to recruit candidates from diverse groups for both Initial and Advanced Teacher Education Programs, as seen in the following examples:

INITIAL PROGRAMS

The SOE section of BU website has a tab called “Minority Candidates” (see <https://www.brescia.edu/soe-minority-candidates>). This link provides information regarding financial supports as well as recruitment incentives for minorities, job market for minorities, information about the shortage/need for minority teachers, as well as information needed by all candidates.

Britton Hibbitt, CRC Coordinator, also serves as The Black Student Union advisor. He presented education as a career path option to the group’s members on September 9, 2014. Using information from the Vice President for Enrollment Management, he also contacted every Brescia student of diverse culture either in person or via email to invite them to consider teaching as a major and to welcome further conversation with him or SOE faculty. Britton also has contacted minority recruiters at Western Kentucky University and OCTC to gain information; as a result of these conversations, he found a need for minority-specific scholarship opportunities.

[Recruitment publication](#) for SOE initial programs includes pictures of culturally diverse staff and candidates.

The Admissions Office attends or sends material to the Minority Fair in Louisville. This office has identified high schools throughout the state who have [Future Teacher clubs](#) that could not only promote recruitment to the SOE but potentially reach diverse students within these clubs.

The SOE actively participates in campus-wide Preview Days and Open Houses by being available to talk with perspective students. SOE faculty also attend pre-registration events, so that they can answer student questions.

During Fall 2015, SOE Chair Dr. Ashley Holland began meeting with other University officials (including the VPAA), and Owensboro city and Daviess County educational administrators and superintendents to develop a “Grow Your Own” program for teachers. The goal is to help local high school students, especially those with diverse ethnic/cultural backgrounds, to see TEACHING as a viable career option by enabling them to take a series of dual-credit courses both on-site at their local high schools and on the college/university campuses in the area. Courses from Brescia, KWC, OCTC, and WKO-O have been identified that could be suitably offered within this format, and one course is being offered this spring at both Brescia and KWC. Interested students from area high schools are to be bussed to the sites in order to take these courses. Though it will take at least two to three years to see results in terms of local college/university enrollments in teacher education programs, the expectation is that the number of candidates with diverse ethnic/cultural backgrounds will increase.

Efforts to retain diverse candidates have up to now been concentrated in faculty advising, and in identifying, providing, and monitoring tutoring services through Student Support Services. Since that program has now transitioned to the Compass Center and will soon be folded into the Ursuline Center for Teaching and Learning – the UCTL – (made possible by a SIP Title III grant), tutoring services are now available to ALL SOE candidates, not just those who qualified under the former SSS program. Retention rates are expected to improve as a result. The UCTL will hire five tutors this spring, and efforts will be made to ensure that at least one of them is a diversity candidate. In addition, the UCTL will soon have both a writing and a math lab, both of which should also increase retention efforts. SOE faculty are committed to utilizing all the resources of the UCTL as soon as they become available in order to retain teacher education candidates.

ADVANCED PROGRAM

As part of the University’s and the Unit’s minority recruitment efforts, the Director of Admission sends all inquiries to the SOE Director of Graduate Program as soon as they are received. The Vice

President for Enrollment Management and Executive Director of BUonline, along with the Curriculum Resource Center Coordinator, tracks and does follow-up with minority students interested in pursuing an initial or advanced program in education (see [Minority Tracking Database](#)). In addition, the MSTL Director designs and distributes recruitment flyers that appeal to diverse candidates. (See flyers and brochure examples – [Endorsement Brochure](#), [Upcoming Courses Mod4](#), and [Upcoming Courses 2014](#)). These pamphlets have been successful in attracting diverse candidates, but sometimes the Unit does not have the program perspective candidates are interested in pursuing, or candidates may not meet the admission requirements, as was true for an MSTL prospective candidate in 2014.

4c.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to candidate diversity may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

[Table 4c.4.1](#) - Brescia University Student Population Demographics Fall 2014

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

4d.1. How does the unit ensure that candidates develop and practice knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity during their field experiences and clinical practice?

INITIAL PROGRAMS

As seen in Standard Three and summarized again in 4a.2 above, all candidates experience, prior to their admission to Clinical Practice, a breadth of Field experiences designed to strengthen their knowledge, skills, and dispositions for working with learners with diverse needs and from diverse backgrounds as dictated in compliance with 16 KAR 5:040. SOE [Field Handbook](#) (p. 25). Surrounding school systems and facilities such as the Wendell Foster Center provide rich diversity, enabling candidates to fulfill their diversity-based Field observation requirement simultaneously with their course-specific Field requirements (see [Table 4.5](#) – School Systems Demographics and [Table 4.6](#) – Field Placement Demographics). The Practicum provides another opportunity to establish a teaching and learning climate by utilizing KTIP Context A1 within a focused placement. CP follows the Practicum as an intense opportunity for application of pedagogical strategies with diverse students, evidenced in unit plans, implementation, and assessment of lessons. Evaluations from the CT and US provide both formative and summative candidate feedback on their skills related to diversity. Candidate lesson evaluations utilizing KTIP Task C build awareness of diversity and learning, which then guides the candidate to develop further strategies related to diverse learners.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

SOE diversity proficiencies are aligned to the MSTL objectives (see [Diversity Proficiencies Aligned to MSTL](#)). They are also aligned in the KTS as shown in [Table 4a.1.1](#) (Alignment of Diversity Competencies with KTS), though at the Advanced rather than Initial level presented in this Table. The Field evaluation forms ([P3A](#), [P3B](#), and [P4](#)) reflect elements of diversity proficiencies. Regional school demographics provide advanced candidates (MSTL and ESL) with opportunities to complete site-based assignments in diverse settings. ESL candidates complete Field placements within four of the five required courses for the Endorsement and interact with ESL P–12 students at all levels. MSTL and TL candidates have opportunities within the program to teach in a variety of school settings during the job-embedded Field projects and are therefore surrounded with diverse experiences (see [Memorandum of Agreement](#)). The EDL 530 course emphasizes a high commitment to ethical use of technology, as MSTL and TL candidates implement technology-integrated projects in the field. The Field observations provide learning experiences for candidates. For example, EDL 550 participants learn about children with emotional disorders/mental illnesses through field projects. As part of their ethical approach of completing an action research, MSTL candidates are respectfully mindful of

diverse needs. For example, in the research courses candidates apply the ethics of human subject research by [obtaining research approval](#) from their school and the [University's IRB](#) (Institutional Review Board), then develop a [consent form](#) for data collection from the field. In the Mentoring Practicum, MSTL candidates demonstrate awareness of students' learning needs and use diverse instructional strategies to meet those needs (see [Mentoring Field Form](#)). The Practicum requires candidates to use a variety of classroom assessment techniques to reach diverse candidates. Data from Field evaluation forms ensure that the MSTL candidates are developing proficiencies related to diversity, as illustrated in [Form P3A Field Evaluation results](#) and [Form P4 Field Evaluation results](#). Course instructors and advisors review evaluation results with candidates to ensure ongoing development. From sharing Field reflections, candidates also help each other to gain new perspectives they can utilize to differentiate instruction when working with diverse P–12 students.

4d.2. How diverse are the P-12 students in the settings in which candidates participate in field experiences and clinical practice? Please complete Table 10 or upload your own table at Prompt 4d.4 below. [Although NCATE encourages institutions to report the data available for each school used for clinical practice, units may not have these data available by school. If the unit uses more than 20 schools for clinical practice, school district data may be substituted for school data in the table below. In addition, data may be reported for other schools in which field experiences, but not clinical practice, occur. Please indicate where this is the case.]

**Table 10
Demographics on Sites for Clinical Practice in Initial and Advanced Programs**

4d.3. How does the unit ensure that candidates use feedback from peers and supervisors to reflect on their skills in working with students from diverse groups?

The Unit collects frequent and ongoing feedback about candidates' experiences with students from diverse groups through multiple Field experiences, class discussions, journals, digital recording sharing, co-teaching models with peers, Clinical Practice conferencing, and portfolio evaluations. The SOE faculty ensures that this feedback is internalized in various ways.

INITIAL PROGRAMS

Course assignments provide feedback from instructors about candidate skills in working with students from diverse groups. Discussions based on assignments, faculty-led discussions, critical analysis of digital recording of self-teaching and co-teaching activities — all these focus on issues of diversity, especially in the connection between community, second language learners (in the reading courses), and students with exceptionalities (in the exceptional children courses). Debates, small group discussions of case studies and classroom scenarios, and group projects allow candidates to use peer feedback as well. Likewise, both the Field experience and Clinical Practice (CP) have evaluation forms, and the CP evaluation form especially provides opportunities for University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers to discuss with candidates the skills in working with students from diverse groups.

Each semester as part of the pre-registration advising conference in preparation for the following semester, program advisors meet with each candidate and review all assessment data from the previous (and current if applicable) semester(s); these data are then incorporated into the candidate's PGP for the following semester.

ADVANCED PROGRAMS

Feedback from peers and supervisors regarding diversity is given and processed in a number of ways. In MSTL courses such feedback occurs through instructor and peer processing of signature assign-

ments, class discussions, journals, digital recording, and Field hours. For example, the job-embedded component of EDL 570 requires that MSTL and TL candidates teach students using a specific strategy for diverse learners and videotape themselves applying their researched teaching strategy for diverse learners. All MSTL and TL job-embedded applications include a post-implementation reflection, which serves as a feedback loop for future improvement. Similarly, reflections and evaluations collected at the end of one Field experience are incorporated into the next Field experience. The reflective journals ([Candidates' Sample Reflections](#)) provide dialog between the candidates and faculty throughout Field and Practicum experiences. Results of the Field evaluation forms ([P3A](#), [P3B](#), and [P4](#)) are discussed with each candidate by their faculty/advisor (see [Samples of completed evaluation forms](#)). The strength and growth areas are discussed in order to target areas of improvement during the next Field opportunity, once again “closing the loop.”

In almost identical ways, the ESL Endorsement Program collects feedback about candidates through class discussions, assignments, tests, journals, and Field evaluations. These types of feedback are shared with candidates and serve as a feedback loop for them as they progress through Field work and Practicum experiences with ESL P–12 students.

4d.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the diversity of P-12 students in schools in which education candidates do their field experiences and clinical practice may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

[Table 4d.4.1](#) Demographics of Sites for Clinical Practice in Initial Programs
[Table 10b](#) Demographics on Sites for Field Experience MSTL

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 4?

The Unit professionally networks with community school/agency partners to provide our candidates with a great variety of high-quality diverse experiences. Within course work, candidates are consistently made aware of the context of the lesson to meet diverse student needs. Candidates are offered multiple opportunities for diverse cultural experience through diverse faculty, integration of remote diverse professionals, classmates, and campus-wide activities.

2. What research related to Standard 4 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

Informational gathering is taking place regarding minority scholarship opportunities.

Standard 5 – Faculty Qualification

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

[In this section the unit must include the professional education faculty in (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

5a. Qualified Faculty

5a.1. What are the qualifications of the full- and part-time professional education faculty (e.g., earned degrees, experience, and expertise)? Please complete Table 11 or upload your own table at Prompt 5a.5 below. [Professional Education Faculty information compiled by AIMS from earlier reports submitted for the national review of programs and updated by your [institution](#) (see Manage Faculty Information page in your AIMS workspace) can be imported into Table 11. For further guidance on completing this table, see the directions provided below (select link "click here") as well as in the Help document (click on "Help" in the upper right corner of your screen.)]

Table 11

Full-Time SOE Faculty Matrix

Name	Highest Degree, Field of Study, and Degree-Granting Institution	Program Assignment (Teaching assignment for this program)	Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (within past five years), and Teaching Experience including Certification(s) Held	Status (FT/PT to Institution, Unit, and Program)
<p>Dr. Patricia Akojie <i>Associate Professor</i></p>	<p>Ph.D. Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky. 2002</p>	<p>U:411 EDL 530, 580, 600, 620, 630, 655, 671, 672</p>	<p><u>Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations and Service:</u> <u>Scholarship:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Akojie, P. (2014, November 13). Using Instructional Models to create interactive online courses. Presentation at the Convergence Conference. University of Louisville, Kentucky. • Akojie, P. (2014, October). <i>Implementing educational technology in P-12 Classrooms</i>. Presentation at the International Academic Research Conference. Chaska, Minnesota. • Akojie, P. (2011). <i>How to Prepare Action Research Project in Educational Settings</i>. Deer Park, NY: Linus Publications. ISBN: 1-60797-169-0 • Akojie, P. (2009). Ethical issues in educational technology (pp. 257-265). In <i>Technology in the classroom</i>. New York: Pearson Publishing ISBN 10: 0558409806 • Akojie, P. (2009, October). <i>Implementation issues for educational technology</i>. Presentation 	<p>Full-Time to Institution, Unit, and Program</p>

			<p>at the Convergence Conference. Somerset, Kentucky.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrote and Secured the Hart Grant (2008) – To write an online graduate course. Brescia University, Owensboro, Kentucky • Education Professional Standards Board. Frankfort, Kentucky. Served on the Revised Program Review Committee (RPRC) (2008) • <i>Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice</i> serve as a Peer Reviewer (2011 to Present). <p><u>Service to P-12 Schools:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborated with the Owensboro city and Daviess county school principals and superintendents to provide programs for teachers and students; such collaborations include science fair judge, and volunteered at the benefit fair for teachers. • Collaborated with P–12 schools to redesign the Master Leader Program at Brescia University • Serve as Graduate Program Director <p><u>Service to the Community:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax preparer for the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) program (2008–Present); program sponsored by the Internal Revenue Service and the Owensboro Daviess County Asset Building Coalition (ODCABC). The coalition’s mission is helping working low and moderate-income families achieve economic self-sufficiency • Economics Tutor for the Junior Achievement Program (2007–2010). • Served on Education Committee for “We the People” of Owensboro, Kentucky (2009-2010). <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary: Kentucky Teachers’ Certification for grades 9–12 	
--	--	--	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology: Kentucky Instructional Technology Endorsement • IRB Certification, University of Miami, Miami, Florida, 2008 <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u> Associate Professor, Brescia University; Owensboro, Kentucky. August 2006–Present Graduate Program Director Faculty, Department of Educational Leadership & Counseling; Murray State University. Murray, Kentucky. Jan 2003–2006 Teacher – Social Studies, Orange County Lutheran High School, Orange, CA. March 2002–April 2003 Teacher – Social Studies Department. Paducah Public Schools. Paducah, Kentucky. 1993–2002 Teacher – Social Studies. Idia Secondary School. Benin-City, Nigeria. 1980–1992</p>	
Dr. Marlaine Chase <i>Associate Professor</i>	Ed.D., Special Education-Teacher Education, Early Childhood Special Education, Illinois State University	U: 104, 255, 309, 310, 311, 350, 412, 413, 414 (formerly 432), 433, 434 (formerly 420), 441 EDL: 570, 581, 640, 655	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCATE Committee • Special Education Program Development Committee • Chair Graduate Programs Committee • Chair of Teacher Education Curriculum Committee <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky: Elementary Education All Grade Hearing Impaired Learning Disabled/ Neurologically Impaired <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u> Associate Professor, University of Saint Francis, Fort Wayne, IN, 2008–2012 Teacher Education and Director of Exceptional Needs Supervision of Practica in Exceptional Needs Research and Statistics for</p>	Full-time to Institution, Unit, and Program

			<p>SPED Methods and Techniques – pre-K and Elem. Teacher Inquiry-Action Research</p> <p>Associate Professor of Teacher Education at University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN, 1999–2008:</p> <p>Evaluation and Exceptionality Instructional Strategies Introduction to Exceptional Needs</p> <p>Associate Professor & Teacher at University of Evansville, Evansville, IN 1977–1999</p> <p>Education Exceptional Needs Program Chair Undergraduate and Graduate Department Chair</p> <p>Preschool Programs at The Rehabilitation Center, Inc. in Evansville, IN 1972–1977</p> <p>Kindergarten Teacher-Deaf and HI at Elm School in Elmwood Park, IL 1971–1972</p>	
<p>Dr. Tom Payne <i>Assistant Professor</i></p>	<p>Ed. D., Education, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN</p>	<p>U: 255, 301, 319, 328, 407, 410, 417(formerly 470), 436(formerly 421), 443 EDL: 500, 650</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Served as an Instructional Leader (Daviess County Public School) • Networked with KECSAC (Kentucky Education Consortium for State Agency Children) and DJJ (Department of Juvenile Justice) • Implementation of the Lee Cantor Assertive Discipline program at Burns Middle School <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kentucky Superintendent Certification • Administration • Educational Leadership • BA Social Studies 7–12 • Endorsement Supervisor of Instruction • Endorsement Secondary Principal • Endorsement Elementary Principal K–8 	<p>Full-Time to Institution, Unit, and Program</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endorsement Secondary Principal 7–12 • Endorsement Director Pupil Personnel • Endorsement Elementary 1–8 • Rank I Administration <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u> Assistant Professor of Education, Brescia University, Owensboro, KY, August 2009–retired 2015 Administrator, Owensboro Treatment Center, Owensboro, KY, January 1998–2009 Administrator, Audubon Elementary School, Owensboro, KY, 1996–1998 Instructor of 3rd through 12th self-contained classroom, Valley Institute of Psychiatry, Owensboro, KY, 1991-1994 Instructor of School Law, Research Methods and School Business Management, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY, 1989 and 2002 Instructor of English and Writing and American and European History, Owensboro Community College, Owensboro, KY, 1985–1992</p>	
Tina Wolken <i>Associate Professor</i>	M.A., Educable Mentally Handicapped, Learning Disabled <i>and</i> Elementary Education, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY	U: 103, 204/108, 213, 256, 257, 307, 334, 336, 337, 415 (formerly 470), 416 (formerly 470), 418 (formerly 440L), 434 (formerly 420), 435L (formerly 422L),	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alpha Delta Kappa Chapter, Affiliation • Council for Exceptional Children, Affiliation • CEC, Teacher Education Division, Affiliation • CEC, Council of Children with Behavioral Disorders, Affiliation • Brescia University Interim Chair School of Education, Coordinator of Special Education and Middle School, 2007–2009 • Faculty Advisor for Brescia’s Kentucky Education Association Student Program <p><u>Certifications:</u></p>	Full-Time to Institution, Unit, and Program

		434L (formerly 420L), 435 (formerly 422), 437L (formerly 444L), 441	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kentucky Standard Teacher Certificate, Elementary Education (Grades 1–8) • Kentucky Standard Teacher Certificate, Special Education: Learning Disabilities (Grades K–12) and Educable Mentally Handicapped (Grades K–12) • Approval for Teacher Consultant in Programs for Exceptional Children <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u> Assistant Professor of Education and Special Education, Coordinator of Special Education and Middle School, 2010–Present (Introduction to Education, Early Childhood Special Education, Introduction to Learning and Behavior Disorders, Behavior Disorders: Techniques and Procedures, Methods: Learning and Behavior Disorders, Student Teaching: Learning and Behavior Disorders) Area Coordinator Middle School Education and Special Education Instructor of Education and Special Education; Coordinator of Middle School Education, 2005–2007</p>	
Dr. Ashley Holland, <i>Assistant Professor</i>	Ed.D. Educational Leadership Oakland City University, MA in Elementary Education, Western Kentucky University	Edu 301, Edu 320, Edu 329, Edu 325/326, Edu 415 Edu 434	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-Teaching Trainer • Kentucky Education Association Student Program Advisor (Outstanding Advisor Award for 2013) • Co-resented at Fall 2014 KATE Conference (“Building Relationships with Community College and Regional Campuses”) • Education Curriculum Committee for KCTCS • Partnership with McLean County Public Schools To Improve 21st Century Learning Skills <p><u>Certifications:</u></p>	Full-Time to Institution, Unit, and Program

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kentucky Standard Teacher Certificate, Elementary Education (Grades P–5) <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u></p> <p>Assistant Professor of Education, Brescia University, Owensboro, KY, August 2015–present</p> <p>Education Program Coordinator and Instructor, Henderson Community College, August 2012–2015</p> <p>Developed and taught Edu 201 (Intro to Amer Ed), EDP (Ed Psych), and EDM 270 (Intro to Middle School Ed); responsible for KFETS; student advisor</p> <p>Education Program Coordinator and Instructor, Henderson Regional Campus of Murray State University, August 2012–2015</p> <p>Taught EDU 303 (Teaching Strategies); University Supervisor for 5 teacher candidates; advisor for all Education majors (all levels); hired and supervised 10 adjunct instructors</p> <p>Hancock County Public Schools, June 2008–June 2012</p> <p>1st grade teacher for regular and special education students for one year</p> <p>2nd grade teacher for regular and special education students for three years</p> <p>Daviess County Public Schools, January 2006–June 2008</p> <p>1st grade teacher for regular and special education students for three years</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Full-Time to the University Part-Time to the Unit/Program Faculty Matrix

Name	Highest Degree, Field of Study, & Degree-Granting Institution	Program Assignment (Teaching assignment for this program)	Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (within past five years), and Teaching Experience including Certification(s) Held	Status (FT/PT to Institution, Unit, and Program)
<p>Dr. Craig Barrett <i>Professor</i></p>	<p>Ph.D. in Modern Literature and Linguistics, University of Southern Illinois at Carbondale, Ill.</p>	<p>U: Eng 306</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member of the National Council of Teachers of English, 2000–Present • Member of over 30 Accreditation Team Member Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS COC) 1988–Present • Member of Chair Registry for SACS, 2010–Present • Rank and Tenure Committee Chair, Brescia University, 2011–Present • Liberal Arts Committee, Brescia University, 2011–Present • Area Coordinator of English and Academic Advisor, Brescia University, 2011–Present <p><u>Teaching Experience:</u> Professor of English, Brescia University, 2011–retired Fall 2015 (years working in ESL only); Professor of English 1990–2015</p>	<p>Full-Time to the University/ Part-Time ESL Program (<i>P-T to the University AND to ESL since Fall 2015</i>)</p>
<p>Dr. Nancy Keeton <i>Professor</i></p>	<p>Ph. D. in Social Work, University of Louisville, Kent School of Social Work, Louisville, Ky.</p>	<p>EDL 550</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board member: Owensboro Chapter of the American Red Cross, Owensboro Area Spouse Abuse Shelter, and Parents without Partners • Staff liaison to the Professional Citizen’s Advisory Council, the Substance Abuse Advisory Board and the Committee on Disaster Readiness • In November 1984, only social worker in the area to be granted hospital privileges for both city hospitals • Part-time consulting social worker with local M.D. 	<p>Full-Time Faculty to Brescia University and Part-Time to the MSTL Program</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1987, I received status of Clinical Diplomate, highest credential then conferred by the National Association of Social Workers • In 1988, received Diplomate status by the American Board of Clinical Examiners • 1990–1992: two-year term as president of the National Association of Social Workers, Kentucky Chapter; during 1990 served as Delegate to the Assembly in Washington, as a member of the policy making body for nation’s social workers <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In March 1980, became first social worker in region to be licensed by the state for Independent Practice; criteria included successful past experience and successful completion of state-administered examination <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brescia University – Owensboro, Kentucky: August, 1993–Present • Owensboro Community College–Owensboro, Kentucky :August 1988–1993 • Kent School of Social Work – University of Louisville October 1982–1987 	
Dr. Carol M. Maillet <i>Associate Professor</i>	Ph.D. in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; The University of Texas Health Science Center Houston, Tex.	BIO 501	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Society of Cell Biology • American Association for Advancement of Science • Sigma Xi • Visiting Scientist, University of Tennessee, 1997–2006 • Member on ad hoc committee for First-Year Experience, Brescia University • Member on the Quality Enhancement Proposal committee, Brescia University • Director, Honors Program, Brescia University • Chair, Division of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Brescia 	Full-Time Faculty to Brescia University and Part-Time to the MSTL Program (<i>P-T to the University AND to MSTL since Fall 2014</i>)

			<p>University</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Project Volunteer, 2005–Present <p>Scholarship/Grant: Faculty Summer Research grant, Augustana Foundation, 2004</p> <p>Teaching Experiences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistant Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Brescia University, Owensboro, KY, 2005–present • Assistant Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology: Cell Biology, Genetics, Biological Principles, Augustana College, Rock Island, IL, 2001–2005 	
<p>Dr. Rohnn Sanderson <i>Associate Professor</i></p>	<p>Ph.D. in Economics and Finance, University of New Mexico</p>	<p>BAd 610</p>	<p>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service: Kentucky Economic Association (KEA), Member</p> <p>Teaching Experiences: Assistant Professor Finance/ Economics: Management of Organizational Functions, Business, Gov’t and the International Economy, Managerial Economics, Investments/Derivatives, Business Statistics, Economics at Brescia University, Owensboro, KY, 2009–present</p> <p>Part time Instructor of Economics: Public Finance, Capital Budgeting, Economics, Personal Investing at University of New Mexico, 2005–2009</p>	<p>Full-Time Faculty to Brescia University and Part-Time to the MSTL Program</p>
<p>Dr. Chris Tiaht <i>Professor</i></p>	<p>Ph.D. in Mathematics, Colorado State University, Colo.</p>	<p>MTH 513</p>	<p>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President: Region V Alpha Chi Honor Society, 2003–Present • Associate Editor <i>Open 24 Hours</i> literary Magazine, 1995–Present • Co-founder Owensboro Philosophy Society, Owensboro, KY, 2002 <p>Teaching Experiences: Associate and Full Professor of Mathematics and Computer Science, Brescia University, Owensboro, KY, 1999–Present</p>	<p>Full-Time Faculty to Brescia University and Part-Time to the MSTL Program</p>

<p>Dr. Conrad Toepfer <i>Associate Professor</i></p>	<p>Ph.D. in Zoology, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Ok.</p>	<p>BIO 502</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Association of College and University Biology Educators • Ecological Society of America • Society for the Advancement of Biology Education Research • Historian, Association of College and University Biology Educators, 2010–Present\Past-President, Association of College and University Biology Educators, 2009–2010 • Editorial Board of <i>Bioscene</i>, 2001 Present • Director of the Honors Program, Brescia University, Owensboro, KY, 2009–2013 • <i>Coordinator of Biology</i> Department, Brescia University, Owensboro, KY, 2005–Present • Executive Committee, Brescia University, Owensboro, KY, 2005–2010 • Watershed Watch Volunteer Trainer (certified for chemical, habitat and biological training), Owensboro, KY, 2012–Present • Burns Middle School Science Day demonstrator, Owensboro, KY, 2005–Present • Advanced Placement Environmental Science Table Leader, Owensboro, KY, 2009–Present <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u></p> <p>Assistant Professor of Biology at Brescia University, 2004–Present: Introductory Biology, Ecology and Evolution with Lab, Environmental Science, Genetics, Animal Behavior, Statistics for Social Sciences</p> <p>Assistant Professor of Biology at Milliken University, 1999–2004: Ecology and Evolution with Lab, Ecology with Lab, Ichthyology with Lab, Marine Biology, Senior Seminar</p>	<p>Full-Time Faculty to Brescia University and Part-Time to the MSTL Program</p>
--	---	----------------	---	--

Vicki (Tinsley) Will <i>Associate Professor</i>	M.A. and ABD in Psychology, University of Alabama	Psy 300	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member of the Audubon Board, Owensboro, KY • Member of National Alliance of Mental Illness (NAMI) • Member of the Executive Committee, Brescia University • Member of the Liberal Arts Committee, Brescia University • Member of President’s Strategic Planning Committee, Brescia University • Chair, University Division of Social and Behavioral Sciences <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u> Assistant/Associate Professor of Psychology, Brescia University, Owensboro, KY 1994–Present</p>	Full-Time to Institution Part-Time to the Unit
--	---	---------	---	---

Part-Time Faculty Matrix

Name	Highest Degree, Field of Study, and Degree-Granting Institution	Program Assignment (Teaching assignment for this program)	Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service (within past five years), and Teaching Experience including Certification(s) Held	Status (FT/PT to Institution, Unit, and Program)
Jennifer Brey <i>Instructor</i>	M.A., Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education, Western Kentucky University	U: 104, 308, 309	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Education Association, Affiliation • Kentucky Education Association, Affiliation • Established Preschool programs • Supervising Teacher for student teachers from the IECE Program at Western Kentucky University, 2006–2007 <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education Professional Standards Board Certifying Eligibility for Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education teaching positions • Endorsement for Teaching Severely/Profoundly Handicapped Pupils, Grades K–12 <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u> Lecturer in School of Education at Brescia University, Owensboro, KY, 2006–Present:</p>	Part-Time to Institution, Unit, and IECE Program

			<p>History and Philosophy of Education, Curriculum and Classroom Management, Science Methods</p> <p>Assistant Professor of Education at Campbellsville University, 2004–2006: Introduction to Education, Language Arts Methodology, Evaluation and Assessment of Learning, Introduction to Learning Disabilities</p> <p>Preschool Instructor; Daviess County Public Schools: Deer Park Elementary, Owensboro, KY, 2003–2006</p> <p>Special Needs Preschool Instructor; Daviess County Public Schools, Owensboro, KY, Summer 2007</p> <p>Learning Disabilities Instructor; Daviess County Public Schools: Sorgho Elementary School, 1996–1997</p>	
<p>Dr. Matthew Constant <i>Instructor</i></p>	<p>Ed.D., P–12 Administration, Western Kentucky University</p>	<p>U: 246 EDL 530</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Society for Information and Technology and Teacher Education, 2011 • Innovations for Learning Conference, presenter • Kentucky Staff Development Council, presenter • Daviess Instructional Technology Academy (DITA), presenter • HSTW Local Leaders’ Retreat, presenter • Kentucky Society for Technology in Education, presenter • Kentucky Society for Technology in Education (KySTE) Treasurer, 2009– • Kentucky Teaching and Learning Conference (KTLC), presenter <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education, Grades 9-12 Math • Superintendent Certification <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u></p> <p>Director of Instructional Technology, Daviess County Public Schools, Owensboro, KY, 2008–Present</p> <p>Principal; Instructional Leader, Daviess County High School, Owensboro, KY, 2005–2008</p> <p>Assistant Principal, Daviess County High School, Owensboro, KY, 2003–2005</p> <p>High School Staff Developer, Daviess County Public School, Owensboro,</p>	<p>Part-Time to Institution, Unit, and Program</p>

			<p>KY, 2002–2003 Technology Instructor, Apollo High School, Owensboro, KY, 1995–2002 Technology courses for adults, Instructor</p>	
<p>Janice Eaves <i>Instructor</i></p>	<p>Rank I, School Administration, Principal Certification, Western Kentucky University.</p> <p>Currently Candidate for PhD, Educational Leadership, University of Louisville/WKU</p>	<p>U: Edu 323, 324</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Affiliations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kentucky Association of School Administrations • National Association of Secondary School Principals • National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics • National Council of Teachers of Mathematics • Kentucky Council of Teachers of Mathematics • Director of Curriculum, Owensboro Public Schools, July 2010–Present • Principal, Owensboro Middle School, July 2005–June 2010 • Assistant Principal, Owensboro Middle School, July 2000–June 2005 • Curriculum Consultant, Kentucky Dept of Education, June 1997–June 2000 <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BS in Education: Mathematics & Speech/Theatre • MA Secondary Education <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u></p> <p>Adjunct Instructor, Kentucky Wesleyan College, Fall 1997–Summer 2006, Eled 3304 Math Methods for Elementary Teachers, Ed 3312 Math Methods for Middle/Secondary School Teachers</p> <p>Adjunct Instructor, Owensboro Community College, Summer 2004–Summer 2006, MT 150 College Algebra</p> <p>Classroom Teacher, Daviess County Public Schools, August 1992–June 1997, Burns Middle School: MS Math, Algebra, Algebra II, Geometry</p> <p>Classroom Teacher, Owensboro Catholic Schools, August 1975–June 1992, MS Math, Advanced Math, Algebra I, Science, Language Arts, Trigonometry</p>	<p>Part-Time to Institution, Unit, and Elementary/Middle School Program</p>

<p>Dr. Angela Gunter <i>Instructor</i></p>	<p>Ed. D. Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Kentucky Doctor of Education, Educational Leadership Teacher Leader Strand, May 2011</p>	<p>U:314, 315, 321, 322, 327 EDL 591</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International Reading Association • Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development • National Council of Teachers of English • Kentucky Reading Association • Kentucky Association for assessment Coordinators: Conference Presenter • Kentucky Society for Technology • First Vice President of Kentucky Council of Teachers of English/Language Arts, 2011 • Secondary School Vice President of Kentucky Council of Teachers of English/Language Arts, 2010–2011 • KTIP Resource Teacher, Education Professional Standards Board, 2009–2010 • Fellow of Western Kentucky University Writing Project, a Division of the National Writing Project, 2009 • Master Trainer, Collaborative for Teaching and Learning and Kentucky Department of Education, 2007–2009 <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Computer Technology Endorsement K–12 • National Board Teacher Certification • Secondary Education Certification/ Middle School Endorsement <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u> Dean of Liberal Arts and English Department Head, Daviess County High School, Owensboro, KY 2010– Instructor of English: Accelerated English III, College Preparatory English III, English IV, Daviess County High School, Owensboro, KY, 2003–present Adjunct Instructor: English 101: Writing I and English 102: Writing II, Owensboro Community and Technical College, Owensboro, KY, 2009–</p>	<p>Part-Time to Institution, Unit, and Elementary, Middle, Secondary, and MSTL Programs</p>
---	--	--	--	---

<p>Dr. Dolores Kiesler <i>Instructor</i></p>	<p>Ph.D. (English). Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill.</p>	<p>EDL 590</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and /or Service:</u> <u>PUBLICATIONS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Preparing a Self-Study Report.” A <i>Collection of Papers on Self-Study and Institutional Improvement</i>. Ed. Susan E. Van Kollenburg. Chicago: North Central Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, 1998. 283–86. (Co-authored with April Beavers.) • “Ferdinand Sisters: Colombia, Guatemala, Peru.” In <i>Women Evangelizing: The Story of the Benedictine Women of the Federation of St. Gertrude in Latin America, 1961-1996</i>. Mott, ND: Eido P, 1996. 129–147. • “Faces of Poverty: Status of the Poor in Kentucky Part 1: Feminization of Poverty.” Pastoral Statement of the Bishops of Kentucky. <i>The Record</i> 30 October 1986, Supplement: 1A-4A. <p><u>PRESENTATIONS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Transitions from High School to College for Students with Disabilities.” 2nd Annual Transitions Conference, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Ky.: March 13–14, 2003. • Panel Member, “Disability Transitions to College.” Assumption High School, Louisville, Ky.: February 2, 2003. • Facilitator, Dreaming the Vision Workshop, Mount St. Joseph, Maple Mount, Ky.: October 4–6, 2002. • “Transitions from High School to College for Students with Disabilities.” 1st Annual Transitions Conference, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Ky.: July 12, 2002. • Co-Presenter: “Preparation of a North Central Report: tedious and time consuming exacting.” 103rd Annual Meeting of the North Central Association, Chicago, Ill: March 27–29, 1998. • “The Mutual Influence of Feminists and Novelists in Nineteenth-Century England.” <i>Languaging: The Ninth Annual Literature and Language Conference</i>, Denton, Tex.: February 7–9, 	<p>Part-Time to Institution, Unit, and MSTL Program (<i>through Fall 2014</i>)</p>
---	--	----------------	---	--

			<p>1997.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ““Improving the Lot of the Real World's Poor’: Women Novelists and Feminists in Nineteenth-Century England.” Women and Power Conference, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tenn.: March 3–4, 1995. • “George Eliot and Feminism: Accepting the Peril.” Conference on Languages and Literature, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.: February 23–25, 1995. • “Women and Spirituality.” Women's Studies Colloquium, Southern Illinois University Carbondale: November 4, 1993. <p><u>PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board Member, Audubon Area Services, Owensboro, Ky: 2002–2004 • Secretary, Governor’s ADA Task Force: 2007–2014 • Board Member, Kentucky Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel: 2003–2005 • Regional Interagency Transition Team, River Region Cooperative: 2008–2014 <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u></p> <p>Instructor, First Year Experience, Brescia University: 2009–2014</p> <p>Instructor, Harrison College Online, Communications: 2009–Present</p> <p>Instructor, University of Phoenix Online, College of General and Professional Studies: 2002–Present</p> <p>Assistant Professor of English, Division of Languages and Literature, Concord College: 1995–1998</p> <p>Teaching Assistant, Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC): 1988–1994</p> <p>Graduate Assistant, Special Project: Developing Syllabi Coordinating the Teaching of Composition, Speech and Reading, SIUC: 1990</p> <p>Instructor, Sullivan Junior College, Louisville, Ky.: 1985–1988</p> <p>Teacher, English Department, Mater Dei High School, Evansville, Ind.: 1984–</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			1985 Proctor and Teacher in English, Journalism and ESL Departments, Marian Heights Academy, Ferdinand, Ind.: 1976–1984	
Joanna McDowell <i>Instructor</i>	M.A., Education, Indiana Wesleyan University	U: 323, 324	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member of KEA <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning and Behavior Disorders, K–12 • English and Communications, 5–8 • National Board Certification in the area of Special Education. <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u></p> <p><u>Special Education Teacher:</u></p> <p>Modified the general education curriculum for special-needs students based upon a variety of instructional techniques and technologies.</p> <p>Employed activities and techniques to encourage student learning and build community within the collaborative and resource classrooms</p> <p><u>College View Middle School</u>, Owensboro, KY June 2012 to Current: Math Recovery Intervention Specialist Identified and designed instruction for students needing math intervention. Instruction centered on scaffolding from current math understandings to grade level Common Core State Standards.</p> <p>Developed student-centered and teacher-friendly activities to increase math skills; activities could be implemented inside the regular math program; collaborated with a state-wide team of faculty to develop a comprehensive instructional resource to help students meet the Common Core State Standards in math; Facilitated monthly grade level meetings of math teachers designed to extend student success in elementary mathematics</p> <p><u>East View Elementary</u> Owensboro, KY August 2010 to May 2012: Special Education Teacher Performed student background reviews to develop</p>	Part-Time to Institution, Unit, and Elementary, Middle School Programs

			<p>tailored lessons based on student need in reading, writing, and math in both resource and collaborative settings to students in grades K–5.</p> <p><u>East View Elementary Owensboro, KY</u> May 1998 to May 2012</p>	
<p>J. Michael Meece <i>Instructor</i></p>	<p>M.A. Elementary Education, Western Kentucky University</p>	<p>U: 402, 403</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducted teacher training in ESL on a regular basis for New Teacher Academy at Lost River Elementary 2014-2015. • Conducted teacher training in EFL for Cabrini Ministries in Swaziland Africa. Summer 2015 • Presented EFL techniques to public school teachers in Swaziland Africa Summer 2015 <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, 2006 • Elementary Education, 2002 <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u> English to Speakers of Other languages, Lost River Elementary 2006–Present: 6TH grade Mathematics teacher, Lost River Elementary 2002–2006</p>	<p>Part-Time to Institution, Unit, and ESL Program</p>
<p>Connie Morgan</p>	<p>MA Elementary Education, Western Kentucky University</p>	<p>U: 204, 213, 257, 321,325, 326, 431</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kentucky Leadership Academy • Kentucky Association of Elementary School Principals • Kentucky Association of School Administration • Kentucky Education Association • Daviess County Education Association • National Education Association <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endorsement, Elementary Principal, K–8 • Endorsement, Supervisor of Instruction, K–12 • Approval for Teaching Gifted Education, 1–8 • Approval for Teaching Kindergarten • Elementary Education <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u> 1998–2011 Principal, West Louisville</p>	<p>Part-Time to Institution, Unit, and Elementary, Middle, and Secondary Programs</p>

			<p>Elementary School, a National Blue Ribbon School</p> <p>1980–1998 Gifted and Talented/Enrichment Program Teacher</p> <p>1995–1998 Director, Deer Park/Masonville Jump Start Summer School</p> <p>1994–1995 TALENTS Extended School Coordinator, Masonville</p> <p>1993–1998 Deer Park/Masonville Extended School Coordinator</p> <p>1992–1993 Director of Camp Discovery, a remedial summer school for grades 4 and 5</p> <p>1989–1998 KTIP Resource Teacher</p> <p>1977–1980 Teacher, Our Lady of Lourdes Elementary School</p> <p>1977 Student Teaching, American School of Guatemala, Guatemala City, Guatemala, Central America</p>	
<p>Jennifer Payne <i>Assistant Professor</i></p>	<p>Masters of Education in School Counseling, Western Kentucky University</p>	<p>U: 320, 329</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American School Counselor Association • Kentucky Science Teachers Association • National Science Teachers Association <p><u>Certification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middle School Science and Social Studies 5–9 • Certified School Counseling K–12 <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u></p> <p>Science Teacher, Daviess County Middle School, Fall 2014–Present</p> <p>Adjunct Teacher, Fall 2013–Present, Brescia University,</p> <p>Science Teacher, Fall 2007–Spring 2014, Owensboro Catholic Middle School</p> <p>School-Community Collaborative Initiatives and Leadership: TEAC Committee, 2010–Present, Brescia University</p> <p>Hancock County Animal Shelter Advisory Board, 2008–2013</p> <p>Hancock County High School Senior Project Community Mentor, 2010–2013</p> <p>Organized a school-wide Earth Presentation Day, 2009–2010</p>	<p>Part-Time to Institution, Unit, and to Elementary and Middle School Programs</p>

<p>Tom Pope <i>Instructor</i></p>	<p>M.A. Music Education, Eastern Kentucky University</p>	<p>U: 401</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard High School Certification, Grades 7–12 Area Specialization: Music Teaching Minor • Economics Endorsement for Teaching • ESL, All Grades <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u></p> <p>Teach Music Appreciation online through BU Online, Brescia University, Owensboro KY, 2012–PRESENT Taught English as a Second Language (ESL) to ESL students enrolled at Brescia, Brescia University, Owensboro KY, 2009–2010</p>	<p>Part-Time to Institution, Unit, and ESL Program</p>
<p>Karissa F. Ritter <i>Instructor</i></p>	<p>M.S. Communication Disorders, Western Kentucky University</p>	<p>U: 430</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and/or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Speech, Language and Hearing Association (ASHA) • Kentucky Speech, Language and Hearing Association (KSHA) • Western Kentucky Speech, Language and Hearing Association (WKSLSHA) • Evansville Speech, Hearing and Language Association (ESHLA) • Rehabilitation Engineering and Assistive Technology Society of North America (RESNA) <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certificate of Clinical Competency (CCC) in Speech-Language Pathology from ASHA • National Examination in Speech-Pathology and Audiology (NESPA) Praxis Examination Passed • RESNA Certified Assistive Technology Professional (ATP) • Scientific Learning: Fast For Word software training certification • American Red Cross Adult, Child and Infant CPR Certification • American Red Cross First Aid Certification <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u></p> <p>Krisle Elementary School November 2000–January 2001 Springfield, TN</p>	<p>Part-Time to Institution, Unit, and to Special Ed and IECE Programs</p>

<p>Matthew Lindsey-Stephens <i>Instructor</i></p>	<p>Rank I, Nova University, Las Vegas, NV, TESOL MAT, Grand Canyon University, Phoenix, AR BA French Education (K–12), Berea College</p>	<p>Edu 404</p>	<p><u>Leadership in Professional Associations and /or Service:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • World Language Coordinator, 2005 – 2015, Trigg County High School <p><u>Certifications:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rank I: TESOL • MAT • BA French Education (K–12) • BA English Education (9–12) <p><u>Teaching Experiences:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daviess County High School, Owensboro, KY 2015–present teaches French Levels I, II, III, and AP and Arts and Humanities Survey • Trigg County High School, Cadiz, KY, 2005–2015 Taught French Levels I, II, III, and AP, supervised All World Language Students, managed lab and grade records of 300+ students • Lone Oak High School, Paducah, KY, 2004-2005, taught French levels I, II, and AP and English I • Valley High School, Las Vegas, NV, 1999-2004, taught levels I, II, III, and IV, advanced placement level grammar and literature, international Baccalaureate Program • Mojave High School, Las Vegas, NV, 1998-1999, Careers/Vocational Teacher • Berea College, Berea, KY, 1994-1998, worked directly with professor and students, managed language lab, assisted students with lab equipment 	<p>Part-Time to Institution, Unit, and to ESL Endorsement Program</p>
--	--	----------------	--	---

5a.2. What expertise qualifies professional education faculty members who do not hold terminal degrees for their assignments?

TINA WOLKEN (Full-Time SOE) holds a Master of Arts with an emphasis in Learning and Behavior Disorders, a Rank I, an Endorsement in Special Education, and an Approval for Teacher Consultant in Exceptional Children. She earned promotion and tenure in 2011. After having taught for 26½ years, this faculty member retired from public school teaching in December 2004 and joined Brescia’s SOE faculty, first as part-time and then full-time. She was named recipient of Alpha Chi Delta Epsilon Sigma 2010 Teaching Excellence Award. The significant number of years as a successful

classroom teacher makes her an excellent instructor for candidates preparing for similar careers of their own. Likewise, her qualifications in both middle-school education and special education make her even more valued as a professional colleague. Her role as Coordinator of the SOE middle schools program is supported by her ongoing work with the National Middle Schools Association's Center for Middle School Academic Achievement (CMSAA) "Schools to Watch" middle school project, which involves her with middle schools all over the country and includes site visits. Finally, through her continued involvement in both middle-school systems and special education organizations, she maintains a strong professional reputation and is well-respected in the field. Perhaps more importantly, she brings to SOE candidates enrolled in her courses the contacts and network of relationships that she's spent much of her adult life developing and offers them in support of candidates' continued growth as professional educators.

JENNIFER BREY (Part-Time SOE) holds a Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Early Childhood Education. She is currently owner operator of Brey's Early Learning Center, an outgrowth of her earlier endeavor, Brey's Little House of Learning. Her public school experience includes teaching children with special needs at multiple levels; she holds LD and Severely/Profoundly Handicapped endorsements. At Campbellsville University she served as an Assistant Professor of Education from 2004–2006; from 2006–2007 she then supervised candidates at Western Kentucky University in Clinical Practice placements in IECE. At Brescia she has served as an Assistant Professor since 2006 to teach a variety of courses common to Education majors. Based on a needs assessment of the Owensboro and surrounding area and because of her extensive knowledge base, she was asked to function as a co-designer of the curriculum for a new IECE program; she was then assigned to launch and grow the program. She is well-respected in the early childhood community and has built an extensive network of professional colleagues in private and public agencies. She shares these resources with candidates enrolled in her classes and utilizes them as quality Field experience and Clinical Practice placements.

CONNIE MORGAN (Part-Time SOE) holds a Master's of Arts in Elementary Education and is certified to teach Elementary, Gifted 1–8, and has a principal's K–8 endorsement and an endorsement as Supervisor of Instruction K–12. She has been principal for 13 years (1998–2010 at West Louisville Elementary, a National Blue Ribbon School, and also at Trinity High School. Her knowledge and expertise in these areas provide a rich base for our candidates to explore.

JOANNA MCDOWELL (Part-Time SOE) was assigned to teach Edu 323 Math Methods for Elementary Grades and Edu 324 Teaching Mathematics for middle-grade level during Spring 2013. She holds a B.S. degree in Special Education from Brescia, a Master in Education in Curriculum and Instruction from Indiana Wesleyan University and holds National Board Certification in the area of Special Education. She has fourteen years of experience as an elementary special education teacher in resource and collaborative settings and three years at the middle grades level. In addition, she has served as a Math Recovery Intervention Specialist. In this role she has valuable experience in identifying students in need of specially designed instruction, then designing the instruction aligned with KCAS and Common Core State Standards in math, along with facilitating grade-level team meetings of math teachers and collaborating with a state-wide team in Kentucky to develop a comprehensive instructional resource to assist students in meeting CCSS in math. She also has expertise in modifying the general education curriculum for students with exceptional needs and has served in resource and collaborative classroom settings. Sharing her theoretical and practical knowledge, Joanna allows our candidates to acquire a basis for differentiating instruction in math to meet unique student needs grounded in evidence-based practice and aligned with multiple professional standards.

KARISSA RITER (Part-Time SOE) is assigned to teach Edu 430 Adaptive and Assistive Technology: Communication and Curricular Issues. She was awarded both her B.S. and M.S. degrees in Communication Disorders from Western Kentucky University. Her certifications include Certificate of Clinical Competency (CCC) in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology from ASHA; she passed the National Examination in Speech-Pathology and Audiology (NESPA) Praxis Examination; and she is a RESNA Certified Assistive Technology Professional (ATP). Since January 2001 Karissa has been employed as a Speech-Language Pathologist at Wendell Foster's Campus for Developmental Disabilities, Inc. in Owensboro, Ky. Her professional practice includes providing assessment and treatment for children and adults through the Intermediate Care Facility for the Mentally Retarded and the Developmentally Disabled as well as through the Comprehensive Outpatient Rehabilitation Facility. Areas of treatment include assistive technology, aural rehabilitation, apraxia, dysarthria, articulation and expressive/receptive language skills. She has collaborated with school personnel; served on IEP teams; scheduled interventions utilizing a variety of service models; and conducted speech, language and hearing screenings. Her facilitation of Field experience placements at the Wendell Foster Campus allows candidates to observe and actively participate in putting theory into practice.

Matthew Lindsey (Part-Time SOE) is assigned to teach the ESL Practicum course, Edu 404, in the ESL Endorsement Program. He has a K –12 teaching certification for French and a 9–12 certification for English. He earned his MAT, achieving Rank II, before going on to earn his Rank I in TESOL. He has taught world languages in a number of Kentucky schools for the past 11 years. His secondary teaching experience along with his academic credentials make him more than qualified to serve as the Practicum instructor for the ESL Program.

JENNIFER PAYNE (Part-Time SOE) was assigned to teach Edu 320 Science for Elementary Grades and Edu 329 Teaching Science for middle grades. In addition to her Master's in School Counseling, she has a B. S. degree in Education in Science and has taught middle grades science in both public and parochial schools in the Owensboro area since 2007. The candidates benefitted tremendously from being able to complete their Field experience placements in her classroom, thus easily bridging what was being taught on campus with what was being taught to middle-grade students in her classroom setting.

MICHAEL MEECE (Part-Time SOE) is assigned to teach Edu 402 Acquisition and Skill Set for Teaching ESL Students and Edu 403 ESL: Methods and Materials for Teaching ESL Students. His Master's in TESOL and his classroom experience teaching ESL in the Warren County School system, plus his experience in teaching ESL in a foreign country, provide candidates with real-life applications. He has also enhanced his on-ground courses with guests who are refugees in order to offer candidates opportunities to become acquainted with parents of P–12 students and to understand better the cultural and linguistic challenges faced by these students and their families

Tom Pope (Part-Time SOE) is assigned to teach Edu 401 in the ESL Endorsement Program. Tom has a Master's in Music Education as well as a Certificate in ESL; he has taught music in a number of secondary schools and at Brescia University. He is also certified to teach ESL at all grade levels.

5a.3. How many of the school-based faculty members are licensed in the areas they teach or are supervising? How does the unit ensure that school-based faculty members are adequately licensed?

All the school-based faculty members who supervise candidates are licensed in the areas in which they teach or supervise. All school-based faculty members have appropriate documentation on file (either in the office of the local school building site or at the central administration office of the school system, depending on system preferences). This documentation proves they are licensed in the areas they teach and/or supervise.

The Chair of the School of Education assumes the responsibility, with assistance from the SOE Administrative Assistant/Data Manager and the CRC Coordinator/Field Placement Director, for verifying that every school-based faculty member utilized for Field experience, Practicum, or Clinical Practice supervision is appropriately licensed in the area required for the program, course, and candidate. Such assurance involves verification with school and community partners at the building or central administration level that each individual holds the appropriate credentials. Involvement of members of the Teacher Education Advisory Committee also facilitates these efforts.

Cooperating Teachers must meet the KAR 5:040 Section 2 requirements, and the SOE requires a minimum of five years teaching experience and a Master's Degree. (See [Clinical Practice Handbook](#), p 13) This is confirmed through school administration and the EPSB website.

5a.4. What contemporary professional experiences do higher education clinical faculty members have in school settings?

Unit faculty participate in a variety of activities and experiences in P–12 school settings. All Program Coordinators for Initial-level certification function as the University Supervisors (US) for the candidates in their assigned programs. This involves a minimum of three on-site observations per placement and facilitates experiences in a variety of schools and agencies in Kentucky and Indiana. Clinical Practice candidates (CPCs) are required to communicate via email daily with their US. Cooperating Teachers (CTs) and CPCs utilize bi-weekly formative assessments to communicate status and progress with an accompanying Action Plan component, lesson plans for US observations, and three-way debriefing as ways to ensure that the US is actively involved in the life of the classroom and school.

During the Spring 2015 term, content area faculty in Spanish P–12 and in Mathematics 8–12 also completed an on-site observation and assessment of their candidates during the Clinical Practice experience. When CPCs are eligible in other content areas (Biology, Social Studies and English 8–12 and Art P–12 and at Middle Grades), content area faculty in those units/divisions engage in this new best practice of at least one formal observation (preferably two) per Clinical Practice placement. In addition, a pilot for extending this best practice of a minimum of one on-site observation and assessment has been proposed for content-area faculty to mirror what is currently being done by SOE faculty for all candidates during their Practicum placements.

SOE full-time faculty ([Akojie](#), [Chase](#), [Wolken](#), and [Payne](#)) along with P–12 faculty from area school districts attended a summer Co-Teaching Training workshop featuring Marilyn Friend. [Tina Wolken](#) and [Marlaine Chase](#) and candidates attended a professional development event held at College View Middle School for area math teachers regarding assessing of skills in mathematics. [Patricia Akojie](#) has collaborated with the Owensboro Independent and Daviess County Public Schools, assisting principals and superintendents to provide programs for teachers and students; such collaboration has included serving as science fair judge and involvement with Junior Achievement. [Tina Wolken](#) is a member of the Center for Middle School Academic Achievement (CMSAA) Schools to Watch (STW) Middle School Project and participates on-site visit teams. [Tom Payne](#) was a local and state

member of KASA and was elected to the Daviess County Public Schools Board of Education just prior to his retirement in May 2015. As Chair of the School of Education, Marlaine Chase has represented the Unit at meetings at the invitation of superintendents and assistant superintendents of Owensboro Independent and Daviess County Public Schools to discuss, plan for, implement, and assess collaborative P–20 efforts. She currently serves as the BU coordinator for a collaborative 21st Century Partnership Grant involving candidates in the BU Social Work programs and candidates in the School of Education with a unique approach to the After School Program at Cravens Elementary.

Current part-time faculty are P–12 teachers, practitioners, administrators, or recently retired from such. They provide current and innovative practices that serve as a valuable asset to SOE and candidates.

5a.5. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty qualifications may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

5b.1. How does instruction by professional education faculty reflect the conceptual framework as well as current research and developments in the fields?

At Brescia University, evidence of the Conceptual Framework is found throughout all education courses. All course syllabi reference the elements of the Conceptual Framework (CF): professional knowledge and skills as well as the dispositions of ethics, advocacy, service, and lifelong learning. These are aligned with applicable Kentucky and SPA standards. Course assignments in courses with an Edu prefix, especially Signature Assignments and their accompanying assessments, indicate areas of emphasis, including both CF elements and the identified themes of the Unit: content/professional/pedagogical knowledge and skills, assessment, diversity, dispositions, technology, and the impact on P–12 student performance. Beginning in AY 2012–2013 SOE faculty began discussions with content area faculty designed to facilitate inclusion of [Signature Assignments and Related Assessments](#) in courses taken by SOE majors, with corresponding alignment to CF elements and the relevant SPA standards. Efforts in this area continue to be enhanced and expanded.

Teaching is a core value at Brescia University; the [Faculty Handbook](#) notes a “special emphasis on teaching effectiveness” (p. 2-9) as a central element in the procedures for determining promotion and tenure. Teaching effectiveness includes “a) mastery of subject matter; ability to organize and present it clearly and imaginatively; b) thorough preparation of course material and instructional objectives; c) good rapport with students; and d) continued growth and involvement in improvement in teaching.” (p. 2-7, [Faculty Handbook](#)) All of Brescia’s programs reflect quality instruction. The SOE is no exception. As stated in the Conceptual Framework, “In all [its] programs, the SOE of Brescia University is committed to providing quality instruction that reflects current educational practice.” The professional education faculty members demonstrate mastery of subject matter, having earned advanced degrees in their subject areas. They also participate in an ongoing manner in related professional organizations; they maintain and extend their knowledge of subject matter through reading, professional development, and research. One example of SOE professional faculty development to remain knowledgeable concerning current educational practice was the opportunity to attend the October 2013 “Teaching with Technology Conference” in Atlanta, Ga, funded through a University Hart Grant received by two SOE faculty and two additional University faculty. Full-time faculty members have also used some of their annual professional development allotment from the University for SPA con-

ference attendance such as the National AMLE and the National and/or State CEC. In addition to these developmental opportunities, faculty members utilize professional development funds to pay dues/fees for professional memberships; these typically come with access to a variety of resources. The Unit also has several memberships with organizations that produce and disseminate current research and development in a variety of content areas.

In light of its CF, the SOE faculty remains committed to improving its professional knowledge and skills and well as deepening the teaching dispositions of BU teacher education candidates. The following examples illustrate this commitment: a) addition of a significant Practicum experience for all education majors prior to Clinical Practice so that candidates have greater opportunity to identify knowledge *lacunae* and practice teaching skills before assuming the responsibilities of Clinical Practice; b) use of the “How Can I Improve My PowerPoint Skills” DVD in BU’s Ursuline Center for Teaching and Learning, so that candidates both improve their own presentation skills and become better prepared to aid their students; c) faculty modeling of the disposition of service through volunteer work in organizations such as Habitat for Humanity and Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA); d) faculty modeling of the disposition of advocacy through assisting candidates negotiate scheduling and course sequencing issues with University administration when complicated by athletic involvement, part-time jobs, and/or transfer credits; and e) use of the BU Library’s *Choice Review—Education* information about current publications in the field of education, so that candidates see faculty engaged in and modeling the disposition of lifelong learning in their reviewing and ordering for the Curriculum Resource Center or main Library various contemporary works relevant to education coursework (for example, the recent purchase of *The pursuit of racial and ethnic equality in American public schools*, ed. by Kristi L. Bowman. Michigan State, 2015, for use in Edu 204 and 255 discussions/activities/assignments related both to SOE dispositions of advocacy, service, and lifelong learning and to elements of diversity).

5b.2. How do unit faculty members encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions?

The Brescia faculty promotes reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions in many ways. They facilitate candidates as they learn to reflect on and evaluate both their specific teaching experiences and their overall performance (KTS 7 and 9) through oral and written requirements as they move through the various levels of the program. Candidates acquire practice through reflections on required Field experiences, through the strengths and needed areas of growth identified in the Professional Growth Plans/Action Plans, and through the numerous requirements embedded in Practicum and Clinical Practice.

Brescia’s SOE is committed to extensive Field and Clinical Practice experiences in diverse settings with subsequent reflection from the beginning of initial coursework to the final Clinical Practice experience or advanced degree completion. Candidates are required to assess continuously the Field environment and their progress toward competency in that environment. They are required to engage in journaling as they reflect on their individual Field placements. Candidates in Practicum and Clinical Practice are required to email daily reflections on their clinical teaching experience to their University Supervisor. They analyze their teaching practices and formative and summative assessment data on P–12 students. This requires critical thinking about alignment with standards, use of differentiated instruction/assessment based on best practice, and identification of gaps or themes that need to be addressed. They next engage in problem-solving by looking at the environment, the climate, the instruction, and the student performance, seeking insights into alternative ways that various situations

could have been handled, how access to learning could be better facilitated, and/or how to “tweak” elements to produce increased success.

All Unit faculty members require their candidates to read research in the field. Candidates are challenged to think critically through research, reports, Field placements, and class activities. In many courses, Unit faculty require candidates to reflect through journaling, writing, and analyzing their observations and formulating specific connections between theory and practice. The required book-reading-and-review assignment in Edu 255 has two major elements that invite candidates to make connections between the book and the professional knowledge base that is the foundation of the SOE CF, and how these both impact their dispositions towards individuals with diversity and disability. (See [Edu 255 Rubric for Book Review Assignment](#).) Appropriate mastery of the SOE Conceptual Framework dispositions of ethics, advocacy, service, and lifelong learning is assessed initially through the Field Supervisor Evaluation Form in early Field experiences. SOE faculty also assess candidate dispositions if they are instructors in any of the courses common to all Edu majors: Edu 204 (108 if transfer), Edu 246, Edu 255, Edu 301, and Psy 300; these same instructors engage in continuous emphasis on the CF and dispositions necessary for becoming a Brescia professional educator. With the incorporation of Signature Assignments/Assessments in other Edu and EDL courses, aspects of the assignments and elements of the assessments are “tagged” in a number of ways, including professional skills and dispositions. As these assignments and assessments are introduced, implemented, and evaluated, SOE faculty stress to candidates both the importance of this work in individual courses and how their performance in these key areas is being tracked over time.

Dispositions are assessed at Admission to School of Education by SOE and cross-campus faculty. At Admission to Clinical Practice dispositions are assessed again by SOE and cross-campus faculty. Area professionals and TEAC members also engage in the assessment of candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions primarily through the use of a portfolio but also utilizing advisor recommendations. Candidates of concern are identified and a number of intervention strategies have been put in place to assist them when data and observation indicate the development of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and professional dispositions is not meeting target levels as a candidate attempts to progress through the program.

Unit faculty members model the target professional habits of reflection, critical thinking, problem solving, and the CF dispositions both in and out of the classroom and course experiences. Prior to the start of every academic year, Unit faculty spend several days in retreat involving interaction with cross-campus faculty and targeted SOE faculty interaction. During this time faculty address personal, Program, and Unit goals that were established for the previous year and utilize new data from the Faculty Activity Summaries and BU Assessment grids to set new goals in all areas mentioned. As changes are implemented in courses, Programs, or at the Unit level, candidates are informed of ways in which their feedback coupled with faculty professional development and scholarly activities generated the data utilized to inform faculty decision-making.

5b.3. What types of instructional strategies and assessments do unit faculty members model?

SOE faculty use many different teaching strategies and assessments as they differentiate instruction based on candidates’ diverse needs and data from multiple forms of assessment. They plan instructional strategies and activities that address learning objectives for all candidates, thereby recognizing various learning styles and Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences; they also incorporate Universal Design for Learning and Understanding by Design principles. In the Edu 255 Teaching Diverse Populations of Children and Youth, the Signature Assignment integrates knowledge gained when appropriate best

practices are utilized to address the unique needs of P–12 students with disabilities, elements that place such students at risk (e.g. poverty, culture, ESL, sexual orientation, gender). Candidates enrolled in methods courses examine the advantages and disadvantages of teaching strategies in the various content areas. Some of the teaching strategies incorporated by faculty include cooperative learning; direct instruction; discovery learning; whole-group discussion; independent study; interdisciplinary instruction; concept mapping; inquiry method; questioning; play; learning centers; small-group work; revisiting; reflection; project approach, and whole group lecture. Faculty also have purposefully engaged in poor practices or utilized technology to view examples of ineffective practice, then aided candidates in dissecting and analyzing the issues.

Various assessment methods used by faculty are seen in the course syllabi. Faculty model the ability to differentiate in assessments, again based on candidates' diverse needs and data from multiple forms of assessment. Examples of assessments include book reviews, quizzes, literature reviews, comprehensive exams, projects, research papers, KTIP lesson and unit plans, role play, Web Quests, mock classroom teaching, digitally recorded lessons in Field/Practica and Clinical Practice placements, research articles, portfolio, and professional development.

Finally, SOE faculty have begun to model as an instructional strategy and form of assessment the use of Signature Assignments and Related Assessments. Initially begun in School of Education courses, this strategy is increasingly permeating coursework across the Brescia University campus. Thus SOE candidates are experiencing a variety of instructional strategies and assessments throughout their educator preparation program not only in the SOE but in major content areas as well. (See [Math content syllabi](#), [English content syllabi](#), [Social Studies content syllabi](#), [Science content syllabi](#).)

5b.4. How do unit faculty members incorporate the use of technology into instruction?

Unit faculty incorporate technology into instruction by modeling effective technology integration. Examples included PowerPoint, Prezi, interactive white board, YouTube, blog, chat rooms, Web 2.0 production tools, Moodle, document camera, Classroom Performance System (clickers), technology lab for interactive presentations, and relevant webinars. Three full-time SOE faculty have each spent a week during the summer learning to develop [LibGuides](#), an online support which provides resources for course work such as copies of PowerPoints, electronic copies of course material, and enrichments ([Wolken LibGuide](#)). At the 2015 Fall Institute, faculty attended a workshop on how to improve Prezi presentations; faculty have also used resources in the Ursuline Center for Teaching and Learning on how to improve their own PowerPoint presentations and teach SOE candidates to do the same. As SOE faculty learn or improve their skills in these and other technologies, they incorporate them into their classes. For example, in Edu 204 the instructor uses technology to support instruction; access and manipulate data; enhance professional growth and productivity; communicate and collaborate with colleagues, parents, and the community; and conduct research. In Edu 411, students are exposed to technology integration by using the free online Dipity software to create an interactive historical timeline of educational events in America.

The adoption of Taskstream by the SOE in Fall 2014 requires faculty and candidates to acquire and utilize new skills to upload, assess, and communicate through this system. All Signature Assignments and their accompanying assessments are now located on Taskstream.

Beginning in August 2015, all on-campus Brescia faculty now have access to a course-specific Moodle page, where they are free to design and upload Moodle-based assignments and assessments. Candidates are encouraged to bring their own devices (BYOD) to class to promote inquiry and extension

of discussion. Both the Unit's LibGuides and Moodle pages provide an electronic component to on-ground face-to-face courses and facilitate candidate access to required and or frequently used documents and resources within a particular course.

Faculty communicate with candidates through email, text, and Facebook. Most assignments are submitted to faculty and returned to candidates electronically through email or Taskstream.

Education courses incorporate candidate use of technology through research, presentations, lesson plans.

5b.5. How do unit faculty members systematically engage in self-assessment of their own teaching?

Brescia University faculty, including SOE faculty, engage in a systematic self-assessment of their own teaching in three primary ways. As outlined in the [Faculty Handbook](#) under "Faculty Duties and Responsibilities" on pp. 2-25 and 2-26, the first part of a "Developmental Evaluation" process includes an evaluation by the individual faculty member and her/his Division/School Chair: At some time in the spring semester, faculty members review their goals and activities of the current year, establish their goals for the coming year, and complete both pages of the "Annual Faculty Activity Summary" (see Appendix E of the [Faculty Handbook](#)). Untenured faculty set goals for each year; tenured faculty may choose to develop three-year goals instead. The first section of this annual summary is "Professional Development Activities" that concludes with "continued growth and improvement in teaching." After each SOE faculty member completes this report, they meet with the Chair of the School of Education to review and discuss it in light of faculty responsibilities and personal, Divisional, and University goals. Both will sign the form that is then submitted to the Academic Dean as part of the Annual Division/School Report on June 1. If the VPAA/Academic Dean notes issues of concern, she then meets with the individual faculty member.

The second half of the "Developmental Evaluation" is done by SOE students. According to University policy, full-time tenured faculty will have one class evaluated per year; first-year untenured faculty have all courses evaluated; all other untenured faculty will evaluate at least one class per semester; all part-time faculty are required to evaluate each course unless exempted by the Division/School Chairperson or the Academic Dean. In all cases, the Division/School Chairperson and/or Academic Dean may request additional evaluations. The SOE Unit practice exceeds the University's expectations by requiring that every course taught every semester—whether by a tenured or untenured, full- or part-time faculty member—be evaluated; thus faculty members receive extensive and ongoing candidate feedback through the standard course evaluation known as the [Course Evaluation Form](#). In addition, the SOE encourages faculty to conduct at least a mid-term evaluation in each course, which may be formal or informal. This mid-point evaluation allows faculty to make instructional adjustments within a course or utilize the information to inform revisions the next time the course is offered. Comparing candidate evaluation data across courses can also assist the faculty in determining whether there are themes or patterns regarding instructional practice that may need to be addressed through deletion or modification or expansion and enhancement. Course evaluation data are made available to faculty early in the following term after review by the VPAA/Academic Dean and the Chair of the SOE. If a faculty member makes mid-term evaluation data available and invites discussion with the Chair, preliminary decisions could be made for the second term of the academic year. The Chair may also request a discussion with the faculty member if data indicate a need.

The third way faculty engage in self-assessment occurs as part of the pre-tenure and tenure process, during which both the Division/School Chair and the Academic Dean do classroom observations of

faculty members, write up a report on the classroom visit, and then meet with the faculty member to discuss the teaching experience. These meetings include an invitation to self-reflect on what went well and what could be improved. The focus of these observations and follow-up is to highlight areas of strength and make recommendations for any improvements that might be warranted. In the latter case, part of the discussion might involve identifying possible professional development opportunities.

5b.6. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty teaching may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.] n –n

- [Conceptual Framework Symbol](#)
- [Edu 411 Akojie Syllabus Fall 2013](#)
- [Edu 334 Wolken Syllabus Fall 2013](#)
- [Edu 255 Payne Syllabus Fall 2013](#)
- [Edu 350 Chase Syllabus Fall 2013](#)
- [Faculty Activity Summary 2011–2012](#)
- [Faculty Activity Summary 2012–2013](#)
- [Faculty Activity Summary 2013–2014](#)

5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

5c.1. What types of scholarly work are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and unit's mission?

The Brescia University [Faculty Handbook](#) describes scholarship as follows (p. 2-7, Section 2.6.2.3): “Professional Competence and Scholarship: Scholarly efforts require professional integrity, intellectual vitality and breadth, and vary with academic areas but include such activities as: a) original research in the discipline or in methods of teaching; b) publication of books, articles, essays, or reviews relating to the teaching discipline; c) presentation of papers at professional meetings, exhibits/performance of works by faculty; d) participation in workshops, conferences, seminars in the discipline/teaching; e) active collaboration with professionals in the academic field; f) directing research for students; g) development of proposals for grants in discipline/teaching; h) reading current scholarly literature and incorporating this material into curriculum in areas of academic responsibility; i) creating new courses and assembling new instructional materials.” Because Brescia is primarily a teaching institution, there is no requirement for peer-reviewed publishing; however, SOE faculty *ARE* expected to participate in some forms of the research listed above, and faculty seeking tenure are evaluated on this point. Such ongoing research is considered both professional development and as service to the University and community.

Faculty members in all divisions—including the SOE—are encouraged not only to model but also to promote candidate engagement in professional development and scholarship. Annually the Honors Program/College sponsors the “[Celebration of Excellence](#)” event, which occurs immediately following the University Honors Convocation two weeks prior to graduation. This event showcases faculty-sponsored student research and is open not only to BU faculty and staff but also to family members and members of the community. In the past several years SOE faculty have aided qualified candidates in choosing and conducting research in an area of interest and have attended the candidates’ presentations or have served as judges during the event.

5c.2. In what types of scholarship activities are faculty members engaged? How is their scholarship related to teaching and learning? What percentage of the unit's faculty is engaged in scholarship? (Review the definition of scholarship in the NCATE glossary.) [A table could be attached at Prompt 5c.3 below to show different scholarly activities in which faculty members are involved and the number involved in each activity.]

As noted in 5c.1 above, Brescia University's understanding of "scholarship" is broader than NCATE's definition that is more weighted to traditional research, publication, and peer-review of scholarly work. Within the scope of Brescia's expectations in this regard, all current full-time Unit faculty are professionally active in a range of scholarly pursuits as described in the [Faculty Handbook](#); faculty who were a part of the Unit within the past year also demonstrate professional scholarly pursuits that affect the Unit. Such pursuits often comprise a pattern of activities not necessarily limited to a single year. [Table 5.3](#) illustrates a sampling of such scholarly activity on the part of current Unit faculty; it should be noted that, since part-time faculty are not required to submit annual reports on their activities, no information is available about the scholarly work of part-time faculty. Even within these limits, however, the table shows a range of selected scholarly pursuits such as original research, publication, presentations, workshops, conferences, collaborations with P-12, advising action research projects, grants, scholarly reading, development of new online and on-ground courses, KTIP teacher educator training, mentoring seminars, LibGuide training, and Moodle online training.

Brescia University is not a research university; from its 1925 founding as a two-year women's college, its focus has been teaching. Teaching is at the heart of the University; as a result, the [Faculty Handbook](#) notes a "special emphasis on teaching effectiveness" (p. 2-9) as a central element in the procedures for determining promotion and tenure. Teaching effectiveness includes "a) mastery of subject matter; ability to organize and present it clearly and imaginatively; b) thorough preparation of course material and instructional objectives; c) good rapport with students; d) continued growth and involvement in improvement in teaching." (p. 2-7, [Faculty Handbook](#)) All of Brescia's programs reflect quality instruction. As stated in the Conceptual Framework, "In all these programs, the SOE of Brescia University is committed to providing quality instruction that reflects current educational practice."

5c.3. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty scholarship may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

- [FH Appendix H – Hart Grants](#)
- [KEA Professional Development Day](#)
- [Celebration of Excellence](#)
- [Faculty Activity Summary 2011–2012](#)
- [Faculty Activity Summary 2012–2013](#)
- [Faculty Activity Summary 2013–2014](#)

5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

5d.1. What types of service are expected of faculty as part of the institution's and the unit's mission?

As a Catholic Christian institution, service is a hallmark of the University's mission; as such, it is expected that faculty and staff engage in various kinds of service, thus modeling this value for students

to emulate. Because it is so central, service one of the criteria by which full-time faculty are evaluated for promotion and tenure. They are expected to serve both the University and the wider community. As explained in the [Faculty Handbook](#), Section 2.6.2.4, service to the University includes a) “ability to support the mission of the University; b) special service to area, division/school, University; c) support of student activities and/or intellectual life; and d) consistent fulfillment of contractual duties.” Section 2.6.2.5 outlines the expectations of service to the community: a) “participation in civic, church, or community activities; and b) service to community groups within or without one’s discipline.” The “Annual Faculty Activity Summary” referenced above in 5b.5 provides the channel for faculty to report on both forms of service annually; it also offers an opportunity to report on additional forms of service such as “special duties in University, service, and *ad hoc* or advisory committees.”

Service is also one of the four essential dispositions embodied in the SOE’s Conceptual Framework. The understanding is that the role of professional educator is to be of service to students, to families, to schools, community, country, and the world. The Unit’s faculty strives to model lives of service daily in their offices, classrooms, on campus, and in the community. Candidates are provided with unfettered access via direct contact and use of multiple technologies. Faculty members serve on Unit and University committees. They serve as advisors and sponsors for groups, clubs, and events. As will be noted in greater detail below, faculty members also engage in active service at various levels, including community, state, national, and even international. SOE faculty offer service in a variety of settings and areas, some directly related to curricular and pedagogical development in the P–16 venue, and others reflecting the more eclectic vision of education itself as a service profession.

5d.2. In what types of service activities are faculty members engaged? Provide examples of faculty service related to practice in P-12 schools and service to the profession at the local, state, national, and international levels (e.g., through professional associations). What percentage of the faculty is actively involved in these various types of service activities? [A table could be attached at Prompt 5d.3 below to show different service activities in which faculty members are involved and the number involved in each activity.]

All unit faculty (100%) routinely collaborate in multiple types of service across the University and with colleagues in P–12 and community settings to improve candidate learning and facilitate the education of all students. These types can be examined as follows:

Faculty provide service to the University, schools, and community consistent with the mission of the Unit and the institution – 100%:

- Facilitated Special Olympic Village as part of Special Olympic Regional Track and Field Meet or have served as judges of the event
- Served on Board of Directors for ARC of Owensboro and Camp MARC
- Volunteered at annual Mt. St. Joseph Ursuline picnic
- Volunteered at Pitino Homeless Shelter meal each semester and with Habitat for Humanity
- Member of Disabilities Awareness Committee for Diocese of Owensboro
- Chaired St. Stephen Cathedral Restoration and Renewal Committee
- Served as a tax preparer for VITA (Volunteer Income Tax Assistance) program
- Redesigned a new Masters in Teacher Leadership Program and developed an Endorsement for Teaching English as a Second Language Learner, both now accepted by EPSB
- Attended annual *Green River Asset Building Coalition* meetings, the *Volunteer Appreciation Banquet*, and *We the People* meetings at the local community college
- Provided food, clothing, and financial gifts to the needy through local church groups

Faculty collaborate with school faculty and faculty in other units of the institution – 100%:

- As Chair of the School of Education, collaborated with other Division/School Chairs as part of the Dean’s Council
- Represented School of Education on key University committees: Faculty Welfare, Curriculum and Standards, Academic Program and Review
- Served on other University committees such as Student Welfare, the Institutional Review Board, the Institutional Computing Committee, the Faculty Assembly’s Executive Committee, and the Retention Committee
- Worked with content-area faculty to incorporate SPA standards into course syllabi and to develop Signature Assignments
- Served on various search committees for faculty hiring in multiple disciplines
- Collaborated with BU Advancement team and with STARS/BUonline and the Admissions Office to develop new recruiting materials and to recruit new students into the undergraduate and graduate SOE programs
- Initiated an effort to incorporate authentic experiences into SOE coursework and to accomplish this by creating a collaborative opportunity with Dr. Carol Maillet in Biology at BU. Candidates enrolled in Edu 441 Career and Family Life taught life skills and then co-taught science lessons to clients from Opportunity Workshop in Owensboro, KY

Faculty members are actively involved in professional associations – 100%:

- Wrote KMSA grant through Center for Middle School Academic Achievement (CMSAA) for students to attend Fall KMSA
- Served as Brescia Representative on the Kentucky Safe Schools Council
- Member KEA and CEC
- Attended AMLE Conferences

Faculty provide education-related services at local, state, national, and international levels – 100%:

- Facilitated “Make It Take It” workshop for education students
- Supervised anywhere from one to five graduate action research projects each year
- Prepared graduate students for curriculum development in K–12 schools in Kentucky and neighboring states
- Attended Owensboro Catholic Schools principals meeting to promote the MSTL
- Planned and coordinated S.P.A.C.E., a religious education group for adults with mental and physical disabilities
- Organized and attended the annual Crystal Apple Dinner to recognize cooperating teachers and each year’s clinical practice candidates
- Served on Owensboro Catholic Schools Task Force on Special Needs Children
- Engaged SOE candidates in Education courses in Junior Achievement learning opportunities in area schools
- Elected to serve on Owensboro Board of Education
- Serves on local “Grow Your Own” Initiative with area school systems and local colleges/universities to promote teaching as a viable career option
- Participated in the Governor’s Transforming Education in Kentucky Task Force
- Served on four CAEP site-visit teams
- Served as a CAEP Board of Examiners Evaluator

The Annual Faculty Activity Summary reports reflect faculty participation in these and other service activities. [Table 5.4 – Unit Faculty Community Service Involvements](#) indicates that the faculty participated in 10 different types of service to the Unit, 12 to the University, 11 to Professional Communities, and 15 to the Local Community. These reports reflect the wide range of interests and the generosity of faculty who carry full (and sometimes heavy) academic loads as part of their contractual duties, but still find the time to serve others. Service projects vary from soup kitchens, to homeless shelters, free income tax filing assistance, work with the physically and developmentally disabled, church groups, and civic or business groups (JA). SOE faculty serve alone, or with church or social groups; they also lead candidate service projects, especially with the diverse populations involving individuals who vary culturally and linguistically, economically or who have disabilities.

5d.3. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to faculty service may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

- [Faculty Handbook – Appendix E](#)
- [FH Service Expectations](#)
- [Table 5.4 – Unit Faculty Community Service Involvements](#)
- [Faculty Activity Summary 2011–2012](#)
- [Faculty Activity Summary 2012–2013](#)
- [Faculty Activity Summary 2013–2014](#)

5e. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

5e.1. How are faculty evaluated? How regular, systematic, and comprehensive are the unit evaluations of adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants?

The Brescia University practices for faculty evaluations are outlined primarily in the [Faculty Handbook 2.10.3.4](#) “Developmental Evaluation and Professional Plans. According to this document, the number of courses to be evaluated annually depends upon whether the faculty member is full-time or part-time, in the first year of service, and tenured or untenured. However, the SOE Unit evaluation practices exceed University expectations regarding faculty/course assessment. All courses in the Unit with Edu or EDL prefixes taught by full- or part-time, tenured or non-tenured faculty are evaluated each term. Candidates use the University’s [Class evaluation form](#) and follow the [evaluation protocol](#). The SOE Chair meets at least annually with each faculty member to discuss evaluation results, the annual Faculty Activity Summary, and future directions. If a problem has been identified that is serious enough to warrant a meeting with the Academic Dean, such a meeting is scheduled in collaboration with the faculty member’s Division/School Chair.

In addition to this annual course evaluation process, the SOE faculty follow the same policy for promotion and tenure review as all other full-time University faculty; this policy is outlined in the [Faculty Handbook](#) section 2.6 “Policies and Promotion” and 2.7 “Policies on Tenure.” According to this policy, both the Division/School Chair and the VPAA/Academic Dean do a classroom observation during each of the first two years of full-time faculty service. The classroom visit is followed up with a written report and a face-to-face meeting. Results from these evaluations form part of a tenure-track pre-tenure review portfolio; for non-tenure track faculty, such observations and assessments may be

submitted in a promotion application portfolio. For faculty submitting applications for promotion and/or tenure, a special student evaluation form is administered by the VPAA in all classes currently taught by the faculty member.

Both as University and SOE policy, all courses taught by part-time faculty are evaluated; the SOE Chair meets with these faculty prior to the beginning of the next semester (or at least very early in the following semester) to review the results of the course evaluations. If part-time faculty seek (or are recommended by the SOE Chair) status as Senior Lecturers, normally the VPAA and/or SOE Chair does a classroom observation, followed by a meeting with the instructor.

While only full-time and half-time faculty are required to submit annual Faculty Activity Summaries (see [Faculty Handbook](#), Appendix E), part-time faculty are evaluated formally based on the results of their course evaluations and informally through ongoing dialogue with SOE faculty and/or the SOE Chair.

5e.2. How well do faculty perform on the unit's evaluations? [A table summarizing faculty performance could be attached at Prompt 5e.4 below.]

Data available for courses taught by both full- and part-time SOE faculty during every term provide additional evidence that the level of performance is truly reflective of the actual quality of instruction candidates receive consistently in the Unit. The University [Course Evaluation Form](#) asks candidates to respond to the instructor's performance on behaviors using a 4-point rating scale, where 4 = Strongly Agree (or Excellent), 3= Agree, 2 = Disagree and 1 = Strongly Disagree (or Poor). [Table 5e.2.1](#) – “School of Education Course Evaluation Averages 2011–2015” – presents summative data for course evaluations for initial and advanced candidates. Minor edits of the evaluation form occurred in Spring 2013, which are indicated by N/A. The overall evaluation average for initial courses was 3.6 and at advanced level the course average was 3.8.

Across the semesters for initial SOE programs, the identified areas of strength included the following: *Encourages questions and/or opinions; Has adequate knowledge of the material; Shows enthusiasm for teaching the class; Grades fairly and impartially; Evaluates student performance based on material assigned, Is available for help outside of class; Summarizes or emphasizes major points in lectures or discussions; The content of the courses were appropriate for the students enrolled; Class discussions were beneficial for assignments and exams; and The instructors replied to student inquiries in a timely manner.* The chief area that rated lower scores included the following: *Returns class assignments, especially graded ones, in a timely manner.*

At the advanced level the Masters course evaluations identified the following strengths: *Returns class assignments in a timely manner and If textbook is required, presents textbook material as essential to the class.* Areas that rated lower included: *The workload for this course was appropriate and The books used for the course were appropriate.*

These data support strong faculty performance overall as rated by candidates.

[Table 5e.2.2](#) – “Course Evaluations for Common Core Courses” – shows overall averages for each common core course and the average of common core courses. Lower ratings in the introductory Edu 204 are found for 16/21 indicators, yet fall within the 3 = Agree rating. The overall average of 3.5 indicates consistent quality across the initial programs. Areas of high ratings were similar to previous ones, but areas of lower ratings also included: *Makes assignments which are clear and definite and The workload for this course was appropriate.*

The [Table 5e.2.3](#) – “Course Evaluation Comparison of Part Time to Full Time Faculty Initial Courses”– finds an average rating of 3.7 for full- *and* part-time faculty. These data offer evidence that candidates perceive full- and part-time faculty to offer consistent and equivalent quality performance.

Candidates are also allowed and encouraged to provide additional comments that they believe would be beneficial in assisting faculty to improve teaching. Such commentary provides additional specific insights to aid in the interpretation of raw number data. See [Table 5e.2.4](#) Candidate Comments on Course Evaluations 2011–2014.

5e.3. How are faculty evaluations used to improve teaching, scholarship, and service?

Unit faculty use their evaluations to reflect on their teaching and seek opportunities to improve on their craft. After the evaluations are received by the SOE Chair and distributed to faculty, if there are issues that need addressing, they are handled privately, or if an issue presents as common across the curriculum arises, during regular weekly SOE faculty meetings.

Faculty evaluations are also reviewed by the VPAA; if there is a serious issue, the VPAA meets with the SOE Chair to determine the best way to address the situation. For positive evaluations, brief encouraging notes from the VPAA are written on the top of the evaluations before distribution.

Course evaluations are also used as part of the process of applying for promotion and tenure. Both the VPAA and the Rank and Tenure Committee look for evidence of improvement as the semesters pass in order to be able to recommend faculty for either promotion or tenure. As part of the now-mandatory pre-tenure review process during the third year of a tenure-track professor’s service at Brescia, the Rank and Tenure Committee notes for the faculty member areas of perceived strength as evidenced by the portfolio presented, and they point out any apparent areas of weakness or needed growth in order to continue successfully on the path to tenure and quality teaching, professional scholarship, and service.

In addition to assisting with course improvement, faculty use end-of-year self-evaluations that are part of the Faculty Activity Summary report to improve in the areas of both professional development and service, both cornerstones of the Unit and the University. The faculty also tries to excel in scholarship within the limits of a full-time teaching load. Once each year, the SOE Chair meets with each faculty member to review their strengths and areas of improvement based on their evaluations. The faculty then design and implement a plan of growth that is reflected in their Faculty Activity Summary. Specific areas of need are addressed by appropriate professional development opportunities.

5e.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's evaluation of professional education faculty may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

- [Table 5e.2.5](#) Course Evaluation Scores 2011–2014
- [Faculty Activity Summary 2011–2012](#)
- [Faculty Activity Summary 2012–2013](#)
- [Faculty Activity Summary 2013–2014](#)

5f. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

**5f.1. How is professional development related to needs identified in unit evaluations of faculty?
How does this occur?**

In the annual Faculty Activity Summary (FAS) [2011–2012](#), [2012–2013](#), and [2013–2014](#), SOE faculty evaluate their success in meeting the previous year’s goals, list goals for their improvement for the coming academic year, and outline specific steps they will take to attain these goals. The SOE Chair reviews FAS as part of the faculty review and includes the FAS in the Division Annual Report. Faculty members, supported by the SOE Chair, pursue appropriate professional development opportunities as related to agreed-upon goals.

Three examples of how identified needs of the Unit were addressed through the use of University resources include the following. First, as part of the accreditation process, the search for needed but missing or incomplete data resulted in identifying two pressing needs of the Unit: review/revision of assessment tools and curricular mapping. The SOE Chair received funds from a Summer Hart Grant and an Ursuline Center for Teaching and Learning (UCTL) Grant specifically to respond to these identified needs. Second, in response to a need that had surfaced in spring evaluations during 2014, the SOE Chair received a Summer Hart Grant sponsored by Brescia Library staff to help faculty create LibGuides that further integrated technology into courses. Third, in response to annual self-evaluations, two SOE faculty were granted a [UCTL grant](#) to attend a Three-Day “Teaching with Technology” Conference in Atlanta.

5f.2. What professional development activities are offered to faculty related to performance assessment, diversity, technology, emerging practices, and/or the unit's conceptual framework?

A variety of professional development activities is offered to faculty, both as individuals and as an entire group. In the area of [Performance Assessment](#), the University has engaged over the past several years in identifying and addressing the need for improvement in the area of assessment both University-wide and within the various Units/Divisions. As a result of Brescia’s most recent SACSCOC accreditation visit, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research since 2010 has intensified the focus on identifying, collecting, analyzing, and engaging in what Dr. Lance Tomei has termed data-informed (as opposed to data-driven) decision-making at the University, Unit, Program, and candidate levels. As evident in the annual Fall Institute Agendas for the last four years (attendance required for all full-time faculty, with invitations to part-time faculty as well), assessment has been an ongoing topic of discussion and growth (see FALL INSTITUTE Agendas: [2012](#), [2013](#), [2014](#), and [2015](#)). One particular concern has been to strengthen Academic Program and General Education assessment, as well as to develop and assess Student Learning Outcomes. During Spring 2015, Dr. Renea Akin from Paducah Community College, a SACSCOC presenter, led a training session on “Assessment” for faculty and administration; she utilized some of the recent assessment efforts from the SOE as examples that could prove amenable to broader campus-wide application.

Faculty have utilized webinars individually or in small groups and/or with candidates to increase their knowledge base and skills in the area of performance assessment. Some examples from CEC include: Real-World Co-Teaching at the Secondary Level; Real World Co-Teaching at the Elementary Level; Standards-Aligned IEPs: an Educators’ Guide; Behavior Management Basics; and Self-Determination, UDL, Access to the General Education Curriculum, and the Third Generation of the Inclusion Movement.

In the area of [Diversity](#), the SOE brought in Donna Lanham, who presented information to faculty and candidates related to the impact of poverty on P–12 students and their learning and life outcomes.

Brescia University also hosts the Young Lecture Series as an annual event involving the campus and the wider local community. In 2011 the featured speaker was Dr. Greg Davis, a Forensic Scientist; the artist Sandra Kelly was also featured in 2011; economist Jerry Robertson spoke in 2015, as well as autism specialist Dr. Temple Grandin, who spoke to several hundred people in a presentation that was both informative and inspirational. In October 2016, nationally known educator and urban school trouble-shooter Dr. Henry Pankey will be the featured Young Lecture Series speaker that will be hosted by the School of Education; possible co-hosts include the Owensboro School Corporation and the local NAACP.

In the area of Technology, Annual Fall Institutes include opportunities for learning. Other opportunities have included Level 1 and Level 2 training offered by BU library staff for faculty on the construction and utilization of LibGuides as an electronic component to on-ground courses. Regular Friday Technology Sessions are hosted each semester by BU IT personnel, Library staff, and/or members of the Institutional Computing Committee. A variety of hardware and software items and issues have been presented. (See [Sample from Fall 2015](#).) Jeffrey Barnette, Associate Academic Dean and Director of Instructional Technology, also offers training opportunities to faculty groups or individual faculty. Currently, with the acquisition of Taskstream in the SOE and of Campus Labs for all Divisions/Units on campus, faculty members have needed introductory and supportive sessions on how each functions and how the systems (Learning House, Moodle, Net Classroom, and Blackbaud) do and don't communicate and interface with one another. Faculty in the SOE also access assistance from textbook publishers such as Pearson and Cengage to facilitate the use of their Instructor and candidate resources. Recent upgrades in hardware and software in faculty offices, in classrooms, and in computer labs across campus have also prompted Brescia IT personnel to provide group and one-on-one training for Camtasia, new projectors, new smartboards, and other software. New SOE full- and part-time faculty, as well as faculty members in other Division/Units across the campus, have been involved in state-mandated training and modules for Edmodo, SB-1, and KTIP.

Four areas of Emerging Practices merit attention. First, as seen in the [2015 Fall Institute Agenda](#), all full-time faculty received training in August 2015 on the use of Moodle technology and the “flipped classroom” approach to pedagogy. Secondly, SOE faculty and personnel involved in the 21st Century Grant with Cravens Elementary have been expanding and enhancing the opportunities for both candidates and K–4 students as Year Two of the grant begins: This year faculty and candidates will be on-site prior to, at the same time as, or even after the program has ended for the day. Teachers, staff, SOE faculty, and SOE candidates are collaborating on content and instructional strategies as well as formative assessments in order to determine impact on student learning outcomes for this unique after-school program. Thirdly, the IT department of Brescia has recently acquired an electronic device that can track a moving teacher in the classroom and record a variety of data for analysis and data-informed decision making that can later be used in a variety of ways. Unit faculty are awaiting training to begin using this device in their courses. Finally, acquiring a variety of new materials in the Curriculum Resource Center (CRC), particularly in the areas of IECE, ESL, and Social Justice, has been a priority over the last several years; materials for differentiating instruction in a number of content areas and at all levels P–12 has also been a focus. Regarding these and other emerging practices, the SOE Chair alerted both full- and part-time faculty to potential resources of interest and utilized technology to facilitate discussions and decisions about what to purchase and how to best utilize them in specific courses and across programs.

In the area of the Unit's Conceptual Framework, at the SOE Annual Fall retreat in mid-August 2012, faculty reexamined the then-current Conceptual Framework for the Unit as well as its visual represen-

tation. It was determined that both needed to be clarified and updated. The SOE Chair wrote proposals for and was awarded (on behalf of the Unit) funding from two sources at BU: Hart Grant and UCTL Grant funds. This money supported professional development days for SOE faculty during May and June of 2013, in which the faculty engaged in a process attributed to Wiggins, Stiggins and McTighe known as “Backward Design”; as a result they produced a slightly revised Mission Statement and a new visual display. Full-time and part-time SOE faculty have continued to engage in the refinement of this CF with input from current candidates, past candidates, cross-campus partners, Teacher Education Advisory Committee members, and BU administration. Some of the most recent efforts have involved alignment with BU/EPSTB/SPA standards, increased involvement of cross-campus faculty who prepare candidates in content area certification, and implementation of Signature Assignments/Related Assessments through the utilization of Taskstream as key elements in evaluating the quality of candidates, faculty, Programs, and the Unit.

5f.3. How often does faculty participate in professional development activities both on and off campus? [Include adjunct/part-time, tenured, and non-tenured faculty, as well as graduate teaching assistants.]

The [Faculty Handbook](#) (p. 2-27) states that “it is the duty of each faculty member to remain current in his/her academic area, and to continue to develop personally and professionally”; likewise, “it is the policy of the University to promote and encourage for all faculty the continuous process of scholarship . . . [thus] enriching the faculty, students, and academic programs of the University.” SOE faculty welcome and take great advantage of these professional development opportunities. Evidence of SOE full time faculty participation in professional development activities both on and off campus can be located in each faculty member’s Faculty Activity Summary submitted annually to the Chair of the SOE. Report of activity for part-time faculty is evidenced in Table 11 above, column 6. While they do not qualify for the annual \$425 (in 2015–16) allotted to full-time faculty, professional development is available in a limited number of cases to part-time faculty through SOE special funds or through special consideration by the VPAA. For the past four years, part-time faculty have been invited to the professional development sections of the annual Fall Institute. In addition, many part-time faculty have access to opportunities through their school districts or community agency employers. All four full-time SOE faculty participated, at the invitation of local schools, in a multi-day professional development in June 2013 on [Sustaining Co-Teaching](#) that featured Marilyn Friend.

An analysis of Faculty Activity Summary data and reported information from part-time faculty indicate involvement occurred in such forms as peer reviewer for a journal; supervisor of candidate research projects; presentations and/or attendance at local, state, national or international conferences; service as an officer or committee member on local, state and national committees or associations; utilization of podcast or webinar formats to access training; attendance and participation in a variety of on-campus opportunities, including technology, assessment, speakers, art displays, and Celebration of Excellence.

5f.4. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's facilitation of professional development may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

- [Faculty Activity Summary 2011–2012](#)
- [Faculty Activity Summary 2012–2013](#)

- [Faculty Activity Summary 2013–2014](#)

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 5?

SOE faculty members are exceptionally well-rounded, devoting significant time to teaching and their own professional development as educators, but also investing quality time in service to the profession of teaching, to the University as a whole, and to the wider community of this region.

2. What research related to Standard 5 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

STANDARD 6. UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

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

[In this section the unit must include (1) initial and advanced programs for teachers, (2) programs for other school professionals, and (3) off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, noting differences when they exist.]

6a. Unit Leadership and Authority

6a.1. How does the unit manage or coordinate the planning, delivery, and operation of all programs at the institution for the preparation of educators?

The School of Education (SOE) is one of six Divisions/Schools at the University under the leadership of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA), one of five Cabinet-level positions in the overall University governance structure. (See [BU Organizational Chart](#).) SOE faculty members collaborate with other faculty and staff who offer General Education Requirement (GER) courses, middle-school and secondary content area courses, and extracurricular activities.

The SOE Chair is responsible for the overall operation of both the undergraduate and graduate programs designed to prepare educators to work in early childhood settings and P–12 schools; the SOE Chair, a standing member of the Dean’s Council, is liaison with the EPSB and other educational agencies/systems, and reports to the VPAA. A separate Director of the Graduate Program has direct responsibility for the oversight of the MSTL, subject to the direction of the SOE Chair. A SOE faculty member serves on the University’s Curriculum and Standards Committee (CSC), with responsibility for initial and revised curriculum approval, as well as approval and/or development of curricular policies and standards.

SOE planning is done in two primary ways. First the Unit meets prior to the beginning of each academic year to review the Unit’s Annual Report which contains a summary of achievements, goals set and actions taken, and a preliminary Program Assessment report that includes Summary of Changes/Improvements to be Made in the Next Academic Year Based on Analysis of Assessment Results. (NOTE: Effective 2014–2015, the annual program assessment report due date to the Institutional Effectiveness Office has officially changed from June 1 year end to October 1 of the new academic year, so the August 2015 SOE planning meeting used a preliminary version of the new BU assessment grid

format.) Utilizing this information, the Unit plans for needed changes, reviews the upcoming year, plans activities, reviews the candidates' needs, and makes needed alignments of the SOE to the Institution's [2015–2020 Strategic Plan](#) and [Education Outcomes](#) (p. 41 of the *Catalog*). Second, mid-fall and mid-spring, after reviewing candidate needs the SOE meets to create the schedules for the following year. In light of identified needs, part-time faculty members are identified based on their areas of expertise and credentials. Schedules are coordinated with the University community through the Dean's Council, which includes the Registrar.

As a result of this ongoing two-part planning process, new budget needs are identified for annual budget requests due to the VPAA by Dec. 1 each year.

The SOE Chair, in collaboration with SOE faculty, the Director of the Graduate Program, the VPAA, and the Registrar, is responsible for the ongoing delivery and operation of all programs, which are monitored during weekly Unit faculty meetings led by the Chair to ensure program consistency and to address issues as they emerge in all programs. These meetings are also used to work on two other Unit operations required by the University and/or EPSB: submissions to the CSC and/or EPSB, and to the Academic Program and Review Committee (APRC), a University faculty committee with responsibility for a comprehensive review of all academic programs every five years.

New courses or course/curriculum changes are submitted to the University's CSC for approval. After official CSC approval, the proposed changes/additions (such as the IECE major and the ESL Endorsement) are submitted to the EPSB for its approval. In the case of a new program, the University SACSCOC liaison notifies or applies for relevant permission from SACSCOC.

University programs are reviewed by the APRC according to a regular cycle. The purpose ([Faculty Handbook](#), Appendix A) is "to assure the maintenance of quality and to stimulate continued development in all programs; to recognize and reward excellence in strong programs; [and] to provide for adequate faculty, administrative, and student involvement in the discontinuance of programs." The last APRC assessment of SOE programs was in 2010–2011 (see [APRC Final Letter RE Education 2011](#)); SOE programs are scheduled for APRC review in late Spring 2016.

The Unit also meets regularly with the Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC). [TEAC membership](#) includes SOE faculty; faculty from academic content areas; and teachers, principals, and central office staff as education practitioners. The Committee offers suggestions about future planning, raises operational issues (such as how portfolios are assessed), evaluates candidates, and votes on their admission to the SOE and to Clinical Practice.

Along with Faculty Development Funds, Faculty also participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation through grant-funded opportunities. The University has two avenues to fund additional faculty work within their disciplines: a [Hart Grant](#), and an [Ursuline Center for Teaching and Learning Grant](#). To improve its planning, delivery, and operations, the SOE faculty was awarded both grants in summer 2013: the first to realign curriculum with KTS and relevant SPAs, the second to design the learning progressions of the key strands: pedagogy/content, dispositions, assessment, technology, and diversity. In 2015 SOE faculty received a summer grant from the Ursuline Center for Teaching and Learning to reflect on data and implementation of Taskstream to drive the Unit forward.

Some graduate courses are offered online through the Moodle learning management system (LMS), with Adobe Connect as the program used to facilitate synchronous chat sessions. The Director of the Graduate Program oversees the development and scheduling of the online EDL courses.

6a.2. What are the unit's recruiting and admissions policies? How does the unit ensure that they are clearly and consistently described in publications and catalogues?

The Office of Admissions, under the direction of the VP for Enrollment Management, recruits according to University policies approved by the University's Admissions Committee, a faculty committee with responsibility to formulate and seek appropriate approval for admissions criteria and for making final admissions decisions on any students who do not meet the stated criteria. [BU Catalog](#), (pp. 12–15).

The SOE follows these policies, and adds additional requirements based on EPSB and SOE standards. These additional requirements for admission into the SOE include having earned passing scores on the PRAXIS I test series; initial-level demonstration of teacher dispositions and of written and oral competence; reference screening; and completion of a state police background check. For further elaboration on SOE admission policies and requirements, and the requirements for admission into Clinical Practice, see the University [BU Catalog](#), (p. 158).

In addition to relying on the Admissions Office for recruiting, if prospective University students express interest in an Education major and attend an early registration event, SOE faculty register them. Additionally, once all new freshmen arrive on campus, Student Development activities such as the “Major Fair,” part of freshmen orientation, provide other opportunities for recruitment, since faculty in all disciplines gather together with program displays to answer questions students might have. Freshman who have expressed an interest in Education are placed together in the Intro to Brescia University one-credit required freshman course, BU 101.

SOE recruiting and admission policies are reviewed by SOE faculty and the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) as part of the University's *Catalog* update. As noted above, the CSC, charged with responsibility for the *Catalog* along with its other curricular duties, contains a representative from the SOE. This ensures that the *Catalog* reflects SOE input. Approved changes are updated to the online *Catalog* every year.

All publicity materials (web and print) are reviewed whenever program changes are made ([recruitment brochures](#)). The CRC Coordinator is responsible for the SOE website. In Fall 2014 an open forum on SOE web pages with Brescia's PR Director elicited feedback from candidates and faculty, resulting in changing the SOE page layout by adding side tabs; adding Potential, Current, and Minority information; putting the Conceptual Framework (CF) on the front page; and adding hyperlinks to *Handbooks* and the current *Catalog*.

The first-level of SOE undergraduate and graduate admissions policies are found in the [BU Catalog](#) (p. 158). The Undergraduate [SOE Handbook](#) contains more details on admission requirements for Admission both to the SOE (pp. 30–33) and to Clinical Practice (pp. 35–37) High visibility areas in SOE halls and classrooms display various sections of the [SOE Handbook](#) pertaining to Unit policy changes, Admission to the SOE and to Clinical Practice, upcoming deadlines, PRAXIS information, and other timely information.

SOE candidates are formally introduced to all these admission policies in Edu 204/108. They also receive this information in one-on-one advising sessions with their program advisor.

6a.3. How does the unit ensure that its academic calendars, catalogues, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current?

The SOE course scheduling follows the University [academic calendar](#) and the [University Catalog](#) located on several different pages of the Brescia University Website and in the published *Catalog*. The online calendar is updated every year; the *Catalog*, updated as approved changes are made, includes a two-year calendar. Department-specific calendars and deadlines are included in the [SOE Handbook](#). Course times are aligned with University policy. Courses offered by part-time faculty who

are practicing teachers or other professional are offered primarily in the late afternoons or evenings. Providing candidates with time for Field experiences and observations is a consideration in course scheduling.

Annually, or when requested by VPAA, each Division/Program submits *Catalog* revisions to the CSC for approval. As noted above, that committee includes a SOE representative to ensure that its programs are current and accurately described. The online *Catalog* is updated annually to reflect changes.

Recruitment and advertising materials created by the University Communications Office for the Office of Admissions and the Unit are approved by the SOE faculty and the VPAA. At the point of republication need or when Unit changes have occurred to impact accuracy, constituents work collaboratively.

The University's letter grading system is published in the *Catalog*; however, individual faculty members and/or divisions/schools are free to determine the numeric value of the letter grades. The SOE numeric grading standard, common across the Unit, is published in all syllabi.

6a.4. How does the unit ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling?

During freshman year (2011–2014), all traditional undergraduate students took BU 101/102; the instructor for this year-long “Intro to College” course served as the student’s academic advisor. Once a student expressed interest in a specific major or at the end of their freshman year, they received an advisor in their declared discipline (or one dedicated to “undecided majors”). Since the beginning of 2014–2015, freshmen who declare an Education major are now placed in the same BU 101 course (taught by SOE faculty or staff as schedule and class size allow), and BU 102 is required only of freshmen having academic difficulty.

After the first semester in BU 101, all SOE candidates have a SOE academic advisor with whom they meet before registering each semester. Secondary Education (Biology, English, Mathematics, and Social Studies) and P–12 (Art Ed and Spanish Ed) majors must also have a second content area advisor. Middle School Education majors work in consultation with content area(s), but SOE faculty serve as their academic advisor. During advising sessions academic progress is reviewed, four-year plans are updated, permission for online or off-campus courses is requested, and PGPs are developed and reviewed. The SOE Data Manager tracks current advisees for each SOE faculty advisor. This record also identifies the content area advisor when applicable.

The Graduate Program Director advises all MSTL and TL endorsement graduate candidates, both at the mid-semester advising conference, and more informally by email, before/during/after classes held on campus, and prior to or after any academic term. The ESL Program Coordinator advises the ESL P-12 endorsement candidates.

If need for additional academic counseling/support is indicated, candidates are referred to the Compass Center (formerly "Student Support Services"); for personal rather than academic issues, students are referred to the University Counseling Center as appropriate. With the University-wide [Student of Concern](#) system now in place, any current faculty member (or a fellow student) on-ground or online can submit this form to the Director of the Counseling Center for follow-up. Someone from the CARE team or its designee then reaches out to provide the student support and resources. In addition, an [Academic Warning Slip](#), copies of which are sent to faculty advisors and coaches as well as to the candidates, provide another opportunity to suggest counseling if deemed appropriate. For graduate

candidates enrolled in online EDL courses, access to the Counseling Center can be by phone if necessary.

The [BU Student Handbook](#) endorses the KY “Medical Amnesty” policy, in which students can report themselves or others for alcohol or drug problems without disciplinary consequences.

6a.5. Which members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation? In what ways do they participate?

Members of the Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC) include representatives from the surrounding school systems and community agencies. These representatives are drawn from central office personnel, building administrators, classroom teachers and related service providers. The TEAC also includes professional faculty representatives from the English, Math, Science, History, Art, and Spanish content areas ([TEAC roster](#)). The TEAC meets two or three times per year: in the fall, spring, and (if needed) summer. Email may also be used to convey information or vote on minor issues as needed.

The TEAC serves in an advisory capacity to SOE programs. Individual members or the group as a whole also review, approve, and submit recommendations for program and policy development and modification (see [TEAC minutes](#)). They sometimes share recommendations for candidate Field placement sites and/or for Cooperating Teachers. Most recently the committee has been an essential part of the ongoing assessment and refinement of the Conceptual Framework and the refinement of portfolio scoring guidelines and procedures.

As part of the regular TEAC meeting agenda, the TEAC approves or disapproves the recommendations of the TEAC subcommittee (SOE full-time faculty) regarding each teacher education candidate’s status for Admission to SOE or Admission to Clinical Practice. They review data for each applicant and render the final decision based on three action options: Action 1: ADMIT; Action 2: DEFER; or Action 3: DENY. As part of their responsibility, they also score portfolios and provide feedback to candidates seeking Admission to Clinical Practice and integrate the resulting data into their final decision.

Prior to TEAC meetings, local area teachers, many of whom are Brescia SOE alumni, participate in the Portfolio Preview event. They score candidates’ portfolios and provide formative feedback to candidates the week before candidates formally present to TEAC as part of the Admission to Clinical Practice process.

Various other educational system practitioners (both administrators and teachers) also serve as adjunct part-time faculty, teaching SOE coursework within their area(s) of specialization. Their contributions make available to Brescia candidates a wealth of “real-world” experience and “best-practices” expertise within a wide variety of educational fields.

6a.6. How does the unit facilitate collaboration with other academic units involved in the preparation of professional educators?

TEAC members include representatives from the English, History, Mathematics, Science, Art, and Spanish content areas. As one of the Schools/Divisions of the University, the SOE enjoys the cooperation of all other Schools/Divisions in planning, scheduling, and teaching the General Education Requirements (GER) for all Brescia majors. Toward this end, a SOE representative serves on the newly

formed Educational Outcomes Assessment Committee (EOAC – formerly the Liberal Arts Committee), whose task is to assess achievement of the University’s Educational Outcomes as well as the University’s General Education Outcomes and make recommendations for needed changes.

SOE Unit faculty collaborate with the Compass Center (previously Student Support Services) to serve at-risk candidates, directing them to tutoring and test preparation practice as appropriate. SOE faculty also make recommendations to the Director of the Fr. Leonard Alvey Library for materials needed for coursework or research. In this way, the holdings of both the Sr. Sharon Sullivan Curriculum and Resource Center (CRC) Library and the main library can be enhanced.

The SOE Chair serves on the Dean’s Council, an advisory group to the VPAA. This Council meets every two weeks and is a major channel of coordination and communication across both the curricular and co-curricular spectrums. In addition, the SOE has a representative on the CSC that oversees all academic curricula. Also, a SOE member serves on the APRC, not only helping Committee members understand the required every-five-year reports on all education programs but also reviewing other University academic programs regularly with an eye toward their impact on the needs of Education majors.

Content-area faculty members have aligned their courses to cover and assess respective SPA standards, incorporating them into their syllabi. Through meetings with SOE faculty, content area faculty improve alignment of courses with SPAs and KCAS/KYECS. The VPAA also requires these faculty to complete the SB 1 training through online modules.

Faculty members outside the SOE have developed other discipline-specific courses in Math, English, and Biology for advanced candidates enrolled in the MSTL program, but these have not yet been taught.

6a.7. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit leadership and authority may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

6b. Unit Budget

6b.1. What is the budget available to support programs preparing candidates to meet standards? How does the unit's budget compare to the budgets of other units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other institutions?

Every year, each Unit (undergraduate and graduate programs) submits its operational budget for Cabinet and Board of Trustees approval. This “departmental” budget is only part of the resources allocated to the Unit. The following chart provides information over the last four years about resources allocated to the School of Education, as well as to the Social Work program, the only other program at Brescia that has significant clinical practice requirements.

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Brescia operating budget	\$ 8,755,000	\$ 9,706,000	\$ 10,752,000	\$ 11,406,000
<u>Education budget:</u>				
Salaries	\$ 217,500	\$ 231,000	\$ 246,000	\$ 250,000
Benefits	\$ 46,500	\$ 56,500	\$ 58,000	\$ 62,000
Departmental	\$ 13,800	\$ 14,800	\$ 15,000	\$ 13,900
	\$ 277,800	\$ 302,300	\$ 319,000	\$ 325,900
<u>Social Work budget:</u>				
Salaries	\$ 288,500	\$ 341,000	\$ 435,000	\$ 589,000
Benefits	\$ 63,000	\$ 67,500	\$ 87,500	\$ 119,000
Departmental	\$ 8,700	\$ 10,100	\$ 10,500	\$ 10,950
	\$ 360,200	\$ 418,600	\$ 533,000	\$ 718,950

The following points merit consideration when interpreting the data represented in this chart:

1. Faculty salaries include both full-time and part-time: the former receive full benefits (health and dental insurance, retirement, and life insurance). Budget projections for part-time faculty cannot by definition be precise, as classes sometimes have to be reassigned to full-time faculty as part of a “full” course load, and in other cases, additional sections of courses have to be created (especially in the online Social Work program).
2. Another reason that the part-time salary budget cannot be precise is that, depending on the semester, full-time faculty in related disciplines (Art Ed, Spanish Ed, Music for Classroom Teachers, Developmental Psych, etc.) sometimes teach these teacher education courses as part of their regular load; at other times, adjunct or part-time faculty must be hired.
3. The number of undergraduate education majors has remained relatively stable over the review period. However, as the Social Work online degree-completion program has continued to expand rapidly (with 412 current online declared degree-completion majors and 26 on-ground), the salary budget in Social Work has dramatically increased. For example, in 2009–2010, Brescia employed one part-time education instructor in Fall and three in Spring; during that same period, Brescia hired two part-time social work instructors in Fall and four in Spring. In contrast, for Spring 2014, Brescia employed four part-time education instructors (plus one art educator for Art 370) and 15 part-time social work instructors, many of whom teach more than one course or section.
4. Currently, there are at least two administrative support persons for each program: Education has the Data Manager and the CRC Coordinator; Social Work has an administrative assistant and two full-time 12-month student advisors (with MSW credentials). Note on this point that beginning in Fall 2015, the SOE has obtained additional support staff by four assigned Work-Study students, who provide services totaling approximately 37 hours per week. In Spring 2016 another Work-Study student will be added, with the possibility of a few more additional hours available to the Unit per week (see [SOE Work Study Master Timesheet](#)).
5. The 2013–2014 departmental budget was \$15,000: \$13,200 for undergraduate teacher education and \$1,800 for the graduate program ([2013–2014 TE and MSTL Budget](#)). Until 2013, Special Education had its own budget of \$2,200, which has now been folded into the overall undergraduate teacher education budget. In addition, there are two small restricted funds for the SOE available for use when

special funds are needed: For the 2014–2015 fiscal year approximately \$2,750 was available from these two funds. (In contrast, the social work program has one small restricted fund of approximately \$650 available this current year.)

6. When compared with other academic program budgets, the SOE Unit (“department”) budgets are larger than most because of the need for travel, postage, membership dues, and the CRC library. The only other programs on campus with significant Clinical Practice requirements are the social work degree (\$10,100) and the speech pathology/audiology (formerly CSD) degree (\$1,700). Both these budgets are smaller: the former because the majority of majors are online and thus supervised primarily by off-site supervisors, and the latter because of fewer students and fewer required site placements.

7. P–12 (Art and Spanish Ed) and content-area majors do not have budgets outside the content areas.

8. The student club, KEA/CEC, receives a small amount of funds annually from the Student Government Association for club activities, since it is an officially recognized campus organization.

6b.2. How adequately does the budget support all programs for the preparation of educators? What changes to the budget over the past few years have affected the quality of the programs offered?

The SOE has an adequate Teacher Education and a Graduate Education budget. Given a Teacher Education budget of \$12,850 for 2014–2015, \$10,914 was spent. Given a Graduate budget of \$1,050 for 2014–15, \$400 was spent.

A separate line item in the budget was created for the CRC in 2014 of \$5000.00. This money was moved from Initial and Graduate in order to track more effectively CRC spending. Last year the CRC spent \$2,948. As of mid-December 2015, only slightly more than \$1,000 had been spent on updating CRC materials and acquiring a variety of new materials, particularly in the areas of IECE, ESL, and Social Justice, which has been a priority over the last several years; materials for differentiating instruction in a number of content areas and at all levels P–12 has also been a focus. The current annual budget of \$5,000 is more than adequate to meet these needs at present.

The Dues budget was reduced by \$1,100 in 2014–2015 to reflect actual expenditures/cost of AACTE and KACTE dues. When Brescia’s SOE becomes a CAEP accredited program, the Dues budget item will be increased to reflect higher annual dues.

Overall the Teacher Education budget has increased 12% or \$1,400 from 2011–2015. The Graduate budget has decreased by \$350, due exclusively to minimal enrollment in the MSTL, TL and ESL advanced programs.

This budget does not reflect University grant money made available to the Unit as a whole for faculty training and program development, nor the University’s purchase of a software module from Campus Labs/*Compliance Assist* to track SOE data (though the SOE later chose Taskstream as a more versatile and student-friendly program and made that software program available through student subscriptions).

The previous accreditation visit resulted in an AFI regarding the need for additional support staff for the Unit. Since that time, three things have been put into place to address this AFI and bring additional support to the SOE:

- The TASKSTREAM software program has been purchased by the University and funds were allocated for training in its use. As ease of use grows, this software continues to lessen the amount of staff time required to calculate Practicum hours manually, assess and analyze scores from numerous

assessment forms, track candidate PRAXIS scores, as well as many other tasks that have heretofore been labor-intensive.

- While an additional full-time support staff person has not been hired, when the Data Manager position became open yet again, great efforts were expended to find and hire someone who already knew the field of education and was familiar with KTS and other state certification requirements, discipline-specific language, and the challenges to modern educators. With the hiring of Sr. Betsy Moyer into this position, the Unit believes it has found a staff support person who can “work faster” and more intuitively because of her significant experience in the field of education, both as an elementary teacher and as a principal.

- The SOE now has available to it several Work-Study students, whose combined workload is the approximate equivalent of an additional full-time position of 37.5 hours.

In investing in all three of these improvements, the institutional budget supports the SOE’s teacher education programs so that it has adequate staff to ensure Program quality.

6b.3. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to the unit's budget may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

[2014–2015 Teacher Education Budget Report](#) (p. 1)

[2014–2015 Graduate Education Budget Report](#) (p. 2)

6c. Personnel

6c.1. What are the institution's and unit's workload policies? What is included in the workloads of faculty (e.g., hours of teaching, advising of candidates, supervising student teachers, work in P-12 schools, independent study, research, administrative duties, and dissertation advisement)?

As outlined in the [Faculty Handbook](#) 2.10.2 “Faculty Workload” section, the normal faculty workload University-wide (with some exceptions for science lab courses and studio art classes) is now 12 hours per semester. In addition to standard credit for coursework, credit is also given proportionately to SOE faculty who supervise Practica and Clinical Practice experiences. Two-thirds credit hour per candidate is given for Clinical Practice; and faculty teaching methods courses with Practicum components of 15–20 hours are given an additional workload credit of ½ credit hour per 10 students enrolled. In light of this discipline-specific difference, faculty contract language specifies that the basic teaching load is 12–15 credit hours per semester, not to exceed 27 in two semesters.

Faculty teaching in the Graduate Program receive four credits per graduate course toward their load.

All full-time faculty members are expected to serve as advisors for up to 15 students as part of their regular load; if their advising responsibilities exceed this number, an adjustment in workload or compensation can be made by the VPAA.

Other normal duties of full-time faculty include office hours (10 per week) during which they meet with students, prepare classes and grade papers, and work on their own professional development (via reading, webinars, or other modes of learning) or research projects.

Full-time faculty also serve on University committees as assigned and appropriate. In addition, faculty are expected to provide at least some University and community service above and beyond contractual obligations.

Faculty who agree to supervise student Independent Study courses do not receive additional compensation or course load credit if these are done during the academic year. If done during the summer,

there is a pro-rated payment for such direction (one-ninth the appropriate per-credit-hour salary per student).

All faculty who wish to engage in research can apply to the VPAA for possible course load adjustment, according to the FH 2.10.2.1. Faculty may also apply for Hart Grant Summer Stipends or a Hart Grant Faculty Time-Out, both of which provide time and money for research projects. Finally, faculty are eligible for a sabbatical after seven years of full-time service.

The SOE Chair and the Graduate Program Director get one course release per semester (3 credits) for administrative duties. During years when accreditation reports are due, additional release time has been granted. Time devoted to administrative responsibilities by faculty serving as Program Coordinators for specific education majors is considered part of the normal faculty workload.

Finally, though this has not been the case during the current review period in the SOE, the VPAA can make course load adjustments (usually one-course release time) for full-time faculty attempting to complete their dissertation.

6c.2. What are the faculty workloads for teaching and the supervision of clinical practice?

As noted above, FT faculty members now generally teach 4 courses or 12 credit hours per semester. However, before the [Faculty Handbook](#) revision in 2011–2012, the previous VPAA considered standard workload to include up to 27 credits per year, as per contact language, so faculty during that time had 12/15 or 15/12 loads for Fall/Spring semesters. Some SOE workloads were between 24 and 27 credit hours. However, since Fall 2012, the standard 12–12 course load is normative, and faculty teaching more than that are given overload credit. Credit for supervision of Practicum is calculated on a 1/3 credit per candidate and supervision of Clinical Practice candidates is calculated on a 2/3 credit per candidate ratio.

Faculty supervising candidates in significant (15–20 hours) Field experiences receive ½ credit hour per 10 candidates supervised. As specified in the “Faculty Workload” policy cited above, faculty receives overload payment when the combination of courses taught, candidate supervision, and/or administrative responsibilities exceed 12 hours per semester.

The [SOE Faculty Workload](#) chart outlines the various teaching loads faculty have carried during AYs 2011–2015. As is evident, one instructor with dual responsibilities for middle grades and special education regularly teaches an overload, while on occasion other faculty members do not have a full load. When that occurs, the latter assume more of the administrative responsibilities as appropriate, or in one case, agree to convert 1–2 MSTL courses into the online format as part of her regular load.

6c.3. To what extent do workloads and class size allow faculty to be engaged effectively in teaching, scholarship, and service (including time for such responsibilities as advisement, developing assessments, and online courses)?

University-wide, the faculty-to-student ratio is 1–14. This would be similar for both on-campus and online courses. Few SOE classes have more than 15 students, and the larger classes are those required for all education majors. Most major-specific courses are approximately eight students per course. Graduate numbers are considerably smaller, often two or three students per course (due in part to being an on-campus program). SOE faculty have ample opportunity to engage in effective teaching and ongoing dialog/mentoring with candidates, to undertake scholarly efforts, and to participate in professional development.

The SOE workload for most faculty has been low enough to allow for fulfillment of University expectations regarding student advising, service, and student engagement ([SOE Annual Report 2014–2015 Report Faculty Development and Service](#)).

This past fall, because of minimal enrollments in some graduate courses, the Graduate Program Director was granted course load equivalency to convert two MSTL courses into an online format. Normally, time for developing program and course assessments would be part of the weekly SOE faculty meetings, and would thus be part of standard workloads.

6c.4. How does the unit ensure that the use of part-time faculty contributes to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the unit and its programs?

Part-time faculty must have the same credentials as full-time faculty, as demonstrated by transcripts and current CVs on file in the VPAA’s office. Part-time faculty members are represented in TEAC, so that they bring their experience to the planning and evaluation processes. All part-time faculty members are invited to attend a part-time faculty orientation by the VPAA at the beginning of each academic year; this orientation provides an introduction to the Ursuline educational tradition, to the history and mission of Brescia University, and to the policies and procedures needed by faculty. These orientation modules are available online at [About Brescia](#) and [Academic Resources](#). Thus the quality of part-time faculty is expected to be at the same level as that for full-time faculty.

The SOE Chair reviews all faculty syllabi (including part-time) for consistency with the University’s [Syllabus Template](#) and meets regularly with part-time faculty to review course evaluations. She has adjusted her daily office schedule, so that she comes in later each day and stays later into the early evening in order to be available for part-time instructors teaching in late afternoon. All of these efforts, from requiring the same credentials to providing multiple opportunities for orientation and faculty development, from the availability of the SOE Chair for support and direction to part-time faculty inclusion in the TEAC point to the integrity (defined as “wholeness”) of the SOE program. Faculty, expectations, and work are woven together in a remarkably seamless whole, resulting in a higher quality educational experience for Brescia’s SOE candidates.

In terms of coherence, the SOE faculty works with part-time instructors to ensure that candidates have experiences that are aligned with: KCAS, P–12 student assessment requirements, SOE dispositions, and relevant teacher standards. Their presence on the TEAC ensures that they have a sense of the overall SOE and its programs and are committed to the CF and other SOE policies and procedures.

The use of part-time faculty allows the SOE to offer candidates quality content and skill development in areas of expertise that full-time faculty do not currently have, as is currently the case in the areas of instructional technology, math education, science education, and reading and language arts. Furthermore, these part-time faculty bring their expertise and current practice within contemporary educational settings to the classroom, thereby enriching SOE candidates’ exposure to many different approaches and experiences.

6c.5. What personnel provide support for the unit? How does the unit ensure that it has an adequate number of support personnel?

The SOE has a full-time Data Manager who keeps meeting minutes; tracks candidates' progress through various program levels; compiles data for SOE, University, and EPSB/ Department of Education reports; and in other ways assists the SOE Chair, other Unit faculty and candidates.

The CRC Coordinator (30 hours per week) is responsible for oversight of the Sr. Sharon Sullivan Curriculum Resource Center, including circulation statistics. He also assigns the Field/Clinical Practice placements and keeps the record of these candidate experiences, with an eye particularly to ensuring that the required DIVERSITY of Field placements and 15 KAR 5:040 requirements for SOE and EPSB are attained.

Institutional support for ongoing technology needs comes from the IT department (and the Learning House Help Desk for online courses); the Director of Institutional Research and Institutional Effectiveness (IRE) provides data for ongoing program assessment and assists SOE faculty in improving the quality of their Annual Reports; librarians provide training for faculty to create Lib-Guides for courses, solicit purchase suggestions (print, online, and AV) from all academic areas, and this past fall provided training in various available campus technology resources. In addition, the Director of Communications (from the Advancement Office) posts and updates SOE material on the Brescia website and designs and prints advertising brochures. The Registrar's Office helps the Unit track candidate grades, course pre-registrations, cumulative and major-specific GPAs, and progress toward degree completion. The Financial Aid Office supports students earning or needing scholarship or other financial aid. Finally, the Office of Student Development (including the Director of Student Activities and Leadership Development, Director of Campus Ministry, Director of Residence Life, and Director of the Counseling Center) provides various kinds of non-academic student assistance.

When short-term additional support personnel are needed, the SOE Chair makes a request to the VPAA, who submits a personnel requisition form to HR, subject to approval by the CFO and University President. Such additional (temporary) staff was requested and hired during this past two years to assist in preparation of the self-study.

The previous accreditation visit resulted in an [AFI](#) regarding the need for additional support staff for the Unit. Since that time, three things have been put into place to address this AFI and bring additional support to the SOE:

- The TASKSTREAM software program has been purchased by the University and funds were allocated for training in its use (students purchase their own individual license). As ease of use grows, this software continues to lessen the amount of staff time required to calculate Practicum hours manually, assess and analyze scores from numerous assessment forms, track candidate PRAXIS scores, as well as many other tasks that have heretofore been labor-intensive.

- While an additional full-time support staff person has not been hired, when the Data Manager position became open yet again, great efforts were expended to find and hire someone who already knew the field of education and was familiar with KTS and other state certification requirements, discipline-specific language, and the challenges to modern educators. With the hiring of Sr. Betsy Moyer into this position, the Unit believes it has found a staff support person who can "work faster" and more intuitively because of her significant experience in the field of education, both as an elementary teacher and as a principal.

- The SOE now has available to it several Work-Study students, whose combined workload is the approximate equivalent of an additional full-time position of 37.5 hours.

In investing in all three of these improvements, the institutional budget supports the SOE's teacher education programs by ensuring adequate staff for the Unit to accomplish its mission.

6c.6. What financial support is available for professional development activities for faculty?

SOE faculty have several sources of funding available for their professional development:

1. All full-time faculty receive a small annual Faculty Development Fund allotment to be used at their discretion (conference attendance, books, professional dues, etc.). It has been part of the ongoing 2011–2016 Strategic Plan to increase that amount at least slightly each year; in 2014–15 the allotment was \$388, and for 2015 it is \$424. Faculty who do not use any or all of their allotment may share it with other members of the School/Division.
2. For a special project and with the approval of the VPAA, SOE faculty MAY use some of the education restricted funds for professional development in an identified need area.
3. Faculty who have been at Brescia at least one full year CAN apply for the various Hart Grants (see [Faculty Handbook](#) Appendix H), and all full-time SOE faculty have received such grants, most recently this past summer. These grants are awarded annually by the VPAA, based on the recommendation of the Division/School Chairs. Hart amounts available (depending on number of people applying and whether applicants have recently received Hart funds) include:
 - Summer Stipend: Up to \$1,500
 - Faculty Time-Outs: Part-time faculty replacement for one course, plus up to \$250 for specific items related to proposed Project
 - Summer or January Institutes (for 3 or more faculty working on an interdisciplinary project): Up to \$3,000
 - Travel Stipend: Up to \$700
 - Conference Stipend: Up to \$1,000
4. Beginning in 2011–2012, faculty could also apply for grants from the Ursuline Center for Teaching and Learning ([UCTL Grant Fund](#)), according to the same process as used for Hart Grants. All full-time SOE faculty have also received this grant recently.
5. Beginning in Spring 2016, faculty will have access to additional faculty development funds through the recently-awarded SIP Title III grant from the federal government. One of the objectives of that grant is to provide more significant funding than previously available to faculty in the targeted areas of assessment, pedagogy, and technology.

Other professional development resources (print, DVD, and online) are available in the Ursuline Center for Teaching and Learning room in the University Library, funded out of the Office of the VPAA.

Full-time faculty with more than seven years of service are eligible for a full-semester sabbatical, or for half-time status for an entire year. Faculty receiving this opportunity usually develop new courses, work on significantly enhancing or revising existing courses, or do independent research in their field.

6c.7. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to personnel may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

6d. Unit facilities

6d.1. How adequate are unit--classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, the technology infrastructure, and school facilities--to support teaching and learning? [Describe facilities on the main campus as well as the facilities at off-campus sites if they exist.]

The Administration Building houses the School of Education, which uses three third-floor classrooms: 344, 350, and the CRC computer lab (340); each is large enough, and long tables and chairs have replaced traditional desks. Each space has technology access: 350 has an interactive LCD projection system along with computer. Room 344 has a computer/LCD projector with white screen. The Computer Lab, which can be accessed daily until 2 a.m. via a current Brescia ID card, contains 20 new 2015 Dell multi-core Intel-based computers, equipped with 19" LCD monitors, and connected to Brescia's network, allowing for internet connectivity speeds up to 100 Mbps. Computers run the Windows 7 operating system and have various software packages installed, such as Adobe Photoshop Elements, PSP, SPSS Statistical Analysis Software, Microsoft Office Professional 2013, and Read and Write Gold. Also available is a multimedia program complete with an interactive LCD projector, Elmo, DVD, and VCR/Videodisc players.

Faculty/staff office computers were recently upgraded with Windows 7 and dual monitors as needed. Wireless access is available throughout the building, allowing internet access for personal devices. The underlying network infrastructure is re-evaluated annually, adding or replacing needed network switches for higher bandwidth. Building wireless access is also mapped to realign or add coverage in areas with the most activity. New Cisco switches and Enterasys wireless access points have been added in key locations to improve network performance and wireless coverage. The core wireless controller runs with redundant hardware to allow for more stability and bandwidth throughput on campus.

SOE offices are sufficient; it is especially helpful that they are in the same area, solidifying relationships through frequent interaction. Classroom space available in the same area for program-specific courses is an additional bonus to faculty and candidates alike, in that candidates have easy and frequent access to faculty, who in turn have opportunities to view/hear/and interact with candidates outside of class.

The Father Leonard Alvey Library provides additional technology supports. Available to candidates are 15 PC workstations throughout the library; 10 laptops which can be checked out and used in the library; 10 laptops which can be checked out for a week outside of library; wireless access throughout the building; digital cameras; digital camcorders; webcams; flash drives; headphones with microphones; a digital voice recorder; multimedia technology lab with 10 PCs and hook ups for 10 laptops; three group study rooms with projection system/monitors; and two scanners.

The Curriculum Resource Center (CRC) uses Resource Mate to catalog and track materials. A stand-alone CPU allows candidates to search electronically through Resource Mate.

6d.2. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit facilities may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

6e. Unit resources including technology

6e.1. How does the unit allocate resources across programs to ensure candidates meet standards in their field of study?

SOE faculty determines ordinary specific program needs during their regular weekly meetings; these specific needs are then funded from the annual operational ("departmental") budget. There have been no complications arising from folding the Special Education budget into the overall Teacher Education budget in 2013–2014. Itemizing the \$5,000 CRC budget has allowed for more detailed tracking of CRC expenditures. Programs utilize the CRC budget to build resources in the CRC to support can-

didates as they meet standards in their field of study. The need for additional technology is funneled through IT or the Institutional Computing Committee (ICC), which includes a SOE representative. When needs are identified that cannot be met by the SOE operational budget, the SOE restricted fund, or the current IT budget, a request is submitted through the VPAA to the Cabinet for possible inclusion in the following year's budget. Utilization of the [Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment Document](#), Section "Need Summary – Based on Analysis of Assessment Results," helps track requests for budget considerations/request to accommodate needs.

Since the departmental budget is unified, with no divisions for specific SOE programs, SOE faculty collaborate on Unit spending, dividing the resources among the various Programs as needed. To date, there have been no problems with this approach.

6e.2. What information technology resources support faculty and candidates? What evidence shows that candidates and faculty use these resources?

Brescia has campus-wide wireless internet access. Each faculty office also has a desktop computer, and all faculty and candidates have a University email account accessible both on and off campus, along with access to all the Library's online databases. Recent technology upgrades and several ongoing technology assessment procedures were described above in 6d.1. Each University academic program identifies how its majors meet computer competency. All SOE candidates demonstrate competency through Edu 246: Technology Application and Integration in Education, taught in the CRC computer lab (A340) with a Signature Assignment/Related Assessment where candidates demonstrate appropriate technology use. Candidates in Art Education have access to an Apple Graphic Design lab. The Library has extensive resources as stated in 6e.4. SOE faculty developed Lib-Guides, which served for a time as a resource for course materials. These have not been updated due to a shift to Moodle and Taskstream. The University has given Moodle access (long available in online courses) to all on-campus faculty/classes, enabling online blogging, posting/grading of assignments, and uploading of filmed lectures and other course materials. Up to this point, assessment data for SOE candidates has been tracked using Excel spreadsheets and Word documents; the transition to utilizing Taskstream has begun, with initial assessment information for candidates related to their signature assignments to be available this spring.

Two SOE faculty attended a 3-day "Teaching with Technology" Conference in Atlanta in Fall 2013. All SOE faculty continue to take advantage of multiple on-campus training opportunities. All SOE faculty and staff attended a 2-day workshop in the CRC lab on Taskstream presented by a consultant in August 2015.

The Institutional Computing Committee (ICC) meets monthly to assess technology and information literacy needs, and a SOE faculty member serves on the committee. ICC conducts student, staff, and faculty surveys to gain input. Based on input, new software is purchased, additional classrooms are chosen for technology upgrades, and topics are generated for Friday technology sessions. This committee recommended, for example, that the LCD projector in one of the SOE classrooms be upgraded, which happened this past summer.

In various courses, candidates are required to stay current in their field by reading journal articles, to be found in Library databases; they must in this way demonstrate competency in accessing these databases. Candidates also demonstrate use of technology resources in their lesson plans, and KTS Standard 6 of their Application to Clinical Practice and Clinical Practice Portfolios. Lesson plans and portfolios are uploaded to Taskstream. Portfolio scorers, both SOE faculty and community partners, access portfolios through Taskstream.

6e.3. What resources are available for the development and implementation of the unit's assessment system?

The SOE has adequate resources for the development and implementation of its assessment system. Though there has been turnover in the Unit office, the SOE has a full-time “education professional” serving as Data Manager; among her other responsibilities she tracks assessment of SOE candidates throughout their specific majors. The CRC Coordinator tracks Field placement experiences using KFETS as well, with a particular focus on ensuring the necessary diversity of experiences and 15 KAR 5:040 requirements. Academic information is obtained through the University’s Blackbaud and NetClassroom data systems. In turn, this information is catalogued and tracked through the various forms specifically developed by the SOE. The SOE currently utilizes Taskstream to track student data. Still in the beginning stages of use, Taskstream is poised to serve as the tool for data management for Unit, Programs, and candidates.

The University’s Director of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) is available with resources for standard program assessment reports needed for the required annual Division/School Reports and the APRC cycle of program assessments. To aid in this endeavor, the University has purchased a software system, Campus Labs/Compliance Assist, into which Area Coordinators of all University majors and programs input data for annual assessment and eventual SACSCOC reporting. In addition, if needed information about specific teacher education candidates is not readily available to SOE advisors and/or the Data Manager, the IRE Director or the University Registrar is available to find the information.

During this current assessment cycle, the University has funded (through both Hart and Ursuline Center for Teaching and Learning grants) significant faculty work and an outside consultant to revise the Unit’s assessment system. In other situations, as needed, the VPAA has offered course release time to create or revise needed procedures and forms.

6e.4. What library and curricular resources exist at the institution? How does the unit ensure they are sufficient and current?

Brescia’s Fr. Leonard Alvey Library houses approximately 83,704 print volumes. Additional access to approximately 170,000 electronic titles is available through subscription databases. Last year the Library purchased four hundred thirty-five (435) print volumes, one hundred sixty-five (165) ebsco ebook volumes, forty-six (46) Gale ebook volumes, sixty-eight (68) DVDs, four (4) music cds and twenty (20) audiobook titles for a total of \$32,100.19. It received and processed gifts of one hundred sixty-one (161) hardbound books, fifty-four (54) DVD titles, four (4) computer file cd titles and one (1) music cd title. Catalogued web sites are checked annually for address accuracy and live sites. Electronic databases subscribed to last year include these eBook Collections: 1) ACLS Humanity E-books; 2) EBSCO eBook Collection; 3) EBSCO eBook Academic Collection; 4) Gale Virtual Reference Library; 5) Oxford Reference Online; and 6) Salem Press – Health, History and Literature.

Journal Databases include 1) EBSCOhost (36 databases; 25 are full-text); 2) JSTOR – 2 full text journal databases; and 3) ProQuest Direct – 21 journal databases, all full-text. Other Databases include 1) Atomic Learning; 2) Britannica Online; 3) Country Watch; 4) Facts on File: World News Digest Database; 5) First Search WorldCat – library catalogs from all over the world; 6) Gale – CLC literature database; 7) Historic Documents; 8) Kentucky Encyclopedia; 9) Kentucky Virtual Library; 10) Learning Express Library; 11) Origins Online; 12) Oxford Biblical Studies Online; 13) Science Online and Science Express; 14) VAST: Academic Video Online; and 15) WT Cox Journal Finder. Materials not available in the Brescia Library may be requested through interlibrary loan.

Current Brescia ID cards allow Library access to all other city libraries: the Daviess County Public Library, the Kentucky Wesleyan College Library, and the Owensboro Community and Technical College Library.

The UCTL offers money for faculty development opportunities and resource purchases that are made available in the UCTL resource room in the Library.

The CRC makes resources available to SOE faculty and candidates. These resources include P-12 texts and materials, manipulatives, professional resources in disciplines, PRAXIS test preparation materials, and professional journals. SOE faculty periodically cull outdated materials, review the holdings, and determine if additional materials are needed in their specialty areas. Recent areas of focus have been: IECE, ESL, Social Justice and resources for differentiated instruction and assessment for diverse P-12 student populations.

6e.5. How does the unit ensure the accessibility of resources to candidates, including candidates in off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs, through electronic means?

Most SOE candidates take courses on campus, and thus have physical access both to the University Library and to the CRC resources. Candidates have remote access to University Library resources through the many online Library databases, most of which are listed above in q. 6e.4; these are accessible anywhere on campus that has wireless access, including residence halls and off campus. Through the candidates' BU email accounts, they are also available via the internet from anywhere, even beyond campus. These online databases are essential to candidates in the online graduate courses currently offered as part of the MSTL; however, many candidates are local and able to access both the University and the CRC libraries in person if they so choose.

Also available to all candidates via the Library homepage is any developed SOE Lib-Guide.

This fall the University launched Moodle for on-campus course communication and support of content delivery.

If a SOE candidate needs a resource from the CRC and cannot get to campus, the CRC Coordinator can mail the resource. Recently attention is being given to purchasing items where print and e-book formats are bundled together and more e-book resources are also being acquired.

6e.6. (Optional Upload for Online IR) Tables, figures, and a list of links to key exhibits related to unit resources, including technology, may be attached here. [Because BOE members should be able to access many exhibits electronically, a limited number of attachments (0-3) should be uploaded.]

Optional

1. What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 6?

The Unit does an outstanding job of utilizing existing resources within Brescia and networking with local schools systems and alumni to gain additional resources. Part-Time Faculty members bring expertise and resources to meet candidates' needs. Practicum and Clinical Practice placements serve to complete and compliment needs of candidates in technology areas such as Infinite Campus and other fee-based instructional technologies.

2. What research related to Standard 6 is being conducted by the unit or its faculty?

Not applicable

Appendices

Appendix A: Linked EDU Form Numbers and Titles

- [EDU #1: Admission to School of Ed](#)
- [EDU #2: Appl for Adm to School of Ed](#)
- [EDU #4A: Faculty Recommendation](#)
- [EDU #4A "Old": Faculty Recommendation](#)
- [EDU #4B: Professional Disposition](#)
- [EDU #4B "Old": Faculty Recommendation](#)
- [EDU #5A: Interview Presentation Rating Form](#)
- [EDU #5A "Old": Interview Presentation Rating form](#)
- [EDU #6: Admission into Clinical Practice](#)
- [EDU #7: Application for Adm to Clinical Practice](#)
- [EDU #8: Health Certificate](#)
- [EDU #10: TC and CT Information](#)
- [EDU #11: Personal Data](#)
- [EDU #12: Formative Evaluation CT](#)
- [EDU #13: Formative Evaluation US](#)
- [EDU #14A: Final Eval Form A](#)
- [EDU #15: Final Eval Form B](#)
- [EDU #16A: Field Supervision Evaluation](#)
- [EDU #17 ESL: Field Experience Practicum Supervisor and Candidate Form](#)
- [EDU#17A ESL: University Supervisor Form](#)
- [EDU #18: Record UG Field Clinic Exp Showing Diversity](#)
- [EDU #20: Field Exp Accountability Form](#)
- [EDU #23A: TEAC Portfolio Preview P-12](#)
- [EDU #23B: TEAC Portfolio Preview IECE](#)
- [EDU #24A: TEAC Portfolio Presentation P-12](#)
- [EDU #24A "Old": TEAC Portfolio Presentation P-12](#)
- [EDU #24B: TEAC Portfolio Presentation IECE](#)
- [EDU #25A: Portfolio Eval CT P-12](#)
- [EDU #25A "Old": Portfolio Evaluation Cooperating Teacher P-12](#)
- [EDU #25B: Portfolio Eval CT IECE](#)
- [EDU #25B "Old": Portfolio Evaluation Cooperating Teacher IECE](#)
- [EDU #26: Content Assessment](#)
- [EDU #27: Prof Growth Plan \(PGP\)](#)
- [EDU #28: Portfolio Development Guide](#)
- [EDU #29A: P-12 Portfolio Review-US](#)
- [EDU #29B: IECE Portfolio Review US](#)
- [EDU #29A "Old": University Supervisor Review of Clinical Practice Portfolio - P-12](#)
- [EDU #29B "Old": University Supervisor Review of Clinical Practice Portfolio - IECE](#)
- [EDU #30A: Portfolio Teacher Standards Rubric](#)
- [EDU #30B: Portfolio IECE Standards Rubric](#)
- [EDU #30 "Old": Portfolio Rubric](#)
- [EDU #31: CT Evaluation](#)
- [EDU #32A: Prof Growth Plan IECE Self Assessment P-12](#)
- [EDU #32B: Prof Growth Plan IECE Self Assessment IECE](#)
- [EDU #33: Code of Ethics](#)
- [EDU #34: Permission to Digitally Video Record](#)
- [EDU #35: Digital Observation Form](#)
- [EDU #36: Character and Fitness Review](#)

Source of Evidence

Overview

A. Institution

BU Catalog
The Champaign for Brescia University Publication
Owensboro *Messenger-Inquirer's* Bright Future article
2015-2020 Strategic Plan

B. The Unit

Y1: MSTL program Change Proposal
Y2: Minutes School of Education Approval of MSTL curriculum change
Y3: Minutes of Curriculum Committee Approval of MSTL Program Change

C. Conceptual Framework

Conceptual Framework
CF Image
BU Catalog
Integrated Technology Lesson and Rubric
Alignment of Diversity with Ursuline Values
Continuous Assessment Plan

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.a. Content Knowledge of Teacher Candidates

Table 1a.2.1 Average Overall GPA at Application to SOE
Table 1a.2.2 Average Overall GPA at Application to CP
EDU #12
EDU #14
EDU #13
Table 1a.2.3 Content Knowledge in Clinical Practice by CT and US Observations
Table 1a.2.4a Content Knowledge Evidence in Application to SOE and CP Portfolios KTS 1
EDU #24A
EDU #24B
EDU #25A
EDU #25B
EDU #29A
EDU #29B
EDU #30
Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC)
Table 1a.2.4b Portfolio Scoring per Indicator 2014-2015
EDU #16
Table 1a.2.5 Content Knowledge Field Experience
Table G6b ESL GPA Data
Table G6 MSTL GPA Data
Table G7 MSTTL PRAXIS Scores

Lesson Unit Assignment

Rubric

Table G1

Table S3

ARP Form 4

Exhibit F4

Graduate Exit Survey

KTS Table 1a.4.1

Table 1a.4.2 Content Knowledge New Teacher Survey 2011–2012

MSTL Program Exit Survey

2013 MSTL Exit Survey Data

2015 MSTL Exit Survey Data

Chart GS1

1.b Pedagogical Content Knowledge of Teacher Candidates

Table 1b.1.1 GPA of the Unit at Application to CP

KTIP Rubric

Table 1b.1.6 Pedagogical Content Knowledge Data from KTIP Lesson Plan Rubric

Table 1b.1.2 Pedagogical Content Knowledge in Clinical Practice by CT and US Observations

Table 1b.1.3 Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skill Evidence in Application to CP and CP

Table 1b.1.5 Pass Rates on Principles of Learning and Teaching Exams for Initial Teacher Preparation
Technology Integrated Lesson Assessment

Table 1b.3.1 Graduate Exit Survey Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Table 1b.3.2 Pedagogical Content Knowledge New

Teacher Survey 2011–2012

Table SG1

Table GS1

Chart SG4

Chart SG6

Chart SG7

Table SG1

Table SG3

Table SG5

Table SG2

1.c Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills of Teacher Candidates

Table 1c.1.1 Average Professional and Pedagogical GPA at Application to SOE

Table 1c.1.2 Average professional and pedagogical GPA at Application to CP

EDU #4A

EDU #4B

Table 1c.1.3 Professional Disposition

Table 1c.1.7 Pedagogical Knowledge Data from KTIP Lesson Plan Rubric

Table 1c.1.4 Professional and Pedagogical Evidence in Clinical Practice by CT and US Observations

Table 1c.1.5 Professional and Pedagogical Evidence in Application to SOE and CP Portfolios

Table 1c.1.6 Professional Skills Field Experiences

KTS Assessments within the MSTL Program

Table 4 MSTL links to KTS
EDL 620 Course Syllabus
EDL 655 Course Syllabus
EDL 671 Course Syllabus
EDL 570 Signature Assignment Rubric
Table 4.2 Assessment Descriptions and Rubrics
Exhibit IG 22
Signature Assignments
Chart for Course Averages for Signature Assessment submitted in Taskstream
EDU #35
Task A1
Task A2
Task C
Table 1c.2.4 Overall Averages from KTIP Lesson Plan Rubric
Field Handbook
Table 1c.2.2 Pedagogical Evidence in Application to CP and CP Portfolios
Table 1c.2.3 Pedagogical Knowledge Evidence in Application to CP and CP
Exhibit S3
Integrated Technology Lesson and Rubric
Exhibit 1G1
Exhibit 1G2
Exhibit S3
Exhibit IG3
Exhibit 1G4
Exhibit 1G5
Diversity Form #20Graduate
Exhibit 1G6
Exhibit 1G7
Exhibit IG8
Exhibit 1G9
Exhibit 1G10
Exhibit 1G12
Exhibit 1G13
Exhibit 1G14a
Exhibit 1G14b
Exhibit 1G16
Exhibit 1G17
Exhibit 1G18a
Exhibit 1G18b
Table 1c.4.1 Graduate Exit Survey Results for Professional Pedagogical Knowledge
Table 1a.4.2 Professional Pedagogical Knowledge New Teacher
Survey 2011–2012

1.d Student Learning

Table 1d.1.4 Student Learning Averages from KTIP Lesson Plan Rubric
Table 1d.1.5 Advocacy Averages from KTIP Lesson Plan Rubric

Table 1d.1.1 Student Learning in Clinical Practice by CT and US Observations
Table 1d.1.2 Student Learning Skill Evidence in Application to CP and CP Portfolios
Table 1d.1.3 Supervisor Evaluations of Student Learning Field Experiences
Exhibit 1G19
Exhibit 1G20
Exhibit 1G21a
Exhibit 1G21b
Table 1d.3.1 Graduate Exit Survey Student Learning
Table 1d.3.2 Student Learning New Teacher Survey 2011–2012
Exhibit SG17
Table SG3
Table SG4

1g Professional Dispositions

EDU #5

Table 1g.2.1 Oral and Dispositional Skills Interview 2011–2015

Table 1g.2.2 Advocacy Disposition at Core Courses and Application to SOE

Table 1g.2.3 Field Supervisor Evaluations of Advocacy

Table 1g.2.4 Professional Disposition Advocacy in Clinical Practice by CT and US Observations

Table 1g.2.5 Advocacy Evidence in Application to CP and CP Portfolios

MSTL Interview

Interview Rating Guide

Table 5D

MSTL Performance Assessment of Unit's CF

Midpoint Evaluation

Exit Evaluation Form

Table IG3

Table 1g.3.1 Field Supervisor Evaluations of Professional Dispositions

Table 1g.3.2 Ethics

Table 1g.3.4 Service

Table 1g.3.5 Lifelong Learning

Table 1g.3.6 Collaboration Evidence in Application to CP and CP Portfolios

Table IG2

EDU #17 ESL Field Experience and Practicum Formative Evaluation

Table 1g.4.1 Graduate Exit Survey Dispositions

Table 1g.4.2 Professional Dispositions New Teacher Survey 2011–2012

Table SG7

Chart SG8

Table SG8

Chart SG9

Table SG9

Chart SG10

Table SG10

Chart SG11

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

2.a Unit Assessment System

Table 2a.1.1 Key Assessments

Table 2a.1.2 Continuous Assessment System Aligned with Program Levels 1–4 and Kentucky Teacher Standards P–12 and IECE

Table 2a.1.3 Alignment with the Specialized Professional Associations for Assessments

Table 2a.1.4 Assessments aligned with the KTS

Table 1g.2.1 Unit’s Assessment System

BU Mission

SOE Conceptual Framework and Mission

Table 2a.1.8 BU Educational Outcomes

MSTL Performance Assessment of Unit’s CF

Signature Assignments

Table 5D

Coaching/Mentoring Form

Interview Questionnaire Rating Guide

Interview Questions

Mid-program Evaluation Form

Exit Program Evaluation Form

KTS Assessments within the MSTL Program

Table 4

EDL 620 Course Syllabus

EDL 655 Course Syllabus

EDL 671 Course Syllabus

EDL 57- Signature Assignment Rubric

ARP Form 4

2a.2 Table 6

Graduate Exit Survey

Table 8B

Exit Survey

Table 2a.5.1 Assessment System

Unit Assessment System Visual

Data Day Minutes

Faculty Handbook

APRC Calendar 2015-2016

Program-wide Assessments

Lesson Plan Rubric P-12

Lesson Plan Rubric IECE

Key Assessments

Signature Assignment and Related Assessment

EDU #17

EDU #17A

“Old” EDU #4A

“Old” EDU #4B

EDU #4A

EDU #4B

Table 4.2 Sample Assessments and Rubrics

Unit Assessment System
Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment
Table 2a.5.2 SOE Common Core Courses
Table 2a.5.3 Initial Level Signature Assignments and Related Assessments
MSTL SA + RA Advanced Level Signature Assignments and Related Assessments
Table M8

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

Table 2b.1.1 Detail Key Assessments
Table 2b.1.2 Data Collection of Key Assessments
Survey Monkey
Learning House
Blackbaud
Taskstream
Table 8C
Table 9
BU Student Handbook Grievance Procedure
Probation/Termination Policy

2.c Use of Data for Program Improvement

Assessment Grid – Secondary
 -Special Education LBD P-12
 -Elementary Education
 - Middle Grades 5-9
Annual Faculty Activity Summary
Unit’s Annual Report
EDU #31
Future Educators
Minority Recruitment
Table 2c.2.1 Field Experience Requirements
Clinical Practice Seminar Session
Signature Assignments and Related Assessments in all EDU and EDL Course at Initial
and Advanced Levels
Table 2c.4.1 Feedback Loops for P–12 and IECE Candidates at Initial Program Levels 1–4
TEAC Minutes
Table M2.3
S2.4
S2.5
Grid 2013-2014
Grid 2014-2015

Standard 3 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

3.a Collaboration Between Unit and School Part-
ners

Teacher Education Advisory Committee (TEAC)
Letters of Agreement with Superintendents
Letters of Agreement with local agencies

Memoranda of Understanding
Redesign Committee Members
Field Placement Sheet
EDU #24A
EDU #24B
TEAC Minutes
EDU #16
EDU #12
EDU #13
EDU #14
EDU #15
EDU #25A
EDU #25B
EDU #29A
EDU #29B
Master's Redesign Committee
Samples Graduate Committee Minutes
Form P3A
Form P4
Form P2
EDU #17A
Field Handbook
School Contacts
Letter of Introduction
EDU #7
CP Handbook
Form P1
Diversity Form #20G
Sustaining Co-Teaching
Leadership Days
KCAS math
CP Seminars
Table 7B
Table 7C

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

Table 3b.3.1 Assessment Alignments for Field and Clinical Experience

Table 3b.3.2 alignment using the Faculty Recommendation

EDU #4A

Table 3c.4 Field Supervisor Evaluation

EDU #4B

EDU #5

Table 3b.3.4 Clinical Practice Evaluations

Table 3b.3.5 Aligned Clinical Practice Evaluations

Portfolio Sample

Table 1a.2.4b Portfolio Scoring per Indicator 2014–2015

EDU #32A

EDU #32B

EDU #27

Table 6

Table 5D

KTTS Assessments with the MSTL Program

Alignment of Forms P3A Disposition and the KTS

Table 3.1

Table 3.4
Form P3A results – Table 3.2
Form P4 Evaluation Results – Table 3.5
Table 3.3
Table 3.6
EDU #17
Alignment of KTS (P-12/IECE)
EDU 246
Technology Assessment from the field
Form P4 Technology results
Table 5.2 Cooperating Teacher Qualifications
EDU #11
Ice Breaker
C Formative/Summative Training
CT Portfolio Training
Clinical Practice Orientation Agenda
Mentoring Seminar
P3B

3.c Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
for Helping All Students Learn

Samples of Completed Evaluation Forms
Candidates' Sample Reflections
Table 3c.4 Unit Dispositions at Core Course and Application to SOE
Table 1c.1.3 Professional Dispositions/Skills
Table 3c.4.3 Ethics
Table 1g2.2 Advocacy
Table 3c.4.2 Service
Table 3c.4.4 Lifelong Learning
Table 1g.1.1 Oral and Dispositional Skills Interview 2011–2015
Table 3c.4a Field Supervisor Evaluations 2011–2015
Reflective Journals
Table 3c.4b Clinical Practice Evaluations by CT and US 2011–2015
Table 1d.1.2 Student Learning Skill Evidence in Application to CP and CP Portfolios
Table 1d.1.4 Student Learning Averages from KTIP Lesson Plan Rubric
Table 4.5 School Demographics

Standard 4. Diversity

4.a Diversity Proficiencies and Assessments

Alignment of Diversity with Ursuline Values
2015-2020 Strategic Plan
Educational Outcomes of Human Welfare Value
BU Catalog
Table 4a.1.1 Alignment of Diversity Competencies with KTS at Initial Level
Table 4a.1.2 Alignment of Diversity Competencies with IECE KTS at Initial Level
Diversity Proficiencies Aligned to MSTL
EDU #17
EDU #17A
Table 4.2 Course Alignment with Advocacy and Diversity Proficiencies

Rubric for Lesson Plan
Field Handbook
EDU #27
EDU #32A
EDU #32B
Table 5C
Required Coursework and Experiences
EDL 530 Course Syllabus
EDL 570 Course Syllabus
EDL 630 Course Syllabus
EDL 655 Course Syllabus
EDL 550 Course Syllabus
EDL 570 Course Syllabus
EDU 401 Course Syllabus
EDU 402 Course Syllabus
EDU 403 Course Syllabus
EDU 404 Course syllabus
ENG 306 Course Syllabus
Table 4a.3.1 Diversity Proficiency Assessments
Table 4a.3.2 Diversity Proficiency Assessment Data 2011–2015
Table 4a.3.3 Unit Diversity Proficiency Assessment Data
Table 4a.3.4 Program Diversity Proficiency Assessment Data
Signature Assessment
Diversity Proficiencies Performance
Multicultural Lesson Rubric
Ethical Case Scenario and Classroom Embedded Ethical/Policy Issue Rubric
Rubric for Model Lesson Unit
Mentoring Practicum 1 Rubric
Discipline Plan Rubric
Coaching/Mentoring Practicum2/Achievement Gap Assignment and Rubric
Unit Assessment Rubric
Integrated Technology Lesson and Rubric

4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty
SOE Candidate Check sheet – Diversity
EDU 325/326
EDU 321/322
EDU 314/315
Temple Grandin
Exhibit 4b.1e
Exhibit 4b.1a
Exhibit 4b.1b
Exhibit 4b.1c
Exhibit 4b.1d
Dr. Mary Temple Grandin

Academic – Education Professor 14

4.c. Diversity

BU Student Population Demographics

2015-2020 Strategic Plan

Culturally Diverse Activities

Minority Candidates BU site

Recruitment Publication

Future Teacher Clubs

Minority Tracking Database

Endorsement Brochure

Upcoming Courses Mod4

Upcoming Courses 2014

Table 4c.4.1 Brescia University Student Population Demographics Fall 2014

4.d. Diversity of P-12 Students in Schools in which Education Candidates Do Their Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Table 4.5 School Systems Demographics

Table 4.6 Field Placement Demographics

Diversity Proficiencies Aligned to MSTL

P3A

P3B

P4

Memorandum of Agreement

Approval of Research

University's IRB

Consent form for research

Mentoring Field Form

Form P3A Field Evaluation results

Form P4 Field Evaluation Results

Candidates' Sample Reflections

Samples of Completed Evaluation Forms

Table 4d.4.1 Demographics of Sites for Clinical Practice in Initial Programs

Table 10b Demographics on Sites for Field Experience MSTL

Standard 5. Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

5.a Faculty

Clinical Practice Handbook

5.b. Faculty Teaching

Signature Assignments and Related Assessments

Faculty Handbook

EDU 255 Rubric for Book Review Assignment

Math Content Syllabi

English Content Syllabi

Social Studies Content Syllabi
Science Content Syllabi
LibGuides
Wolken LibGuide
Course Evaluation Form
Conceptual Framework Symbol
Edu 255 Rubric for Book Review Assignment
Edu 411 Akojie Syllabus Fall 2013
Edu 334 Wolken Syllabus Fall 2013
Edu 255 Payne Syllabus Fall 2013
Edu 350 Chase Syllabus Fall 2013

5.c. Faculty Scholarship

Celebration of Excellence
Table 5.3 SOE Faculty Scholarship
KEA Professional Development Day
Faculty Activity Summary 2011-2012
Faculty Activity Summary 2012-2013
Faculty Activity Summary 2013-2014

5.d. Faculty Service

Table 5.4 – Unit Faculty Community Service Involvements
FH Service Expectations

5.e. Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty

Evaluation Protocol
Table 5e.2.1 School of Education Course Evaluation Averages 2011–2015
Table 5e.2.2 Course Evaluations for Common Core Courses
Table 5e.2.3 Course Evaluation Comparison of Part Time to Full Time Faculty Initial Courses
Table 5e.2.4 Candidate Comments on Course Evaluations 2011–2014

5.f Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

UTCL Grant
Fall Institute 2012
Fall Institute 2013
Fall Institute 2014
Fall Institute 2015
Technology PD - Sample from Fall 2015

Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources

6.a. Governance and Resources

BU Organizational Chart
2015-2020 Strategic Plan
Educational Outcomes
Faculty Handbook
APRC Final Letter RE Education 2011

TEAC Membership
Hart Grant
Ursuline Center for Teaching and Learning Grant
BU Catalog
Recruitment Brochures
Academic Calendar
SOE Handbook
Student of Concern
Academic Warning Slip
BU Student Handbook
TEAC Roster
TEAC minutes

6.b. Unit Budget

SOE Work Study Master Timesheet
2013-2014 TE and MSTL Budget

6.c. Personnel

SOE Faculty Workload
SOE Annual Report 2014-2015 Report Faculty Development and Service
About Brescia website
Academic Resources site
Syllabus Template
AFI

6.e. Unit Resources (including Technology)

Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment Document

Brescia University
Response to Areas for Improvement from 2014 Review

1.1 AFI: Dispositions for all candidates are not clearly defined or communicated to all stakeholders. (I/A)

Inconsistent evidence was provided to demonstrate that candidates and partners are familiar with the professional dispositions as outlined in the unit's conceptual framework

INITIAL PROGRAM RESPONSE

1. School of Education holds an annual Fall Convocation which is a required event for candidates to attend. Beginning Fall 2013 a key component of the program was the formal presentation of new Conceptual Framework model/image and our mission dispositions. To further establish the School of Education Conceptual Framework, Director of Mission Effectiveness speaks of the Ursuline Heritage of Brescia (see [SOE Fall Convocation](#)). **This event both clearly defines and communicates to stakeholders.**
2. The Conceptual Framework image and Mission Statement are posted conspicuously in the main SOE hallway and in classrooms and offices. Likewise, the Conceptual Framework Mission Statement and its image appear on all SOE webpages. This visual presents serves as a **communication to stakeholders.** (<https://www.brescia.edu/school-of-education>).
3. The CF Mission Statement is included in every SOE syllabus with alignment to course goals/objectives and assignments. (see [Edu108 Wolken](#), p.3; [Edu 320 Holland](#), pp. 3–4; and [Edu 415 Chase](#), p.5, for samples). This **clearly defines** the relationship of the dispositions to the coursework thus **communicating to stakeholders.**
4. SOE initial program forms have been revised and all address the relevant items of the CF and its Mission Statement, beginning with the Application for Admission materials ([EDU #4A](#)) and extending through the Clinical Practice portfolio (CP Portfolio) and summative CT evaluation ([EDU #14 and EDU #15](#)). In both course requirements and journal reflections for Field, Practicum, and Clinical Practice, candidates reflect on various elements of the CF and its Mission Statement.
5. In order to **communicate and clearly define dispositions** to cross-campus partners more fully, the SOE Chair presented the revised symbol and Mission Statement to the VPAA's Dean's Council (composed of the Division/School Chairs of all six academic areas, other academic officials such as the Registrar and Library Director, and major heads of student development departments such as the AD and Director of the Counseling Center).
6. At monthly Fall 2015 Faculty Assembly meetings, SOE faculty have **communicated** with the faculty and cabinet **stakeholders** the specific elements of the CF and **clearly defined** the Mission Statement dispositions ([Faculty Assembly Minutes 10-13-2015](#))..”
7. Candidates have been alerted issues such as plagiarism and offenses against “Academic Integrity” are directly linked to the SOE’s commitment to the disposition of ETHICS; a new pol-

icy approved by TEAC in June 2015 addresses implications for SOE candidates who have been charged with Academic Integrity violations. (See [TEAC Minutes](#).)

8. As part of the Orientation for Clinical Practice Supervisor the SOE's conceptual framework and mission/dispositions are **communicated to all stakeholders**. As part of the assessment tools training, alignment of elements to KTS, mission/dispositions and diversity components are **clearly defined**. ([Edu #12](#)). [Sample Agenda](#)
9. A Signature Assignment in Edu 204 Intro to Education & Edu 108 Orientation to School of Education is a mission philosophy paper requiring candidates to reflect on their beliefs framed around the SOE dispositions and Ursuline heritage ([rubric Edu 204 mission paper](#)). A book report assignment in Edu 255 Teaching Diverse Population of Children and Youth requires candidates to make connections to two dispositions in respect to themselves in the field of education and students with diverse needs. As common core courses, these activities ensure candidates the opportunity to **clearly defined** SOE dispositions.
10. Director of Mission Effectiveness speaks to every Edu 204 Intro to Education class and to Clinical Practice candidates during seminar to address the Ursuline Mission of Teaching which is a component of SOE's Conceptual Framework. This both **communicates to stakeholders** and further **defines dispositions**
11. Graduate Exit Survey found respondents rated each disposition $\geq 3.5/4.0$ with an overall Unit average of 3.65. Each Program achieve ≥ 3.4 for each disposition. From these data, it can be concluded that graduates believe the program prepare them adequately in dispositions. [Table 1g.4.1](#) Graduates Exit Survey Dispositions.

Advanced Program Response

Starting with the [interview](#) into the MSTL program, advanced candidates are exposed to the SOE's professional dispositions (see [Interview Rating Guide](#)). As candidates progress through the program, they are further exposed to opportunities to develop professional dispositions within the courses (see [Table 5D](#)). The assignments linked to dispositions are displayed in the [MSTL performance Assessment of Unit's CF](#). In addition, self-evaluation is another way the advanced program measures candidate understanding of dispositions. Candidates evaluate their degree of attainment of program goals and disposition using the [Midpoint Evaluation](#) and the [Exit Evaluation Form](#). A summary of professional disposition data is presented in [Table IG2](#). The results of the analysis shows that at exit point, candidates scored a 3.5 (2012–2013), 4.0 (2013–2014), and 4.0 (2014–2015) on a 4.0 scale. Data show that most advanced candidates generally enter the program demonstrating professional disposition on a scale of 2.5, and move to 3.1 midway through the program and keep growing through program completion with an average of 3.8 (see Dispositions Average for 2011–2015 in [Table IG2](#)). MSTL and TL mentoring evaluation forms ([P3A](#) and [Form P4](#)) also reflect elements of Unit's Conceptual Framework, state standards, and professional standards (see [Alignment of Forms P3A disposition and the KTS](#)). These multiple sources ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the Unit's Conceptual Framework in the MSTL and TL programs, as shown in [Table 3.3](#) and [Table 3.6](#). The former, [Table 3.3](#), shows mean scores ranging from 3.57 (for professional skills) to 3.95 (Ethics). The latter, [Table 3.6](#), shows mean scores ranging from 3.3 (Advocacy) to 3.9 (Lifelong Learning). These results show that by program completion MSTL candidates are developing proficiencies outlined in the Unit's Conceptual Framework to a quite high degree. This is supported by evidence from the [MSTL Exit Survey](#). [Chart SG8](#) provides a summary of the responses of all gradu-

ates in the area of Ethics; [Chart SG9](#) provides a summary of responses regarding Advocacy; [Chart SG10](#) summarizes responses in the area of Service; and [Chart SG11](#) provides a summary of the responses of all graduates in the area of Lifelong Learning. Therefore, the follow-up results indicates that graduates continue to demonstrate professional dispositions of ethics, advocacy, service, and lifelong learning. Candidates and partners thus demonstrate familiarity with the professional dispositions as outlined in the Unit’s Conceptual Framework.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

2.1 AFI: It is unclear how data are used to improve unit and program operations. (I/A)

Review of the IR and interviews with faculty and staff do not clearly show how data are used in program and unit improvement.

INITIAL PROGRAM RESPONSE

The Unit regularly and systematically uses data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences through the implementation of the [Unit Assessment System](#) which is a cycle consisting of five phases. First, the SOE begins each academic year (AY) by reviewing internal and external data summarized by the Data Manager and the Director of Field Experiences for the previous AY in preparation for the submission of the [Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment](#) document (“assessment grids”). Preparation of the grids requires, at a minimum, the comparison of data on identified Unit and Program goals between the prior AY and the just-completed AY. A comparison of data over a period of several years can provide helpful trend data as well. The final column of the grid for each identified goal/objective at Unit and Program level is titled “Next Steps/Use of Results.” The final section for any goal/objective is titled “Summary of Changes/ Improvements to be Made in the Next Academic Year Based on Analysis of Assessment Results.” Responses for these sections come directly from the analyses and interpretation of the data and indicate whether the identified next steps were taken and/or the ways in which those results were utilized to sustain practices or to drive needed changes.

The SOE Data Manager and the Director of Field Experiences use continuous, end of term, and end of AY data entry processes and report on any issues with the current system and/or updates by technology providers to the system that may require additional training for users.

At the conclusion of each AY, each Program Coordinator analyzes and summarizes Key Assessments per SOE Program Levels related to their certification area(s) as well as the Unit as a whole. Some of the data include GPA, PRAXIS results, disposition scores, performance on Signature Assignment assessments, Field hour completion rate, portfolio passing rates, and candidate performance in Field/Practicum and Clinical Practice. Coordinators individually engage in review of the data, interact in more depth with course faculty as needed, and bring data to the SOE for informal and formal analyses at unit meetings or Data Days.

A similar process is followed for analyses of data regarding Field Experiences and Clinical Practice placements. Course instructors receive data in two ways: on forms submitted directly by candidates or by Field Supervisor/ Practicum Supervisor or Cooperating Teacher, or from analyses submitted by the SOE Data Manager and/or Director of Field Experiences. Course instructors share analyses with Program Coordinator(s), which then are taken to the SOE for informal and formal analyses at Unit meetings or Data Days. With regard to Field Experiences, course instructors and Program Coordinators at end of term and annually engage in data analysis. Two areas currently under investigation are an analyses of how many and which specific elements on Edu #16A receive “Not Applicable” or no rating indicator and sources of the consistently low rates of return by evaluators.

This analytical process is also part of the Unit faculty’s regular and systematic use of data at the end of term and annually to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to the Clinical Practice experiences; this is done primarily through candidate ratings of Cooperating Teachers (Edu #31) and through onsite observations by faculty while acting in the role of University Supervisor to determine whether to continue the partnership. Program Coordinators (also University Supervisors) use analysis of portfolio scoring data to determine at indicator level within each KTS P–12/IECE standard where an individual candidate or where candidates within a Program or across Programs are achieving target level for Level 3 – Admission to Clinical Practice and for Level 4 – Program Completion. Analyses of formative and summative evaluation data during Clinical Practice are now focusing on two areas: no ratings entered for certain elements by Cooperating Teachers or University Supervisors and elements where ratings of candidate performance are below the target level of 3 Accomplished and targets are established in the “Action Plan” section. Informal analysis of Clinical Practice candidates’ self-assessments can be viewed as an additional indicator of how prepared and effective candidates perceive themselves in the sections and elements of the evaluations, as can analysis of the “Action Plan” section, where short-term targets are established for concentrated emphasis through analysis of reflective journal daily dialog content with University Supervisor.

A review of many of these analyses is also available to TEAC for their input.

Ultimately, the loop (completion of the five phases of the [Unit Assessment System](#)) is closed when the identification of new targets to be achieved and a determination of whether the assessments and evidence currently in place will continue to prove useful in determining the efficacy of the Unit and its approved Programs has been formalized in the submission of the annual “assessment grids.”

Section 2c.2 in the submitted Institutional Report provides specific details of data-driven changes that have occurred during AY 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 relative to *Unit Operations* (7 changes), *Unit Assessment System: Key Assessment 2 – Dispositions* (3 changes); *Key Assessment 3 – Portfolios* (2 changes); *Key Assessment 5 – Field Experiences* (3 changes), and *Programs and Courses* (4 changes).

ADVANCED PROGRAM RESPONSE

The Unit Assessment System and the Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment process described above for Initial programs are also utilized in all three Advanced programs. Summaries of data and information for analysis utilize Access and Excel formats and a transition phase is in progress to migrate data entry directly into Taskstream, which allows the SOE Data Manager, the Director of Field Experiences, and Program Coordinators (Director of Graduate Programs and Program Coordinators responsible for the TL and ESL P-12 endorsement programs) to run reports for their own analyses. Sharing of data occurs at least monthly during one of the SOE faculty meetings, once a term at Graduate Committee meetings and TEAC meetings, and annually through the preparation of the Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment Document. The data collected are reported in tables, charts, and graphs for program review. [Table 8C](#) shows the process and [Table 9](#) shows the *Program Review Timeline Summary*. Faculty use these data to modify teaching strategies, course objectives, activities, course alignments plus course assignments and assessments including Signature Assignments and Related Assessments. Ongoing review is the responsibility of Brescia University's Vice President for Academic Affairs/Academic Dean, the Director of IRE, the APRC, the School of Education's TEAC, and the University's Education Graduate Committee. TEAC members also help determine future directions for the MSTL program and advise the SOE on specific areas of interest and concern. The SOE Graduate Committee (MSTL) meets once a semester and provides ongoing assessment for the Advanced level programs by establishing communication between all participants of the program, the School of Education, and Brescia University. Data from all these sources are used for continuous program review efforts. The Coordinator of the Graduate Program meets regularly with the School Chair, and more formal reviews are conducted by Unit faculty and staff once each semester and annually in the preparation and submission of the Advanced Programs section of the Unit's Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment Document.

The MSTL Director annually evaluates the MSTL and TL programs. The evaluation (using an assessment grid) tracks all major assessment data for each of the MSTL program goals. Each goal emphasis is identified, linked to the University Mission, and the annual assessment results summarized and reported to the SOE Chair. The data analysis is used to make changes or improvements the following academic year. The data report is shared at the University level within the SOE Annual Report to the VPAA, and within the SOE at the annual Fall Retreat. At the University level, program modifications are discussed following review of assessment within the Dean's Council and the President's Cabinet. The MSTL modifications are made at the program level as a result of annual analysis discussed within MSTL Committee meetings, within the Unit's annual Fall Retreat, and through data analysis and discussions among faculty during weekly faculty meetings in the School of Education.

2.2 AFI: Data analyses are not systematic, clearly linked to program and unit improvement, or aligned with the Kentucky Teacher Standards. (I/A)

While the unit has an assessment that gathers and inconsistently analyzes data, interviews with faculty and staff and a review of data files do not indicate how these data are used to improve the individual programs or the unit as a whole.

INITIAL PROGRAM RESPONSE

The Unit regularly and systematically uses data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences through the implementation of the [Unit Assessment System](#) which is a cycle consisting of five phases. First, the SOE begins each academic year (AY) by reviewing internal and external data summarized by the Data Manager and the Director of Field Experiences for the previous AY in preparation for the submission of the [Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment](#) document (“assessment grids”). Preparation of the grids requires, at a minimum, the comparison of data on identified Unit and Program goals between the prior AY and the just-completed AY. A comparison of data over a period of several years can provide helpful trend data as well. The final column of the grid for each identified goal/objective at Unit and Program level is titled “Next Steps/Use of Results.” The final section for any goal/objective is titled “Summary of Changes/ Improvements to be Made in the Next Academic Year Based on Analysis of Assessment Results.” Responses for these sections come directly from the analyses and interpretation of the data and indicate whether the identified next steps were taken and/or the ways in which those results were utilized to sustain practices or to drive needed changes.

Table 2b.1.1 is a visual display providing specific details regarding the seven key assessments, the target of each assessment, when it is administered, the format in which it is administered, who summarizes the data, and who reviews the data. Table 2b.1.2 provides a visual display of data that are monitored and who is responsible, as well as what assessments produce data related to the five performance areas of the Conceptual Framework, who is responsible for the data, and when and by whom the data are collected and reviewed.

Section 2c.2 in the submitted Institutional Report provides specific details of data-driven changes that have occurred during AY 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15 relative to *Unit Operations* (7 changes), *Unit Assessment System: Key Assessment 2 – Dispositions* (3 changes); *Key Assessment 3 – Portfolios* (2 changes); *Key Assessment 5 – Field Experiences* (3 changes), and *Programs and Courses* (4 changes).

SOE Programs demonstrate KTS alignment through Signature Assignments. Samples: [Elementary](#), [Middle School](#), [Secondary English](#), [Special Education](#), [P-12 Art](#). This process of assessment is in the initial stages.

Edu forms are aligned to KTS: [EDU #4B](#): Professional Disposition & Skill Evaluation

[EDU #12](#),13,14 CLINICAL PRACTICE EVALUATION

[EDU #16](#) Field Supervisor Evaluation

[EDU #23A](#), 25A 29A P-12 Portfolio

[EDU #23B](#), 25B, 29B, IECE Portfolio

[EDU #27](#) PGP Plan

[EDU #32A](#) PGP Self-Assessment P-12 KTS

[EDU #32B](#) PGP Self-Assessment IECE KTS

Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment Grids 2014-2015

[IECE](#), [Elementary](#), [Middle](#), [Secondary](#), [Special Education](#), [P-12 Spanish](#), [ESL](#)

ADVANCED PROGRAM RESPONSE

Candidate proficiencies outlined in the Unit's state standards at the Advanced level and professional standards are collected via Signature Assignments/Related Assessments for all three Advanced programs: ESL P-12 endorsement, TL endorsement and MSTL. Each of the five courses in the ESL P-12 endorsement has a Signature Assignment and Related Assessment in addition to other activities, assignments and assessments. These are aligned with Kentucky Teacher Standards-Advanced Level as evidenced by the [ESL P-12 Endorsement Kentucky Teacher Standards Matrix for Assessments](#) and also aligned with the SPA standards for TESOL as evidenced by the [ESL P-12 Endorsement TESOL Standards Matrix for Assessments](#). In addition, the ESL P-12 Portfolio is aligned with both the KTS Advanced standards and the TESOL standards. All candidates in the MSTL program are assessed in core courses on competencies in the Kentucky Teacher Standards at the Advanced level (see [KTS Assessments within the MSTL Program](#). [Table 4](#) shows how the MSTL courses are linked to the KTS. Each MSTL course syllabus outlines how the course objectives and course activities meet each of the KTS at the Advanced level; for samples see [EDL 620 Course syllabus](#), [EDL 655 Course Syllabus](#), and [EDL 671 course syllabus](#). The Signature Assignments within the MSTL courses are tagged to KTS Advanced standards in the Taskstream assessment program used by the School of Education; for example, see [EDL 570 Signature Assignment Rubric](#). To ensure that all 10 KTS Advanced standards are assessed in the capstone project, candidates are required to attain a *Satisfactory* score in each of the 10 KTS Advanced standards on the [ARP Form 4](#) capstone assessment tool.

2.3 AFI: There is no direct structure for eliminating bias or demonstrating fairness, and consistency in the unit assessment system. (I/A)

Although the unit's CAP identifies a requirement that assessments are fair, consistent, and free of bias, there is little evidence this requirement is being consistently followed.

INITIAL AND ADVANCED PROGRAMS RESPONSE

SOE full- and part-time faculty are required by the Unit to use a **common syllabus template** composed of sections that have been **specifically designed to orient candidates at the outset of any Edu or EDL course to SOE expectations**. These include:

1. The knowledge, skills and dispositions targeted for evaluation in the course
2. The **Signature Assignment (SA)** and **Related Assessment (RA)** and the link to Taskstream
3. The course objectives/activities and the Means of Evaluation, including alignment to:
 - A. Conceptual Framework components
 - B. KTS P-12 or IECE and relevant SPA standards
4. The proposed calendar with due dates for all assignments
5. The common grading scale utilized within the SOE

These elements of a common syllabus template demonstrate several aspects of fairness:

- early identification of the assessment and how it will be assessed
- indication of when the assessments will occur, and when it is to be uploaded and submitted
- a discussion of how the assessment and its elements relate to the course content, objectives, activities, KTS and SPA standards, EPSB themes, and the Unit's Conceptual

Framework through the process of "tagging".

Another example of fairness occurs when faculty teaching coursework at the *Initial level* **use a common rubric throughout the candidates' experiences across Levels 1–4**, e.g. [lesson plan rubric](#) or **portfolio rubric (P–12, IECE)**. These rubrics were designed to provide consistent indicators as evidence of a candidate's growth over time, based on experienced faculty input about the **clearly identified performance targets** that should be evident in each level: *Beginning, Developing, Accomplished, or Exemplary*. By applying and evaluating the same performance targets at the appropriate benchmarks for the candidate's progression through their specific coursework in their desired area(s) of certification, SOE faculty are demonstrating FAIRNESS as they measure candidate performance.

Accuracy

In its initial programs, the SOE utilizes seven [Key Assessments](#): GPA, Praxis I-II (content/professional/pedagogical), KTS standards-based portfolios, KTIP Lesson/Unit Plans, measures of professional dispositions, and measures of performance in Field experiences (including a Practicum of 50 hours P–12 or 150 hours in the IECE) and performance in Clinical Practice. The revised lesson plan rubric used with all Edu candidates (P–12/IECE) is aligned with the KTIP process, including the Kentucky Framework for Teaching and its embedded alignment of the components with Kentucky Teacher Standards. The revised portfolio scoring assessment is now a rubric and assesses each indicator of each KTS P–12 and IECE standard. The design of each [Signature Assignment and Related Assessment](#) (SA+RA) is determined by identifying the evidence required for demonstrating specific knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions targeted in a course and then constructing a tool for their measurement. Individual course syllabi provide the description and the supporting explanation of how the RA relates candidate performance or level of proficiency to the expected learning outcomes based on “tagging” elements of the RA. Tagging allows candidates to understand the target(s) as behaviors demonstrating one or more of the following:

1. BU and SOE Educational Outcomes
2. EPSB Initial or Advanced Standards and the relevant SPA Standards for each Program
3. Unit and Program goals: content/professional/pedagogical knowledge, professional skills, assessment skills, technology skills, professional dispositions (the four pillars), and diversity/advocacy proficiencies, all of which constitute the uniquely “Brescian” teacher education candidate.

Since performance expectations around all the elements of SOE Programs are clearly and consistently outlined in every course syllabus, the SOE is demonstrating ACCURACY.

Consistency

The calculation of GPA and the qualifying scores set by Kentucky's EPSB produce one demonstration of consistency in two of the seven SOE Key Assessments. The use of the KTIP lesson plan format and the recent adoption of a common rubric for use by faculty across SOE Program levels 1–4 are also showing some consistency among raters regarding acquisition of the performance targets at a given level in the initial programs. Assessment

of candidate portfolios is in transition; however, multiple internal and external raters are involved in the process: SOE full- and part-time faculty, content-area faculty, BU SOE alumnae, P–12 community partners, and TEAC members. The use of the “old” rubric for holistically scoring candidate portfolios at program Levels 3 and 4 demonstrated consistency among internal and external scorers. Data on the consistency in the use of the “new” rubrics that provide scores for each KTS standard (P–12/IECE) upon evaluation at the indicator level are not yet available; however, internal and external scorers did receive face-to-face or digitally recorded training on the use of the tool in an effort to address the issue of consistency in scoring. During the face-to-face training using Smartboard technology in combination with individual copies of the new tool, the presenter engaged the reviewers in facilitated discussion of the key factors that would result in assigning a rating of 1–4 for each piece of evidence in candidates’ portfolios presented as part of their request for Admission to Clinical Practice. Reviewers then paired up; they scored evidence individually and then compared their ratings; after that ratings were compared as an overall group. This presentation was digitally recorded and used for a second round of training: again individual scorers had access to the paper copy of the tool and the same presenter discussed the key factors that would result in assigning a rating of 1–4 for each piece of evidence from a candidate’s Clinical Practice portfolio. Through these efforts the scope of trained evaluators has broadened from the Unit to Brescia’s cross-campus faculty, portfolio pre-viewers, TEAC members, and Cooperating Teachers. In all this training a concerted attempt has been made to promote consistency in scoring, impact inter-rater reliability, reduce potential for bias, and provide more accurate data on candidate proficiency over time.

Regarding assessment in Field placements at Levels 1–3, the same form, Edu #16, has been utilized for some time by multiple external individuals serving as Field Experience Supervisors for all applicants or candidates observing/ participating in a single placement for ≥ 10 hours in a term. New Field Experience/Practicum observation tools, Edu #17, used by Field/Practicum Supervisors and ESL candidates and Edu #17A used by University Supervisors have recently been designed and are being piloted for use in the ESL P–12 Endorsement Program. The assessment tools for Clinical Practice at Level 4 (also utilized during Practicum Level 3) are Edu #12 (formative) and Edu #14 (summative). These forms are completed by Cooperating Teachers; the Edu #13 (on-site visit observation) is completed by University Supervisors. All three of these forms are identical for every candidate and have been in use for some time. The assessment of candidate dispositions, however, has undergone revision. Utilized primarily at Program Level 1, the “old” Edu #4A and #4B used a rating scale completed by multiple evaluators when applicants were enrolled in the SOE Common Core courses (Edu 204/108, Edu 246, Edu 255, and Psy 300). The same form was utilized by both SOE across-campus faculty when providing recommendations for applicants seeking Admission to SOE. By contract, the “new” Edu #4A and #4B forms use a rubric. Professional consultants facilitated SOE faculty efforts in creating the rubric and guiding faculty to a common understanding of key aspects of each cell. When cross-campus faculty were later introduced to the rubric, a SOE faculty member provided guidance and emphasis was placed on the “common language” as well as the key elements of each cell. These efforts promote CONSISTENCY among both internal and external reviewers.

Based on the current enrollment in the SOE, there are no multiple sections of course offerings during any given term. For a number of courses, however, the faculty assigned to teach the course has remained constant over time. Both the consistency of instructor and the common syllabus template strengthen Program CONSISTENCY.

The SOE faculty look for evidence of consistency at several times during the course of an academic year. When acting as a subcommittee of TEAC, faculty compare data from multiple assessments and monitoring tools and from multiple evaluators. This review occurs as SOE faculty prepare recommendations for TEAC regarding applicants seeking Admission into the SOE during a specific term in comparison to prior applicant performance; SOE faculty also compare data from candidates seeking Admission to Clinical Practice to prior candidates. Through the preparation of the “assessment grids” for submission annually to the Director of IRE, SOE faculty also engage in comparison and utilization of the next steps/use of results that also informs determination of consistency.

In this manner, the SOE ensures assessment procedures that are CONSISTENT.

Free of Bias

The SOE works in a number of ways to ensure an environment where assessment is free of bias. The physical facilities utilized for the delivery of on-ground courses are spaces that are contextually appropriate. Candidates have input on factors such as amount of lighting, use of fans, amount of workspace, access to technology, and temperature variation in learning spaces. Assessments may be in paper format, e-documents, or accessed through Taskstream or other systems such as Campus Labs or textbook student resource sites. Faculty are required to submit copies of all final examinations each term and an analysis of this sample can provide evidence of attention to avoiding other factors of bias, such as missing or vague instructions, poorly worded questions/tasks, poor readability, or cultural insensitivity. Faculty are also sensitized to the necessity of avoiding bias whenever they are individually or collectively engaged in the revision or creation of any assessments, but with special attention focused on the Related Assessment of each Signature Assignment. Consultants also recently modeled and facilitated discussion of potential issues of bias when facilitating the revision of the disposition rating forms; one consulted provided written feedback when reviewing samples of faculty efforts to revise other tools or to develop Signature Assignments and Related Assessments.

As a result of these efforts and policies, as well as those noted earlier in the sections on “fairness,” “accuracy,” and “consistency,” the SOE ensures assessment procedures that are FREE OF BIAS.

ADDITIONAL ADVANCED PROGRAM RESPONSE

Because the SOE is a Unit comprised of approved programs at both Initial and Advanced levels, the common elements of the ways the Unit ensures that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias have been addressed above. Related As-

assessments (rubrics) are also provided for Signature Assignments in the advanced programs (see sample assessments and rubrics in [Table 4.2](#)). To ensure validity, the rubrics identify all assessment elements to be measured. Results of assessments are consistent across raters and across scoring occasions. Because of the small numbers of candidates enrolled in the courses in the three programs at the Advanced level, there have not been incidences of multiple raters for any Related Assessment for a Signature Assignment. At present, the MSTL program only has four active candidates, the ESL P–12 endorsement had three in cohort one and has four in cohort two, and there are no candidates pursuing the “stand alone” Teacher Leader Endorsement. The same rater (course instructor) grades the Related Assessment for each Signature Assignment. Training for ESL raters is conducted 1:1; however, for the MSTL Field Mentoring Practicum, where there are multiple raters, a mentor training session is provided. Mentors are selected from those who have already completed the KTIP Training. In addition, mentor training is provided to ensure that different raters understand the rubric used by Brescia University. Training helps to ensure the consistency of ratings when using the Unit’s assessment instruments.

2.4 AFI: The unit does not consistently display three years of data. (I/A)

While the databases have in some cases three years of data, such as “Percent of Program Completers by major/Certification Area who have Passed their Relevant PRAXIS II Exam(s)”, the unit does not have three years of data for every assessment.

INITIAL PROGRAM RESPONSE

The Unit has provided data from 2011-2015 for all initial programs within the submitted Institutional Report. Samples of data evidence included in Institutional Report for the unit and for programs include:

- Average Cumulative GPA:
 - [Table 1A.2.1](#) Average Overall GPA at Application to School of Education 2011-2015
 - [Table 1A.2.2](#) Average Overall GPA at Application to Clinical Practice 2011-2015
- Assessment of Dispositions:
 - [Table 1C.1.3](#) Professional Dispositions at Core Courses & Application to SOE
 - [Table 1G.3.2](#) Professional Disposition Ethics in Clinical Practice by CT & US Observations 2011-2015
- Portfolios:
 - [Table 1A.2.4](#) Content Knowledge Evidence in Application to CP and CP 2011-2015
 - [Table 1A.2.4B](#) Portfolio Scoring Per Indicator 2014-2015
- KTIP Unit/Lesson Plans:
 - [Table 3c.5](#) KTIP Lesson Plan
- Field Experiences:
 - [Table 1D.1.3](#) Field Supervisor Evaluation of Student Learning
 - [Table 1G.2.3](#) Field Supervisor Evaluation of Advocacy
- Diversity Competencies:

- [Table 4A.3.2](#) Diversity Proficiency Assessment Data 2011-2015

These assessments provide data on all initial candidates' content knowledge; pedagogical content knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state and institutional standards; professional dispositions (Ethics, Advocacy, Service, and Lifelong Learning) and proficiencies in diversity, assessment, and technology.

As a result of the utilization of the cycle of the SOE Unit Assessment System, all assessments in all initial programs may not have three years of data because analyses of evidence indicated a need for:

1. Minor or major revision of assessments (on-going)
2. Adoption of Signature Assignments and Related Assessments as unit requirements for Edu and EDL prefix courses (concept endorsed 2013-14 with limited pilot in SOE, expanded in SOE and content areas with teacher certification options 2014-15)
3. All Edu and EDL prefix courses have not been offered within the three year timeframe

ADVANCED PROGRAM RESPONSE

The three Advanced programs were recently approved by EPSB. The MSTL program and the Teacher Leader Endorsement program were launched in Fall 2011 and the ESL P-12 Endorsement was launched in Fall 2013. There have been no candidates in the TL endorsement program. The initial cohort for the ESL P-12 endorsement program included four candidates with one subsequently transferring to another KY institution. The second cohort began Fall 2015 and included four candidates.

The ESL P-12 endorsement program was initiated in Fall 2013 with the offering of the first course in the sequence, Edu 402 ESL Acquisition and Skill Set. The endorsement is comprised of a sequence of five courses offered over the course of four consecutive semesters. Eng 306 Linguistics was first offered Spring 2014 and Edu 401 ESL Language and Culture was offered Fall 2014. During Spring 2015 both Edu 403 ESL: Methods and Materials for Teaching P-12 ESL Students and Edu 404 ESL Practicum were offered to complete the first cycle. Therefore, the available assessment data are limited to this two year timeframe. The Unit's utilization of Signature Assignments/Related Assessments (SA + RA) was piloted AY 2014-15 with a few courses in both fall and spring terms. During fall term of 2014 -15 it was determined that the Edu #16 Field Evaluation form was insufficient for use with ESL P-12 endorsement candidates and new forms [Edu #17](#) and [Edu #17A](#) were piloted for use by Field/Practicum Supervisors and candidates and by University Supervisors. One candidate has taken the PRAXIS TESOL and two candidates are scheduled to have ESL portfolios reviewed Spring 2016. For these reasons three years of data for every assessment are not available for this program.

The institutional standards are aligned to course requirements and Signature Assignments. [Table 4.2](#) displays the assessment descriptions and rubrics; and [Exhibit IG22](#) shows the performance of all MSTL candidates on these assessments [this exhibit has 3 semesters, not 3 years?]. The MSTL program now displays three years of data for every assessment. Examples include

candidates' engagement in professional activities, which is displayed in [Exhibit IG3](#). Related to this, [Exhibit 1G12](#) shows the courses from which assessments are collected for candidates' awareness of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices. [Exhibit 1G16](#) displays assessments for candidates' ability to analyze educational research and policies and then explain the implications for their own practice and the profession. A summary of professional disposition data is presented in [Table IG2](#).

A summary of MSTL professional disposition data is presented in [Table IG2](#). The results of the analysis shows that at exit point, candidates scored a 3.5 (2012–2013), 4.0 (2013–2014), and 4.0 (2014–2015) on a 4.0 scale. Data show that most advanced candidates generally enter the program demonstrating professional disposition on a scale of 2.5, and move to 3.1 midway through the program and keep growing through program completion with an average of 3.8 (see Dispositions Average for 2011–2015 in [Table IG2](#)). MSTL and TL mentoring evaluation forms ([P3A](#) and [Form P4](#)) also reflect elements of Unit's Conceptual Framework, state standards, and professional standards (see [Alignment of Forms P3A disposition and the KTS](#)). These multiple sources ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the Unit's Conceptual Framework in the MSTL and TL programs, as shown in [Table 3.3](#) and [Table 3.6](#). The former, [Table 3.3](#), shows mean scores ranging from 3.57 (for professional skills) to 3.95 (Ethics). The latter, [Table 3.6](#), shows mean scores ranging from 3.3 (Advocacy) to 3.9 (Lifelong Learning). These results show that by program completion MSTL candidates are developing proficiencies outlined in the Unit's Conceptual Framework to a quite high degree. This is supported by evidence from the [MSTL Exit Survey](#). [Chart SG8](#) provides a summary of the responses of all graduates in the area of Ethics; [Chart SG9](#) provides a summary of responses regarding Advocacy; [Chart SG10](#) summarizes responses in the area of Service; and [Chart SG11](#) provides a summary of the responses of all graduates in the area of Lifelong Learning. These charts demonstrate that the Unit tracks at least three years of data for ongoing analysis.

Standard 4: Diversity

4.1 AFI: The unit lacks racially diverse student body. (A)

There are no racially diverse advanced candidates in the MSTL, ESL, or LBD 8-12 endorsement programs.

ADVANCED PROGRAM RESPONSE

Table 9 below shows the diversity of current advanced candidates; there is one candidate of American Indian/Alaskan cultural heritage. NOTE that the LBD 8-12 endorsement program has been discontinued at Brescia University.

**Table 9
Candidate Demographics**

	Candidates in Initial Teacher	Candidates in Advanced	All Students in the Insti-	Diversity of Geographical
--	-------------------------------	------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------

	Preparation Programs n (%)	Preparation Programs n (%)	tution n (%)	Area Served by Institution (%)
American Indian or Alaska Native		1 (8%)	12	155 (0.13%); (DC unknown; 0.2% for KY)
Asian		-	6	838 (0.72%); (DC 0.7%; 1.1% KY)
Black or African American, non-Hispanic		-	142	4,891 (4.2%); (DC 4.8%; 7.8% KY)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		-		[included in Asian; (0.1% KY)
Hispanic or Latino	1 (2%)	-	61	2,863 (2.5%); (DC 2.6%; 3.1% KY)
White, non-Hispanic	40 (95%)	12 (92%)	703	105,477 (90.9%); (DC 91.2%; 86.3% KY)
Two or more races	1 (2%)	-		1,806 (1.6%); [unknown]; [unknown]
Other		-	9	
Race/ethnicity unknown		-	130	
Total	42 (100%)	13 (100%)	1063	116,030 (met- ropolitan ar- ea); 4,380,415 (KY)
Female	35 (83%)	10 (77%)	782	51%; (DC 51.46%; 50.8% KY)
Male	7 (17%)	3 (23%)	281	49%; (DC 48.54%; 49.2% KY)
Total	42 (100%)	13 (100%)	1063	116,030 (met- ropolitan ar- ea); 4,380,415 (KY)

4.2 AFI: The unit has not articulated candidate proficiencies related to diversity. (I/A)

Candidate proficiencies related to diversity are not clearly articulated in the unit's conceptual framework or program documents. Diversity proficiencies used in assessments are not aligned to the Kentucky Teacher Standards.

INITIAL PROGRAM RESPONSE

The heart of the Brescia Ursuline teaching tradition is to treat each student as a unique individual, meeting them where they are and addressing their needs accordingly. ([Alignment of Diversity with Ursuline Values](#)) The University considers diversity a key value, as evident in through-out the 2015–2020 Strategic Plan. For over two decades, the University articulated commitment to this value in various elements of its Educational Outcomes, according to which Brescia graduates are expected to “respect individual differences” and “appreciate diversity of culture.” (See [the Educational Outcome of Human Welfare Value](#).) To facilitate improved assessment, in the spring of 2014 Brescia faculty revised the Education Outcomes, reducing the number from 10 to four. The revised Outcomes continue to embrace the individual and promote development of the whole person. All courses in the curriculum and all facets of the co-curriculum together support these Educational Outcomes ([BU Catalog](#), p. 41). Since Brescia began in 1925 as a teachers’ college, its teacher education programs from the beginning have embraced this value of diversity as part of the legacy of the Ursuline educational tradition. The current School of Education considers attention to diversity synonymous with the Conceptual Framework disposition of advocacy that it seeks to cultivate in teacher education candidates.

The proficiencies related to diversity and advocacy that candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate are reflected in KTS and with IECE KTS ([Table 4a.1.1](#) – “Alignment of Diversity Competencies with KTS at Initial Level” and [Table 4.a.1.2](#) – “Alignment of Diversity Competencies with IECE KTS at Initial Level”), and they are embedded throughout the SOE initial programs in their attention to the following:

- Plans for learning and cultural diversity
- Engages students at all levels
- Fosters a positive learning climate with effective classroom management
- Collaborates to design, implement, and support learning
- Assesses and analyzes results to meet diverse learning needs and situations
- Integrates technology to address diverse student needs

ADVANCED PROGRAM RESPONSE

Similar to the undergraduate programs, the proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate in the advanced programs are listed below.

- Plans for learning and cultural diversity
- Engages students at all levels

- Fosters a positive learning climate with effective classroom management
- Collaborates to design, implement, and support learning
- Assesses and analyzes results to meet diverse learning needs and situations
- Integrates technology to address diverse student needs

ESL diversity proficiencies are listed below.

- Collaboration
- Cultural sensitivity
- Planned for learning and cultural diversity
- Multiple language proficiency levels/language system deficiencies
- Addresses and implements multiple language domains
- Integrates technology to address diverse student needs
- Incorporates vocabulary from content areas
- Addresses students' cognitive/emotional/social/behavioral status
- Positive classroom management/Fosters self-control
- Uses/Analyzes assessment to improve instruction
- Creates/Uses assessments that are bias-free and culturally sensitive
- Uses data from cumulative record to validate or critique programs and services

Proficiencies (see [Diversity Proficiencies Aligned to MSTL](#)). The proficiencies related to diversity and advocacy that candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate are also reflected in the KTS in [Table 4a.1.12](#) (Alignment of Diversity Competencies with KTS) for ESL, TL, and MSTL and in the [Edu #17](#) and [#17A](#) Alignment document for ESL.

4.3 AFI: Assessment instruments do not generate data to provide feedback to the unit and the candidates for improving their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping diverse learners.

There is limited and inconsistent evidence to support unit assessment of candidate diversity proficiencies.

INITIAL PROGRAM RESPONSE

The initial programs have assessment instruments which generate data to provide feedback to the unit, the programs and the candidates for improving their knowledge skills and professional dispositions for helping diverse learners.

SOE Course Syllabi

Each SOE course syllabus includes the alignment of course objectives/goals and activities to the disposition of Advocacy/Diversity. [Table 4a.3.2](#) – “Course Alignment with Advocacy and Diversity Proficiencies”– provides evidence of addressing advocacy/diversity across all programs through course work.

Candidate Lesson Plans

The development of lesson plans is required in all methods courses. Candidates must consider P–12 students’ learning characteristics in the context, lesson plan, and post observation using the KTIP lesson plan. Candidates document in Task A1 – “Context” their understanding of diversity elements impacting the learner. Candidates as evidenced in Task A2 – “Lesson Plan” – differentiate instructional strategies, assessment, and materials to engage and enhance all students’ learning based on the context. Technology selection is purposeful to enhance learning for all students. Candidates in the Task C “Post Observation” reflection utilize assessment data to differentiate future instruction. ([Table 3c.5](#) KTIP Lesson Plan)

The [Table 4a.3.2](#) – “Diversity Proficiency Assessment Data 2011–2015” – presents average data across all years for each diversity proficiency (from both the “advocacy/diversity” SOE requirements and the relevant KTS); the table also includes the item(s) from each assessment tool for the Unit and each Program. This data is use in Annual Institutional Planning and Assessment Grids 2014-2015 Goal 4: Candidates demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to Diversity to positively impact P-12 student performance. [Table 4a.3.3](#) Unit Diversity Proficiency Assessment Data Table and [Table 4a.3.4](#) provide summary data from assessment instruments.

As candidates continue their professional preparation, their field experiences become more participative and interactive, and thus require greater responsibilities and more careful preparation on the part of the candidates. Growth toward mastery of KTS and an integrated understanding of Kentucky’s curricular expectations, together with awareness of and development in the SOE dispositions (including advocacy/diversity), increase throughout the field experiences. Candidates examine their own development in skills, knowledge, and dispositions. They reflect on their experiences, and they receive evaluative feedback from their field supervisors and University faculty.

Clinical Practice (CP)

Candidates develop KTS-aligned portfolios at the Application to CP and at the completion of their CP; these give evidence of candidate competence across the KTS. Diversity is central to KTS P–12 in Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8; and in KTS IECE Standards 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Utilization of the portfolio rubric measures candidate’s competence from Developing to Exemplary, as may be seen in the following forms: Edu # 24A/Edu #24B, Edu #25 A/Edu #25B.

Professional Growth Plans (PGP)

Candidates self-assess and plan for their professional growth in KTS through the PGP process. These plans track the candidate’s growth from Acceptance to the SOE through completion of CP. They are developed and reviewed by each candidate and her/his academic advisor during semester advising sessions and by US of the Practicum and the CP. (See Edu # 27, Edu #32A/Edu #32B.)

ADVANCED PROGRAM RESPONSE

Attention to diversity permeates the MSTL program (see [Table 5C](#)). Specifically, the following [required coursework and experiences](#) enable MSTL candidates to develop awareness, knowledge, skills, and professional disposition to adapt instruction to diverse learners. The rationale for the implementation of the ESL program is that teachers are prepared to teach in a global environment. The ESL program curriculum designed to meet the unique needs of P-12 students whose first language is not English and who are members of cultural and linguistic minority populations is also therefore rich in diversity. The ESL endorsement involves coursework at the 300-400 levels. Therefore, diversity proficiencies for ESL candidates are embedded within the undergraduate data in [Table 4a.3.3](#). Candidates' performance in the area of diversity on the average is greater than 3.0 on a 4.0 scale. The piloting of [Edu #17](#) and [#17A](#) evaluation forms for ESL Field Experience and Practicum evaluation forms in spring and fall terms of 2015 includes the identification of twelve indicators designed to measure ESL candidates' diversity proficiencies.

For the MSTL program, Diversity Proficiencies are assessed within the [signature assessment](#). Results of these signature assignment are displayed in [Diversity Proficiencies Performance](#) data. Candidates design a unit that embodies a culturally relevant curriculum in EDL 655 with a mean of 4.0. EDL 630 participants implement discipline plans and share reflections on the effectiveness of the plan when used for students with different learning needs and styles with an average grade of 3.0. EDL 640 candidates develop and implement assessments for diverse P-12 classrooms with an average grade of 3.0. EDL 570 participants developed curriculum for diverse learning needs in accordance with Advanced Teacher's Standards. In EDL 570 instructional competencies were demonstrated by planning and implementing lessons for special needs with a class average of 4.0.

The SOE diversity proficiency "*Plans for learning and cultural diversity*" is assessed in EDL 655 the [Multicultural Lesson Rubric](#) (lines 1, 2, 4, and 5) and in EDL 620 using the [Ethical Case Scenario and Classroom Embedded Ethical/Policy Issue Rubric](#) (lines 7 & 8). The proficiency "*Engages students at all levels*" is assessed in EDL 570 using the [Rubric for Model Lesson Unit](#) (line 1) and EDL 500 [Mentoring Practicum 1 Rubric](#) (lines 1, 2, 3, & 4). The diversity proficiency "*Fosters a positive learning climate with effective classroom management*" is assessed in EDL 630 [Discipline Plan Rubric](#) (lines 4 & 8). "*Collaborates to design, implement, and support learning*" proficiency is measured in EDL 650 using the [Coaching/Mentoring Practicum 2/Achievement Gap Assignment and Rubric](#) (under Design section – d, f, & j; and Knowledge section f). The proficiency "*Assesses and analyzes results to meet diverse learning needs and situations*" is assessed in EDL 640 [Unit Assessment Rubric](#) (lines 5 & 6). The final proficiency "*Integrates technology to address diverse student needs*" is assessed in EDL 530 [Integrated Technology Lesson and Rubric](#) (lines 7, 8, & 9). Data from these assignments show a mean of 3.7 for [Diversity Proficiencies Performance](#). Data from these assessments therefore show that advanced candidates met or exceeded expected diversity competencies with particular strengths in their *ability plan for learning and cultural diversity, engage students at all levels, and collaborate to design, implement and support learning*.

4.4 AFI: The unit does not ensure candidates have opportunities to work with diverse faculty. *The one diverse faculty member teaches occasionally in the initial program, therefore candidates have limited interaction in course work, field experiences, or education activities.*

INITIAL PROGRAM RESPONSE

Initial teacher education program candidates have consistent opportunities to interact with higher education faculty and school-based faculty from diverse groups. All candidates are required to take Intro to Psychology as a prerequisite for the SOE-required Developmental Psychology course; Psy 105 has been taught for many years by Dr. Jubemi Ogisis from Nigeria. To meet their Physical Science General Education Requirement (GER), candidates choose from courses taught by Dr. Dmitry Uskov, and English-Language Learner (ELL) from the Soviet Union. As the modern language GER requirement, candidates are strongly urged to choose Spanish, which is taught by either Dr. Iris Moreno-Brown from Belize or Dr. Martin Velez from Peru, both ELLs. SOE candidates also have the opportunity to take a political science class in American Government from Dr. Anna Kuthy, another ELL originally from Poland. Secondary candidates have Dr. Patricia Akojie from Nigeria for one or more of their Edu courses. Dr. Patricia Akojie also guest lectures on the “Philosophy” chapter in the Edu 204 course, a required Core Course. CRC Coordinator/Director of Field Experiences Britton Hibbitt, an African American, teaches the section of BU 101 (Intro to Brescia University) for incoming freshmen interested in Education majors. Matthew Lindsey, a local high school French teacher with double Master’s degrees in French and in TESOL who teaches the ESL Practicum (Edu 404), is legally blind. In order to ensure that all SOE candidates have the opportunity to interact with these diverse faculty, the SOE Data Manager has begun to track candidates taking these various courses to ensure that, by the time they complete their individual Program, they will have had opportunities to interact with diverse faculty in at least one and preferably two formal classroom face-to-face settings. (See [SOE Candidate Checksheet – Diversity.](#))

Other examples of providing teacher education candidates with exposure to professionals of diverse backgrounds includes the following:

- Edu 204 has Dr. Akojie guest lecture on Philosophy of Education &/or incorporates a Ted Talk by black educator Rita Pierson;
- Edu 325/326: Teaching Language Arts in Elementary/Content Area requires candidates to design a center with books on cultural diversity;
- Edu 321/322: Teaching Reading in Elementary/Content Area utilizes a Shawna Moore video presentation, “Guided Groups,” from Teaching Channel” (Moore is of Hispanic ethnicity);
- Edu 314/315: Children/Adolescent Literature requires candidates to evaluate literature representing diverse perspectives, selecting from a large group of African American authors including Walter Dean Myers, Julius Lester, Toni Morrison, and Mildred Taylor

Professional Development opportunities during the current accreditation review cycle include both Ruby Payne’s presentation on the Framework of Poverty on November 21, 2014 and Temple Grandin’s public lecture and SOE meeting with students on meeting diverse learning needs, given on April 9, 2015.

SOE candidates also have available to them experience with diverse school-based faculty. These include Beth Ewing, bi-racial special education alumna, who serves as field and practicum supervisor in Special Education; Bob O'Brien, African American, who has served as field placement supervisor in Social Studies; and Karen Ellis, another African American who is currently working with Elementary candidates doing field hours as part of a BU partnership with Cravens Elementary School.

4.5 AFI: The unit has not demonstrated good faith efforts to increase or maintain a pool of candidates from diverse ethnic/racial groups. (I/A)

The unit does not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate the unit's efforts to develop INITIAL PROGRAMS

The SOE section of BU website has a tab called "Minority Candidates" (see <https://www.brescia.edu/soe-minority-candidates>). This link provides information regarding financial supports as well as recruitment incentives for minorities, job market for minorities, information about the shortage/need for minority teachers, as well as information needed by all candidates.

Britton Hibbitt, CRC Coordinator, also serves as The Black Student Union advisor. He presented education as a career path option to the group's members on September 9, 2014. Using information from the Vice President for Enrollment Management, he also contacted every Brescia student of diverse culture either in person or via email to invite them to consider teaching as a major and to welcome further conversation with him or SOE faculty. Britton also has contacted minority recruiters at Western Kentucky University and OCTC to gain information; as a result of these conversations, he found a need for minority-specific scholarship opportunities.

Recruitment publication for SOE initial programs includes pictures of culturally diverse staff and candidates.

The Admissions Office attends or sends material to the Minority Fair in Louisville. This office has identified high schools throughout the state who have Future Teacher clubs that could not only promote recruitment to the SOE but potentially reach diverse students within these clubs.

The SOE actively participates in campus-wide Preview Days and Open Houses by being available to talk with perspective students. SOE faculty also attend pre-registration events, so that they can answer student questions.

During Fall 2015, SOE Chair Dr. Ashley Holland began meeting with other University officials (including the VPAA), and Owensboro city and Daviess County educational administrators and superintendents to develop a "Grow Your Own" program for teachers. The goal is to help local high school students, especially those with diverse ethnic/cultural backgrounds, to see TEACH-ING as a viable career option by enabling them to take a se-

ries of dual-credit courses both on-site at their local high schools and on the college/university campuses in the area. Courses from Brescia, KWC, OCTC, and WKO-O have been identified that could be suitably offered within this format, and one course is being offered this spring at both Brescia and KWC. Interested students from area high schools are to be bussed to the sites in order to take these courses. Though it will take at least two to three years to see results in terms of local college/university enrollments in teacher education programs, the expectation is that the number of candidates with diverse ethnic/cultural backgrounds will increase.

Efforts to retain diverse candidates have up to now been concentrated in faculty advising, and in identifying, providing, and monitoring tutoring services through Student Support Services. Since that program has now transitioned to the Compass Center and will soon be folded into the Ursuline Center for Teaching and Learning – the UCTL – (made possible by a SIP Title III grant), tutoring services are now available to ALL SOE candidates, not just those who qualified under the former SSS program. Retention rates are expected to improve as a result. The UCTL will hire five tutors this spring, and efforts will be made to ensure that at least one of them is a diversity candidate. In addition, the UCTL will soon have both a writing and a math lab, both of which should also increase retention efforts. SOE faculty are committed to utilizing all the re-sources of the UCTL as soon as they become available in order to retain teacher education candidates or implement plans to increase the number of diverse candidates.

ADVANCED PROGRAM RESPONSE

As part of the university's and the unit's minority efforts, the Director of Admission sends all inquiries to the SOE Director of Graduate Program as soon as they are received. The Vice President for Enrollment Management and Executive Director of BUonline and the Curriculum Resource Director tracks and follows-up with minority students interested in pursuing an initial or advanced program in education (see [Minority Tracking Database](#)). In addition, the MSTL Director designs and distributes recruitment flyers that appeal to diverse candidates. See flyers and brochure examples – [Endorsement Brochure](#), [Upcoming Courses Mod4](#), and [Upcoming Courses 2014](#). These pamphlets have attracted some diverse candidates, but sometimes the Unit does not have the program prospective candidates are interested in pursuing or candidates may not meet the admission requirements. For example, a prospective diverse candidate in 2014, did not meet the admission requirements for the MSTL program.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

6.1 AFI: The budget for the CRC is insufficient. (I/A)

Evidence was not provided to indicate consistent budgetary consideration for the CRC

INITIAL AND ADVANCED PROGRAMS RESPONSE

The Brescia University Business Office disaggregated CRC expenses and in 2014 created a separate budget line item for the CRC, as may be seen here:

Academic Dean Income Statement

		CURRENT YEAR			PRIOR YEAR		
		5/31/2016 Budget	5/31/2016 Actual	Difference	5/31/2015 Budget	5/31/2015 Actual	Difference
TEACHER EDUCATION - ACADEMIC DEAN							
01-5432614	TEACHER EDUCATION - SUPPLIES	\$4,000.00	\$2,483.86	\$1,516.14	\$3,550.00	\$4,880.35	(\$1,330.35)
01-5432615	TEACHER EDUCATION - PRINTING	\$200.00	\$0.00	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$151.29	\$48.71
01-5432616	TEACHER EDUCATION - POSTAGE	\$400.00	\$83.61	\$316.39	\$400.00	\$151.52	\$248.48
01-5432617	TEACHER EDUCATION - CRC	\$5,000.00	\$1,010.85	\$3,989.15	\$5,000.00	\$2,947.71	\$2,052.29
01-5432619	TEACHER EDUCATION - TRAVEL	\$1,800.00	\$488.59	\$1,311.41	\$1,800.00	\$800.63	\$999.37
01-5432620	TEACHER EDUCATION - DUES	\$2,000.00	\$2,005.00	(\$5.00)	\$1,900.00	\$1,970.00	(\$70.00)
01-5432631	TEACHER EDUCATION - FILM	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$12.88	(\$12.88)
TOTAL TEACHER EDUCATION		\$13,400.00	\$6,071.91	\$7,328.09	\$12,850.00	\$10,914.38	\$1,935.62

As seen here, the current budget for the CRC is \$5000.00, money moved from the Initial and Graduate "SUPPLIES" budget line item in order to track more effectively CRC spending. Last year the CRC spent \$2,948. At present, this is adequate funding; acquiring a variety of new materials in the Curriculum Resource Center (CRC), particularly in the areas of IECE, ESL, and Social Justice, has been a priority over the last several years; materials for differentiating instruction and assessment in a number of content areas and at all levels P-12 has also been a focus. Since slightly more than \$1,000 has been spent during this current fiscal year, even with renewed acquisition emphasis, the current budget of \$5,000 is more than sufficient to meet current needs.

6.2 AFI: An inadequate number of support personnel limit faculty effectiveness and unit efficiency. (I/A)

Evidence provided indicates the unit has insufficient support staff to carry out operational demands, including data management, and placement and tracking of field experiences.

INITIAL AND ADVANCED PROGRAMS RESPONSE

Within this current accreditation cycle, three initiatives have been established to address this AFI and bring additional support to the SOE:

- TASKSTREAM has been adopted as the electronic data service provider for SOE data by the University and funds were allocated for training in its use. As ease of use grows, this continues to lessen the amount of staff time required to calculate Field Experience/Practicum hours manually, assess and analyze scores from numerous assessment forms, track candidate PRAXIS scores, in addition to numerous other tasks that have heretofore been labor-intensive.

- While an additional full-time support staff person has not been hired, when the Data Manager position became open yet again, great efforts were expended to find and hire someone who already knew the field of education and was familiar with KTS and other state certification requirements, discipline-specific language, and the challenges to modern educators. With the hiring of Sr. Betsy Moyer into this position, the Unit believes it has found a staff support person who can "work faster" and more intuitively because of her significant experience in the field of education, both as an elementary teacher and as a principal.

- The SOE now has assigned Work-Study students available whose combined workload is the approximate equivalent of an additional full-time position of 37.5 hours. (See [Work Study Timesheet](#).)

By investing in all three of these improvements, the institutional budget supports the SOE's teacher education programs by ensuring that it has adequate staff to carry out operational demands.