

**BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY**

Salem State University
July 10, 2013 1:00-5:00 p.m.

Offsite BOE Team Members

Dr. John R. Ward, Chair
Dr. William Bradley Colwell, Member
Dr. Mary Kay Finan, Member
Mrs. Jan P. McCarthy, Member
Dr. Pamela K. Hill, State Member
Dr. Vera M. Ossen, State Team Chair
Dr. James Martin-Rehrmann, State Member

Offsite BOE Team Observers

Ms. Maria Frederick, State Consultant
Ms. Margaret F. Regan, State Consultant
Mary Beth Nowinski, NCATE Affiliated Editor

**BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY**

The Purpose the of BOE Offsite Report

One of the key features of the Continuous Improvement (CI) Pathway is the combination of formative and summative processes. *The BOE Offsite Report provides formative feedback from the offsite review meeting. The BOE Onsite Report provides a summative evaluation of the findings from the onsite visit.*

The following BOE Offsite Report indicates areas of concern on which the Onsite BOE Team will focus during the upcoming visit. In addition, the last section for each standard is a list of evidence that the team plans to validate during the visit to ensure that the standards continue to be met. This validation will occur as the team interviews faculty, administrators, school-based partners, and other members of the professional community. Validation could also occur in the visits to schools and observations on campus. The validation list also includes some specific documentation that the team would like to review during the onsite visit. In some cases, the Offsite Team members could not locate a document or open a link and have requested that the Onsite Team review those documents.

The BOE Offsite Team has conducted a thorough review of the Institutional Report and exhibits to produce this report; however, the BOE Onsite Team is not limited to these findings. If the team is unable to validate information, or if further or contradictory information is found, the Onsite BOE Team may request additional evidence and/or cite new concerns as areas for improvement.

**BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY**

I. Movement Toward Target

Please indicate the standard(s) on which the unit selected to demonstrate movement toward target:

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

II. Unit Standards

STANDARD 1. CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS

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

1.1 Preliminary Findings

1.1.a What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit uses several measures of content knowledge. The first is the Massachusetts Test for Educator License (MTEL). These tests include Communications and Literacy Reading and Writing, Foundations of reading and (depending on the content area) one or two subject area tests. Data disaggregated for each program area and for Bachelor of Science in Education (BSE) and post-baccalaureate candidates is available for the last three years and shows that in all programs and years with more than 10 test takers, the passing rate exceeds 80 percent. For most areas, 100 percent of test-takers pass. The unit does require a passing score to enter the practicum, and so this would indicate that 100 percent of program completers pass the MTEL exams.

Grade point average (GPA) is a second indicator of content knowledge. The overall mean GPA of all initial level BSE students is 3.41. Average GPA is available and disaggregated for all programs and for BSE and post-bac candidates for the last three years. Frequency data show that less than one percent of candidates have a GPA of less than 2.75 and generally the average GPA exceeds 3.3 for all programs.

Grade point average for specific courses is the main source of evidence for advanced teacher candidate demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions for all elements of Standard 1.

Program specific content assessments (portfolios, research papers, exams, and other assessments) are also reported for the Early Childhood, English, History, Middle School, Humanities, Moderate Disabilities, and Spanish programs. GPA and comprehensive exam data are reported for the Elementary, Art, Early Childhood and Physical Education M.Ed. programs. Survey data from program graduates for the CLAS (acronym not clear from Salem State materials), Early Childhood, and Elementary BSE and post-bac programs also provide evidence of content knowledge proficiency. At the advanced teacher candidate level, assessment data is provided indicating content knowledge proficiency for the Early Childhood M.Ed. program.

Multiple key assessments are used to demonstrate both pedagogical content knowledge and professional and pedagogical knowledge. Various elements of the unit-wide initial level assessments are aligned with these two NCATE elements including Core Lesson Plan, Core Unit Plan, and Preservice Performance Assessment (PPA) for practicum candidates. Lesson plan and unit plan assessments are comprehensive assessments covering a range of planning requirements. Lesson plan assessments, for example, include evaluation of candidate plans for

Generative Topic, Essential Question(s), Knowledge of Students, Connection to Frameworks and Appropriate Goals, Learning Activities, Structure of Lesson, Extension and Enrichment, Assessments, and Reflection. Lesson and unit plan assessment data are available for many, but not all programs. Data are available from the key assessment page of the online exhibit room for the Early Childhood, Elementary, Health, History 5-8, Theater, and Visuals Art 5-12 programs and for all post-baccalaureate programs, but are not available for English, science BSE programs, and Spanish. This pattern of data demonstrating proficiency in many, but not all programs is repeated for the unit planning assessment. The Institutional Report (IR) reports that lesson and unit planning are unit-wide key assessments. The NSTA report shows that it includes candidates at both the post-baccalaureate and the BSE level, but consistent with reporting in the exhibit room, data for lesson plan and unit plan assessments were only provided for post-baccalaureate students. The NSTA reviewers did not comment on missing data for BSE students for these assessments. Data for lesson and unit planning were found in the NCTE Specialized Professional Association (SPA) report.

Data from the Preservice Performance Assessment (PPA) for practicum candidates were available for all programs. This instrument appears to be based on the Danielson framework adding Promoting Equity as a category and emphasizing both student and teacher inquiry. Data from this assessment provides evidence of pedagogical content knowledge and professional knowledge for all initial level teacher candidates. Similar to evidence for content knowledge, program completer survey data as well as survey data from cooperating teachers show positive evaluation of preparation for all Standard 1 elements. Eight employers also responded to a survey providing small sample evidence also supporting all NCATE Standard 1 elements although no survey question addressed content preparation.

In addition to assessments that cross pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical and professional knowledge, the unit assesses candidates using the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model, a nationally recognized model for addressing the needs of English-language learners. Disaggregated data show candidate proficiency using this model for all programs at the initial level.

Responsiveness to data on student learning is evidenced through multiple assessments. Lesson and unit plan assessments require candidates to answer questions on student performance, student misconceptions, and response to data. These elements are evaluated separately from other lesson and unit elements and data demonstrate candidate proficiency. The SIOP model is also cited as evidence although the model calls for use of assessment data to give feedback to students and does not require analysis of data for instructional improvement. It is not clear if the lesson plan, unit plan, and SIOP models are used in field experiences where candidates would get real learning results to analyze from P-12 students. Finally, most programs have additional program-specific assessments of candidate impact on student learning. A review of these assessments shows a range of approaches, all consistent with the impact on student learning element of Standard 1. Data from these assessments is program specific and demonstrates candidate proficiency.

Grade point average is used as an indicator of professional knowledge for other school professionals. Distribution of grades for competency and course is reported for Content,

Research, Leadership, Cultural Competency, Family/Community Resources, Use of Data, and Advanced Practice with the large portion of candidates earning A or A- in these areas. The data are disaggregated by M.Ed. programs including Educational Leadership, CAGs (acronym not in IR) programs. SPA approval and evidence for SPA assessments is provided for the M.Ed. in reading program and from ELCC SPA reports for Leadership programs. Comprehensive exams are reported for the Leadership program. Survey data for Principal and Leadership programs from practicum candidates indicate school-based supervisors rated candidates highly.

Data are limited or not available for the School Counseling, School Adjustment Counseling, and Technology Education programs. Evidence from state program reviews that are not available online may provide evidence for the School Counseling program.

The Principal/Supervisor CAGS and Reading programs provide evidence related to candidate to student learning. The Principal/Supervisor CAGS program uses a survey of candidates aligned with ELCC standards to demonstrate effectiveness. They also use a more direct measure – a program specific Preservice Performance Assessment (PAA) that addresses among related criteria that the candidate, “Assures presence and quality of educational programs that address the needs interests, and abilities of all students.” The School Counseling program uses a specific form of the PPA which clearly aligns to creating developmentally appropriate learning environments. Data for both programs indicate all candidates demonstrate proficiency. The Reading program requires a portfolio that in part emphasizes candidate assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation of student learning and the ability to create a literary learning environment. The Library program uses an assessment of planning that is linked to student learning in the exhibit room. It is not clear how this planning instrument is connected to creating a positive learning environment. Other evidence is available through SPA report, specifically the ToolKit assessment. It is not clear if the unit connects this or other data from the SPA report to this element. Data were not available for the School Counseling, or Technology Education programs.

Initial level candidate dispositions are assessed using the Professional Attribute Scale (PAS), an extensively developed rubric describing multiple dimensions of professional dispositions. The instrument was implemented two years ago. This is initially a self-reflective exercise and candidates self-rate. It is reported that the PAS is also used as a summative assessment in practicum. It is not clear whether data reported in the exhibit room of 100 percent of all candidates meeting all disposition expectations is based on candidate, supervisor, or cooperating teacher evaluation. The unit also uses elements of the PPA and the SIOP assessment to demonstrate candidate professional behavior and responsiveness to diverse student learning needs. It is not clear whether the PAS is used with advanced teacher candidates or generally how dispositions are assessed for advanced teacher candidates and other school personnel.

1.1.b How were unit programs reviewed by the BOE? What trends emerged? What do these trends reveal about the unit’s programs?

The MA DESE (acronym not provided) reviews programs and provides approval for programs that do not have associated NCATE SPA organizations. Salem State University has current MA DESE for programs in theater, physical education, health and consumer science, art, and School Counseling. Other programs are reviewed by SPAs and SPA reports are used as evidence for state accreditation. SPA approval has been earned for the programs not reviewed by the state with elementary education, mathematics, Spanish, teachers of English as a second language, teacher of students with mild disabilities, SPA applications in process.

The general trend that emerges is strong evidence for initial level candidate knowledge skills and dispositions with data disaggregated by program, by BSE and post-baccalaureate levels, with strong alignment between NCATE, state, and institutional standards. Assessment data also provides evidence for advanced teacher candidates, reading teachers, and principal and CAGS programs. Limited data are available for the programs in School Counseling, School Adjustment Counseling, and Technology Education.

The unit offers initial licensure through both BSE and M.A.T. programs in middle school, art education in PreK-8 and 5-12, Spanish for elementary and secondary, health and consumer science, physical education teacher licensure, history, mathematics, and theatre arts. BSE programs are offered for biology, chemistry, English, and earth sciences, whereas a general science program is offered at the MAT level. Initial licensure is offered through an MAT program in middle-level mathematics and through M.Ed. programs in middle-level humanities and math/science. Initial licensure is also offered through both BSE and M.Ed programs in early childhood, elementary education. An M.Ed. program in special education also offers initial licensure.

For advanced teacher candidates, the unit offers professional licensure programs in elementary, middle-level, and secondary education that align with Massachusetts requirements for professional licensure. Candidates may also enroll in M.Ed. programs aligned with their professional work to earn credentials for professional licensure.

Other school personnel programs include a specialist program in reading, School Counseling, School Adjustment Counseling, educational leadership, and teacher leadership, library media studies, and technology education.

Not included in this review are five certificate options listed on the “Programs of Study” page of the online exhibits: Applied Behavior Analysis, Autism Spectrum Disorders, Teaching English as a Second Language, Holocaust and Genocide Studies. These are four course sequence options that earn a Salem State University certificate recognition, but do not lead to licensure.

1.2 Continuous Improvement

1.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has engaged in significant continuous improvement. Because Standard 1 is the

ultimate outcome of unit activities, many improvements that may also impact other NCATE standards are reported here. For example, there is extensive reporting of improvements in individual assessment validity and reliability and most significantly the development of the assessment of candidate dispositions (Standard 2). Improvements have been made in field experiences at the secondary level (Standard 3) and improvements to meet the needs of English language learners (Standard 4). While all of these improvements relate to Standard 1, there are curricular improvements cited in the IR that provide additional evidence of ongoing improvement that don't easily fit with other standards. For example, curriculum changes to better help candidates pass MTEL subject tests during a time of rising expectations. An ad-hoc Education Working group is examining significant structural changes to programs. The topics under discussion would seem to in part be responses to changing employment trends for graduates of highly enrolled programs.

1.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

There were no AFIs cited from previous visits.

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. The unit appears to have limited data available demonstrating that School Counseling, School Counseling, and technology education candidates meet proficiency for professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills and student learning for teacher candidates (Standard 1 Elements C and D).

Rationale: Evidence in IR attachments, exhibit room, or SPA reports for these programs was not located. Evidence from state program reviews not available online may provide evidence for the School Counseling program.

2. The unit appears to have limited data demonstrating knowledge, skills, and dispositions for advanced teacher candidates.

Rationale: GPA for specific courses is the main source of evidence for advance teacher candidate demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions for all elements of Standard 1. An explanation of how this demonstrates knowledge, skills, and dispositions is not provided.

1.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

1. Data tables refer to post-baccalaureate programs. It is not clear if these are initial license only students or if these data also refer to MAT students.
2. Acronyms Key: Acronyms are frequently used in the IR without the full title being made clear. What is the CLAS program for example? The IR indicates this is the Committee on Licensure in the Arts & Sciences, but data documents indicate this is a program. It is assumed that CLAS is an internal reference to secondary education programs, but this and many other acronyms are unclear. MTEL is clearly well-known in Massachusetts, but still should be named the first time it is referred to.

3. Are data available for lesson and unit planning key assessments for all programs? Science program data were not found.
4. P-12 student learning data: Are these data collected during the student teaching? Samples of when and where the candidates collect and analyze P-12 student learning data is needed.
5. It is not clear if the lesson plan, unit plan, and SIOP key assessments are used in field experiences where candidates analyze real learning results from students as a basis to improve instruction.
6. A description is needed connecting the assessments used in the library program and the element for student learning for other school personnel.
7. Is PAS data based on candidate self-rating or is it based on ratings from faculty, supervisors, or cooperating teachers? For the other disposition assessments, who completes the assessments?
8. How are dispositions assessed for advanced teacher candidates and other school personnel?

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit assessment system, SEAS, has been revised and updated since the last NCATE accreditation visit. According to the IR, Salem State University (SSU) has committed resources to building the infrastructure needed for a large-scale assessment system; the unit is at the forefront of the assessment system. The Unit Assessment Committee has been engaged in work to improve and enhance the assessment system. This work includes analyzing reports on all candidates and pre-licensure students and working with faculty to use the data, and finally continued refinement of rubrics. In close cooperation with the Informational Technology Services (ITS), unit faculty and field supervisors can enter rubric ratings on candidates' performance on program key assessments (Exhibit 2.3.a SEAS Basic Description).

The unit has an assessment system that supports the conceptual framework, professional and state standards. It has been designed to include assessments and measures to analyze candidate, course, and program performance, and to manage and improve the unit's programs and operations. Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments at admission into programs, appropriate transition points, and program completion. The new assessment system is part of the university assessment system and has been woven into the university's data warehouse and reporting system, iStrategy. A "Licensure Tracking System" has been developed over the last year and a half to capture candidates' performance on key assessments and a robust reporting system that will allow faculty to see how candidates are moving through the program and who and perhaps why some are not progressing. This system was piloted in spring 2013 and will be fully implemented in fall 2013 (Exhibit Room Standard 2 - Element 2c).

Key Assessments, which are tied to specific courses or points in the candidates' program, are to

be part of the unit's assessment system. SEAS is also responsible for collecting program completer and cooperating educator data at the end of each semester. Currently, these reports are produced through the FileMaker database but this system will be replaced by the iStrategy reporting system in the fall of 2013—at least for undergraduate reporting. In addition to these assessment reports, surveys are administered online via SurveyMonkey. All reports are given to program coordinators, department chairs, and the associate dean. (See Exhibit 2.3.d Sample of Program Completer Results for Program Coordinator - Elementary). To help the Office of Licensure and Field Placement (OLFP) check the accuracy of a practicum applicant's information as well as assist with tasks like practicum placements, a FileMaker Pro database system has been used to bring in MTEL scores from the university's database system as a means of verifying students' MTEL passing status. Also, reviewers noted that averages are being used to analyze data on a rubric that appears to be ordinal in its scale. An example, found in the exhibit room, is 'SEAS Spring 2011 Rubric Ratings: Key Assessments by Course.' Is there evidence that the scale used in this rubric and others like it meets the standard of interval data, i.e., all items on the scale represent an equal amount of the skill or criterion being measured?

The Unit Assessment Committee has been charged with the responsibility to oversee the development of assessment tools and the utilization of assessment information. The members of the committee include faculty from each of the Education Departments and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) along with the director of the OLFP, the SEAS data manager, the faculty assessment coordinator, and the associate dean. The Unit Assessment Committee has been responsible for working with the SEAS faculty coordinator and the SEAS data manager to review data and to recommend refinements or more extensive changes to the system. According to the Standard 2 Exhibit 2 – Element 2.b, the Assessment Committee is comprised of seven to nine members.

According to the IR, the most significant change in practice as a result of SEAS data reporting and data quality concerns has been the extensive revision of both the Lesson Plan rubric and the Lesson Plan itself. Information about the interrater reliability study is available in Exhibits 2.3.c. In spring 2011, a working group composed of faculty, field supervisors, and elementary classroom teachers took part in a multi-step reliability study of the unit's Core Lesson Plan. As a result, a working group was formed to revise the Core Lesson Plan rubric. Figure 2b-1 shows the process that was followed to enhance the Core Lesson Plan. More reliability studies are scheduled to occur in 2013 - 2014 on other key assessments, such as observations of practicum candidates' teaching.

Improvements in the tracking of the assessments for the advanced programs have occurred over the past three years. Program coordinators for Advanced Programs in Moderate Special Needs, Early Childhood and Elementary Education, Art, Spanish, Physical Education, and Leadership have developed a common set of advanced proficiencies: Content, Research, Leadership, Cultural Competency, and Family/Community Resources. Proficiency-related data for the past 3 years can be found in the Exhibit Room "Key Assessments - Advanced Programs" area. Data from these advanced programs will be woven into the iStrategy system during AY2013-14 once ITS completes the development of the degree tracker system for graduate programs.

2.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has been engaged for three years in significant work on the new assessment system that is scheduled to be fully implemented in fall 2013.

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

2.3.a What AFIs are removed

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1.The unit is not using data from follow-up surveys of graduates or from employers to inform the programs.	ITP,ADV	The unit is using data from follow-up surveys of graduates and employer surveys to inform the programs through SurveyMonkey. The IR exhibit indicates this has been addressed. This needs to be verified onsite.

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. The unit assessment system does not include a systematic evaluation of data on unit operations.	ITP,ADV	Evidence was not found to verify that the unit systematically evaluates data on unit operations.
2.The unit's assessments of student learning for other school personnel are not adequate.	ADV	Data were not found to verify student learning for other school personnel is adequate.

2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. The unit will implement iStrategy in fall 2013. What is the timeline for iStrategy implementation? Clarification of timeline on implementation is needed for the initial and advanced programs. What is the unit’s plan to transition to the iStrategy?

Rationale: The specific timeline for both implementation and transition plans is not evidenced in the IR.

2. What is the process for addressing candidates who are not meeting expectations at each transition point in the program?

Rationale: There is no evidence of transition points for addressing candidates who are not meeting expectations of each program.

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

1. Data from the spring pilot of the new assessment system.

2. Evidence that the iStrategy system is live.
3. Evidence of timeline for the advanced programs part in the iStrategy system.
4. Interview unit faculty and public school faculty about the unit assessment system's collaborative process. What is the level of faculty involvement in the evaluation and refinement of the unit's assessment system? What data are shared with P-12 partners? How do the data get disseminated to the stakeholders?
5. Evidence to verify that assessment data are carefully considered by the faculty and advisory committees for program improvement.
6. Interview the candidates from both initial and advanced programs to validate the evaluation and feedback process.
7. Interview the Unit Assessment Committee to verify the process of the development of the iStrategy system. Was the process collaborative with the unit's professional community?

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.

3.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard

The unit has developed a collaborative relationship with both public and private P-12 schools in 50 districts to ensure all candidates have rich and diverse field and clinical experiences. Beginning with pre-practicum courses, field experience and clinical practice give candidates a platform for the conceptual framework of inquiry, practice and reflection as they apply the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions to help all children learn.

As found in the IR and exhibits, faculty, cooperating practitioners, principals and superintendents participate in the design and development of the field and clinical experiences as well as the placement and assessment of candidates. The Professional Community Advisory Board (PCAB) includes faculty, seminar leaders, cooperating practitioners, and principals and supervisors. The PCAB minutes from April 2008 note a discussion of the designed units for student teachers and how they learn. Minutes also noted that unit faculty would do a workshop on "How to Be a Cooperating Teacher" at the Best Practices Conference. November 2012 minutes report one unit member asked: "What would you like us to do in five years?" Many examples of the unit and schools working together for staff professional development, licensure programs offered at school sites and assisting schools with grant applications were found in exhibits. It is unclear to the team how all stakeholders including school partners are involved in the design, delivery and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice or clinical placements.

Collected data is one source for evaluation, assessment, and changes to both the initial and advanced programs. The unit uses Survey Monkey to collect data from program completers as well as the cooperative practitioners. Feedback from advanced candidates resulted in change in information sessions on licensure. Office of Licensure and Field Placement (OLFP) director now discusses the licensure needs for each program in small group sessions. In 2012, the unit

implemented “clusters” of initial candidates at three school sites for field experiences to create strong linkages between the stakeholders. Midway through the year, the unit asked and received feedback evaluating the cluster format for enhanced field and clinical experience. Positive comments were received as well as suggestions for change. A formal evaluation data was to be gathered in May according to the IR. Minutes from informational meetings between the unit and possible school sites were in the exhibits.

All candidate entry and exit criteria are found in unit catalogues as well as the OLFP website and are aligned with the unit’s conceptual framework. Expectations for the practicum experience can be found in the Practicum Handbook. Field supervisors attend the practicum and clinical orientations each semester. Exit criteria found in exhibit 3.3g includes PPA performance ratings, MA DESE standards met, the evaluation of portfolios and input from field supervisor and cooperating practitioners as well as the completion of field work in a diverse setting.

OLFP coordinates all field experience placements. Placement of initial candidates is jointly determined by the unit and its P-12 partners with input from candidates. Advanced candidate applications for Graduate Student Teaching Practicum require documentation for pre-practicum hours and the diverse site. The procedure for practicum placement of advanced candidates was found in exhibits in Academic Information & Policies. The School of Graduate Studies provides practicum experience in consultation with OLFP, the candidate and the program coordinator. Graduate level initial candidates can request Reduction in Student Teaching when prior experience is applicable. It is unclear how the unit determines if candidates are to be approved for a Reduction in Student Teaching. The policies, procedures and criteria for the unit’s waiver policy were not described.

Field and clinical experience vary in length based on the program. Syllabi for advanced and initial courses state the required hours of field experience with specific assignments noted. EDU 105 requires 15 hours of field work while EDU 252A is 25 hours. The hours required of candidates in clinical practice meet or surpass the MA DESE requirement of 300 hours for initial candidates and from 300 to 500 hours for advanced candidates based on program. As found in the IR and exhibits, candidates are expected maintain reflective journal during field experiences.

Initial candidate fieldwork begins with assignments that are linked to the pre-practicum courses. Candidate field work will include but not be limited to observations, staff interviews, case studies, and learning logs. Prior to admission to practicum, all candidates must complete 75 hours of field work which includes experience with a diverse student population. The pre-practicum documentation form and practicum forms are reviewed by the instructors and field supervisors. Initial candidates in elementary education will do field work in the diverse four labs schools. Secondary education candidates are placed in the culturally and linguistically diverse Salem High School for field experience in the required EDU 252A.

Principals, coordinators and field supervisors identify potential cooperating practitioners who must meet the MA DESE regulations. All cooperating practitioners have a licensure and three or more years of classroom experience with evaluation ratings of proficient or higher. The process for selection, training and evaluation of full-time and part-time clinical faculty was found in the exhibits. Examples of communication with clinical faculty were found in the Supervisor and

Seminar Leader meeting minutes. The unit held an interrater reliability study with field supervisors observing classroom teachers for consistent evaluation of candidate work. Training materials and information for cooperating practitioners were not found. The process for communication with cooperating practitioners was unclear.

Multiple measures/assessments are used to evaluate skills, knowledge and dispositions. These measures are aligned to the unit's conceptual framework as well as professional, state and unit standards. Candidates are assessed with the MA DESE Pre-Service Performance Assessment which asks content specific questions. Assessment and rubrics for the Core Lesson Plan, Core Unit Plan, the Professional Attribute Scale and the Sheltered Institution Observation Protocol (SIOP) are used to evaluate skills, knowledge and dispositions of candidates. Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) will be required for all licensure core candidates in 2014. Key assessments have diversity related proficiencies. The unit has ten proficiencies for initial candidates and seven common proficiencies for advanced programs. Candidates rated 75 percent proficiency with lesson and unit plans and 100 percent proficiency in PPA and SIOP key assessments. As found in exhibit Table S1-AdvProg2.Grades-Prof 1-7, all advanced candidates were found proficient or higher. In the exhibit: Adv Prog 2. PS-Prof1, all candidates were rated 100 percent on all dimensions. Program specific proficiencies were also found in Exhibit 1.3c. Assessments are completed by the candidates, P-12 partners and unit faculty.

Field supervisors evaluate candidates formally three times during a clinical practice. Many informal evaluations are completed by cooperating practitioners, unit and program supervisors.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

3.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has implemented changes that demonstrate continued improvement with use of field experience and clinical practice. The pre-practicum courses link the required fieldwork with course or program assignments that include reflection. In foundation courses, candidates begin with directed observations and journaling to develop their skills and knowledge. Established assessment and rubrics for the required lesson and unit plans indicate candidate proficiency in knowledge, skills and dispositions. Programs for other school professionals also align with the five standards for MA DESE. To assure that all candidates have met the criteria for field experience and clinical practice, the Office of Licensure and Field Placement assigns all candidates to a school site and grade level. OLFP can accommodate initial candidates living on campus with field experience in the laboratory schools. Advanced candidates can file a request for Reduction in Student Teaching. The unit hired a coordinator of field placement. The coordinator is charged with community outreach and off-campus programs as well as field placements.

Through surveys, committee discussions and seminars, the unit has initiated several changes to the field experience and/or clinical practice. Feedback from advanced candidates led the unit to include specific guidelines in the agreement signed by employers so candidates were given support and time for required field experiences and course assignments. The unit also changed

the licensure wrap-up sessions when surveys showed that the post-baccalaureate candidate needs for information were different from the baccalaureate candidates.

Challenges created by the distances with field placement across 50 districts led the unit to create the cluster approach to field experience placement. This approach allows field supervisors greater opportunity to collaborate and mentor candidates. Clustering focuses on developing a team and whole school community to give time for support through the field/clinical placement by peers, school site personnel, and unit faculty.

The unit has developed verification forms for both the initial and advanced candidates for pre-practicum, field and clinical experiences. All initial and advanced candidates are required to submit the pre-practicum documentation of 75 hours field experience in at least one diverse setting prior to admission to practicum and clinical practice. The unit uses both informal and formal methods to evaluate the programs and candidate progress. The unit developed the Student at Risk form which formalized communication between cooperating teachers, candidates and field supervisors.

The unit has created more specificity for assessment of lesson plans and extension activities. The unit has workshops for field supervisors and cooperative practitioners for interrater reliability.

3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

There were no AFIs cited from previous visits.

3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None

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

1. What are the three sites for the cluster schools? I could only find two referenced.
2. Which of the Winthrop schools is being used as a cluster site?
3. What are the P-12 demographics for other two cluster schools? I found the demographics for the Winthrop school in Ipswich and Melrose districts.
4. What are the criteria for a cluster school site?
5. How has the unit addressed the concern from mid-year feedback that candidates in a cluster site will lack diversity of experience through the practicum?
6. What was the result of formal survey of the cluster school experience?
7. We need to see examples of candidate portfolios.
8. Which candidates are eligible for reduction in student teaching hours. How is that decided?
9. What is the orientation process for cooperating practitioners? Letter from the OLFP sites the requirements and policies but doesn't indicate a training session for cooperating practitioners.

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.

4.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Diversity is an integral part of Salem State University's and the School of Education's mission. It is clearly articulated in the major tenets of the unit's conceptual framework. The unit's mission is committed to preparing culturally responsive teachers and leaders. The unit broadly defines diversity to include English language learners, gender, sexual orientation, students from low-income backgrounds, and students with exceptionalities, and it has developed proficiencies related to diversity that are interwoven throughout coursework and assessments.

According to the IR, the unit provides curriculum for candidates to learn about (1) exceptionalities and inclusion, (2) English language learners and language acquisition, (3) ethnic/racial and cultural groups (4) linguistic differences, and (5) gender differences, and the impact of these factors on learning. To ensure focused attention to diversity in education, all programs—for teachers, leaders and other school personnel--include required diversity courses, with pre-practicum field experiences (Exhibit 4.3. a,b).

Diversity-related proficiencies are documented in key assessments, including the Core Lesson and Core Unit Plans; the Professional Attributes Scale (PAS); the Climate, Equity and Professionalism standards of the Pre-Service Performance Assessment (PPA); and the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), in addition to other program-specific assessments (Exhibits 2.3).

Beginning in AY 2013-2014, programs to prepare teachers in core academic subjects (early childhood, elementary, reading, special education, English, history, math, and the sciences) will be required to take an additional course in sheltering English for ELLs, comprising an "SEI endorsement" required by MA DESE for those teachers by July 2014 (Exhibit 4.3.i.)

The Office of Academic Affairs has worked with deans, department chairs, and Search Committees to recruit a diverse pool of faculty (Exhibit 4.3.g). All advertised faculty positions have, as a preferred qualification, the commitment to working in a multicultural, multiracial environment with persons of diverse backgrounds and learning styles and to serving as a role model and mentor for students. In some faculty searches where applicant pools contain little or no diversity, the search may be held for further advertising and recruitment efforts. There are 22 full-time unit faculty, two Latino/as, one African-American, and one Asian, for a total of four diverse faculty or 18 percent. Four new faculty will begin in AY 2013-2014 (one shared with the

English Dept); two have been hired to date; one is a Latina (F), the other a White male (Exhibit 4.3.d).

Experience with male and female and diverse candidates from different socio-economic groups, work together on committee and education projects, affirm the value of diversity in good faith efforts to recruit and maintain pool of candidates.

Although the institution is noted in the IR as the most culturally diverse school in the Massachusetts state university system, the unit demographics show the unit is heavily white and female. The unit recognized their challenge for candidate interaction with candidates from diverse cultural, ethnic and/or racial backgrounds. As seen in the candidate demographic chart in exhibit 4.3.e, only four percent of undergraduate candidates identify as students of color with 88 percent as white. Advanced candidates have even less chance of working with a candidate of color with 91 percent identified white. Demographics for 2010 to 2012 graduate programs showed Education Leadership CAGS have no minority candidates. Both initial and advanced candidates are over 70 percent female. Elementary Education and Early Childhood have the highest percentages of female candidates with all Early Childhood pre-licensure candidates female.

The unit does use cohort model to give greater interaction with advanced candidates. The clustering of initial candidates during pre-practicum and practicum also offers greater opportunity for interaction with candidates of color as they collaborate and offer support at these diverse sites. There was no information found in the IR or the exhibits concerning the demographics of the candidates assigned at the clustering school sites during this first year.

The minutes for the SOE Student Service and Personnel Committee meeting listed a number of suggestions to recruit candidates of color. To recruit more diverse advanced candidates, it was proposed that the unit collaborate with the Graduate Admission and Presidents Advisory Committee on Diversity as well as the SOE participate in the Spring Graduate Open House.

As found in the IR and exhibits 4.3h, the unit has several initiatives to recruit more initial candidates of color. The minutes from the SOE Retention Meeting in March 2008 included brochures to high school guidance counselors, unit representatives at school college fairs, and bringing interested high school students to campus for a half day. Other efforts found in the exhibits include culturally diverse staff reaching out to high schools with large diverse student populations such as in Boston. The unit has supported the peer mentoring Transition Support Program. From these efforts, three students of color have applied to Project SAEL. Project SAEL grants are to prepare future STEM – ELL educators. Found in the exhibits were numerous efforts by the institution to help freshmen and first generation college students succeed. These included Summer Bridge Academy, Upward Bound Program, College Access Program and the programs through Student Academic Support Services (SASS). However, there was no clear connection of recruitment for the unit or the retention of candidates for SOE in these programs.

The unit requires initial and advanced candidates have field experience in a diverse setting. The Director of OLFP assigns all field and clinical experiences to assure that each candidate is placed

with a diverse P-12 student population. Initial candidates in Early Childhood and Elementary Education are assigned field experiences in the highly diverse laboratory schools; while secondary education candidates complete a field experience at Salem High School, a culturally and linguistically diverse student body. Course syllabi for initial and advanced candidates include specific assignments to develop proficiencies for cultural and learning needs of the diverse learner. Syllabi for EDU 256A include assignments for curriculum planning and multiple instructional assessment. Assignments focus on the diverse student that include but are not limited to reflection regarding cultural differences and the creation of culturally appropriate instructional strategies and assessments. Advanced candidates and other school professionals are required to have field experience with a diverse student population. Exhibit 4.3.f, Table S4-3.f2: Practicum Placement AY2011-2012 shows that advanced candidates and other school personnel candidates have field placement with socio-economic diversity, students with first language not English, and special needs. Advanced candidates in EDU 705, 739, and 829 are required 25 hours classroom observation and participation with culturally diverse students.

Exhibit 4.3.f, lists all the school districts and school site P-12 demographics. A separate chart with demographics for the six districts with the highest number of candidates placed for practicum is in this exhibit. District school populations at these sites are over 50 percent students of color, 52 percent students on free/reduced lunch and 17.8 percent special needs. The unit has three school sites used to cluster candidates for practicum and clinical practice. Although two of these sites were named in the IR, one school demographics were not listed and there are two schools of the same name in the Exhibit 4.3.f.

All candidates have multiple interactions with diverse P-12 students through pre-practicum and practicum field experience, and during clinical practice. Candidates in EDU 100 and 308 are also involved in F.A.S.S.T, an after school program for culturally diverse and high poverty students.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Movement Toward Target. Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

4.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Very significant improvements have taken place since the last visit to meet the needs of English language learners. Curriculum has been developed to provide all teacher and leader candidates with competence in sheltered instruction starting in the fall of 2014. In the mean time, a key assessment of sheltered instruction using the SIOP model has been implemented for all initial candidates. Recent faculty hiring has led to more diversity with 4 new underrepresented faculty starting in the fall of 2013.

4.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

4.3.a What AFIs are recommended for removal?

1.The unit does not ensure that all graduate candidates have opportunities to complete field experiences in diverse settings.	ADV	The unit requires all advanced candidates to complete field experience in a diverse setting. The field experience is documented with the OLFP prior to program completion.
---	-----	--

4.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1.The unit does not ensure that all graduate candidates have opportunities to complete field experiences in diverse settings.	ADV	The director of OLFP assigns all candidates field experience to assure that all advanced candidates have opportunities to complete a field experience in diverse settings.

4.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. There is little opportunity for advanced candidates to collaborate with culturally, ethnically, or racially diverse candidates.

Rationale: Ninety-one percent of all advanced candidates are White. There is no stated process to assure that an advanced candidate has an opportunity to work with candidates of diversity. It was unclear what good-faith efforts have been to recruit diverse candidates by the unit.

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

1. Examples of candidate work focused on diversity issues.
2. Policies and practices for recruiting including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty.
3. Interview faculty and candidates regarding the unit's efforts in the area of diversity.
4. Verify the hiring of diverse faculty in fall 2013.
5. There appears to be no a clear connection between the institution's diversity recruitment effort and the unit's recruitment efforts. Evidence is needed indicating a good faith effort by the unit to recruit candidates from diverse socioeconomic and ethnic/racial groups.
6. What are the P-12 demographics for other two cluster schools? I found the demographics for the Winthrop school in Ipswich and Melrose districts.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

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

5.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

5a. **Qualified Faculty:** The unit has 22 full-time faculty, all of which has an earned doctorate (Ed.D/Ph.D), and is comprised of 2 instructors, 6 assistant professors, 9 associate professors, and 5 full professors. There are 29 part-time faculty (but full-time at SSU) and 71 adjunct (external) faculty. Of the 71 adjunct faculty, 33 have a doctorate. The remaining 38 all have a masters' level degree and are licensed or have experience in school settings. Exhibits indicate that the SOE is hiring two new tenure-track faculty in areas of high need (special education, ESL) as well as anticipate hiring a leadership faculty member in 2014-2015. A review of selected faculty vita indicates that both those who are full-time in the unit and part-time in the unit/full-time in the institution have expertise that qualifies them for their assignments. In addition, the majority have had professional experiences in school settings as teachers and administrators.

5b. **Teaching:** A review of the exhibits provides initial evidence that faculty have a rich understanding of the content they teach. It will be essential to confirm this through additional documentation, candidate interviews, and student evaluations data. Exhibits show that twenty-four (24) semester hours of credit of instruction is considered the normal faculty teaching workload for the academic year

5c. **Scholarship:** Evidence shows that faculty are expected to maintain a scholarly agenda while at SSU. Of the 22 full-time faculty, 16 had at least one book/chapter/article since the last visit. Specifically, the 16 faculty generated 12 books, 26 book chapters, 56 articles, and 21 "other" types of scholarship during this time. In addition, unit faculty were active in making academic presentations to their professional organizations at all levels (Local – 55; Regional – 82; National – 96; and International – 63) for a total of 296 presentations. An exhibit showed that 6 full-time faculty in the unit were grant active since the last visit. Though secured primarily by one faculty (associate dean), there was a total of twenty external grant awards. The university and unit provide financial support for faculty scholarship. Specifically, there are 3 types of grants (ranging up to \$3000) to support faculty who are pursuing conference presentations or publication.

5d. **Service:** Evidence shows that a majority of the faculty are involved in service to the university, college, department, or community. Ranging from search committee membership, model syllabi development to advisor of an honor society, faculty have made a wide array of contributions to furthering candidate knowledge and student/teaching learning.

5e. **Faculty Performance Evaluation:** The procedures and guidelines for review, promotion, and tenure of faculty are clearly outlined in the exhibits. Faculty evaluations are comprehensive, systematic, and conducted on an annual basis, including voluntary post-tenure review. Full-time

non-tenured faculty and adjuncts are evaluated by student evaluations, which consist of the Student Instructional Report II instrument. No evidence was presented on how new faculty are mentored in the unit.

5f. Professional Development: In accordance with the collective bargaining agreement, each full-time unit faculty member that completed an application received \$682 in FY12 and \$703 in FY13 in professional development for conference travel. Further, both full-time and part-time faculty participate in workshops, reading circles, one-week intensive institutes, semester-long programs in hybrid and online learning, and year-long faculty learning communities to help bolster their faculty and scholarly capacities. There is no reference in the IR regarding whether the unit offers faculty sabbaticals.

5.2 Moving to Target

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
<p>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>AND</u></p> <p>There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</p>	<p>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <p>There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</p> <p>[BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]</p>	<p>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>AND</u></p> <p>There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</p>	<p>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>AND</u></p> <p>There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</p>

The unit has selected Standard 5 as their “target” standard. The evidence reviewed would demonstrate the unit is “moving toward target” at the “developing” level. Evidence would appear that the areas of teaching, scholarship and service are satisfactory and that faculty are being fairly and consistently evaluated. The IR states the faculty are strong in collaboration and active in local schools. The unit is focusing its professional development on issues of English Language Learners as well as co-teaching.

5.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

There are no AFIs cited from previous visits.

5.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None

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

1. Need unit policy on faculty professional development
2. Additional data regarding quality of teaching
3. Evidence of faculty mentoring

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.

6.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

6.a Unit Leadership: The academic structure of Salem State University (SSU) consists of the undergraduate day colleges, the School of Graduate Studies (SGS), and the College of Continuing and Professional Studies (CCPS). Within this structure there are five deans who direct the academic programs: the SGS and CCPS each have a dean as well as the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the Bertolon School of Business, and the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS). The deans of CAS, CCPS and the SGS have significant administrative responsibilities for different academic operations within the Unit.

The School of Education (SOE) is located in the CHHS, along with five other schools (which include criminal justice, nursing, occupational therapy, social work, and preschool). College leadership is provided by the dean (who is also a university associate provost), while the SOE is headed by the associate dean (unit head and NCATE coordinator) and 3 chairpersons (one for each department). The SOE is organized into three departments -- childhood education (CE); literacy, counseling & learner development (LCLD); and adolescent education & leadership (AEL) – along with five coordinators in specific content areas within the various departments.

There are a large number of leadership positions in the unit that are currently unfilled or have interim titles. Specifically, there is a search underway for a newly-created position of SOE dean, the associate dean just announced her return to faculty, and two of the three departments have interim chairpersons.

Restructuring: There was a faculty retreat on May 22-23, 2013 to discuss proposed restructuring of the SOE. Review of the retreat minutes show a total overhaul of the entire unit governance and structure, and may best be summarized with a statement from the minutes that the restructuring is “redefining everyone’s role in this process.”

6b. Budget: There is a lack of detail in the budgetary exhibits and attachments. Financial data are only shown for expenditures. Comparatively, within the CHHS the SOE had the second highest percentage increase in expenditures (FY 09-12) at 12 percent (behind criminal justice with a 23 percent increase); between colleges, the CHHS had the lowest percent increase in expenditures (10 percent compared to 14 percent for Art/Sciences and 17 percent for the School of Business

and “Other”). There are no data regarding financial allocations nor is the data divided into personnel and operational budgets. Other missing data include information from the foundation/advancement area, overhead from external contracts/grants, student tuition increases, budgets of the three departments in SOE, and student scholarship information – just to name a few. In sum, there is not enough information to tell if SSU’s budgetary allocation is in proportion to the unit’s student enrollment or other colleges.

6c. Personnel: The collective bargaining agreement with the faculty union provides a full-time faculty workload at a maximum of 12 credit hours of teaching per semester. The actual number of instructional hours depends upon each faculty member’s teaching, research, and service. Reductions from this level are determined on an individual basis by the faculty member, department chairperson, and the dean. There is no information on the availability of summer course offerings for faculty or teaching overloads. Data are not available regarding the hiring process of clinical/field supervisors or the number of candidates they supervise.

The unit effectively utilizes part-time faculty, who contribute to the integrity and quality of the various programs. There are 100 part-time faculty teaching in the unit (29 who are full-time in other colleges at SSU and 71 adjuncts). There appears to be a significant reliance on part-time faculty (22 FT vs. 100 PT) in the SOE. There are 51 field supervisors, comprised of currently employed SOE faculty.

Regarding support staff, exhibits show that the unit has four support staff members, who undertake the secretarial or support work of the departments as well as administrative offices. There are another four professional staff members who function in specialized services, namely, Director of the Office of Licensure and Field Placement (OFLP), the Coordinator of Field Placement, Outreach and Off-Campus programs, the SOE Assessment Data Manager, and the MTEL Test Preparation Coordinator. It appears that academic advisement is undertaken centrally by professional university advisors, then by SOE faculty once a major is declared. It is unclear if the SOE utilizes undergraduate student workers or graduate assistance in its operation.

6d. Unit Facilities: SSU’s library was closed in 2008 due to structural problems in the building. While a new Library and Learning Commons was built, the university supported the creation of an interim library in re-structured space in the Bertolon School of Business, which resulted in the maintenance of full services. Otherwise, no information was provided about the academic facilities, including minimally the number of faculty offices or classrooms, to determine if the building(s) used to house the SOE meet the needs of the unit.

6e. Unit Resources (including Technology): The Sullivan Building, housing the Education Department and Graduate School, contains many technology-enhanced classrooms. The Department of Education also has a dedicated Classroom for Technology Enhanced Pedagogy (CTEP), and there are five open computer labs on campus plus the library comprising about 200 stations. All campus buildings have wireless network access, and SSU recently switched from Blackboard to Canvas as its primary learning management system. All full-time faculty are assigned computers on a 4-year replacement cycle.

SSU is in its seventh year of an extensive laptop project. Freshmen are required to have laptop computers. Over the past seven years, numerous workshops were conducted to assist faculty in integrating technology into their courses

6.2 Continuous Improvement

6.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Even though the unit made some organizational changes after the last visit, there is a restructuring movement ongoing that is incomplete at this time. Further, the IR/exhibits contain minimal financial data, thus making it difficult to make a determination whether the unit is making sufficient progress.

6.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

There were no AFIs cited from previous visits.

6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. Governance Instability and Reorganization

Rationale: Instability: Currently, the unit does not appear to have the leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study. There is no permanent dean, associate dean, or directors in two of three departments.

Reorganization: Further, the SOE is going through an extensive reorganization “discussion”. The President did approve the establishment of a Dean of Education, and the Academic Affairs Committee of the SSU Board of Trustees voted to create a stand-alone SOE with its own Dean on March 27, 2013. However, after reviewing the minutes of the SOE’s May 2013 retreat, there is no reorganization “plan” – just multiple/competing ideas for how to restructure to best serve their many constituencies. In sum, there is definitely a void in leadership that must be examined during the on-site visit.

2. Clinical/Field Supervising Faculty

Rationale: No data are provided regarding how field supervisors are hired (i.e., minimum credentials) as well as number of candidates supervised.

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

1. Number of advisees (total & per individual faculty)
2. Student Informational Questionnaire on Departmental Academic Advising
3. Survey of satisfaction with ITS and related technology assistance and support
4. Will need to see evidence of a new/renovated library facility

5. Who is the leadership team? What is the plan to fill open vacancies with permanent leaders?
6. Budget: the foundation/advancement area, overhead from external contracts/grants, student tuition increases, budgets of the three departments in SOE, and student scholarship information
7. Information on the availability of summer course offerings for faculty or teaching overloads.
8. List of professional development activities for faculty as well as amount for professional travel to conferences.
9. Information about the main education building – to make sure it meets the needs of faculty and candidates.
10. Additional information/visit to the unit's four laboratory schools.

Sources of Evidence

Institution's Institutional Report

Annual Reports and Program Reports in NCATE's Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS)

Website and Exhibits of Institution

Article XII - Workload, Scheduling And Course Assignments