

NCATE Institutional Report Addendum

Standard 1 Responses to Areas of Concern and Validation Questions

Area of Concern 1: There is limited evidence that candidate professional dispositions are assessed and data presented at transition points in the initial and advanced programs.

Rationale: Dispositions data presented are limited to the perceptions of candidates with a lack of assessment of candidate dispositions related to their work with students, families, colleagues, and communities.

The unit collects disposition data on initial and advanced candidates related to their work with students, families, colleagues, and communities throughout their matriculation in their respective programs.

Initial Programs

While the unit requires candidates to assess their dispositions related to interacting and working with diverse groups of people as evidenced by disposition survey data ([Exhibit 1.1 Disposition Survey Data](#)) and teacher education interview data ([Exhibit 1.2 Teacher Education Interview Data](#)), the unit also collects data that extends beyond candidate perceptions of their abilities. Once initial candidates enter the teacher education program, faculty rely on P-12 cooperating teachers' and university supervisors' ratings of candidates' abilities to interact with diverse P-12 students as well as their ability to work collaboratively with families during the field experiences ([Exhibit 1.3 Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor Field Experience Evaluation](#)). The unit also utilizes P-12 cooperating teachers' and university supervisors' ratings of candidates' abilities to interact with diverse groups during their student teaching experience ([Exhibit 1.4 Clinical Practice Evaluations](#)). Cooperating teachers and university supervisors rate candidates' abilities in these areas three times during the course of the student teaching experience to assess growth in these areas. Faculty assess initial candidates' abilities to integrate various points of view through the instructional design and implementation process by examining candidates' performance on Electronic Evidence 3 Content Area Instructional Unit Plan ([Exhibit 1.5 Electronic Evidence 3 Scores](#)) and Electronic Evidence 5 Differentiated Instruction Teacher Work Sample ([Exhibit 1.6 Electronic Evidence 5 Scores](#)). Faculty compare these data with candidates' responses on an exit disposition survey ([Exhibit 1.7 Exit Disposition Survey Data](#)). In addition, candidates learn to work cooperatively with specialist/other school personnel. For example, case studies are used to explore topics such as "navigating the difficult colleague" and defusing the irate parent. Seminar topics vary based upon data analyzed from employers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors.

Advanced Programs

The unit assesses dispositions related to diverse students, families, and communities of those candidates in the Master of Arts in Teaching programs similarly to those candidates in the initial undergraduate program. Faculty utilize P-12 cooperating teachers' and university supervisors'

ratings of candidates' abilities to interact with diverse P-12 students as well as their ability to work collaboratively with families during their early field experience ([Exhibit 1.8 MAT Field Experience Evaluation](#)) and clinical practice ([Exhibit 1.9 MAT Clinical Practice Evaluation](#)). Cooperating teachers and university supervisors rate candidates' abilities in these areas three times during the course of the student teaching experience to assess growth in these areas. Faculty assess initial candidates' abilities integrate elements of their students' diversity within their instructional design and implementation by examining candidates' performance on Electronic Evidence 3 Content Area Instructional Unit Plan ([Exhibit 1.10 MAT Electronic Evidence 3 Scores](#)) and Electronic Evidence 5 Differentiated Instruction Teacher Work Sample ([Exhibit 1.11 MAT Electronic Evidence 5 Differentiated Instruction and Accommodations](#)).

Faculty assess advanced level candidate dispositions from program admission to program completion. At the admission point, faculty assess advanced candidates by evaluating their reference letters and by measuring candidate dispositions during oral interviews via indicators that focus on their beliefs about student learning, their beliefs about assessing student learning using multiple measures, and their beliefs about interacting with parents and communities. Once admitted, faculty in each advanced program assesses candidate dispositions using multiple indicators. The Joint Master of Social Work program utilizes a combination of candidate field ratings relative to interactions with diverse students, families, and communities ([Exhibit 1.12 JMSW Candidate Disposition Field Ratings](#)). These data provide faculty with multiple data points to evaluate candidate effectiveness with diverse groups of people. In Agricultural Education, faculty assess advanced candidate dispositions related to diverse students, families, colleagues, and communities through their Electronic Evidences ([Exhibit 1.13 Promoting Affective Educational Environments](#), [Exhibit 1.14 Professional Communication and Collaboration](#), [Exhibit 1.15 Professional Learning Community](#), [Exhibit 1.16 AGED Diversity Management Plan Families and Communities](#)). In the Masters in School Administration (MSA) program, candidate dispositions are assessed via electronic evidences and during the internship, which includes student internship work plans as well as feedback and evaluations from mentoring principals. A Direct Response Folio (DRF) in Taskstream assesses candidate dispositions at Transition Points 1, 2 and 4 ([Exhibit 1.17 Sample MSA DRF Screenshot](#)). Faculty assess candidates' dispositions at the end of each semester and feedback from this instrument is provided to students ([Exhibit 1.18 Disposition Instrument and Sample feedback](#)).

Area of Concern 2 - Limited data related to P-12 Student Learning for Candidates and Other School Professionals

Rationale: Unit data provided related to P-12 student learning are based on ratings of performance indicators with a lack of evidence provided that candidates assess and analyze student learning and make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning so that all students learn.

Electronic Evidences 3 and 5 demonstrate how candidates utilized their student data to inform and drive their instruction. Electronic Evidence 3 Content Area Instructional Unit Work Sample

requires the candidate to implement a unit plan then gather data on student success. Electronic Evidence 5 Differentiated Instruction Teacher Work Sample requires the candidate to analyze the data from Evidence 3 and modify the instructional plan based upon these data. Finally, the candidate administers the post-test as a means of evaluating impact on student learning. ([Exhibit 1.19 MAT Technology Education EE 5 Differentiated Work Sample Scores](#), [Exhibit 1.20 BS Elementary Education EE 5 Differentiated Work Sample Scores](#)). Candidate evidences for advanced programs are also available as presented in MAED Reading Electronic Evidence 1 and Electronic Evidence 2 ([Exhibit 1.21 MAED Reading Electronic Evidence 1 Classroom Based Entry Document and Rubric](#)).

Question 1. Are data from employer and alumni surveys utilized to assess that candidates possess knowledge, skills, dispositions to help all students learn and where are these data aggregated, disaggregated, and explained?

Data from employer and alumni surveys are utilized to assess that candidates possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. Aggregate data is compiled and produced in annual reports ([Exhibit 1.22 IHE Reports](#)). Aggregate graduate performance data from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and UNC General Administration are shared with Deans and during statewide meetings ([Exhibit 1.23 UNC Deans' Council Agenda](#)). This information is shared and discussed at the campus level with the unit administrative team during unit faculty meetings ([Exhibit 1.24 Faculty Meeting Minutes](#)) and Teacher Education Council meetings. Disaggregated data are shared with the Teacher Education Council during annual Data Institutes ([Exhibit 1.25 Data Institute Minutes 08.20.13](#)) and regularly scheduled Council meetings ([Exhibit 1.26 TEC Meeting Minutes 02.19.13 and 10.15.13](#)). Alumni and employer survey data are also regularly discussed and explained during unit assessment committee meetings ([Exhibit 1.27 SOE Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes](#)). Faculty use these data to alter curricula, course content, student teaching seminar topics, and program requirements.

Question 2. Does the state require qualifying scores for both the Praxis II content exam and Principles of Learning and Teaching? If not, how are candidates assessed on pedagogy and professional knowledge and skills?

As of fall 2014, the state of North Carolina requires qualifying scores for both the Praxis II content examination and the Principles of Learning and Teaching. Between 2010 and 2014, the state did **not** require qualifying scores on these examinations for any content area except Elementary Education and Special Education. Although these examinations were not required during this time period, the unit maintained the Praxis II content knowledge exam as one measure of candidate content knowledge and professional knowledge ([Exhibit 1.28 Required North Carolina Licensure Examinations](#)). Candidates were not required to attain a qualifying score to receive a recommendation for licensure. Only Elementary Education and Special Education candidates were required to achieve these qualifying scores for licensure recommendations. These data were also integrated into our assessment system. The Unit juxtaposed these data with candidate performance on Electronic Evidence 2 Content Knowledge, Electronic Evidence 3 Content Area Instructional Unit Work Sample ([Exhibit 1.29 Electronic](#)

Evidence 3 Directions), Electronic Evidence 5 Differentiated Instruction Teacher Work Sample (Exhibit 1.30 Electronic Evidence 5 Directions) and Clinical Practice Observations (Exhibit 1.4 Clinical Practice Performance Form Evaluation) to assess content knowledge, content pedagogical knowledge, and professional knowledge.

Question 3. Exhibits 1.4.d.26, 1.4.d.29, 1.4.f.2, 1.4.f.3, 2.4.b.1, 2.4.b.2, 2.4.b.5 could not be located.

1.4.d.26 located – Mean scores of advanced program observation rubric data indicators

1.4.d.29 located –TEC Minutes from April 2014 meeting with vote to change EE 5

1.4.f.2 located – Mean Philosophy of Education Score by Initial Program (linked on website)

1.4.f.3 located –MAT Interview Dispositions at Admissions and Graduation

2.4.b.1 located – Mean Candidate Cumulative Benchmark GPA by Advanced Program

2.4.b.2 located – Mean Candidate GRE Scores by Advanced Program

2.4.b.5 located – Evidence wrongly identified; this evidence is actually 2.4.b 2013-14 Interview Admission Scores

Question 4. How do program specific comprehensive exams at the advanced level assess candidates' pedagogical skills?

The specialty area advanced program comprehensive examination is one metric the unit uses to assess advanced candidate content pedagogical skills. Not all advanced programs utilize a comprehensive examination (**Exhibit 1.31 Advanced Programs Comprehensive Exam Matrix**); however, those programs that utilize specialty comprehensive examinations address instructional design, class based scenarios, and program planning and evaluation by requiring candidates to respond to questions that address candidate pedagogical skills (Exhibit 1.32 Sample Advanced Program Comprehensive Examinations).

Question 5. How are candidate assessment data regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed specifically related to those programs identified by the unit as other school professionals?

Candidate assessment data are regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized and analyzed for all degree programs, including those that serve other school professionals. At the university level, the Office of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness requires all degree programs to submit annual Institutional Effectiveness reports data related to critical thinking, communication skills, content knowledge, professional skills, and diversity (Exhibit 1.33 Institutional Effectiveness Reports for Other School Professional Programs). The unit utilizes these data to examine issues related to continuous improvement where “closing the loop” is a critical focus. Program coordinators for other school professional programs are formally appointed to TEC. The unit also relies on its assessment system to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze for all degree programs, including those that serve other school professionals. These data are reported in the unit’s annual reports (Exhibit 1.34 SOE Annual Reports) and Title II reports (Exhibit 1.21 IHE Reports). These data are shared and discussed during Teacher Education Council meetings, School of Education faculty meetings, and the Teacher Education Council Data Institute (Exhibit 1.24 Data Institute Minutes). This

information is shared regularly during Council meetings. Each of these programs are included as part of the units new tracking system.

Question 6. How are data from field experiences prior to use of the Clinical Practice Performance Form collected, analyzed, and utilized to assess candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions?

Prior to the clinical practice experience, the unit collects and analyzes data on candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions during field experiences using the *Intern Performance Evaluation* in Taskstream. Cooperating teachers and university supervisors use this evaluation document to assess candidate performance throughout their field experience activity. Field experiences are connected to the professional core and specialty area courses and are categorized by Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) I, II, III, and IV (Exhibit 1.35 Field Experience Sequence Chart). Field experiences in PLCs I and II are connected to the freshman and sophomore professional education courses and are considered *Emerging-Developing Phase* courses. Field experiences in PLC III and IV, which are junior and senior level professional and specialty area courses, move the candidate to *Proficient–Accomplished Phase* skills.

The unit also uses Taskstream to collect data for clinical experiences. Currently, candidates complete the early field experience application, analysis and reflections, cooperating teacher information form, and candidate responses to cooperating teacher(s) evaluation in Taskstream (Exhibit 1.36 Field Experience Evaluation).

Feedback from cooperating teacher is provided to the course instructor and student. The student is required to reflect upon the evaluation from cooperating teacher. Lastly, the course instructor and student reflect upon and develop as needed any intervention plans to ensure future professional growth. Department chairpersons, program coordinators, academic advisors, and course instructors can view candidates' performance in Taskstream to make decision regarding advisement, program recommendations, and curriculum decisions. Early field experience performance data is reviewed and shared by the director of Field Based and Clinical Experiences at Teacher Education Council Meetings and Annual Teacher Education Data Institute.

Question 7. Are the Praxis II exam scores in exhibit 1.4.d.2 from a Content Area Exam or the Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam?

Exhibit 1.4.d.2 illustrates Praxis I scores of candidates prior to their admission into the teacher education program. This table indicates that those candidates in their respective academic majors exceeded on average the required cumulative score of 522 established by the state Board of Education. Thus, the unit admits students into its program who have requisite basic knowledge and skills in the areas of mathematics, reading, and writing as assessed by this examination. When these scores are juxtaposed with the average cumulative grade point average at the point of admission for those candidates in the initial program, faculty and administrators feel comfortable and confident that high-quality students are admitted into its program.

Standard 2 Responses to Validation Questions

Question 1. If applicable, what data are available if candidates are in alternate route, off-campus, or distance learning programs?

The unit has been approved by UNC General Administration to offer degrees via distance learning in Instructional Technology, Business Education, and Agricultural Education. Additionally the unit offers alternate route licensure in school administration, technology education, and art education. These candidates must meet the same licensure requirements as traditional candidates. These data are included within our various exhibits and are identified by a marker as "Distance Learning" programs. The unit collects data on candidate performance on these programs to assess the quality of the program. Additionally, the unit utilizes annual SACS Institutional Effectiveness reports to assess the quality, integrity, and strength of these distance learning programs as well (Exhibit 2.1 Institutional Effectiveness Reports for Distance Learning Programs).

Question 2. How does the unit regularly and systematically collect and use data to evaluate the efficacy of its field experiences? Are candidates referred to as interns in all field and clinical experiences?

Candidates and P-12 cooperating teachers provide feedback on early field experience observation forms and clinical practice observation forms. Additionally, the Assistant Dean of Student Support Services engages candidates, P-12 cooperating teachers, and P-12 administrators in focus group sessions (Exhibit 2.2 Focus Group Responses from P-12 Cooperating Teachers) to collect information on what the unit does well with respect to field experiences and what areas the unit needs to improve. Administrators and faculty also examine candidate performance on Electronic Evidences.

These data is used to inform site placements, selection and effectiveness of cooperating teachers

(Exhibit 2.3 Evaluation of Cooperating Teachers), and program review. These data are regularly shared with unit administrators, program coordinators and faculty during regularly scheduled TEC meetings, TEC Assessment Committee meetings (**Exhibit 1.25 TEC Meeting Minutes 02.19.13 and 10.15.13**), Annual Data Institutes (**Exhibit 1.24 Data Institute Minutes 8.20.13**), faculty meetings (**Exhibit 1.23 SOE Faculty Meeting Minutes**), and annual faculty evaluations (**Exhibit 2.4 Annual Clinical Faculty Evaluation Rubric**).

The term *intern* is designated for early field experiences and all graduate candidates whereas *student teachers* are undergraduates completing clinical practice.

Question 3. Who is the primary person responsible for data collection and the unit's use of Taskstream?

Between 2009 and 2011, the Director of Technology was responsible for duties related to data collection and Taskstream. This person drove efforts at the unit level to capture data related to the Transition Points within the assessment system across degree programs. This position was eliminated during the 2012-13 academic year as a result of campus-wide budget cuts, which resulted in the responsibilities of this position being shared between the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs, the Associate Dean of Graduate Programs, and the Technology Media Specialist. Beginning with the 2013-14 academic year the unit's Dean created and funded the Director of Digital Learning, Planning, and Assessment (**Exhibit 2.5 Position Description for Director of Digital Learning, Planning, and Assessment**). This person has assumed the duties of data collection and Taskstream oversight while also driving faculty, staff, and candidate professional development focused on 21st technological tools.

Question 4. How do faculty members utilize the data system to improve teaching and learning?

The unit's assessment system is designed to examine data and make informed decisions about future actions. The unit uses the metaphor that the assessment system "drives" decision making (**Exhibit 2.6 Assessment Graphic**). Faculty members use data to inform their instructional practices with initial and advanced candidates. Each semester, candidates at the university complete "Student Opinion Forms" (**Exhibit 2.7 Sample Student Opinion Form**) where they rate their perception of the quality of instruction and resources utilized to engage them throughout the course. Faculty have immediate access to this information allowing them integrate changes. Based on these suggestions, faculty begin the next academic year by completing a Professional Development Plan (**Exhibit 2.8 Sample Faculty Professional Development Plan**)

The new data system will allow faculty to assess their own knowledge and pedagogical skills based on their candidate's scores on standardized tests (Praxis II and Pearson). Heretofore, faculty have not had direct access to student scores across testing strata, as proposed through Phase II of the new data system. This latter option will allow faculty to determine how well students performed on content areas they teach.

Standard 3 Responses to Validation Questions

Question 1. What professional development opportunities have been provided to ensure the unit remains current in modeling best practices for the candidates?

To model best practices, the unit provides professional development for field and clinical faculty. Faculty receive funding to take the Praxis and Pearson examinations to remain current on relevant content and content pedagogy. The unit also has a model classroom setup for faculty and candidates as well as partner P-12 teachers and administrators to observe and critique best practices (Exhibit 3.1 Model Classroom). The unit offers professional development workshops each year that faculty may attend such as the *Urban Education Institute* and *On Common Ground Conference* (Exhibit 3.2 Agenda of Signature Programs). Additionally, the Teacher of the Year and Principal of the Year have been invited to campus to model and critique best practices for faculty and students and to serve on boards. Over the last four years, the North Carolina Principal of the Year has been an alumni of the unit. Consequently, these persons have been invited to conduct workshops, serve on boards, and teach courses as guest lecturers.

Question 2. What procedures are followed if a candidate does not meet all requirements at the transition points?

If a candidate does not meet all requirements at the individual transition points, assistance is provided or the candidate is counseled out of the program. Faculty use the following process: 1) A conference occurs to discuss the candidate's progress to date, 2) an individualized intervention plan is constructed with a defined time to demonstrate growth in the area identified and monitored, and 3) the candidate's progress is evaluated with a determination for continuation or transition into a new degree program area (Exhibit 3.3 Individualized Candidate Intervention Plan).

When a student teacher or intern's performance is below expected requirements, a conference is held with the student teacher or intern, P-12 cooperating teacher, university supervisor and director of student teaching and internship. During this conference, a plan of action is developed for the student teacher or intern. The student teacher or intern is given a defined time to demonstrate growth in the area identified and monitored by the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. A student teacher or intern may be removed from clinical practice or internship experience for any of the following reasons:

- Failure to attend seminars and complete required assignments, activities, evaluations, etc.
- Failure to conduct himself/herself in a manner consistent with dispositions of professional educators (in keeping with ethical and moral standards). Student teacher/intern will be dismissed from the student teaching/internship experience and the Teacher Education Program. **This also includes the internet and all forms of social media.**
- Failure to meet requirements of the student teaching/internship experience.
- Failure to maintain adequate progress during the clinical experience.
- Failure to maintain adequate attendance during the student teaching/internship experience.
- Any reason that impedes the progress of the student teacher/intern.

Question 3. How does the unit monitor/track each individual candidate “to ensure all candidates have diverse placements and successfully with diverse populations” in Taskstream?

Candidates are required to complete internship experiences in a minimum of two different placement sites during their program of study. The unit uses Taskstream to monitor and track each candidate to ensure that each person has a diverse placement with diverse populations. The application process for field experiences and clinical practice are completed in Taskstream. On this application, candidates must identify previous field experience (item A.16) and clinical practice (item C.1) placement sites. The Field Placement Coordinator validates these placement sites to ensure candidates have experiences in diverse settings with diverse populations. This process allows the Field Placement Coordinator and the Program Area Coordinator to recommend, monitor, and assign placements that are diverse for each candidate. The unit utilizes placement sites that are rural and urban and include students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender, socioeconomic groups, and with exceptionalities (Exhibit 3.4 Clinical Practice Placement History and School Demographics).

Question 4. What opportunities are provided by the unit to ensure that feedback between interns and their peers, their cooperating teacher, and unit supervisor occurs on a regular basis?

Peer Feedback

The unit provides various opportunities to ensure that feedback between interns and their peers, the cooperating teacher, and unit supervisors occurs on a regular basis. An orientation conference (**Exhibit 3.5 Orientation Conference Agenda**) is held for all student teachers and interns, cooperating teachers, and unit supervisors. This orientation conference is held at the beginning of each semester either on campus or at a school site. The orientation conference provides an opportunity to present and discuss all aspects of the clinical experience from program expectations and requirements; roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder; evaluation instrument and process; and timeline. Student teachers and interns enroll in weekly seminar classes where they discuss their experiences in the classroom and share instructional strategies, classroom management plans, and other interactions within the school environment. Educators within the community often visit seminar classes to present current strategies and trends in P-12 education.

Cooperating Teacher Feedback

The cooperating teacher facilitates the induction of the candidate into the teaching profession. Roles and responsibilities of the cooperating teacher are outlined in the *Clinical Practice Handbook* (**Exhibit 3.6 Clinical Practice Handbook**). Sample expectations include the following:

- Conduct conferences to keep the student teacher/intern informed of his/her progress, provide suggestions and constructive criticisms necessary to ensure proper planning and preparation to assure maximum learning by students.
- Conduct ongoing evaluation and provide feedback.
- Complete and share three Student Teacher/Intern Performance Evaluations with the student teacher/intern. The first (initial evaluation) should be completed at the end of the fourth week; the second (interim evaluation) should be completed at the end of the seventh week; and the third (final evaluation) completed at the end of the student teaching/internship experience. The three performance evaluations should be completed in Taskstream on the assigned due dates.

University Supervisor Feedback

The university supervisor is cooperatively involved in orientation, supervision, evaluation, and overall concern for the student teaching/internship experience. The unit requires the university supervisor to provide ongoing feedback to the student teacher and intern as a part of their prescribed role and responsibilities. University supervisors' responsibilities are outlined in the *Clinical Practice Handbook*. Sample expectations include the following:

- Conducting individual orientation session with student teacher and intern and cooperating teacher on site.

- Visiting and observing each student teacher and intern a minimum of five times. However, additional visits should be made to provide assistance and problem resolution, as needed. The university supervisor also completes a minimum of three Student Teacher/Intern Performance Evaluations in the Clinical Practice folder in Taskstream.

The university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and student teacher/intern also hold triad conferences to provide feedback and share strengths and areas for growth. Student teachers/interns receive formal feedback three times from the university supervisor and cooperating teacher using the Student Teacher/Intern Performance Evaluation instrument in Taskstream. The student teacher and intern are expected to provide a written response in Taskstream to each evaluation.

The Student Teachers, Interns, and Cooperating Teachers Reception (**Exhibit 3.7 Student Teachers and Intern Reception**) is another opportunity for all stakeholders to provide informal feedback on performance and the program. This reception is held at the end of each semester as a closing activity to reflect on candidates' experience; celebrate candidates' achievement; and to present awards for the most outstanding student teacher.

Question 5. What is the Hampton Partnership Advisory Board?

The Hampton University Partnership was established in 2011 by the Chancellor of North Carolina A&T and the Superintendent of Guilford County Schools. The Hampton University Partnership was between North Carolina A&T State University, Hampton Elementary University Partnership Magnet School, and the Hampton community. The partnership was designed to leverage the human and intellectual resources of the university as a means to enhance teaching and learning, leadership, and community engagement at Hampton Elementary University Partnership Magnet School. An advisory board entitled Hampton Partnership Advisory Board was created to ensure program activities aligned with partnership goals. The advisory board was inclusive of faculty from across the university as well as Hampton staff, Guilford County Schools central office staff, and community partners. During fall 2014, the Hampton Advisory Board was dissolved and the Interim School of Education Dean and New Hampton Elementary University Partnership Magnet School Principal assumed the governance role for the partnership (Exhibit 3.8 Partnership Update to Chancellor Martin 06.21.14).

Standard 4 Responses to Validation Questions

Question 1. How are candidates prepared to communicate with students and families in ways that demonstrate cultural sensitivity and how are candidates' proficiencies documented?

Candidates are prepared to communicate with students and families in ways that demonstrate cultural sensitivity throughout their professional education program.

Initial Programs

In *CUIN 210 Culturally Relevant Pedagogy* ([Exhibit 4.1 CUIN 210 Syllabus](#)), candidates learn to take into consideration the various cultural aspects of the classroom such as race, ethnicity, gender, and P-12 student academic performance ([Exhibit 4.2 Classroom Layout and Cultural Resources Directory](#)) as they plan and implement instruction. In *CUIN 410 Differentiated Instruction*, faculty use Electronic Evidence 3 Thematic Unit Plan to assess candidates' abilities to differentiate instruction along diversity variables such as race, gender, and exceptionalities ([Exhibit 4.3 Electronic Evidence 3 Content Area Instructional Unit Plan Candidate Work Sample](#)). The unit also assesses candidates' cultural sensitivity to diverse students and families throughout the field and student teaching experience. Faculty assess candidate performance throughout their early field experiences using the *Field Experience Interns' Performance Evaluation* form. Standard II of this observation instrument assesses the intern's ability to establish a respectful environment for a diverse population of students ([Exhibit 4.4 Intern Performance Evaluation](#)). Candidates also have opportunities to work with diverse students and families via various signature programs and events such as the Hampton Literacy Family Night at the unit's partnership elementary school, the Hampton Elementary Partnership School ([Exhibit 4.5 Hampton Family Literacy Project](#)) or via projects like the "Help the Homeless" ([Exhibit 4.6 SPED 354 Homeless Children in Our Schools](#)).

Advanced Programs

Candidates in advanced programs are prepared to communicate with diverse students and families. Candidates in MAT programs take into consideration information about the P-12 learner as they plan instruction ([Exhibit 4.3 Electronic Evidence 3 Content Area Instructional Unit Plan Candidate Work Sample](#)). The unit also assesses candidates' abilities to implement instruction with culturally and linguistically diverse students ([Exhibit 1.30 Electronic Evidence 5 Differentiated Instruction Teacher Work Sample](#)). Faculty assess candidate performance throughout their early field experiences using the *Field Experience Interns' Performance Evaluation* form. Standard II of this observation instrument assesses the intern's ability to establish a respectful environment for a diverse population of students ([Exhibit 4.4 Intern Performance Evaluation](#)).

Candidates in Master of Science, Master of Arts in Education (MAEd), and Master of School Administration (MSA) programs demonstrate their cultural sensitivity to diverse students and families through various programmatic key assessments. MSA candidates produce a Crisis Management Plan to illustrate their abilities to plan for school culture and safety ([Exhibit 4.7 Culturally Responsive Crisis Management Plan](#)). Candidates in the MAEd Elementary Education and MAEd Reading programs construct a Documented Accomplishments evidence to demonstrate their engagement with culturally diverse students and families ([Exhibit 4.8 MAED READ Documented Accomplishments](#)). Candidates in the MS Agricultural Education program produce an Diversity Management Plan ([Exhibit 1.16 AGED Diversity Management Plan](#)) to demonstrate their abilities to work with diverse students and families, and candidates in the MS Instructional Technology program construct a Leadership Project ([Exhibit 4.9 MS Instructional Technology Leadership Project](#)) to illustrate their engagement with families and students.

Question 2. When and how do candidates incorporate multiple perspectives in the subject matter being taught?

The professional education core is designed and sequenced to teach candidates how to incorporate multiple perspectives into the curriculum and field and clinical experiences.

Initial Program

Candidates in *CUIN 210 Culturally Relevant Pedagogy* incorporates cultural mini assignments and a final culturally relevant instructional plan where candidates must identify diversity areas to include media perceptions of learners. In *CUIN 410 Differentiated Instruction*, candidates initiate a *Differentiated Instruction Teacher Work Sample* and complete it during the student teaching experience. This evidence requires candidates to respond to the academic, disability, and cultural differences of P-12 students in their classrooms. Linked to these courses are early field experiences where candidates engage in experiential activities. This process culminates with student teaching where candidates must demonstrate their ability to use a variety of instructional methods and design a safe, nurturing environment for all students (Exhibit 4.10 BS Programs Heat Map).

Advanced Program

The MAT programs adhere to a similar progression where candidates are introduced to learning theories and teaching the whole child in *CUIN 618 Learning Theories*. In *CUIN 715 Assessing and Evaluating 21st Century Learning* and *CUIN 729 Diversity Issues in K-12 Classrooms*, candidates explore how and why classroom teachers must engage P-12 students through multiple perspectives. Candidates illustrate mastery of this ability in their clinical practice where university supervisors and P-12 cooperating teachers assess and evaluate via an observational protocol.

Candidates enrolled in *CUIN 729 Diversity Issues in K-12 Classrooms* produce a critical cultural autobiography where they explore their personal biases and subjectivities. Candidates conduct a school-based equity audit where they assess and evaluate school-based resources to determine if the environment is responsive to their students' cultural and linguistic differences. They also construct an educational or social justice grant proposal where they must analyze School Improvement Plan data relative to diversity to propose a responsive program that improves the learning needs of all students (Exhibit 4.11 CUIN 729 Diversity Issues in K-12 Classrooms Syllabus).

Candidates enrolled in *MSA 772 Educational Administration and Management* produce a Culturally Responsive Crisis Management Plan (Evidence 3) where they develop a hand guide that includes an explanation of any "hidden curriculum" (e.g., school climate, informal behaviors, school-specific curriculum), gang knowledge, violent crime data, misconceptions and misguided assumptions about students and the community (Exhibit 4.12 MSA 772 Syllabus).

READ 757 Assessment and Literacy Instruction integrates case study, observation, and discussion board as modes of delivery with assignments that address gender differences in reading, internal and external variables that influence reading. Literacy strategy that takes into account students who read below, on, and above grade level (Exhibit 4.13 READ 757 Syllabus).

Question 3. How are candidates prepared to develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity? How is this data collected and where are these proficiencies documented?

Candidates are prepared to develop a classroom and school climate that values diversity by utilizing curricula grounded in a developmental growth model. Early in curricula, candidates examine and engage in discourse related to ethics of teaching where they explore what it means to teach the “whole” child. Using this information, candidates matriculate through courses where they learn the importance of learning more about their learners within their school and outside the school as well as learning more about their learners’ families and communities. These proficiencies are documented in key assessments throughout the program like Electronic Evidence #3 Content Area Instructional Unit Plan Work Sample and Electronic Evidence #5 Differentiated Instruction Teacher Work Sample (Exhibit 1.28 Electronic Evidence 3 Content Area Instructional Unit Work Sample, Exhibit 1.29 Electronic Evidence 5 Differentiated Instruction Teacher Work Sample). In candidate early field experiences and clinical practice placements, university supervisors and P-12 classroom teachers observe and rate candidates’ abilities (Exhibit 1.3 Early Field Experience Evaluation) to develop a classroom and school climate that values all learners and respects candidate diversity. Candidates also develop classroom management plans where they articulate their philosophy of teaching diverse students then structure and design a classroom layout conducive for all students to learn. Candidates write a justification that articulates how their classroom layout aligns with their philosophical beliefs grounded in theories of learning and explain how this structure would maximize student learning (Exhibit 4.2 Classroom Layout and Cultural Resource Directory). The unit’s model classroom reflects religious, gender, ethnic, racial, and disability diversity in its resources (Exhibit 3.1 Model Classroom).

Question 4. Evidence of specific plans to improve faculty diversity. What specific plans of strategic recruitment are in place to improve faculty diversity?

All employment-related efforts within the unit aligns with the University’s Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action policies (Exhibit 4.14 Human Resources Policies on EEO/AA). The University’s Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Officer utilizes PeopleAdmin 7 to review candidates selected to interview within the unit and across the university to ensure the university’s diversity initiatives are met. The university uses a workforce analysis that identifies any underrepresentation of minorities and females then sets goals and objectives to enhance employment and advancement opportunities for females and minorities.

In 2014, the Provost wrote a grant that included a section on improving diversity among faculty. That grant was funded and those initiatives will go into effect in late spring 2015. They include broadening the advertisement scope to include Latino, international, women, and other multicultural media.

Specific plans include 1) ensuring the university climate welcomes diversity, 2) teach faculty about procedures and customs of the university, 3) provide opportunities for chairs, directors, and other administrators to learn about strategies for recruiting and retaining diversity faculty, 4) address diversity concerns among current faculty, and 5) broaden advertisement and include Latino, international, and women sites.

Question 5. How are the study abroad program and domestic exchange program making positive impact on candidates and provide opportunities for candidates to interact with diverse peers?

The unit provides opportunities for all initial and advanced candidates to participate in study abroad and domestic exchange programs that expose them to diverse P-12 students, pre-service teacher education candidates, in-service teachers, and families. Candidates have had opportunities to participate in several study abroad opportunities such as the ongoing five-week summer Jamaican experience (where they assist elementary- and middle-school aged students in Jamaica with literacy and mathematic skill development) or the five-day summer England-London/Paris experience (where candidates explore and examine school-based differences between American public schools and schools within these countries). Candidates have also had opportunities to participate in the Malawi summer experience (where they engage youth in Africa to impact their learning outcomes) (Exhibit 4.15 Study Abroad Experiences).

Candidates unable to participate in these study abroad experiences have also had opportunities to participate in domestic exchanges such as the Rural-Urban Exchange with Western Carolina or the Muskingum University experience with pre-service teacher education candidates from Ohio (Exhibit 4.16 Domestic Exchange Experiences). With these experiences, candidates at North Carolina A&T have the opportunity to interact with other pre-service teacher education candidates at other institutions that are vastly different in terms of race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status.

Regardless of the opportunities provided, candidates reflect on these experiences to articulate how meaningful and significant they are with respect to how the exchange impacted their learning, beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes (Exhibit 4.17 Student Reflections on Exchange Programs). A candidate reported that as a result of studying another culture, she now questions her own. This student goes on to note it is now her time to make an impact. She went on to set a goal for herself noting, “When I am settled into the classroom I will share my knowledge with students in hopes of them wanting to seek their own understanding of the world.” Another candidate reported the Muskingum trip not only opened his eyes as an educator but also as a person. Specifically, he cited observing and interacting with teachers and students at various schools. He left with knowing that as an educator one cannot make assumptions about students’ prior knowledge and experiences.

The unit also provides opportunities for those candidates who traveled abroad or who participated in domestic exchange programs to share their experiences and to reflect orally with

other candidates at the university, at professional conferences, and through publication opportunities ([Exhibit 4.18 Professional Conference Presentations and Publications](#)).

Question 6. What activities do candidates participate that provide these opportunities to interact with diverse peers?

The unit provides a host of opportunities for initial and advanced candidates to interact with diverse peers not only at the university but also external to the institution. The unit has sponsored and implemented a host of signature programs and meetings open for initial and advanced candidates to attend such as the *Urban Education Institute*, the *On Common Ground Conference*, the *Rehabilitation of Ethnic Minorities with Behavioral Addictions (REMBA) Conference*, the *Graduate Students' Reading Symposium*, and the *Human Performance and Leisure Studies Annual Symposium* ([Exhibit 3.2 Agenda of Signature Programs](#)). Candidates also may participate in numerous student organizations like the Student North Carolina Association of Educators, DreamKeepers Living and Learning Community, Kappa Delta Pi International Honor Society, or the Emergent Educational Leaders' Seminar Series. These organizations provide opportunities for initial and advanced candidates to develop their professional identities as candidates learn to organize diverse people, facilitate meetings, plan agenda, and plan engagement activities in P-12 schools and the community.

The unit also supports initial and advanced candidate attendance in events and activities external to the institution such as the *Triad Teaching Fellows Conference* or participation in professional organization meetings like the North Carolina Social Studies Conference, North Carolina Teachers of Mathematics, the Council for Exceptional Children, and the North Carolina Teacher Education Forum ([Exhibit 4.19 Faculty Attendance at Professional Meetings and Conferences](#)). Candidates also have opportunities to participate in study abroad and domestic exchange experiences. The Rural Urban Exchange with Western Carolina University allows for interaction with peers in seminars and classes on each other's campus. Candidates also participate in an exchange with peers at Muskingum University, a private liberal arts institution in northern Ohio ([Exhibit 4.15 Study Abroad Experiences](#), [Exhibit 4.16 Domestic Exchange Experiences](#)).

Question 7. Candidate participation and proficiency data on the afterschool program in CUIN 210 (ELL). How many students are participating in these activities? Are all candidates required to participate? Are there data to demonstrate that this program is making a difference?

Candidates enrolled in the *CUIN 210 Culturally Relevant Pedagogy* course are assigned to the Elimu Learning Center for their 30-hour early field experience ([Exhibit 4.1 CUIN 210 Syllabus](#)). Because this experience is an afterschool program, not all candidates are able to participate in this placement due to class or work schedule conflicts. Those candidates who are unable to participate in the Elimu Learning Center are assigned to P-12 schools where they complete the same field-based activities in their assigned environment that the candidates at the Elimu Learning Center complete. These activities are designed to explore P-12 student diversity regardless of context or placement so the same proficiencies are documented irrespective of the field experience assignment. Data from the Director of the Elimu Learning Center indicate there

have been positive impacts on student learning (Exhibit 4.20 Elimu Learning Center Impact on Student Learning).

Question 8. Are there specific multiple data points that document that candidates believe that all students can learn?

The unit's assessment system is designed to collect data at each transition point on initial and advanced candidates' beliefs about all students having access to a quality education.

Initial Program Data Points

1. Admissions: Candidates articulate their beliefs about P-12 student learning via the teacher education interview and the philosophy of education
2. Disposition survey: Candidates provide responses that illustrate their beliefs and attitudes related to all students learning
3. Early field experience: Faculty utilize P-12 cooperating teacher and university supervisor observation ratings of candidates in their early field experiences and student teaching experience.
4. Diversity class: Candidates enroll in CUIIN 210 Culturally Relevant Pedagogy and CUIIN 410 Differentiated Instruction where they learn to engage all learners.
5. Employer survey: Specific items address candidates' beliefs that all students can learn.

Advanced Program Data Points

1. Admission: Candidates engage in a teacher education interview where they articulate their beliefs about P-12 student learning.
2. Early field experience: Faculty utilize P-12 cooperating teacher and university supervisor observation ratings of candidates in their early field experiences and student teaching experience.
3. Philosophy of Education: Candidates write a Philosophy of Education as part of their Electronic Evidence 3 and update it in their Electronic Evidence 5.
4. Diversity course: Candidates enroll in *CUIIN 729 Diversity Issues in K-12 Classrooms* where they learn to engage all learners.
5. Employer survey: Specific items address candidates' beliefs that all students can learn.

Standard 5 Responses to Areas of Concern and Validation Questions

Area of Concern 1 – Faculty members do not appear to be assessing their own effectiveness as teachers.

Rationale: Although there are student evaluations, peer evaluations, unit evaluations, and chair evaluations, the IR does not state how these evaluations are used by faculty to assess their own effectiveness and ways to enhance their teaching.

The unit's assessment system is designed to examine data and make informed decisions about future actions. The unit uses the metaphor that the assessment system "drives" decision making ([Exhibit 2.6 Assessment Graphic](#)). Faculty members use data to inform their instructional practices with initial and advanced candidates. Each semester, candidates at the university complete "Student Opinion Forms" ([Exhibit 2.7 Sample Student Opinion Form](#)) where they rate their perception of the quality of instruction and resources utilized to engage them throughout the course. Faculty have immediate access to this information allowing them integrate changes. Based on these suggestions, faculty begin the next academic year by completing a Professional Development Plan ([Exhibit 2.8 Sample Faculty Professional Development Plan](#)). Faculty also have annual access to Institutional Effectiveness reports ([Exhibit 2.1 Institutional Effectiveness Reports](#)) that identifies programmatic and student outcomes. These reports afford faculty opportunities to modify their instruction based on aggregate student performance data.

Question 1: How do faculty in the unit use their evaluations to engage in self-assessment?

Unit faculty routinely engage in self-assessment, utilizing a variety of outcomes to reflect on their instruction, activities, and assessments. Faculty report using a variety of data points, including student course performance data ([Exhibit 2.9 Sample DFW Report](#)), student opinion forms ([Exhibit 2.7 Sample Student Opinion Form](#)), Electronic Evidence performance data ([Exhibit 5.1 Sample Electronic Evidence Performance Data](#)), candidate performance on state and national licensure examinations, and annual faculty evaluation data ([Exhibit 5.2 Sample Annual Faculty Evaluation Rubric](#)) to inform and drive their instructional enhancements. These documents also provide evidence of faculty's progress in reaching the various levels of promotion or earning tenure.

Given faculty reflective analysis, they self-identify areas for improvement each year via their Professional Development Plan ([Exhibit 2.8 Sample Faculty Professional Development Plan](#)). Faculty work throughout the academic year to engage in professional development opportunities

to improve these identified areas. Faculty report using these data points to perform some of the following changes in their courses or instruction: (a) diversify their methods of instruction, (b) assignments and/or projects, (c) change their course goals and/or objectives, (d) embed different content, vocabulary and concepts, and realign existing content and materials for improved student performance/outcomes.

Question 2: Who is responsible for developing workshops on the use of technology? Who is required to attend?

Workshops are developed and offered by the distance learning office, faculty request, and as mandated by upper administration. A department or program may request workshops unique to their discipline and thereby identify who participates. Some are determined by accreditation requirements and others are based on common interest.

Faculty and administrators typically complete workshops related to technology and the goals outlined in the university's strategic plan, *Preeminence 2020: Embracing our Past, Creating our Future*. Professional development workshops are offered at the institutional level through the Instructional Technology Services and Distance Education (ITSDE) and the Center for Leadership and Organizational Excellence (CLOE) and through the technology support staff at the unit level. The following are some specific areas of training: (a) Online pedagogy — Blackboard, (b) Student monitoring and success — Starfish, (c) Advising — Banner, (d) Student assessment — Taskstream, and (e) Faculty excellence — Digital Measures ([Exhibit 5.3 CLOE Professional Development](#)).

Blackboard workshops are developed by Instructional Technology Services and Distance Education (ITSDE) based on campus needs. In addition, ITSDE staff provide training on an individual basis, and faculty are encouraged to meet with ITSDE staff to have specific questions addressed, or to receive support in instructional design specific to their curriculum. ITSDE also offers specific training sessions on modules that faculty can use within BlackBoard to improve the ways they engage instructionally or to assist with the ways they assess student learning products ([Exhibit 5.4 ITSDE Professional Development](#)).

Question 3: Who decides what workshops will be offered during the academic year? Are the workshops mandatory for both full-time and part-time faculty? Do faculty members receive a stipend for their participation?

The types of workshops offered during the academic year is a collaborative decision made by the unit's leadership team in consultation with the unit's technology staff based on faculty perceived needs, faculty request, faculty annual evaluation performance data, and unit needs. At the beginning of the academic year, faculty identified need areas ([Exhibit 5.5 Faculty and Staff Survey](#)). The unit's leadership team also relies on annual faculty evaluation performance data to determine what areas may need further examination and upcoming needs that the unit must address that are aligned with the university's strategic plan such as the rollout of new software like the Starfish Early Alert system or Digital Measures. Using this collaborative approach based on these data points, professional development workshops within the unit are offered but faculty are also encouraged to attend professional development opportunities across the campus such as

CLOE workshops, ITSDE professional development workshops, and other sessions offered by various units.

Question 4: Are the funds allocated for faculty development adequate based on the number of faculty in the unit, the school, the university?

The funds for faculty development are adequate for professional development based on the number of faculty in the unit, the school, and the university. The university and the unit financially supported faculty development through various entities on the campus including external funding. The unit allocated funds for professional development through the dean's office, department offices, and utilized external funds to support faculty attendance at professional meetings and conferences. The unit supported faculty travel and registration fees during the 2011/12 - \$50,453; 2012/13 - \$89,950; and 2013/14 - \$59,080 academic years totaling \$199,483 for the three years. The unit expended \$80,655.00 to assist faculty in research and grant writing activities. This amount includes funding support of \$15,723 for graduate research assistants and \$64,932 for undergraduate hourly and non-hourly wages. A portion of overhead returned to the unit is used for faculty to engage in professional development activities.

Over the 2013-2014 academic year, the School of Education's Title III budget has supported faculty development activities totaling \$14,111.00. The Academy for Teaching and Learning (ATL) supported faculty attendance and participation at professional meetings and international travel endeavors. Faculty development activities supported through ATL total \$64,606.00 within the last three academic years (2011/12 - \$32,330; 2012/13 - \$14,003; and 2013/14 - \$18,273). Additionally, ATL sponsors workshops and seminars to enhance learning in the classroom by strengthening faculty pedagogical skills. The Office of Instructional Technology Services and Distance Education (ITSDE) provides professional development for faculty to model best practices through the incorporation of classroom technology. ITSDE conducts workshops, seminars, and one on one instruction for faculty to develop online teaching modules through the utilization of Blackboard.

Question 5. Exhibit 5.4 does not provide policies and procedures for promotion and tenure. Are these policies and procedures in the North Carolina A&T State University Faculty Handbook? If not, where are they?

The Policies and Procedures for Tenure and Promotion are in the North Carolina A&T State Faculty Handbook in *Appendix B-2: Regulations on Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Due Process* (Exhibit 5.6 Appendix B-2).

Question 6. Are the university evaluations different from the unit evaluations? What document provides a complete description of the evaluation process at each level?

Unit evaluations are different from university evaluations. The five Schools or Colleges that comprise the teacher education unit utilize unique evaluation instruments that share teaching, research, and service as common filaments (Exhibit 5.7 Unit Evaluation Instruments). Three bodies evaluate an applicant's reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) package—the department RPT committee, the School/College RPT committee, and the Dean. The university

committee reviews all applications based upon published university standards, which the unit uses to guide the development of its evaluation instruments. The *Faculty Handbook* provides policies and procedures for promotion, tenure, and due process. In addition, each school has its own tenure and promotion Policies, which comply with the university's policies and procedures.

Question 7. Will examples of faculty promotion and tenure dossiers be available for review by members of the onsite committee?

Examples of promotion and tenure dossiers will be available for the onsite committee.

Question 8. What professional development activities does the unit engage to remain current in modeling best practices?

The unit is committed to promoting effective teaching, innovative scholarship, and dedicated service. That commitment is reflective of NC A&T's mission statement as well as the unit's mission statement. Faculty engage in scholarly work as part of a process for achieving tenure, promotion and maintaining status and a continuing faculty member. The unit's annual report (Exhibit 1.34 SOE Annual Reports) requires faculty to document: research projects undertaken and research projects completed, productive and creative activities and activities relating to research. Faculty are also expected to remain engaged in their fields and be familiar with trends and mandates regarding literacy, numeracy, and high-stakes testing. Faculty are expected to continue to attend and present at conferences, participate in P-12 school settings (Exhibit 5.8 Direct and Ongoing Involvement and Services to Public School) and engage in activities which and model life-long learning for candidates. The unit also has a newly constructed model classroom available for both faculty and candidates (Exhibit 5.9 SOE Model Classroom Layout).

All program coordinators (Exhibit 5.10 Program Coordinators and University Supervisors Licensure Credentials) hold current North Carolina Professional Teaching licenses. All professional education faculty are expected to renew teaching licenses before expiration. Copies of these are maintained on file with the Licensure Officer and the Assistant Dean for Student Services. The process for renewing a professional teaching license is determined by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI).

Faculty have opportunities to engage various forms of professional development which enable them to remain current in modeling best practices. As the State Board of Education and NCDPI changes licensure exam requirements, faculty are extended the opportunity to take the state required professional licensure exam in their respective content areas. P-12 teachers and principals also model best practices via workshops in the model classroom within the unit.

Standard 6 Responses to Validation Questions

Question 1. What professional development opportunities are provided to full-time faculty? Are the workshops open to part-time faculty?

The Unit continually provides professional development opportunities for its full- and part-time faculty related to quality academic advising practices (Exhibit 6.1 Advancement Session with Registrar), K-12 and community engagement (Exhibit 6.2 Advancement Sessions with GCS administrators), reappointment and tenure policies (Exhibit 6.3 Junior Faculty RPT Workshops), and accreditation development (Exhibit 6.4 NC A&T CAEP Conference). The unit also engaged faculty and candidates in professional development that improves their instructional ability and examines current scholarship on best practices (Exhibit 3.2 Agenda of Signature Programs).

Professional development workshops are offered at the institutional level through the Center for Leadership and Organizational Excellence (CLOE) (Exhibit 5.3 CLOE Professional Development) and the Instructional Technology Services and Distance Education (ITSDE) (Exhibit 5.4 ITSDE Professional Development). Blackboard workshops are developed by Instructional Technology Services and Distance Education (ITSDE) based on campus needs. In addition, ITSDE staff provide training on an individual basis, and faculty are encouraged to meet with ITSDE staff to have specific questions addressed, or to receive support in instructional design specific to their curriculum. ITSDE also offers specific training sessions on modules that faculty can use within BlackBoard to improve the ways they engage instructionally or to assist with the ways they assess student learning products.

Question 2. Are handbooks and other school/unit resource materials revised each year?

Various committees associated with the School of Education, Teacher Education Council, and the Office of Student Support Services engage in annual reviews of handbooks and guidelines. The unit's assessment system does not necessitate annual revisions of handbooks and other unit resources; however, these decisions are driven by data that the unit collects, analyzes, and interprets. If these analyses dictate revisions to handbooks and resource materials, then the unit moves these decisions through the Teacher Education Council or School of Education approval process if applicable to enact these changes.

Question 3. What evidence is available that the staffing for technology support is adequate for the on-campus and off-campus programs and teacher education candidates?

The unit does not offer off-campus programs that lead to a professional education license. The university provides information technology resources to support faculty and candidates. There are staff persons assigned to each of the 60 computer labs throughout the university (Exhibit 6.5 NC A&T Computer Labs). The unit employs two full-time individuals and two graduate assistants to support faculty, staff, and students with technological integration and technological repair. One position is a technology support person (Exhibit 6.6 Technology Support Technician Job Description) whose primary responsibility is to work closely with the university's Division of Information Technology area to provide faculty, staff, and students with technology assistance, which may include computer hardware repair, computer software updates, computer networking issues, classroom technology repair and updates, SmartBoard assistance, and hardware provisions during workshops, events, or conferences. The other position is a University Program Specialist (Exhibit 6.7 University Program Specialist Job Description) whose primary responsibility is to work closely with faculty, staff, and candidates with the integration of various software packages and technological devices into their instructional design and implementation.

Question 4. What have been the faculty loads in the unit over the last three years?

Faculty workload policies and procedures are clearly outlined in the *NC A&T Faculty Handbook*. Undergraduate faculty members are expected to teach up to 12 credit hours, and graduate faculty are expected to teach no more than nine credit hours per semester. Department chairs have flexibility to provide alternative assignments based upon needs within the unit or individual faculty goals (Exhibit 6.8 Faculty Instructional Workload).

Question 5. What is the role of cooperating teachers and other school personnel in designing the school program and experiences of student teachers?

Cooperating teachers have the opportunity to participate in the design of our school program and the experiences of student teachers through focus group sessions (Exhibit 6.9 Focus Group Responses from Student Teachers and Interns). Public school partners serve on the Teacher Education Council Field-Based and Clinical Experiences committee (Exhibit 6.10 TEC Field Based and Clinical Experience Committee Meeting Minutes). Also data from cooperating teacher evaluation forms are aggregated and used to assess the quality of the student teaching experience. School principals and cooperating teachers are also asked to give feedback via an

employer survey. The Master of School Administration program engages other school personnel as members of their advisory boards ([Exhibit 6.11 MSA Advisory Board Members](#)).

Question 6. Part-time faculty's knowledge of unit-wide documents such as the CF. What formal and informal activities engage part-time faculty and advisory groups in the unit's work?

The unit employs approximately 27 part-time faculty each year. Part-time faculty are encouraged and expected to attend program, department, and school meetings. These meetings provide an overview of the conceptual framework, institutional effectiveness, student advisement and other pertinent matters ([Exhibit 6.12 CUIN End-of-Year Reflection Session Minutes](#)). The Department of Curriculum and Instruction provides a handbook specifically for part-time faculty ([Exhibit 6.13 CUIN Clinical Faculty and Adjunct Handbook](#)). The Master of School Administration program engages part-time faculty as instructors and as members of its program's advisory board ([Exhibit 6.11 MSA Advisory Board Members](#)).

Question 7. Technician and media specialist. Is this one position adequate to support faculty, staff, and students in the unit?

The unit employs three individuals to support faculty, staff, and students in the unit with technological integration and technological repair. One person is a technology specialist whose primary responsibility is to coordinate and provide leadership for all aspects of instructional technology within the unit ([Exhibit 6.14 Technology Assistant Job Description](#)). The second person is a Technology Support Technician ([Exhibit 6.6 Technology Support Technician Job Description](#)) whose primary responsibility is to work closely with the university's DoIT area to provide faculty, staff, and students with technology assistance, which may include computer hardware repair, computer software updates, computer networking issues, classroom technology repair and updates, SmartBoard assistance, and hardware provisions during workshops, events, or conferences. This person receives training from the university's DoIT area to ensure his professional knowledge, technological skills, and technological policy compliance awareness are at a proficient level. The third person is a University Program Specialist ([Exhibit 6.7 University Program Specialist Job Description](#)) whose primary responsibility is to work closely with the university's ISTE area to provide the unit's faculty, staff, and students with technology integration in the classroom. These services may include maximizing use of BlackBoard in one's instructional presentation, integrating elements of Taskstream into the course design, utilizing software like Respondus or Collaborate into instructional implementation, or orienting people to new technological or software innovations.

Question 8. What is the amount of faculty development funds available per faculty member? What is the typical amount of an award? What percentage of faculty and staff participated in faculty development activities in each of the last three years?

Faculty have access to professional development funds from multiple sources, including their departmental funds, the Dean's Office (when applicable), and Title III via the Academy for Teaching and Learning (ATL). Faculty must submit ATL travel requests that do not exceed \$2100 per academic year. There is no set amount available to the unit. During 2013-2014, 100% of

valid requests were funded. Funding support provided over the past three years evidence how the amount varies per year. The unit provided \$50,453 in 2011-12, \$89,950 in 2012-13, and \$59,080 in 2013-14 to support faculty travel and registration fees, totaling \$199,483.00 over the three year period. The unit expended \$80,655.00 to assist faculty in research and grant writing activities. This amount includes funding support of \$15,723 for graduate research assistants and \$64,932 for undergraduate hourly and non-hourly wages. Additionally, the School of Education provides a portion of the monies received from indirect costs to support faculty engagement in professional development activities. One hundred percent of faculty participated in some form of professional development over the last three years.

During the 2013-2014 academic year, the School of Education's Title III budget supported faculty development activities totaling \$14,111.00. The Academy for Teaching and Learning (ATL) supported faculty attendance and participation at professional meetings and international travel endeavors. Faculty development activities supported through ATL total \$64,606.00 within the last three academic years (2011/12 - \$32,330; 2012/13 - \$14,003; and 2013/14 - \$18,273). Additionally, the university offers a host of on-campus professional development opportunities that are low cost or no cost to faculty. ATL sponsors workshops and seminars to enhance learning in the classroom by strengthening faculty pedagogical skills. The Office of Instructional Technology Services and Distance Education (ITSDE) provides professional development for faculty to model best practices through the incorporation of classroom technology. ITSDE conducts workshops, seminars, and one-on-one instruction for faculty to develop online teaching modules through the utilization of Blackboard.