INSTITUTIONAL REPORT FOR CONTINUING ACCREDITATION: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

Jacksonville State University
Jacksonville, AL
November 3-5, 2013

Unit Head: John B. Hammett, Ph.D
NCATE Coordinator: Jordan M. Barkley, Ph.D
http://www.jsu.edu/edprof/NCATE.html

**INSTITUTIONAL REPORT FOR CONTINUING ACCREDITATION:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY**

Guidelines for Institutional Report and Exhibits

The **Institutional Report** (IR) and **Exhibits** outlined below should be used for the professional education Unit seeking **continuing accreditation** with an onsite visit scheduled for Fall 2013 and beyond.

1. Scope of Review

The Unit must address in its IR and Exhibits **all programs** in the institution for the initial and advanced preparation of teachers and for preparation of other professionals to work in P-12 settings. For clarification of terms, please refer to NCATE glossary presented in the *Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions* (Unit Standards).

2. Reporting Requirements

- *Meeting the Standards*. The Unit is expected to address in its IR and Exhibits how programs are meeting the Unit Standards and their elements. It is critical that the Unit uses the **rubrics** in addressing the expectations for each of the elements as articulated in the Unit Standards.
- *Movement Toward Target*. The Unit is required to demonstrate movement toward and/or performance at the target level for one or more standards at the initial and advanced levels. The Unit may select the same or different standard(s) for the initial and advanced programs, and is expected to report and provide evidence on the following:
  - Describe areas of the standard at which the Unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
  - Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
  - Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in the Unit standard.
- The Unit Accretion Board will grant a distinct decision on Movement Toward Target based on the following criteria:

Target	Moving Toward Target	Insufficient Progress
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the Unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the Unit is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the standard.	Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that the Unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.

3. Institutional Report

The Unit should submit its report using the Institutional Report and Exhibits for Continuing Accreditation template in NCATE's Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS) with prompts and maximum character limitations for each of the responses.

4. Exhibits

Exhibits supporting the IR should be uploaded in AIMS under the last prompt of the standards sections. It is critical that the exhibits are made available at the time of IR submission and prior to the Offsite Review for use by the Offsite Board of Examiners (BOE) team.

5. Data Expectations

NCATE expects institutions to regularly and systematically collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, analyze, and use data throughout the full (five to seven years) accreditation cycle between onsite visits. For the purposes of Unit accreditation, a limited number of years of data are required. Data reported on assessments in the IR for Unit accreditation should be for the most recent **12-month period**. When the BOE team conducts the onsite visit, it should find evidence that the institution has **three years of data** for continuing accreditation. Institutions that do not meet this minimum requirement will have an area for improvement (AFI) cited under Standard 2, indicating that the Unit is not regularly and/or systematically collecting and summarizing assessment data.

For programs that were nationally reviewed through Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) or through a state process that required the review of assessments and data, Units are required to report in the IR only assessments and data on (1) professional dispositions and (2) proficiencies identified in the Unit's conceptual framework. No additional assessment data for these programs are required for Standard 1. Assessments and data collected after the submission of programs for national or state review must be available at the time of the onsite visit. When the state review process does not require reporting of assessments, scoring guides, and data on candidate outcomes, the Unit is required to provide information listed in the first paragraph under Data Expectations.

**INSTITUTIONAL REPORT FOR CONTINUING ACCREDITATION:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY**

I.   Overview and Conceptual Framework

I.1   Summarize the institution's mission, historical context, and unique characteristics (e.g., land grant, HBCU or religious).

Jacksonville State University (JSU) has evolved from modest beginnings as a State Normal School into the educational center of Northeast Alabama. The Governor of Alabama signed into law a bill creating the preparatory school for children of the town and surrounding areas on February 22, 1883. Jacksonville State Normal School acquired the facilities and equipment of Calhoun College, consisting of 12 acres of land and a two-story brick building.

The Normal School remained in operation until 1930 when it became Jacksonville State Teachers College. Five years later, the College earned regional accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, when the first graduate program, the master's degree in elementary education, was created. On August 17, 1967, the Legislature established an independent Board of Trustees for the University and divested jurisdiction from the State Board of Education.

JSU has developed into a modern regional university serving Northeast Alabama on a 318-acre campus. In addition, the University operates an off-campus center in Gadsden, Alabama, at JSU-Gadsden and serves as many as nine video conferencing sites. Through its programs of teaching, research, and service, Jacksonville State University has served the region and state for more than 100 years.

JSU strives for continuous improvement as a learning-centered community and has adopted the 21st century learning skills of being committed to developing the ability to think critically, solve problems creatively and collaboratively, and communicate effectively.

The mission of JSU is to provide distinctive educational, cultural, and social experiences for a diverse student population. As a learning-centered university, Jacksonville State University strives to challenge students academically in a culturally responsive environment, meeting students' educational, career, and personal goals.

I.2   Summarize the professional education Unit at your institution, its mission, and its relationship to other Units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators.

The College of Education and Professional Studies (CEPS and/or Unit) serves students through traditional and online programs of study. Teachers and other school personnel prepared at the baccalaureate, master's, and educational specialist levels develop an extensive knowledge and skill-based education appropriate for the level of certification. Developing initial and advanced education candidates into effective, reflective, and creative decision makers is the fundamental goal of all teacher education preparation programs at JSU. The mission of The College of Education & Professional Studies is to prepare students in a learning-centered

environment for professional engagement through advanced and innovative teaching, scholarship, and service.

The CEPS is one of four major academic Units at Jacksonville State University. All four academic Units strive to balance academic challenges with a range of support services for students' academic, career, and personal goals. As an academic institution, Jacksonville State University seeks to produce broadly educated graduates with skills for employment, citizenship, and life-long learning. As a comprehensive university, JSU supports scholarly and service activities consistent with its academic and professional strengths. JSU will be the regional comprehensive institution of choice for students who want a strong, high quality education. Students will be challenged academically by dedicated and accessible faculty and have access to the latest technology to ensure success in an expanding global community. Curriculum offerings will utilize developing methods of instruction to eliminate barriers of time and distance and allow the JSU experience to transcend regional boundaries. Highly responsive services that demonstrate the institution's commitment to continuous improvement will ensure JSU's reputation as the friendliest campus in the South.

I.3   Summarize programs offered at initial and advanced preparation levels (including off-campus, distance learning, and alternate route programs), status of state approval, national recognition, and if applicable, findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals.

The Unit prepares students for successful careers in a variety of professions. Programs in the Unit enable graduates to become *Creative Decision Makers* who can effectively solve problems using concepts and practices appropriate for each discipline. The Unit meets the changing needs of the region, state, and nation through wide-ranging service and research activities. These activities develop problem-solving strategies and assist in social, educational, and economic development. The uniqueness of the Unit is reflected through the diversity of programs offered in the CEPS. The Initial, Advanced, and Other School Professionals programs in Education are designed to enable graduates to effectively solve problems using concepts and practices appropriate for each discipline in a creative decision-making process. The faculty of the Unit adopted *The Developing Education Professional as Creative Decision Maker* in 2004 as its model for teacher preparation programs. In teaching, as with any creative endeavor, teachers must possess and be able to implement the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to make creative decisions. They must prepare to take on the challenge of the decision making process with the full knowledge that their educational advancement, and consequently that of the individuals whom they serve, requires a commitment to life-long learning.

The five departments forming the Educational Unit include Curriculum and Instruction; Educational Resources; Family and Consumer Sciences; Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; and Secondary Education. These departments offer programs at the baccalaureate, master's, and educational specialist levels. Though not covered by NCATE accreditation, the departments of Communication; Family and Consumer Sciences; Health, Physical Education, and Recreation; and Technology and Engineering offer programs in professional studies in the CEPS. Candidate Support Services associated with the Unit are provided through the Harper

Child Development Center at JSU, the Instructional Services Unit, and the Teacher Service Center.

I.4   Summarize the basic tenets of the conceptual framework, institutional standards, and candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions.

    The Developing Education Professional as Creative Decision Maker is a reflective practitioner who continuously refines the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions of a 21st century learner. Reflectivity can involve seeking insight into one's instruction, classroom management, relationships with colleagues and students (Helterbran, 2008), and the 21st learning skills that are important to a teacher.   As a Creative Decision Maker, the candidate should exhibit the following dispositions: (a) a willingness to engage in a complex task, (b) habitual use of short and long range plans, (c) flexibility, (d) willingness to abandon nonproductive strategies, and (c) an awareness of the social realities that need to be overcome so that thought can become actions (Halpern, 1998, p. 452). That teachers should model and reinforce critical thinking and problem solving when guiding student-centered and collaborative lessons is imperative (Gallavan, 2005). Application of these principles with imagination to create new realities for students in the classroom is imperative for teachers and other professional school personnel.

    To develop successful Creative Decision Makers in the Unit, each program strives to meet the criteria set forth by its mission statement and the eight learning outcomes that make up the goals of the Creative Decision Maker. Teachers and other school professionals make daily decisions related to each of the eight identified outcomes. The eight learning outcomes the Unit has deemed critical to the development of the Creative Decision Maker are as follows:

    Learning Outcome #1: Educational Theory and Research

    Learning Outcome #2: Content Pedagogy

    Learning Outcome #3: Diverse Learners

    Learning Outcome #4: Teaching Strategies and Techniques

    Learning Outcome #5: Professionalism

    Learning Outcome #6: Educational Environments

    Learning Outcome #7: Communication and Technology

    Learning Outcome #8: Assessment

I. 5   Exhibits

I.5.a	Links to Unit catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies: • JSU Undergraduate Bulletin • JSU Graduate Bulletin • JSU State Approved Degree Program Sheets
I.5.b	Syllabi for professional education courses: CTE, EAD, ECE, ECG, ED, EED, EFD, EIM, EPY, ESE, FCS, HPE, IL, LM, RDG, SPE
I.5.c	Conceptual framework
I.5.d	Findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, APA, CACREP Accreditation Letter)
I.5.e	Updated institutional, program, and faculty information under institutional work space in AIMS NCATE Faculty Roster from Digital Measures

II. Unit Standards and Movement Toward Target

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
X	X	Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
		Standard 4: Diversity
		Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
		Standard 6: Governance and Resources

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 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

What do candidate assessment data tell the Unit about candidates' meeting professional, state, and institutional standards and their impact on P-12 student learning? For programs not nationally/state reviewed, summarize data from key assessments and discuss these results. [10,000 characters]

Assessment data indicate that a majority of candidates at both the initial and advanced certification levels are performing at the exemplary or proficient levels in most professional, state, and institutional standards, including those that indicate the impact of candidate work on P-12 student learning (See Exhibit 1.3.d). Aggregate data for institutional standards indicate that fifty percent of candidates across all undergraduate programs perform in the exceptional range on all learning outcomes identified by the Unit.

Analysis of Title II data for the two years prior to and including the 2011-12 school year indicate that candidate performance on Praxis II exams required by the state for initial certification varies by program area, and in some programs, there were variations among traditional and alternative certification candidates (See Exhibit 1.3.b). The average pass rates for each certification area are listed below disaggregated by traditional and alternative certification students for those programs that had both types of certification students in 2011-2012:
- Biology: 55% Traditional, Not Reported % Alternative Certification,
- Business: Not Reported % Traditional, Not Reported % Alternative Certification,
- Elementary: 95% Traditional, 100% Alternative Certification,
- English Language Arts: 95% Traditional, 92% Alternative Certification,
- Family and Consumer Sciences: Not Reported % Traditional,
- General Science: 85% Traditional: Not Reported % Alternative Certification,
- Math: 78% Traditional, Not Reported % Alternative Certification,
- Music: 95% Traditional
- Physical Education: 90% Traditional, Not Reported % Alternative Certification,
- Social Sciences: 54% Traditional, Not Reported % Alternative Certification,

- Spanish: Not Reported % Traditional, Not Reported % Alternative Certification,
- History: 82% Traditional, Not Reported % Alternative Certification.
  **For programs with fewer than 10 test takers, scores and percent passing were not reported on Title II Reporting Sheets.

All candidates within the Unit are assessed based on the level of proficiency exhibited on the eight learning outcomes identified by the Unit. These learning outcomes are evaluated on a four-point scale with levels of (1) exceptional, (2) proficient, (3) basic, and (4) unacceptable. These data indicate that a majority of candidates completing all programs are performing at the *exceptional* or *proficient* levels on these key assessments (See Exhibit 1.3.d).

Data for initial certification programs indicate:
- Learning Outcome 1: Understanding of educational research and theory: Initial certification: 58% exceptional; 33% proficient;
- Learning Outcome 2: Understanding of content pedagogy: Initial certification: 53% exceptional; 40% proficient;
- Learning Outcome 3: Understanding of diverse learners: Initial certification: 71% exceptional; 24% proficient;
- Learning Outcome 4: Understanding of teaching strategies and techniques: Initial certification: 81% exceptional; 14% proficient;
- Learning Outcome 5: Understanding of professionalism: Initial certification: 54% exceptional; 41% proficient;
- Learning Outcome 6: Understanding of educational environment: Initial certification: 66% exceptional; 32% proficient;
- Learning Outcome 7: Understanding of communication and technology: Initial certification: 69% exceptional; 27% proficient;
- Learning Outcome 8: Understanding of assessment: Initial certification: 75% exceptional; 19% proficient;

Data for all of the key assessments for initial certification programs indicate that candidates who complete the undergraduate programs have the knowledge and ability to perform at or above the proficient level and have a positive impact on P-12 student learning.

Data for advanced certification programs indicate:
- Learning Outcome 1: Understanding of educational research and theory: 29% exceptional; 62% proficient;
- Learning Outcome 2: Understanding of content pedagogy: 61% exceptional; 36% proficient;
- Learning Outcome 3: Understanding of diverse learners: 54% exceptional; 40% proficient;
- Learning Outcome 4: Understanding of teaching strategies and techniques: 49% exceptional; 48% proficient;
- Learning Outcome 5: Understanding of professionalism: 68% exceptional; 30% proficient;
- Learning Outcome 6: Understanding of educational environment: 61% exceptional; 37% proficient;

- Learning Outcome 7: Understanding of communication and technology: 60% exceptional; 37% proficient;
- Learning Outcome 8: Understanding of assessment: 55% exceptional; 40% proficient.

Candidates in advanced programs are expected to perform in ways that positively impact student learning and performance. Learning outcome data indicate that a majority of these candidates graduating from the CEPS programs are performing at or above the proficient level.

Measures of candidates' ability to have a positive impact on student learning indicate that at the initial and advanced certification levels, candidates are performing in the exceptional or proficient range over ninety percent of the time (See Exhibit 1.3.g).

Aggregate data from employer feedback indicates that in a majority of areas that are of concern to education employers, Unit graduates are performing at or above the levels expected by school administrators. A principle area of concern by employers was graduates' ability to integrate technology into classroom instruction and knowledge of appropriate uses of personal and professional technology based services (See Exhibit 1.3.j).

Results of graduate survey data indicate that a majority of the Unit's graduates strongly agree or agree that the program:

- Enhanced knowledge of the graduate's subject matter,
- Enhanced the graduate's understanding of professional roles and the responsibilities of the teaching profession,
- Enhanced the graduate's understanding of teaching methodology,
- Enhanced the graduate's teaching skills,
- Caused the graduate to have a greater appreciation for advanced coursework,
- Enhanced the graduate's ability to assess student learning.

Additional measures from graduate surveys indicate that:

- 40-60% of advanced program graduates consulted with their advisor frequently, while 35-50% consulted with their advisor occasionally. These statistics proved consistent for students in all racial groups, genders, and programs. In the initial certification programs, graduates in all groups rated their interactions with an advisor as excellent or good.
- 30-45% of advanced students helped a professor with a research project. All genders, degree programs, and ethnicities fall within this range with the exception of 19% of white students at the Master's level who reported assisting with faculty research during their program of study. At the initial program level, less that 20% of graduates in all categories report having helped a professor with research.
- 60-90% of advanced program graduates reported that their program involved interaction with other students. On this question, a majority of student categories reported that 70% or more students identified that they had frequent interaction with other students. The only group that reported significantly lower percentages was male students in the Educational Specialist degree program. For this group, 57% reported frequent interaction while 39% reported occasional interaction. A majority of graduates in all groups believed that the interactions they had with other students contributed to their success in the program. A majority of initial certification

graduates reported that their relationship with other students was friendly, supportive, and one that produced a sense of belonging.

- Over 85% of all advanced program graduates strongly agreed or agreed that their program provided an understanding of appropriate educational theories and their uses. Over 75% of initial program graduates indicated that they believed their program taught them how to think critically and analytically.
- Over 90% of graduates in all categories and programs indicate that they do not believe their classes were too large.
- Over 95% of graduates rate their overall program as excellent or good.
- A large majority of initial program graduates in all categories indicated that the technology and library facilities were appropriate and that they used these facilities regularly.

While graduates responding to these and other program area questions did not produce any results that suggest major changes are needed, it should be noted that the sample size for graduates who respond to the surveys is small. A larger group of respondents could produce different results. The small sample size is true in both initial certification programs and in advanced programs although a greater percentage of advanced program graduates respond to the graduate survey.

Results of Unit data from all programs indicate that the Unit is meeting the goals for candidate achievement and Unit effectiveness. While data from some areas of performance and data collection indicate room for improvement, overall aggregated and disaggregated data indicate that the Unit is effective in its endeavors to prepare candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards and to impact P-12 learning.

1.2   Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the Unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.b   Continuous Improvement [10,000 characters]
- Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
- Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

The College of Education and Professional Studies (CEPS) has implemented unit wide, data driven program changes intended to improve the overall educational program and continue the Unit's course of continuous improvement (See Exhibit 2.3.g). Many of these changes, while in place for a year or more, are in the process of continued implementation. Other changes, though, are more recent and a result of continued data analysis used to guide program improvement. These Unit wide changes include:
- *The addition of new advanced programs in several departments*. These programs address the needs expressed by current and former students and will improve the preparation of students above the initial certification level. These include the Library

Media program which added a degree at the Educational Specialist level as a result of data from current and former students that suggested this was a need in the Library Media community and the Instructional Leadership program which added a new Educational Specialist program for classroom teachers who wish to advance beyond the Master's degree level but who do not wish to move into administration.

- *Adjustments to the manner in which courses are offered, such as offering more programs that are online or hybrid in order to serve the needs of a diverse student population*. Several departments have implemented these changes to meet the needs of current and future students.

- *At both the initial and advanced levels, programs have developed and continue to refine evaluation of student dispositions*.

- *Many programs made improvements to their existing courses and/or added courses that will improve the overall programs as a result of program data analysis*. The Family and Consumer Science program added a program specific assessment course that will replace the more general assessment course students in the program were previously required to complete, and the Physical Education program realigned several courses in the program to ensure that students are prepared to meet exemplary state and program requirements. The Secondary Education program implemented a plan to add significant classroom experience hours for students in the program prior to internship. These extra hours include guided observation hours, related assignments, and additional instructional time. Additionally, the Secondary Education program continued working with programs in the Arts and Sciences to ensure that students are prepared to meet exemplary standards in both pedagogy and specific academic disciplines.

- *A year-long internship was piloted unit wide and is expected to resolve the issue of newly graduated teachers not having experience in a school throughout an entire year*. This issue is often mentioned in feedback from administrators and in Advisory Council Meetings at the department level. When not addressed, this lack of extended experience can result in graduates who begin their first year teaching with little or no experience in the successful completion of such activities as beginning a school year, preparing for classes to resume after a break, or establishing and maintaining classroom management from the first of the year until the end. Data from participants suggest that when internship extends for the entire school year, first year teachers are better prepared for their first year in their own classroom because they will have completed an entire year of training in one classroom environment.

- *In order to improve the mentoring, feedback, and collaboration among initial certification candidates, university faculty, and classroom teachers, all initial certification programs adopted a video sharing/evaluation program*. This program, EVIRx, allows improved interaction with and more constant evaluation of initial teacher candidates. Additionally, this program increases candidate proficiency in the use of educational technology.

- *All initial certification programs adopted a co-teaching model that was implemented for candidates completing initial certification*. Research indicates that this model will improve candidate performance and positively impact the performance of K-12 students.

- *The Unit implemented an Exemplary Course Design rubric for faculty who wish to improve the design of their courses.*

Overall, programs throughout the Unit have continued to systematically review assessment data in order to ensure that changes made have been implemented as a means to improve and to guarantee that all programs are working effectively to prepare candidates to impact P-12 learning.

All programs have identified dispositions that are necessary for candidate success and are collecting dispositional data from candidates related (a) a willingness to engage in a complex task, (b) habitual use of short and long range plans, (c) flexibility, (d) willingness to abandon nonproductive strategies, and (e) an awareness of the social realities that need to be overcome so that thought can become actions (Halpern, 1998). Review of data related to these dispositions has led several programs to identify a need for improved collection and analysis of aggregate candidate dispositional data. As a result these programs are developing additional collection methods that will ensure that candidate dispositional data is effectively collected, stored in a manner that will allow access for program/university personnel to effectively utilize the information, and development of analysis methods that will allow for a more thorough understanding of both the aggregated and disaggregated data in order to make needed program enhancements.

Collection of data from graduating and graduated candidates has been identified as an area in need of enhancement in order to ensure that the percentage of candidates and graduates providing feedback is as high as possible. The Unit will work with the Jacksonville State University Office of Planning and Research and with the State Department of Education to enhance the survey information, extend the collection of data to a larger percentage of appropriate participants through a more thorough database of contact information, and improve the availability and use of dispositional data at the Unit and program levels.

Improvements in feedback from employers is another area targeted by the Unit for improved data collection and utilization. Current data collection will be supplemented by improved employer surveys targeting all area school administration, including system level and school level administrators. Administration outside of the immediate Jacksonville State University service area will be identified through improved graduate surveys and included in the employer feedback pool.

Several programs throughout the Unit are in the process of in-depth program review as required by the university. Programs are using data regarding candidate proficiency in professional, state, and institutional standards as a principle guide to suggest program changes (See Exhibit 1.3.d). Additionally, review of data from employer feedback, graduating candidate surveys, and disposition reviews are being used to guide program revisions. Program review, along with the enhancement of data collection and analysis for standards at all levels, dispositional data, and graduate and employer data, will provide the Unit with the information needed to make ongoing and sustained improvement in all programs and in the Unit as a whole.

1.3   **Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review**
Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000 characters]

There were no areas for improvement cited for Standard I in the 2005 NCATE Accreditation Review.

1.4   **Exhibits for Standard 1**

1.3.a	[State program review documents and state findings](#) (Some of these documents may be available in AIMS.)
1.3.b	Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years • [2009-2010 Traditional Certification Programs](#) • [2009-2010 Alternate Route Certification Programs](#) • [2010-2011 Traditional Certification Programs](#) • [2010-2011 Alternate Route Certification Programs](#) • [2011-2012 Traditional Certification Programs](#) • [2011-2012 Alternate Route Certification Programs](#)
1.3.c	[Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing candidate learning against professional and state standards as well as proficiencies identified in the Unit's conceptual framework](#) • [Eight Learning Outcomes aligned with AQTS, INTASC, and NBPTS](#) • [Undergraduate (IP) State Standards Alignment Matrix](#) • [Graduate (AP) State Standards Alignment Matrix](#) • [AQTS Unit Assessment Data Fall 2011-Summer 2012](#)
1.3.d	[Aggregate data on key assessments, including proficiencies identified in the Unit's conceptual framework](#) (Data should be disaggregated by program, and for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs.)
1.3.e	[Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing professional dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn](#)
1.3.f	[Aggregate data on key assessments of candidates' professional dispositions (Data should be disaggregated by program, and for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs.)](#)
1.3.g	[Examples of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning](#)
1.3.h	[Samples of candidates' work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels) from programs across the Unit](#)
1.3.i	Aggregate data on follow-up studies of graduates: • [Initial Candidates](#) • [Advanced and Other School Profession Candidates](#)
1.3.j	[Aggregate data on employer feedback on graduates](#)
1.3.k	Data collected by state and/or national agencies on performance of educator preparation programs and the effectiveness of their graduates in classrooms and schools, including student achievement data, when available • [EDUCATE Alabama Explanatory Information](#) • [EDUCATE Alabama Evaluatee Data for JSU Graduates](#)

Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

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

2.1   Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

How does the Unit use its assessment system to improve candidate performance, program quality and Unit operations? [10,000 characters]

The Unit and its partners have created an integrated assessment system utilizing LiveText Education Solutions to house nearly all data collection instances. Although the present assessment system has been functioning since the previous NCATE site visit in 2005, the Unit has significantly strengthened assessment efforts, data collection, and the dissemination of data to stakeholders, including program faculty and advisory council members: principals, teachers, current and former students. The current assessment system has been modified to more thoroughly evaluate candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions as reflected in institutional, state, and professional standards (See Exhibit 1.3.c). The Unit's assessment system utilizes the transition points mentioned in Exhibit 2.3.a to monitor initial, advanced, and other school profession candidates. As data are collected at each transition point, using LiveText where applicable, they are compiled by the NCATE Coordinator and staff for inclusion in both program and college level data portfolios. Data from these portfolios are utilized at annual advisory meetings by program faculty and other stakeholders to suggest necessary improvements and to set action plans for the upcoming academic years. Where candidate performance is concerned, the Unit's primary measures of assessment are derived from the use of standardized rubrics associated with the Unit's eight learning outcomes. At the initial, advanced, and other school profession levels, each of the eight learning outcomes is aligned with a particular program specific course (See Exhibit 1.3.c). Upon completion of these courses, candidate performance is assessed using LiveText rubrics for each of the outcomes. Candidate performance, then, may be evaluated at the Unit level, providing aggregate data for both initial and advanced programs. Further, candidate performance may be disaggregated to provide program specific proficiency in relation to each outcome. Examples of Unit and program data based on the Unit's learning outcomes may be found in Exhibit 1.3.d.

As a measure of quality control, the NCATE Coordinator and staff verify that all required course assessments are completed in LiveText each semester. For an explanation of related policies and procedures, please see Exhibit 2.3.d. Program area faculty are then required to reflect on candidate performance data each term and report back to the NCATE Coordinator. Required areas for reflection include but are not limited to the following: identifying missing data points related to college level and state standards, implementing procedures to eliminate missing data points, and using data to formulate both short and long term action plans. Additionally, the NCATE Coordinator meets with program faculty at least once each semester to assess the placement and assessment of course standards. These meetings allow faculty to visualize how assessment data provide information related to course quality and applicability as related to preparing teacher education and other school profession candidates. To ensure consistency, learning outcome data collection points may not be changed without the Unit Head's approval. Each academic year, generally in May, program faculty arrange an advisory

council meeting where they, along with other stakeholders, review assessment data and attempt to identify both strengths and weaknesses associated with teacher preparation programs. Data related to each transition point outlined in Exhibit 2.3.a are disaggregated for program areas and shared with all members of the advisory council groups. The NCATE Coordinator serves as the facilitator for data review, helping program advisory council groups review data as they relate to the mission of the Unit. After the data review, program advisory council groups formulate a working action plan to provide focus for the upcoming academic year. Examples of significant data driven changes made to program areas based on reflection and advisory council recommendations may be found in Exhibit 2.3.g.

The Unit assessment system directly supports the effective operations of the Unit; the assessment system includes evaluations of the candidates, faculty, and administration from a variety of sources including P-12 partners. Candidates are comprehensively evaluated as they transition through their respective programs. Data used for candidate admission to initial, advanced, and other school profession programs are aggregated and housed in LiveText (See Exhibit 2.3.b). While these data are used for admission purposes, they are also reviewed annually during advisory council meetings to help identify admission trends. Key assessments completed for initial, advanced, and other school profession program candidates are completed using LiveText rubrics. Rubric data are also aggregated and housed in LiveText. The NCATE Coordinator reviews the use of rubrics and their resulting data each term to ensure that data are regularly collected. In addition to the assessment of the Unit's learning outcomes, the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) also requires assessment measures in place for Alabama Quality Teaching Standards (AQTS) for initial certification candidates (See Exhibit 1.3.c). These standards are assessed using LiveText rubrics, allowing the Unit's NCATE Coordinator to generate an AQTS "report card of student proficiency" for the ALSDE, ensuring compliance with state code. Faculty are evaluated in each course taught and must submit a development plan prior to each academic year, addressing teaching, scholarship, and service. Presently, JSU utilizes the IDEA Course Evaluation system to provide students the opportunity to evaluate faculty and course delivery. Faculty receive comprehensive IDEA data reports each term. The faculty review process was updated to employ the portfolio feature in LiveText, allowing for continual faculty self-reflection. Faculty analyze and reflect upon data from the Unit assessment system yearly to compile their evaluation portfolios as part of the faculty review process. Administrators are evaluated, in a confidential manner, each year by the Unit head and the faculty whom they represent. The evaluation procedure for administrators was in the process of being standardized across the university at the time of the IR submission.

The Unit's assessment system has been fully functional for the past seven years. Continuous quality improvement measures have been enacted to improve data collection, standards alignment, and functionality; thus, the system has continued to provide valid and reliable sets of aggregate data. Stakeholders readily understand the assessment system and its features, and these stakeholders annually review candidate proficiencies related to program transition points. Further, the Unit strives to ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent and free of bias (See Exhibit 2.3.c) through the use of Unit learning outcome rubrics, program specific scoring rubrics, parallel measures of practical experience performance, and candidate evaluations by internal and external reviewers. The Unit is committed to providing and fostering initial, advanced, and other school profession candidates the knowledge, skills, and

dispositions necessary for exemplary performance in the school setting; the Unit's assessment system readily furnishes the data faculty need to measure candidate performance.

2.2   Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the Unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.b   Continuous Improvement [10,000 characters]
- Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
- Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

The Unit assessment system has continued to evolve since the last NCATE visit in 2005. While the assessment system adequately assessed candidate performance, the following significant changes were implemented to lead to continuous improvement of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions:

- The Teacher Education Assessment Management System (TEAMS) created by JSU faculty and previously utilized to house assessment system data was discontinued in 2005 as LiveText Education Solutions began serving as the primary vehicle for outcomes assessment data collection as well as the storage system for all other collected Unit assessment data. LiveText's portfolio creation and management features appealed to faculty and students as a way to directly measure candidate growth. The Unit will continue to partner with LiveText Education Solutions to provide direct measures of candidate performance. The Unit plans to incorporate videos of candidate performance into program portfolios as this feature evolves
- In 2007, the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) required all initial program candidates to demonstrate proficiency related to Alabama Quality Teaching Standards (AQTS). A careful review of learning outcome data allowed each AQTS to be aligned with at least one sub element of the Unit's eight learning outcomes. Programs submitted for review this year will align the current AQTS with both the Unit's learning outcomes and program courses. (See Exhibit 1.3.c)
- In 2007, program portfolios were standardized to include professional content and clinical components (where applicable) in an effort to encourage candidate reflection related to growth from program start to finish. P-12 administrators expressed an interest in viewing these portfolios during the job interview process.
- Beginning in 2009, an administrative change in Unit leadership led to the naming of a new NCATE Coordinator and chair for Standard II. The new coordinator received a six hour course release, allowing him to devote much time and attention to the assessment system and the systematic collection of assessment data.
- In 2009, advisory council feedback led to the alignment of advanced and other school profession candidate outcomes being aligned with National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) core propositions for each teaching field.

- Regular evaluation of collected assessment data led to the development of initial and advanced assessment matrices for AQTS, NBPTS, and learning outcome alignment by Unit programs. These matrices may be found on the Unit website for faculty and student reference.
- Based on advisory council feedback across multiple program meetings, university supervisors and cooperating teachers were required to evaluate candidate performance during internship using a common Clinical Experiences Observation Instrument (CEOI) each time candidates were formally evaluated in the field. With both supervisors and cooperating teachers evaluating the same instance of candidate performance, the assessment system was allowed to collect parallel assessments.
- With the naming of a new NCATE Coordinator, regular assessment meetings were held to ensure faculty possessed common assessment terminology. Advisory council feedback spoke to a need for consistent terminology to promote candidate understanding of the assessment process.
- Based on the need for systematic assessment practices, the Unit implemented a faculty mentoring program during the 2010-2011 academic year.
- Candidate course evaluation and faculty reflection promoted the evolution of ED 300, Orientation to Teacher Education, from a zero, to one, and ultimately to a two hour credit course. Stakeholders spoke to the importance of material introduced in the course and the addition of credit hours allowed for greater emphasis on course material.
- Key assessments for programs were updated as needed based on faculty reflection and advisory council feedback. Key assessments were consistently evaluated for real-world relevance.
- Candidate data during the internship semester prompted the creation of a three hour seminar course to accompany internship. This course allows for multiple measures of learning outcome proficiency on a developmental continuum. Candidates now demonstrate learning outcome proficiency during clinical practice and submit materials during their seminar course as an additional outcome measure.
- Based on the previous NCATE site visit, a midpoint review process was developed and implemented for advanced programs.
- Disposition data for initial candidates prompted further development of a disposition measurement for advanced candidates.

2.3   **Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review**
Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000 characters]

In 2005, Standard 2 received two AFIs. Since then, the Unit has continuously improved the assessment system to address each AFI:
1. BOE Team reported: "Program transition points are not fully developed and implemented." Beginning with the 2006 academic term, all transition points were developed and implemented for initial, advanced, and other school profession programs. In 2008, the Unit began focusing on the midpoint review process for advanced candidates. In 2009, a formal midpoint review process was in place for all advanced candidates. Candidates having completed between 15 and 18 hours in an advanced programs were required to submit their program portfolio to program faculty. Program

faculty evaluated portfolios for the inclusion of all applicable course artifacts. Further, advanced candidate dispositions were regularly assessed as part of the midpoint review process. As evidenced in Exhibit 2.3.a, the Unit's assessment system includes well defined transition points at which data collection regularly occurs. Each year since 2005, these data have been integral in admission and retention for initial, advanced, and other school profession candidates.

2. BOE Team reported: "Evidence was not consistently found that showed Unit assessment instruments to be fair, accurate, consistent, and free from bias." Since the 2005 NCATE visit, the Unit has employed numerous practices to ensure that assessment instruments are fair, accurate, consistent, and free form bias. Immediately, all clinical evaluation instruments were reviewed to ensure that candidate performance expectations were clearly stated and measurable. In response, clinical evaluation instruments across all initial levels were standardized and have since been referred to as Clinical Experiences Observation Instruments (CEOIs). Through advisory council meetings and clinical experiences focus groups, stakeholders were consulted in the creation of these instruments. Where applicable, parallel measures of candidate assessment were incorporated into the assessment system to ensure fairness, consistency, and freedom from bias. In the initial, advanced, and other school profession program where applicable, candidate performance was measured by both a university faculty member and cooperating professional in the field. The performance evaluations used were mapped to the Unit's conceptual framework, which is subsequently aligned with institutional, state, and national standards. In addition to the review of candidate performance assessments, Unit faculty also consulted stakeholders to ensure that the standardized rubrics being used to assess the Unit's eight learning outcomes were fair, accurate, consistent, and free from bias. Candidate portfolio data were continuously reviewed by advisory council members. Each year, action plans were drafted in response to concerns related to candidate data. To ensure consistency and freedom from bias of Unit rubrics, the Unit hosted regular evaluation meetings to train new faculty and supervisors on the use of these instruments. Further, the Office of Clinical Experiences held focus groups to identify areas of potential confusion related to rubric use. University faculty were then required to meet with cooperating field professionals each term to explain rubric creation and use.

2.4   Exhibits for Standard 2

2.3.a	Description of the Unit's assessment system including the requirements and key assessments used at transition points
2.3.b	Admission criteria and data from key assessments used for entry to programs
2.3.c	Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that key assessments of candidate performance and evaluations of program quality and Unit operations are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias
2.3.d	Policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and used for continuous improvement
2.3.e	Policies, procedures and practices for managing candidate complaints
2.3.f	File of candidate complaints and the Unit's responses and resolutions (This information should be available during the onsite visit)
2.3.g	Examples of significant changes made to courses, programs, and the Unit in response to data gathered from the assessment system

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   Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

How does the Unit work with the school partners to deliver field experiences and clinical practice to enable candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn? [10,000 characters]

The vision, mission, and goals of Jacksonville State University are focused on providing a learning-centered environment. The Unit engages in PDS partnerships to reflect its commitment to providing engaging experiences whereby students develop the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions needed to enhance student learning. Partnerships began in 2008 with a focus on three specific goals: (1) to develop and offer a comprehensive field-based collaborative pre-service teacher preparation program; (2) to create and manage comprehensive programs for extended development of teaching professionals; and (3) to share the responsibility of designing, delivering, and evaluating field experiences and clinical practices for initial, advanced and other program candidates. These meaningful partnerships have brought about national recognition as well as request from other institutions to visit our campus and the campus of our partner schools. Collaborative work is evidenced through our strong, clinically-based teacher preparation programs and school-based faculty initiatives, presentations, and publications. (Exhibit 3.3.a)

The Unit works with 23 school districts in 10 surrounding counties to provide 173 clinical sites for teacher candidates in initial and advanced programs of study. All Unit clinical experiences are coordinated through the Office of Clinical Experiences. This office provides coordination, leadership, and direction for the clinical experiences component of the Teacher Education program. These responsibilities include taking placement applications (Supplement 3.1.a) of students enrolled in the department of education; arranging placements for practica and internships; implementing approved standards and policies governing clinical experiences; maintaining and updating the clinical experiences handbooks (Supplement 3.1.b); and managing the contracting and travel reimbursement for practicum and internship supervisors. The Director also serves as the liaison between the various teacher education programs and school systems in scheduling and implementing arrangements for all undergraduate and graduate clinical experiences; planning information and orientation meetings for students, faculty, and staff; maintaining teacher candidate records, and communicating with supervisors, principals, and superintendents as needed. The Director works with the service area P-12 schools to ensure that cooperating teachers of initial certification candidates are experienced and qualified. Criteria for cooperating teachers and university supervisors are published in the Teacher Intern Handbook and the Director provides an orientation for all internship university supervisors who, in turn, provide orientation for the cooperating teachers paired with their assigned interns.

All initial certification candidates are required to participate in field experiences prior to their internship. Candidates in initial programs are engaged in field experiences early and often in their program of study. The intensity of these experiences increases each semester, preparing

the candidate for the final clinical practice: internship. In the area of advanced programs, the Unit collaborates on multiple levels with school partners in the delivery of field experiences and clinical practice. This partnership is incorporated into the development, implementation, and evaluation of advanced programs.

Unit programs have been developed with full and equal input from school partners. For example, in 2006, the ALSDE effectively terminated all Educational Administration programs, with the goal of re-designing school leadership programs. The Unit faculty initiated the re-design in partnership with area schools. In a preliminary action, the faculty communicated with both existing and potential partner systems/schools to discuss the process, with a view toward renewing existing partnerships within the new program framework. The re-designed programs of study were submitted to partner school representatives for input and evaluative feedback at every point of the process. The approved programs exampled here (Master's in Instructional Leadership, Ed.S. in Instructional Leadership and Ed.S. in Teacher Leader) are fully the result of collaborative partnership with service area schools and systems.

Advanced program implementation is in full collaboration with partner schools. Because of the collaborative effort in the design of the programs, the Master's in Instructional Leadership has a field experience/clinical component in every course. Candidates in this project-based curriculum are required to implement and deliver the result of their work in each course in a prescribed manner in the partner school. These implementations/deliveries are supervised and monitored by both the field supervisor (principal) and the university faculty. This supervision is provided by on-site visit or by video recording of the clinical presentation.
Ongoing evaluation of advanced programs in conducted systematically and naturally as a result of the collaborative partnership with exists at all points in the program. Specifically, advisory councils meet on an annual basis. These councils are made up of various stakeholders, including representatives from the partner schools (principals, etc.) and program faculty members. Program data is presented to the advisory councils as information, and for evaluation and feedback. Both summary data and disaggregated data, related to student performance in knowledge, skills and dispositions, as well as rubric data informing the group of candidate progress is reviewed.

3.2   Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the Unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a   Standard on which the Unit is moving to the target level [15,000 characters]
- Describe areas of the standard at which the Unit is currently performing at the target level for each element of the standard.
- Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
- Discuss plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in this standard.

The Unit chose Standard 3 as the target standard for the following reasons: 1) we acknowledge that diverse, authentic, and collaborative clinical experiences are essential; 2) we have worked diligently to build relationships with our partner schools in order to provide diverse sites for our candidates in which to observe and teach; 3) we have designed clinical experiences

in a developmental progression across programs, with continuous reflection and evaluation of candidates by their peers, faculty, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors; 4) we provide intensive professional semester experience with consistent and systematic candidate evaluation, allowing candidates to integrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions into the authentic P-12 environment, with the priority of improving student achievement; and 5) we have initiated varied opportunities for Unit faculty, P-12 practitioners, and candidates to work together as collaborative partners.

a. Collaboration Between Unit and School Partners

The Unit believes it is performing at the target level with regard to its collaborative partnerships with P-12 schools and advisory groups such as the Superintendents Consortium. The Superintendent's Consortium is made up of the superintendents from the school systems that serve as Unit partners in the preparation of teachers. At times, other system personnel, such as assistant superintendents, convene with the consortium. The consortium meets two times annually. A prime example of how the consortium functions relates to the programs in Instructional Leadership.

Subsequent to the ALSDE effectively closing down all traditional Educational Administration programs statewide in 2005, and mandating a new design for Instructional Leadership programs, the program faculty designed new course shells using the Alabama Standards for Instructional Leaders. The partner superintendents and principals were convened and asked, "What project(s) would you want candidates to complete as part of their preparation in this course to be instructional leaders?" This collaborative effort produced a priority list of projects that were placed appropriately in each and all courses in the program. After the re-design, consortium meetings have included give-and-take discussions regarding pertinent issues, changes, ideas, goal setting, etc., and receiving feedback regarding the program.

The Unit considers our partners as co-designers, co-implementers, and co-evaluators of our programs. Every new program or program change includes feedback from partners in the design, planning, and execution. Some of this takes place during advisory council meetings each year. Advisory Councils are made up of various stakeholders in each program. Graduate employers, program alumni, present students, program faculty, partner school representatives, etc., are among those who make up the various advisory councils. A primary focus of the council meetings is to update stakeholders on changes that may have been mandated, or otherwise deemed to be essential to the improvement of the program. Council meetings provide a venue for reviewing program learning outcome data, pending changes, the status of employment opportunities, and other worthwhile information. As a result of this sharing of information, the council is better able to make recommendations to program faculty. Additionally, the Unit has cultivated multiple partnerships with P-12 schools. These partnerships are "action-based" in terms of continuously planned events, service endeavors, involvement with P-12 students and their families, contribution of resources, and professional development.

As part of continuous improvement, in November 2012, JSU held the first CORE (Collaborative Regional Education) Partnership, comprised of JSU, national, state, and regional organizations interested in transforming K-20 classrooms through "professional development, project/challenge-based learning, technology, classroom support, change management and

partnership building, evaluation and research, dual enrollment, and innovative teacher preparation.

- In January 2013, a research project was initiated to investigate the implementation of the Core Active Learning Model (CALM) in middle and high school classrooms.
- In June 2013, the first CORE Academy will be held to present innovations related to technology, best practices in teaching, assessment and/or research, partnership building, ideas for organizational change, and classroom environments.

In Spring 2012, the Unit created the Co-Teaching Institute to promote co-teaching as an instructional strategy to prepare candidates for meeting the needs of diverse learners collaboratively and effectively (See Exhibit 3.3.a). A group of Unit and local school faculty and administrators took part in a 2-day training workshop led by founders Nancy Bacharach and Teresa Washut Heck from St. Cloud State University, held in Stadium Towers on the JSU campus. The Unit piloted the co-teaching model in some clinical placements in Fall 2012 and continued into spring 2013 internship. Training has been ongoing for all Unit faculty as well as participating practicum candidates and cooperating teachers. Candidates are required to co-teach with cooperating teachers during internship and various clinical experiences.

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

The Unit believes it is performing at the target level in the design, implementation, and evaluation of field and clinical experiences. Initial certification field experiences begin early in a candidate's program and are highly diverse.

Clinical Experience Levels

- At Level I, these experiences are included in professional studies classes and, in particular, method classes. They involve micro-teaching, project and unit development, subject matter portfolios, group research, presentations, and other activities.

- The purpose of Level II is to provide opportunities for one-to-one tutoring and interaction for our candidates with area children. Our Candidates diagnose learning needs and develop and implement learning activities.

- Level III experiences are provided in collaboration with local schools and provide gradual exposure to the classroom. They include observations, teaching, and participation in school activities. Clinical faculty, along with classroom teachers, monitor the students' performance.

- At Level IV, candidates spend approximately 15 weeks in this level with carefully selected mentors. This level provides continuous, closely-monitored experiences that involve observations, participation in teaching, extensive continual teaching, and other duties of the classroom teacher.

- Finally, Level V, the Unit provides support services to its first and second year teachers and their supervisors upon request. If first- and second-year teacher supervisors identify weaknesses that must be addressed, the clinical faculty is available to develop a personal/professional improvement plan.

Unit teacher candidates engage in regular and focused communication with their cooperating teachers. Each clinical experience as a part of Unit requirements includes implementation of the co-teaching model. In co-teaching, the teacher candidate and cooperating teacher partner in teaching students. This co-teaching partnership requires constant communication and planning in order to cohesively deliver instruction. Through the co-teaching model, teacher candidates have opportunities to interact with students' families and school administrators while functioning as a partner with the cooperating teacher. During clinical experiences, teacher candidates participate in both in-person synchronous and digitally-based asynchronous opportunities for collaboration and reflective conversations. University supervisors plan, observe, and reflect with teacher candidates in each clinical experience through field visits and consultations. The use of Eviryx Videowurks tools offer the teacher candidate and university supervisor additional opportunities for asynchronous communication and continuous improvement in teaching practice. Additionally, teacher candidates interact with one another both in classes and via asynchronous opportunities through blogging, online discussion boards, and Evirx Videowurks Communities.

Each candidate creates a program portfolio upon entering the Unit's Teacher Education and Other School Professions Programs (See Exhibit 1.3.h). These portfolios are designed to demonstrate mastery of program content related to the conceptual framework and the eight learning outcomes. When applicable, portfolios are divided into two parts: Pre-service Studies and Internship. In the Pre-service Studies section teacher candidates include an autobiography, and specific artifacts from designated courses are showcased to serve as evidence of mastery for each of the eight learning outcomes. The Internship section of the portfolio is completed during ED 496/596 and includes a resume as well as a 10-day Unit within which the eight learning outcomes are addressed and supported by student responses to reflective guiding questions. Two videos are also included in the Internship section that highlights the intern's teaching skills.

Unit advanced programs are heavily invested in school-based activities that include peer collaboration projects, the use of varied instructional technologies, and some service learning. For example, in the diversity class, IL 552, candidates are required to work with a group of no fewer than three, to develop diversity training and plans for the school. In IL 510, Action Research, candidates first collaborate with the school principal to devise an action research plan, leading to some specific improvement; then the plan is shared and reviewed by a peer candidate. Still further, open discussion boards (via Blackboard and Livetext) become collaborative forums where candidates discuss the questions, problems, and other challenges encountered in their schools. In IL 564, Law and Ethics, candidates analyze faculty at their partner school regarding what legal and ethical issues in which the faculty needs increased knowledge. Candidates create a seminar in which these legal and ethical issues are discussed.

All advanced program courses utilize extensive and varied information technology,

including LiveText, Blackboard, Blackboard Instant Messaging, Blackboard Collaborate, Wimba, Elluminate, Skype, Wikis, Blogs, online journals, and Evirx, Communication with principals, mentors, etc., is primarily facilitated through email. Candidate projects, reflections, etc., are collected in an electronic portfolio (Livetext), and the body of work is shown to the principals/mentors.

Service learning remains an opportunity of increased emphasis throughout the educational enterprise at all levels. For example, counselor education candidates are required to engage in ten hours of community service in their initial semester, then reflect on that experience in a prescribed manner, as it applies to the needs of people, and the implications of that awareness for counselors, ECG 500. Furthermore, counselor education candidates have been given the opportunity to participate in a service learning research project, sponsored by Chi Sigma Iota, the honorary counseling organization. The research investigated though pre-and post-tests how participation in service learning increased understanding and awareness of the nature of and need for service learning.

In the school Library Media Program, students completing field experiences are required to collaborate with teachers in instructional design. For this project they work with classroom teachers to design an instructional unit, implement instruction by co-teaching content and information skills. Once they finish the unit, they evaluate with the teacher how well the instruction was accomplished within each part of the instructional design components and then decide how they can improve their instruction the next time the unit is taught. The theoretical basis for the design is best practices to use when designing instruction for students. The practices have been developed by Morrison, Kemp, Turner and Zook who developed instructional design models to be followed when planning exemplary instruction. The lessons in the units must involve research by the students and the use of appropriate technology which enhances student learning. Library media specialists are trained to be instructional consultants in their jobs.

Students in the Library Media Program evaluate and implement automation systems to be used in their schools. As they complete field services they are required to learn and implement circulation, inventory, reporting statistics, and cataloging practices that they must do to fulfill their obligations as a media specialist who is a leader and a manager of the media center. They have already evaluated the automation systems in class, but the field experience gives them hands-on experience where they can learn more about the evaluation of automation systems, and give them insight to what works most effectively in the media center. They actually do inventory, circulation of materials, running statistical reports and cataloging of materials as part of their technology field experiences. This practice is supported by theoretical practice which is mandatory for school media specialists to be certified in their jobs.

c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions To Help All Students Learn

The use of Evirx Videowurks tools offer the teacher candidate and university supervisor a web-based technology to make evidence-informed decisions about their teaching. During the practicum semester, candidates are asked to submit a minimum of two videos to their clinical faculty. The first video is an introductory video. The second video captures one lesson from their

experience. The instructional video is evaluated using the [CEOI Rubric #1](). However, during internship, candidates use Evirx for additional supervision. University supervisors rely evidence of actual practices for discussions relating to standards of practice and classroom performance. Performances of candidates enrolled in their clinical placement are formally evaluated three times during the semester by the University Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher.

Initial candidates are responsible for completing the internship section of their professional portfolio during the clinical placement semester. The components of the portfolio are designed to reflect the indicators and professional outcomes in the Unit's assessment plan. The work samples and artifacts included in the portfolio demonstrate the candidates' teaching effectiveness and its impact on learning. Candidates provide learning experiences for all students including students with exceptionalities. Initial candidates gain exposure to student with exceptionalities as well as special education law in specific courses and clinical placements. Through various simulated activities and class discussions, candidates learn strategies and techniques to use to adapt instruction that will enhance student learning in the P-12 setting.

At the advanced level in the Instructional Leadership Program, candidates collaborate with other candidates to some degree in every course in the program. In specific courses including IL 510: Action Research, IL 564: Law and Ethics, and EFD 552: Diversity Issues in Education, candidates have major assignments requiring collaboration as they undertake field-based projects in which an analysis of a problem is completed and a plan addressing the problem is designed and presented to a group of professional educators. In IL 510, candidates are assigned one or two peer reviewers who work with each other to identify strengths and weaknesses of their action research proposals. Candidates work closely with their principals to identify and design field-based projects to complete in their home school for each course in the program. Principals continue to work with candidates as they implement their capstone action research project during their remaining semesters in the program. The candidates, supervised by the JSU instructor and principal who serves as the candidate's mentor, demonstrate proficiencies as they complete coursework, internship activities, field experiences, and a residency during two internship courses . In EFD 552: Diversity Issues in Education, candidates demonstrate proficiencies for working with diverse groups of students including those with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic , linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups.

3.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review
>   Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial
>   and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000 characters]

There were no areas for improvement cited for Standard III in the 2005 NCATE Accreditation Review.

3.4   Exhibits for Standard 3

3.3.a	Examples across programs of collaborative activities between Unit and P-12 schools to support the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice, including memoranda of understanding
3.3.b	Aggregate data on candidate placement in field experiences and clinical practice (Data should be disaggregated by program, and for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs.) • Initial and Advanced Teacher Prep Program Clinical Placement Data • Counseling Clinical Placements • Instructional Leadership Clinical Placements • Library Media Clinical Placements • Reading Specialist Clinical Placements
3.3.c	Criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, which includes both higher education and P–12 school faculty
3.3.d	Examples of support and evaluation of clinical faculty across programs
3.3.e	Guidelines/ handbooks on field experiences and clinical practice for candidates, and clinical faculty, including support provided by the Unit and opportUnities for feedback and reflection
3.3.f	Assessment instruments and scoring guides used for and data collected from field experiences and clinical practice for all programs, including use of technology for teaching and learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.) • CEOI #1 Assessment Document • CEOI #1 Data for Initial and Advanced Teacher Education • CEOI #2 Assessment Document • CEOI #2 Data for Initial and Advanced Teacher Education • Counselor Education Clinical Evaluation Document • Counselor Education Clinical Evaluation Data • Library Media Clinical Evaluation Document • Library Media Clinical Evaluation Data • Instructional Leadership Evaluation Document • Instructional Leadership Evaluation Data
3.3.g	Aggregate data on candidates entering and exiting from clinical practice for all programs (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.) • Entrance Requirements & Data • Summative Data for Exiting Students • Initial Candidates: Exit Survey Data • Advanced and Other School Profession Candidates: Exit Survey Data • CEPS Disposition Data Charts

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 Diversity

How does the Unit prepare candidates to work effectively with all students, including individuals of different ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and/or geographical area? [10,000 Characters]

The Unit is committed to ensuring that candidates have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to effectively teach diverse learners, including those learning English as a second language and students with exceptionalities. This is accomplished through efforts to

- recruit and retain a diverse faculty;
- recruit and retain diverse candidates;
- provide opportunities for candidates to interact with diverse faculty (higher education and school faculty) and other candidates; and
- focus on standards in designing and assessing meaningful diverse classroom and clinical experiences, and using the resulting data to inform and improve educational practice.

The Unit supports Jacksonville State University's pledge to value and promote diversity as embedded in the philosophy, policies, and procedures detailed in the university's Mission, Goals, and Core Values statement, Diversity Plan, Affirmative Action Plan, and the Strategic Plan 2011-2016 (see exhibits in Exhibit 4.3.g and Exhibit 4.3.h.) Following these principles and guidelines, the CEPS strives to recruit and retain a diverse faculty and candidate population (See exhibits in Exhibit 4.3.d and Exhibit 4.3.e).

Every effort is made to ensure that candidates in initial and advanced programs experience diversity in clinical settings and through personal interactions with other candidates and faculty (professional education faculty and school faculty), male and female, differing in at least 2 ethnic/racial groups. ED 300, an introductory course to teacher education admission, is required of all candidates in initial certification programs. In this course, candidates must observe a variety of classroom settings and provide written, focused reflections of those observations. Candidates are exposed to different grade levels and schools illustrating the diversity that exists in today's classrooms. Courses in both conventional and distance learning programs in the Unit provide opportunities for candidates to interact with professional education faculty, faculty outside the Unit, school faculty, and other candidates from diverse groups. Occasions for such cooperation occur during class assignments, field trips, service-related projects, workshops, seminars, practicum and internship placements, advisory committees, and in other collaborative activities. The Unit complies with the Alabama State Code (See exhibit *Alabama State Code* in Exhibit 4.3.b and in Exhibit 4.3.i) requiring that "All candidates shall participate in field experiences or internships that include students with exceptionalities and

students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, linguistic, and socioeconomic groups" (p. 253). Clinical experiences are provided and assessed that promote candidates' working with learners diverse in ability, ethnicity, and learning styles.

The Unit has identified standards (learning outcomes) represented in the conceptual framework for developing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions for working with diverse learners. Alabama Quality Teaching Standards are also aligned with the Unit Learning Outcomes. Learning Outcome 3 (See Exhibit in 4.3.c) is used to guide the Unit in developing curricula, learning activities, and a variety of assessments to ensure and measure candidate proficiency (See exhibits under Assessment Instruments and Scoring Guides in Exhibit 4.3.a and those under Assessment Data in Exhibit 4.3.c). While methods for working effectively with all students are embedded throughout initial and advanced programs in the Unit, specific courses have been identified as highlighting a diversity component meeting the objectives expressed in Learning Outcome 3 (See exhibit *Curriculum Components* in Exhibit 4.3.b for descriptions of course artifacts and potential impact on student learning). In clinical practice and in the variety of coursework provided to them, candidates reflect upon and analyze experiences and receive feedback from faculty and peers. In this way, they strengthen their abilities to meet the needs of diverse learners as well as develop as professionals.

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 you are moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.b   Continuous Improvement [10,000 characters]
- Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.

Based upon both quantitative and qualitative data, the Unit has taken positive steps leading to continuous improvement since the last review.

- In Fall 2007 faculty completed the Multicultural Competency Survey measuring self-perceived multicultural proficiencies. CEPS candidates took the companion survey on faculty multicultural competency, and results were compared. Findings indicated no significant difference between the two ratings. This study stimulated discussion among faculty and affected the decision to bring Tery Medina (See bullet below) to our campus.

- Ms. Tery Medina, Associate Director of the Southeastern Equity Center, was the guest speaker at a seminar collaboratively sponsored by the CEPS and Phi Delta Kappa on April 7, 2009 titled "Building Bridges of Understanding and Respect: Strategies for Reaching and Teaching English Language Learners." Ms. Medina spoke to candidates and faculty in the morning and public school faculty and staff in the afternoon. She met with local school districts in a follow-up meeting that summer. Post-seminar evaluations indicated an overwhelmingly positive response that the information shared was both relevant and valuable.

- The Unit instituted advisory councils that meet annually in order to solicit program feedback from selected stakeholders (faculty, initial and advanced candidates, principals, and cooperating teachers). Suggestions are used to provide input into program development, design, and operations. Some examples of program changes relative to teaching diverse learners that were made in response to these meetings include the following:

  - Faculty teaching ED 300 added a component on collaboration emphasizing the importance of general and special educators working together to meet the needs of diverse learners.
  - ECE 306 added strategies for working with students with diverse needs and encouraged them to attend IEP meetings during their clinical experience in order to observe the collaboration involved among various participants supporting learners with special needs.
  - HPER added adaptive clinical experiences.

- In Spring 2012, the Unit created the Co-Teaching Institute to promote co-teaching as an instructional strategy to prepare candidates for meeting the needs of diverse learners collaboratively and effectively. A group of Unit and local school faculty and administrators took part in a 2-day training workshop led by founders Nancy Bacharach and Teresa Washut Heck from St. Cloud State University, held in Stadium Towers on the JSU campus. The Unit piloted the co-teaching model in some clinical placements in Fall 2012 and continued into spring 2013 internship. Training has been ongoing for all Unit faculty as well as participating practicum candidates and cooperating teachers. Candidates are required to co-teach with cooperating teachers during internship and various clinical experiences.

- In 2012, Transition University was created to provide opportunities for high school students with severe disabilities age 18-21 years of age to interact with their same-age nondisabled peers (our teacher candidates). "Transition U" meets weekly and holds various activities including exploring vocational and social skills and opportunities both on campus and in the local community. Transition U students are diverse in that they are of different ethnicities and come from both rural and urban communities. This interaction is a learning experience for both the students on Transition U and the Unit teacher candidates.

- The Unit supports organizations that provide opportunities for candidates to participate in meaningful activities concerning diversity. For example:

  - Phi Delta Kappa sponsors literacy activities for Black History Month, Hispanic Heritage Month, and Women's History Month that honor the contributions of diverse individuals.
  - Alpha Omicron Omega members volunteer to tutor students with special needs enrolled in "Transition U."

o Alpha Omicron Omega also partnered with Big Brothers/Big Sisters of Gadsden, leading arts and crafts activities with students having special needs.

Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard:

- The Unit will more clearly identify diverse graduate clinical experiences currently in place by highlighting these experiences in course descriptions found within the Graduate Bulletin.
- Programs that do not currently include a course on working with diverse learners will be implementing one in the 2013-2014 academic year.
- The Unit will continue efforts to recruit diverse faculty and candidates.
- The Unit will continue exploring ways for candidates to engage in meaningful interactions with diverse faculty and other candidates.

4.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review
Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000 characters]

In the previous review, it was noted that "Candidates need more interaction with diverse faculty." Diversity of candidates (notably, the percentage of Black or African American compared to White) is similar to that of Unit faculty. The same conclusion can be made when comparing candidate diversity to school faculty, based on the average of data submitted by school districts that host candidates in clinical experiences. (Diversity Comparison Charts) When examining individual school district data, candidate diversity is comparable to over 70% of schools reporting.

- Since the last review, the Unit has created additional opportunities for diverse and collaborative activities. Occasions for such cooperation now occur in initial and advanced programs during class assignments, field trips, service-related projects, clinical placements, and in other collaborative activities.
- With the creation of the Co-Teaching Institute, candidates are interacting in workshops and training sessions with diverse faculty from the Unit and from the schools. This has created stronger bonds between candidates and faculty at all levels and has strengthened the knowledge, skills, and dispositions for working with diverse learners.
- Several Unit faculty have begun to integrate co-teaching in various courses. This provides candidates more opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.

4.4 Exhibits for Standard 4

4.3.a	<u>Aggregate data on proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to demonstrate through working with students from diverse groups in classrooms and schools, including impact on student learning</u> (Please see Learning Outcome 3 and Learning Outcome III data for programs listed in these charts for diversity data.)
4.3.b	<u>Curriculum components and experiences that address diversity proficiencies</u> (This might be a matrix that shows diversity components in required courses.)
4.3.c	<u>Assessment instruments, scoring guides,</u> and <u>data</u> related to candidates meeting diversity proficiencies
4.3.d	<u>Data table on faculty demographics</u> (see Appendix A for an example)
4.3.e	<u>Data table on candidates demographics</u> (see Appendix B for an example)
4.3.f	<u>Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice</u> (see Appendix C for an example)
4.3.g	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty: • <u>JSU Strategic Plan 2011-2016</u> • <u>Diversity Plan</u> • <u>JSU Affirmative Action Plan</u>
4.3.h	Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates: • <u>JSU Mission, Goals, and Values Statements</u> • <u>JSU Strategic Plan 2011-2016</u>
4.3.i	<u>Policies, procedures, and practices that support candidates working with P-12 students from diverse groups</u>

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 Faculty Qualifications, Performance and Development

How does the Unit ensure that its professional education faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators through scholarship, service, teaching, collaboration and assessment of their performance? [maximum of three pages]

The Unit ensures that its professional education faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators in several ways. The first is by only employing faculty members who are well qualified to carry out their assigned teaching duties at the university. When faculty members are hired, they must meet the qualifications outlined in the faculty handbook. These requirements for faculty credentials meet or exceed the guidelines and requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) in all cases. Faculty who teach undergraduate courses must hold a masters or doctoral degree in their teaching discipline or have a minimum of 18 credit hours of graduate work in the teaching discipline. Faculty who teach graduate courses must hold a doctoral degree in the discipline or in a related discipline. The complete qualification guidelines are available in the Faculty Handbook and are demonstrated in Exhibit 5.3.a. Sixty faculty members hold a Doctorate Degree and forty-three faculty members hold at least a Master's degree in the Unit.

Another way the Unit faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators is through an extensive evaluation process conducted each year. All faculty members complete a self-evaluation in teaching, service, and scholarship as a part of the annual faculty evaluation process. This is done prior to submitting their evaluation portfolio to the department head. Effective performance in these areas is necessary for continuing contracts being awarded, tenure, and subsequent promotion in rank. The outcome of this evaluation system provides faculty with information upon which they can reflect and modify their instruction. JSU uses the IDEA course evaluation system. Also, in order to ensure faculty members teaching methods courses stay current, any university supervisor or faculty member teaching methods courses must complete a Recent Professional Activities Form. Additionally, at the end of each year, each program holds regular advisory council meetings with stakeholders to discuss the effectiveness of our teacher education programs. The participants of these meeting discuss current teacher education programs and any problems they see with the current programs. Special emphasis is placed on future goals.

To ensure new faculty at JSU follow all guidelines of the Unit in course preparation and instruction, each newly hired faculty member is assigned a mentor. Mentors assist faculty in preparing instruction that is appropriate and effective in teaching the course objectives and fulfilling all requirements of the Unit learning objectives. Mentors guide new faculty members in course preparation and encourage following the guidelines and policies of the Unit. This mentoring process has resulted in new faculty members being immediately and seamlessly

incorporated into the JSU community. The role and responsibilities of mentors is outlined in the CEPS Mentoring Handbook.

The conceptual framework of the Unit provides a guide for all faculty in the college and ensures a common thread that ties all coursework together. Syllabi throughout the Unit reflect how the performance areas of the Conceptual Framework are linked to state, national, and professional standards (AQTS, NBPTS, ISLIC, CACREP, etc.) and are reinforced and assessed in each course (See Exhibit 1.5.c). Also, syllabi submitted by Unit faculty for courses taught reflect an array of instructional strategies, document the use of technology in instruction, reflect the incorporation of professional development, and provide faculty the opportunity to self-assess and to model teacher professionalism. The conceptual framework of the Unit describes the philosophical principles governing the preparation of effective educators. The Unit's conceptual framework and curriculum stress acquisition of 21st century learning skills beyond basic facts and knowledge while seeking to emphasize new and innovative experiences and environments through which learning can take place.

Throughout initial, advanced and other school profession programs, the conceptual framework is used as a model for teaching decision making in a professional education environment. These guidelines provide developing professionals with a frame of reference by which decisions are made quickly, purposefully, and effectively. Decision making is taught in practical and authentic situations throughout the curriculum. Given this framework candidates are guided through various levels of experiences from the academic classroom to genuine clinical practice ensuring that all graduates of the initial, advanced, and other school profession programs are effective.

As experts in their fields, faculty members incorporate research based practices. Faculty members also incorporate the Alabama Quality Teaching Standards into their courses where appropriate. Through their own scholarship, faculty members become aware of and include appropriate innovations and technology into both the content and delivery of their courses. Additionally, faculty members utilize a variety of research based instructional strategies including cooperative learning, lecture, demonstrations, discussion, individual and small group work, project-based learning, individual and small group presentations, individual reviews, instructional planning, applications of teaching strategies, service learning, case studies, growth plans, rubrics, and portfolios with reflections and with specific instruction and assessment tools.

Scholarship

A key component of the evaluation criteria for promotion and tenure in the College of Education and Professional Studies includes scholarship and requires faculty members to document and report their scholarly efforts. Faculty provide evidence of research based activities through their scholarship activities. Categories of scholarly work expected of tenured and tenure-track faculty include publications, presentations, grants, technological achievements, and other efforts approved by the department head. Faculty may publish in national or international refereed journals, regional level journals, or state and local journals. Publications may also include books, book chapters, editing a book, or an invited book review. Additionally, faculty can demonstrate scholarship through presentations at state, regional, national or international conferences. These presentations may be in the form of a paper, symposium,

keynote speech, or workshop. A review of the presentation of scholarship in Exhibit 5.3.a shows that all full-time faculty participate in a variety of scholarly activities. Additionally, evidence included in the exhibit documents the number of scholarly activities published, accepted, submitted, and in progress by faculty in the Unit. Faculty members may demonstrate scholarship by submitting/securing internal and external grants. Faculty may also illustrate scholarship using technology to create and maintain websites, develop multimedia projects and develop online course modules or complete online courses.

Service
 Faculty members are involved in a variety of service activities including providing assistance in writing grants, serving on editorial boards, serving in leadership positions in professional organizations, serving as faculty advisors to student organizations, acting as consultants to local and state school systems, providing professional development sessions, serving on local and state school boards, and participating as members of department, university, and community committees. The Promotion and Tenure Policies located in Exhibit 5.3.f provide examples of the types of service that are expected from faculty to meet the Unit's expectations. In general the faculty may provide service to the university, college, department, area schools, or the professional community. Evidence of faculty scholarship is provided in Exhibit 5.3.a.

Professional Development
 Faculty members are encouraged to participate in professional development activities on and off campus. Each department in the Unit receives a budget, part of which may be used for travel to support professional development activities (See Exhibit 6.3.f). Additionally, the Unit sponsors numerous professional development workshops, seminars, and webinars to support faculty growth and development. Exhibit 5.3.e outlines the professional development activities in which Unit faculty were involved.

5.2   Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

 Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the Unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

 5.2.b   Continuous Improvement [10,000 characters]
 ▪ Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
 ▪ Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

 In an effort to continually improve the quality of both Unit faculty and instruction; several changes have been implemented leading to significant improvements in the qualifications of faculty members:

 • *Additional course offerings delivered via online and hybrid configurations.*
  This delivery method allows faculty to better accommodate teacher candidates throughout the JSU service region. The flexibility in scheduling courses allowed by this approach also enables the university to make more efficient use of its classroom

resources while better meeting the needs of the students. In order to support this evolution of the curriculum, the university has made substantial investments in the computer and network infrastructure.

- *Establishment of exemplary course rubric and review process for online courses.*
  This represents a tremendous step in promoting continuous improvement at in the Unit at JSU. Course design guidelines developed in cooperation with the office of Distance Learning provide enhancements for online course delivery capabilities. Standards for improving course design including such elements as the structure of the course, learning objectives, and instructional strategies are emphasized in this process.

- *Development and implementation of a new faculty evaluation tool.*
  This is another significant step in the Unit's efforts to promote continuous improvement. A new faculty evaluation portfolio system was implemented in the 2011-2012 academic year. This new evaluation instrument carefully outlines the expectations and records the production of teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service. It also provides faculty with clear guidelines for making sure that their efforts and activities are sufficient and fulfilling all the university's expectations. The university requires the use of Digital Measures to document all faculty qualifications. This is used in coordination with the Faculty Evaluation Program. A sample of the new evaluation form is included in Exhibit 5.3.g.

5.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review
Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000 characters]

There were no areas for improvement cited for Standard V in the 2005 NCATE Accreditation Review.

5.4 Exhibits for Standard 5

5.3.a	Data table on qualifications of professional education faculty (This table can be compiled in the online template from data submitted for national program reviews or compiled in Excel, Word, or another format and uploaded as an exhibit. See Appendix D for an example.)
5.3.b	Data table on qualifications of P-12 clinical faculty and Data table on qualifications of professional education clinical faculty (i.e., P–12 school professionals and professional education faculty responsible for instruction, supervision, and/or assessment of candidates during field experiences and clinical practice)
5.3.c	Policies and practices to assure clinical faculty meet Unit expectations
5.3.d	Policies and samples of faculty scholarly activities • CEPS Tenure/Promotion Policy Concerning Scholastic Activity • Sample Scholarly Activities in the CEPS
5.3.e	Summary of faculty service and collaborative activities in schools (e.g., collaborative project with school faculty, teacher professional development, and addressing the needs of low performing schools) and with the professional community (e.g., grants, evaluations, task force participation, provision of professional development, offering courses, etc.)
5.3.f	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty evaluation (including promotion and tenure) and summaries of the results in areas of teaching, scholarship and service • Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure in the CEPS • Faculty Annual Evaluation Instrument • IDEA Course Evaluation • Faculty/Advising Evaluation Instrument • Faculty Evaluation Data Summary
5.3.g	Policies, procedures, and practices for professional development and summaries of the results • Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures with Professional Development Expectations • Further Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion • Summary of Professional Development Activities Attended by Faculty

Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources

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

6.1   Unit Governance and Resources

How do the Unit's governance system and resources contribute to adequately preparing candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards? [maximum of three pages]

The responsibility for professional education programs at Jacksonville State University is vested in the Unit. The uniqueness of the Unit is reflected through the diversity of programs and services that make up the college. The Unit has the leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study for the preparation of educators and other professionals. Authority and leadership of the Unit is centralized in the Office of the Dean of the Unit, with the assistance of the Associate Dean. The Dean is responsible to the Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs (VPASA), represents the Unit as a member of the University Council, and chairs the Council of Department Heads.

Currently the Unit is organized into seven departments and additional support/service areas: Communication (non-teacher education); Curriculum and Instruction; Educational Resources; Family and Consumer Sciences; Health, Physical Education and Recreation; Technology and Engineering (non-teacher education); and Secondary Education. Service areas include the Teacher Service Center, Instructional Services, TV Services (non-teacher education), and the In-service Center at McClellan. Leadership is provided to the departments by the department heads, and directors serve support areas. Each of these administrators reports to the Dean. The College Organizational Chart identifies the departments and service units within the Unit and delineates the programs and service areas included in each.

The Dean schedules a minimum of two meetings a month with academic department heads and directors of support service areas. Department heads conduct monthly department meetings; program faculty meet monthly or more frequently; and directors of support services have regular meetings with staff. In this manner, information is regularly and systematically shared within the Unit. The Council of Department Heads and Directors, Department and College Curriculum Committees, Teacher Education Council, Graduate Council, Superintendents Consortium, The College Advisory Committee, Program Advisory Committees, and other groups serve as advisory groups to the Unit.

Curriculum decisions are generated by faculty and are then submitted to the College Curriculum Committee. The College Curriculum Committee reviews proposals and makes recommendations to the Dean. The Dean submits the recommendation to the University Curriculum Committee and/or Graduate Council as appropriate. Final approval is vested with the Provost and VPASA. The Unit provides for collaboration with colleagues in other departments on campus in various ways to ensure that candidates meet standards. For example, within the Department of Secondary Education advisement issues and program development are frequently shared endeavors with the College of Arts and Sciences. The Secondary Education Council

establishes a formal means of coordination between the various colleges or Units across the University that contributes to teacher education.

Involvement in departmental functions, faculty meetings, and other advisory groups assures strong involvement by faculty members in the decision making process. The Unit seeks the participation of the professional community (both across campus and off-campus) in program design, implementation, and evaluation, and facilitates this involvement regularly through various dialogic and evaluative structures. The Superintendent's Consortium, consisting of superintendents from partner school systems, meets twice per year to discuss relative issues and to offer program suggestions. The Secondary Education Council, with representation from the Unit and from the College of Arts and Sciences, to coordinate information among the various stakeholders in the teacher education effort. Annual Advisory Councils assist the Unit in maintaining effectiveness by meeting regularly to provide input into program design, development, and revision.

The Unit receives budgetary allocations that are proportional to other Units on campus requiring a clinical element (See Exhibit 6.3.f and Exhibit 6.3.g). The budget is sufficient to support both on campus and off campus educational activities for effective candidate preparation. The Unit's budget supports a full-time coordinator for clinical experiences. Clerical staff support is provided. A separate budgetary line item is funded each year to support clinical faculty travel for candidate evaluations. Each academic department within the Unit has a separate operational budget. Funds from these budgets are used to support instruction.

Each of the Unit's classrooms is equipped as a "smart classroom" with a Smartboard, Elmo, and Apple TV technologies.   Smart devices such as Macbooks and iPads are made available to students in classes as requested. Faculty are provided with an iPad for class instruction.

The Unit's full-time faculty, pro rata, and adjunct faculty are sufficient to maintain the quality of current initial, advanced, and other school profession programs offered. The Unit has adequate support personnel. Full-time secretaries are employed in each department and support/service area. Departmental offices are supported with student worker positions and graduate assistants are utilized as needed. Graduate teaching assistants are not used to teach classes.

As per university policy the normal workload of full-time undergraduate faculty is 15-hours with a 12-hour teaching load. The remaining three hours includes time for advising, scholarship, and service activities. Graduate faculty members teach nine semester hours each semester with the expectation of scholarly activity. Student advisement is included in workload expectations. Adjunct and pro rata faculty are actively involved in academic programs and are included in college, department, or program meetings as well as training sessions. Faculty are encouraged to participate in faculty development activities. Professional development funds come from departmental budgets, the Unit budget, and university travel and self-improvement grants.

The Unit's facilities, classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, and other school facilities support teaching and learning. A Unit goal is to provide the best technological resources available for instruction. The Unit's facilities include Ramona Wood Building, East Mason Hall, Self Hall, Pete Mathews Coliseum, part of Ayers Hall and the Joe Ford Center, an off-campus distance-learning site. The Unit's facilities aspire to support the most recent developments in technology and allow faculty to model the use of technology and candidates to practice its use for instructional purposes. To provide the technology and resources necessary to accommodate candidate and faculty needs as outlined in the conceptual framework is a major Unit priority. In situations where facilities are not adequate, classrooms in other buildings are utilized.

The Unit does not currently depend on external resources to carry out its core programs. The Unit allocates resources to its programs in a manner that allows candidates to meet standards in their fields, providing adequate resources to develop and implement the Unit's assessment plan. The Unit has purchased additional information technology resources to support faculty and candidate activities and learning experiences. Faculty and candidates have access to sufficient and current library and curricular resources.

The Unit has a university-wide Technology Fund that is designated for technological updates. Allocation of these funds is dependent upon the age, condition, or memory capabilities of current equipment. The University has a Vice President for Information Technology who oversees technology resources. A wide range of information technology resources supports faculty and candidates in teaching and learning. All classrooms in the Ramona Wood Building, the primary instructional facility for the Unit, are equipped with Smart Board equipment. These facilities support recent developments in technology and provide the opportunity for faculty to model the use of technology and candidates to practice its use for instructional purposes. Ayers Hall provides additional state of the art technology for classroom and laboratory use.

In addition to the available classroom Smartboards, office computers, iPad, tablet, and hand held devices, student-accessible computer labs and other program specific technology training has been provided. Personnel are encouraged to participate in scheduled training for new technologies. Personnel from the Office of Distance Education, Academic Computing and Network Support Services, Information Technology, and the Instructional Services Unit are available to assist faculty and staff. Evidence of use of these resources is reflected through the required acquisition of LiveText and EVIRX subscription by candidates; required use in internship portfolio and lesson planning; required use of LiveText for assessing intern portfolios by supervising faculty.

The Houston Cole Library is the main university library. There are numerous resources accessible to candidates, including those in off-campus and distance learning programs, and via the Internet. The Education Collection at the Houston Cole Library is rated an overall 3cP (Advanced Study or Instructional Support Level). The Education Collection contains over 53,238 titles, not including over 400,000 ERIC Microfiche publications or individual counts for approximately 5,529 journal volumes. The Education Collection Assessment completed June 2004 indicated that the Education Collection was strong in the areas of pedagogy, educational

foundations, instruction, and administrative and organizational aspects of education. The Education Collection is strong and is sufficient to support the courses taught within the Unit.

The Instructional Services Unit serves as the primary resource for media, software, and other hands-on materials for faculty and candidates to support teaching. The Learning Resource Center provides educational materials and equipment including instructional games, computer programs, a large text collection (including Big Books, adoption textbooks, and Alabama Courses of Study), teaching kits, videos, professional journals, a library of children's literature and assessment materials.

6.2   Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the Unit is moving to the **target level**. If it is **not** the standard on which you are moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

6.2.b   Continuous Improvement [10,000 characters]
- Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.
- Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in this standard.

- Faculty in Curriculum and Instruction have collaborated and worked dilligently to develop two integrated and innovative programs: the dual elementary and collaborative program (the Elementary Collaborative Teacher (ECK) and the dual elementary and early childhood (Elementary/Early Childhood (ECE)) programs for teacher candidates.
- Educational Resources redesigned the Instructional Leadership degree program.
- The Unit has strengthened field experiences in all programs and engaged in deeper discussions of curriculum than we have in the past.
- All initial certification candidates are served by specific advisors assigned to them based on their programs of study. In Fall 2012, a Pre-Education Admissions Advisor was hired to work with all pre-education candidates. This individual provides individual meetings and academic advisement to these students during each semester. When a student moves into his/her sophomore year, a program adviser is assigned who specializes in the degree that student is pursuing. This relationship continues throughout the students' program of study at JSU. An Academic Advisor from the Office of Clinical Experiences consults with students who are moving into their final semesters and enrolling in student teaching. Faculty of their respective programs advises advanced program students. The Teacher Service Center and the Graduate School support all advanced students.
- In 2011 and 2012, college-wide upgrades to information technology were made to support faculty and candidate use of informational technology and in online instruction thanks to the Provost's office. These resources support programs, faculty, and candidates on campus and via distance learning.
- Recent upgrades of technology resources include campus-wide Wi-Fi access and the purchase of iPads for faculty (funds, in large part, for iPads were transferred to the Unit budget from the Provost's office).

- The Unit purchased a cart containing 30 iPads and another with 32 PC-based netbooks. These carts can be used in any room in the building, allowing all (or most) students in the class to access technology during class sessions.
- A Disciplinary Action Committee (DAC) was created to handle disciplinary problems that may arise that would warrant dismissal from the Unit and other programs.
- A faculty mentoring program was designed to help new faculty members adjust to their new position and environment. Department heads assign a mentor to new faculty members upon signing the initial contract.
- The [Institute for Research and Collaboration](#) supports faculty and University personnel in the pursuit and administration of externally funded grants and contracts. The IRC assists faculty in the preparation of proposals by assisting in the pre-award, award, and post-award activities.
- Ramona Wood's current physical plant is in need of extensive renovation and expansion. Such work will create additional classroom and collaborative learning spaces, as well as upgraded HVAC and the physical structure of the facility.
- All classrooms have multimedia capabilities and full Internet access. With multiple access points, the main campus is wireless and supports the increased use of mobile devices. Continuous improvements to the technology infrastructure are reflected in the current plan to equip all classrooms with Apple monitors.
- All graduate programs within the Unit are moving to fully online course offerings. These online courses are subject to the same rigorous curriculum approval process as traditional courses. Distance Education and the Instructional Designer provide support faculty in the development of course materials. Online resources for distance learning programs are available via Blackboard to provide introductory lessons and refresher information regarding the online delivery system.

6.3 Areas for Improvement Cited in the Action Report from the Previous Accreditation Review
Summarize activities, processes, and outcomes in addressing each of the AFIs cited for the initial and/or advanced program levels under this standard. [12,000 characters]

There were no areas for improvement cited for Standard VI in the 2005 NCATE Accreditation Review.

6.4 Exhibits for Standard 6

6.3.a	Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the Unit • CEPS Handbook • JSU Organizational Chart
6.3.b	Organizational chart and/or description of the Unit governance structure and its relationship to institutional governance structure • CEPS Organizational Chart • Faculty Handbook (Governance Sections Highlighted)
6.3.c	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate services such as counseling and advising The links below illustrate services available to all enrolled students at JSU: • Academic Advisement • Career Services • Counseling Services • Disability Support Services • Learning Services • Student Affairs • Student Health Center
6.3.d	Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate recruitment and admission, and accessibility to candidates and the education community • Admissions Policies at JSU • Graduate Admissions Policies at JSU • Recruiting at JSU
6.3.e	Academic calendars, catalogs (undergraduate and graduate), Unit publications, grading policies, and Unit advertising
6.3.f	Unit budget, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning , and alternative route programs when applicable
6.3.g	Budgets of comparable units with clinical components on campus or similar units at other campuses
6.3.h	Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty workload (see pages 42-46) and summary of faculty workload
6.3.i	Policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that all candidates have access to physical and/or virtual classrooms, computer labs, curriculum resources, and library resources that support teaching and learning • Physical Classrooms • Virtual Classrooms • Computer Labs • Curriculum Resources • Library
6.3.a	Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the Unit • Faculty Handbook (Governance Sections Highlighted) • JSU Organizational Chart