

Contact: Diana Gonzalez

EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS
ACCREDITATION REPORT AT IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Action Requested: Receive the accreditation report for the Educator Preparation Programs in the Colleges of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Human Sciences, and Liberal Arts and Sciences at Iowa State University.

Executive Summary: The programs (1) underwent a self-study that addressed the standards of accreditation defined by the accrediting body; and (2) had an on-site visit by peer evaluators, as well as Iowa Department of Education and Board of Educational Examiners representatives. The programs were accredited for the maximum five-year period through 2020. However, there were a number of conditions that were not met and which must be addressed. This accreditation report addresses the Board of Regents Strategic Plan priorities for “access, affordability, and student success; educational excellence and impact; and economic development and vitality.”

Background:

- ❖ Description of programs. Both teacher and administrator licensure programs across a wide range of disciplines and degree levels were reviewed, including undergraduate degrees, endorsements for initial licensure in Early Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, K-12, graduate degrees and endorsements for initial licensure in secondary education, graduate degrees and endorsements other than initial licensure, educational administration (PK-12 Principal, Supervisor Special Education, Superintendent/AEA administrator), and Special Education additional endorsement. Secondary Education fields include the following:
 - ⇒ Agricultural Education (grades 5-12)
 - ⇒ Biology (grades 5-12)
 - ⇒ Chemistry (grades 5-12)
 - ⇒ Earth Sciences (grades 5-12)
 - ⇒ English (grades 5-12)
 - ⇒ Family and Consumer Sciences Education (grades 5-12)
 - ⇒ Health Education (grades 5-12)
 - ⇒ History – Social Sciences (grades 5-12)
 - ⇒ Mathematics (grades 5-12)
 - ⇒ Music (grades K-12)
 - ⇒ Physical Education (grades K-12)
 - ⇒ Physics (grades 5-12)
 - ⇒ World Languages and Cultures (grades 5-12)
- ❖ Accrediting Agency. The accrediting body is the Department of Education for the state of Iowa.

- ❖ Purpose of Accreditation. An accredited educational program is recognized by its peers as having met state and national standards for its development and evaluation. To employers, graduate schools, and licensure, certification, and registration boards, graduation from an accredited program signifies adequate preparation for entry into the profession. In fact, many of these groups require graduation from an accredited program as a minimum qualification. Accreditation is also intended to protect the interests of students, benefit the public, and improve the quality of teaching, learning, research, and professional practice.
- ❖ Review Process. The self-study prepared by the Educator Preparation programs contained the responses to the appropriate standards required by the accrediting body – governance and resources; diversity; faculty; assessment system and unit evaluation; teacher preparation clinical practice; teacher candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions; administrator preparation clinical practice; and administrator knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
- ❖ On-Site Team Report. In November 2013, the visiting team determined that the Educator Preparation programs substantially met the requirements for accredited status, although there were a number of recommendations affecting accreditation that had to be addressed prior to the State Board of Education meeting.
- ❖ Sample Strengths Identified by the Visiting Team.
 - “The structure of the Education Preparation Program governed by the Educator Preparation Coordinating Council within the school of education provides a system for decision-making, communication/collaboration, and strategic planning.
 - The library is a state-of-the-art facility that is available to support faculty and students.
 - There is commitment at the University and in the School of Education to foster a welcoming inclusive climate through hiring practices and by encouraging diverse viewpoints, and sponsoring programming such as the ISU Leaders in Education and Diversity for students who identify as diverse or who are interested in issues of equity in education.
 - The university has a clearly established set of criteria for promotion and tenure of tenure-track faculty appointments.
 - In elementary education, collaborative programs with area schools have been established and are viewed as successful by faculty, students, and school personnel.
 - There is clear alignment of unit standards with INTASC standards for teacher education, ISSL standards for administrator preparation, and appropriate standards for other professional programs, as well as with Iowa Teaching Standards.
 - The Placement Office has made substantive improvements over the last year in clarifying aligning practicum and student teaching experiences. They have implemented a four level system for clarification of experiences.
 - The team finds an intentional effort to integrate technology across educator education programs.

- The strength and support of the alumni network has been essential in ensuring quality clinical opportunities and selecting cooperating teachers.
- The team noted that online discussion board components were guided by a rubric providing a measure of quality of discussion as well as learning from the discourse itself."
- ❖ Concerns and Recommendations Affecting Accreditation Identified by the Visiting Team and Action Plans developed by the Educator Preparation Programs. The concerns and recommendations noted by the accrediting agency as well as the responses from Iowa State University are included in the Attachment.
- ❖ Accreditation Status. In September 2014, the State Board of Education awarded accreditation to the Educator Preparation Programs at Iowa State University for the maximum five-year period through 2020. ISU must submit responses to the concerns and recommendations to the Iowa Department of Education.

GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES

(Initial Finding: Met with Pending Conditions Noted)

Concern #4: 79.10(5) The team requires the ELP to develop a documented plan to consistently use their external advisory committee at least twice a year as a source for curricular and assessment information.

Action Plan:

The Educational Leadership Program (ELP) will meet twice a year with its external advisory committee. It met in June 2013 to discuss and approve the overview section of the accreditation report. In March 2014, the ELP External Advisory Committee held a combined meeting with the EPCC External Advisory Committee and then split into a smaller group to specifically discuss the identified concerns from the review team's visit. We asked, for example, how we might provide our candidates more diverse field experiences? External advisory members suggested, for example, that candidates could be required to experience 15 hours out of their district, particularly in summers, and that we could use year-round school experiences. They noted that it would be important to candidates to be able to schedule time and know expectations beforehand. Feedback and suggestions from this group have already been used for curricular and assessment adjustments.

The plan for the future will be to schedule at least two meetings per year (one in fall and one in spring/summer semester) for the ELP External Advisory Committee. Our external advisory committee will meet on October 16, 2014 and on March 26, 2015. Both of these meetings are scheduled in conjunction with the EPCC External Advisory Committee. Video conferencing or other electronic communication will be used as needed. Possible upcoming discussions include revising the principal preparation curriculum and course delivery models, determining terms of service for the advisory committee members and ensuring representation from different leadership positions, geographic locations, building levels, and other demographic groups. The purpose of the external advisory committee is to gather important information and insight to continually improve the curriculum and assessment process.

**Governance and Resources
Additional Concerns/Recommendations Being Addressed**

1. 79.10(1). The Education Preparation Coordinating Council (EPCC) is the governing body and, as such, should be guided by clearly written by-laws, policies, and procedures that are published in a handbook and widely distributed. EPCC decisions should be published and easily accessible to all members of the EPP. Since the EPP is large with many moving parts and many components, a document to clearly define the roles and responsibilities and types of decisions made by each group within the program would be helpful. The team recommends the EPCC develop a document defining roles, responsibilities, and procedures.

EPCC will define their role and responsibilities in the oversight of the Educator Preparation Program (EPP) during the 2014-2015 academic year. These coordinated efforts will help inform what decisions are made by the EPCC and what decisions will be made by the larger EPP faculty. The EPCC, led by the Selection and Retention Subcommittee, will begin work immediately on a handbook that will include written by-laws, policies and procedures. Current policies and procedures provided in the handbooks will be reviewed in light of those decisions and adjustments will be made if they are needed. This handbook will include relevant EPCC policies along with roles and responsibilities of the committee members and basic processes/procedures for common issues the committee addresses. Finally, the relationship between the ELP and TES will be decided and needed changes made (i.e. change from TES to Educator Preparation Services (EPS)).

In addition, Teacher Education Services (TES) is creating its own handbook of policies, procedures, and processes that address admission to the Teacher Education Program (TEP), background check issues, Praxis issues, placement issues, and licensure issues specific to teacher preparation. This document will include relevant EPCC policies along with procedures that all areas of the TEP follow. This handbook will be ready to share with the TES team in fall 2014. In addition, this document will be shared (with the relevant components highlighted) with program coordinators and program advisors.

Both handbooks will be shared with members of the EPCC. Many of the representatives on the Coordinating Council serve as program coordinators and/or program advisors. They will share the handbooks with appropriate faculty and staff, including department chairs or unit directors, in their program.

5. 79.10(8). There does not appear to be a systematic process for reviewing teaching effectiveness for all faculty members, including lecturers, senior lecturers, adjuncts, and tenure-track faculty members. The team suggests the unit develop a formalized plan for evaluation of instruction and for how evaluation results will be used to improve teaching.

The EPCC Assessment Subcommittee presented goals and outcomes for the Educator Preparation Program. These goals and outcomes will be an action item for the first EPCC meeting of the upcoming 2014-2015 academic year. Goal 2 and its first and last outcomes are listed below. As can be seen by this goal, it is a priority of the unit to use data to enhance the quality of the program; this includes the continual improvement of instructional practices of faculty and staff to better meet the needs of students. The process for how this will be done is discussed in more detail in the Assessment section below.

Goal 2: Implement a cohesive and collaborative educator preparation program that supports the development of highly qualified educators.

Outcomes for the Educator Preparation Program:

- The Educator Preparation Program will systematically implement data-based decision making to enhance the quality of the program.
 - Collect, analyze, and use formative and summative student data to improve curriculum, coursework, and field experiences.
 - **Collect, analyze, and use formative and summative data on the instructional practices of faculty and staff.**
 - Regularly and frequently collect data following the established assessment cycle.

- *The Educator Preparation Program will implement a curriculum aligned to national and/or state standards and recommendations taught through research-based instructional methodologies.*

Review of teaching effectiveness is up to the departments and/or school where the faculty are located. The departments and school have their own evaluation processes in place, so EPCC cannot dictate otherwise.

6. 79.10(9). *Interviews with supervisors and cooperating teachers indicate they are generally pleased with the level of support from the unit. Student teaching supervisors did mention that there are increased expectations of cooperating teachers and that the unit might need to consider increasing the compensation for the cooperating teachers in order to retain the best cooperating teachers for the candidates. This is not noted as a concern to be addressed, but information the team is bringing forward for the unit to consider.*

Faculty and staff associated with the TEP are aware that the compensation for the cooperating teachers is low. While we would like to increase compensation, there is concern about doing so without passing the additional cost to the students. After reviewing the student fee structure, the Director of Teacher Education Services lowered the fees paid by students (see response to next concern/recommendation). Discussions have been held, and will continue to be held with the Dean of the College of Human Sciences and the Associate Dean of the College of Human Sciences to resolve this issue. The Director of Teacher Education Services is working on a draft of a proposed supervisor compensation plan that will be shared with the Dean and the Associate Dean during fall semester 2014.

7. 79.10(9, 12). *The team found no evidence of systematic training for clinical supervisors for all programs. As the unit and EPCC re-evaluate their conceptual framework and standards and develop their assessment system, the team suggests it will be important to devote resources to training the clinical supervisors so they are able to ensure the candidates have a quality clinical experience that is aligned with unit standards.*

As stated above, a draft of a proposed supervisor compensation plan is being written that includes plans for TEP to provide on-going professional development for clinical supervisors. Potentially, the university supervisors could be required to attend one full day and three half days of professional development throughout the school year. These professional development sessions would be coordinated and facilitated by the TES team. Faculty would also be asked to provide the training in some cases. The learning sessions will be based upon the needs of our supervisors and teacher candidates using a data-informed approach. The initial sessions would focus on the following:

- *Anchoring in the ISU Teaching Standards*
- *Anchoring in the unit's Assessment Outcomes*
- *Anchoring in cognitive coaching*
- *Anchoring the required documentation and approaches*
- *Anchoring in quality feedback*
- *Anchoring in alignment with Iowa Common Core*

Future sessions would also focus on the instructional methods students are learning about during coursework. This August, an instructional technology session is going to be held during our half-day University Supervisor Retreat.

The supervisors for the educational leadership program are clinical faculty with three-year contracts and regular teaching assignments in the program. They teach six credits of Educational Administration 591, the field experience component of the principal program, and Educational Administration 691, the clinical experience component of the superintendent program. These courses are part of their regular teaching assignments (two courses plus 591). They are licensed administrators in Iowa with extensive experience and are approved as Iowa Evaluators. They are regular participants in everything we do, from School of Education meetings to Educational Administration meetings (both of which meet twice a month), from curriculum development to assessment. As clinical faculty members, they may participate in any professional development program necessary for them to carry out their duties as supervisors. These programs can be offered by faculty in the ELP or by professional organizations related to educational leadership.

In addition, as the Educator Preparation Program continues to function as a single unit rather than a collection of programs, the issue of common learning sessions for ALL supervisors (including faculty supervisors) will be an upcoming agenda item for the EPCC.

8. 79.10(10). The faculty and staff in almost all programs expressed concern with the budget model; specifically, skepticism that funds generated by student tuition are fully available to the SOE for use in preparing candidates. If equitable funding is available, the team wonders if the TEP program has considered reducing student fees. The team recommends the SOE examine budgeting policies for equity and transparency as is practical.

Teacher Education Services (TES) examined current student fees that exist in the teacher preparation program and the expenses that can be covered through student fees. After this analysis, student fees for clinical placements were reduced. Below is a chart that provides this information:

Practicum Fees:

	Spring 2013	Fall 2014
Level 1	No Fees	No Fees
Level 2	\$25.00	\$25.00
Level 3	\$90.00	\$75.00
Graduate Placements	\$55.00-\$125.00	\$55.00-\$125.00

Student Teaching Fees:

	Spring 2013	Fall 2014
8 weeks	\$300.00	\$155.00
12 weeks	\$455.00	\$230.00
14 weeks	\$525.00	\$270.00
16 weeks	\$600.00	\$310.00

Additional conversations regarding student teaching fees and tuition monies will be on-going in an attempt to continue to reduce these fees. The Dean of the College of Human Sciences, Associate Dean of the College of Human Sciences, Director of the School of Education, Associate Director of Educator Preparation, and Director of Teacher Education Services will continue to be involved in these conversations.

11. 79.10(12). While the institution is clearly supportive of scholarship, there is inconsistent support for the professional development of adjuncts, lecturers, advisors, and student teaching supervisors across all of the programs in the TEP. The team recommends the unit consider consistent professional development support for all faculty members that prepare candidates.

Lecturers in the School of Education are encouraged to take advantage of professional development opportunities provided within the University and those provided by professional organizations. The administrative structure of the School of Education now includes an Associate Director for Administration. While lecturers are members of the program area team (Educational Psychology, Foundations, Literacy, Math, Multicultural, Science, Social Studies, Special Education, and Instructional Technology) and are mentored by the team, one of the Associate Director's responsibilities is to provide support to the lecturers. This support may include regular meetings, professional development opportunities, and annual evaluations.

Clinical faculty members in the ELP have used funds for travel to conferences such as the National Superintendents Roundtable or for professional journals such as Phi Delta Kappan. This use of funds for professional development is encouraged by the SOE.

TES is addressing this concern for its team members, elementary advisors and the university supervisors. Last year (2013-2014), the Dean of Human Sciences allocated funds targeted at professional development for the TES team. Some team members were able to attend local conferences with these monies. Assuming this support will continue, a "Conference Rotation Schedule" has been created and team members have been directed to begin to identify learning opportunities in the area of educator preparation.

The TES Team will address on-going professional development in a number of ways. For example, the team will begin an on-going Book Club/Professional Learning Community in August and will meet once a month for two hours. Initially, the focus will be on works by Dr. Linda Darling-Hammond, who will be the visiting Hilton Chair in the College of Human Sciences during the 2014-2015 academic year. Three of Dr. Darling-Hammond's books were purchased for each team member and the books will be read and studied as a group. As a result, the TES now has a professional library with access to professional books and journals. During the monthly TES team meeting, two team members will choose an article or a chapter of interest to share with the rest of the team. In addition, as the Director of TES finds relevant readings, she will share these with team members.

EPCC will document the types of professional development opportunities that are available to faculty and staff in the program areas and will communicate the need for professional development opportunities to be available for members across the entire unit.

**Governance and Resources
Items in Need of Clarification**

9. 79.10(10) There appears to be general consensus that renovations of Lagomarcino Hall will provide spaces for collaboration, excellent faculty and administrative office spaces, and classrooms that are designed to allow faculty to model best practices. However, in interviews with science education faculty, a concern was raised about having a room that is appropriate for teaching secondary science methods. Since this type of lab space would require space for storage of chemicals and equipment, installation of gas lines and acid resistant cabinets, sinks, and eye-wash stations that might not be possible within the scope of the renovations, the team suggests the unit work to help secure a physical space on or near campus that would be more conducive to the needs of science methods courses.

During the planning of the renovation of Lagomarcino Hall, secondary science education faculty were involved in discussions about the needs for secondary science methods courses. In addition to the classroom dedicated to STEM methods courses (both elementary and secondary math and early childhood and elementary science), a classroom specifically for secondary science methods courses was included in the renovation plan. The classroom will be housed in the basement of Lagomarcino Hall, across the hall from the locked storage unit that currently contains all chemicals and equipment from the former science/math methods classroom. The classroom will be designed in a similar way to the former classroom. The architects and construction manager worked in conjunction with the science faculty to ensure the classroom meets or exceeds all federal and state safety requirements.

DIVERSITY
(Initial Finding: Met or Met with Strength)

Diversity
Additional Concern/Recommendations Addressed

1. 79.11(1) Comments from various current SOE students indicate that *CI 406 Multicultural Foundations of School and Society* syllabi and instruction offers what candidates need to know about diverse student populations but not 'how to' modify planning and instruction – also that there is great variability in value of the course relative to the instructor assigned to teach. The team recommends the SOE examine the curriculum and delivery of instruction for *CI 406 Multicultural Foundations of School and Society* to enhance consistent instruction, including strategies.

At the time of the review team's visit, there was one three-quarter time lecturer and one one-quarter time graduate assistant teaching this course. They worked with a tenured faculty member in multicultural education who was working on a special project. Since that time, a tenured faculty member in this area was hired. Beginning fall 2014, this faculty member will be teaching a section of CI 406 and will work closely with the lecturer who will teach the remaining three sections. The multicultural team has worked this summer on the content presented and on the activities and assignments used within the course.

2. 79.11(3) The team finds that clinical placements (practicum/student teaching) made through the Field Placement Office (FPO) are more likely to be made in a variety of settings and grade levels than those not made by the FPO. Placements made at the program level are often in limited locations and may be with the same teacher/school for multiple settings. The team recommends the EPCC or other EPP body examine the management of clinical placements to assure diverse placements for all candidates as well as is practical. AND

3. 79.11(3). Tracking of clinical placements for each student is not kept consistently across all programs. This information is well maintained however, through the SOE field placement office for the candidates they serve. The team recommends the EPCC or other EPP body examine tracking practices to ensure consistency.

The School of Education has purchased a data management system (TK20) and we are currently working with company representatives to implement the system. The entire EPP will use this system for data management and assessment. This data management system will be used to track all field experiences for all programs within the unit. The program or office that "owns" the placement will be responsible to enter this information. Once these data are in place, reports of placements will be run and shared with EPCC at least once a semester to ensure students experience a variety of settings. Current policies and practices will be examined and discussed within the context of these data.

Diversity
Items in Need of Clarification

4.79.11(3) For early childhood students, multiple placements for clinical experience with children ages birth to 5 are frequently in the same location. The team recommends the SOE examine clinical placement management for the EC program to ensure, as well as is practical, candidates are well prepared with diverse placements.

The Early Childhood Education-Unified (ECE-U) program is shared between the Department of Human Development and Family Studies (birth to age 5) and the School of Education (grades K-3 or ages 5-8). Therefore, the ECE-U program coordinator and the EPP will examine the clinical placement management for the early clinical experiences.

5. 79.11(3). Physical Education students consistently indicated that they lack high school practicum experience prior to student teaching. Secondary practicum experience is essential for a K-12 program. The team recommends the SOE examine the management of clinical placements in the PE program to ensure candidates are well prepared with appropriate placements.

Students receiving teacher licensure in physical education are overseen by the Department of Kinesiology. Therefore, the PE program coordinator from the Department of Kinesiology and the EPP will examine the clinical placement management of this program.

6. 79.11(3). The results of a survey conducted with recent graduates (2011-12) of ISU's teacher preparation programs indicated that the mean of ISU student responses on three diversity variables was statistically lower than comparison institutions. The self-study indicates a need to "improve how we prepare our teacher candidates to work with students with diverse backgrounds" but no strategy has been identified. The team recommends the SOE examine the preparation of candidates to teach students from diverse backgrounds and make adjustments as necessary.

The SOE is not solely responsible for the preparation of ALL students in the TEP. Program areas within the unit also bear responsibility, especially for those students focusing on secondary or K-12 teacher education. Therefore, in addition to the SOE, which needs to examine how students are being prepared to work with students with diverse backgrounds in courses for which they are responsible, EPP needs to examine the preparation given in the courses for which they are responsible (especially secondary content area methods courses).

FACULTY

(Initial Finding: Met with Pending Conditions Noted)

Concern #5: 79.12(5) The team requires the unit to document a plan to address faculty shortages in the PreLEAD and CAS programs.

Action Plan:

The School of Education hired four new faculty members in Educational Administration for the 2014-2015 school year: three tenure-track faculty members and one clinical faculty member, which brings our full-time faculty to four tenured/tenure-track positions and 2.5 clinical faculty positions. A brief summary of "new" faculty expertise follows:

- Jason Salisbury (tenure-track assistant professor) graduated from the University of Wisconsin at Madison. A former Chicago high school special education teacher, teacher leader, and principalship intern, his research interest is the transition experiences of students of color into high school.
- Daniel Spikes (tenure-track assistant professor) graduated from the University of Texas at Austin, where he has worked with UCEA president Mark Gooden on the professional development of district administrators around cultural competency. He is a former middle school teacher and assistant principal of a summer school program.
- Doug Wieczorek (tenure-track assistant professor) graduated from Syracuse University with an interest in Race to the Top as an example of leadership and policy implementation. He has experience as a secondary social studies teacher, assistant principal, partnership coordinator, and administrator in higher education.
- Greg Robinson (clinical faculty member) has experience as a superintendent, principal, BOEE member, Iowa Department of Education consultant, and special education teacher.

ISU offers new assistant professors start-up packages for the first three years, including technology and course releases. There is also a mentoring program for new faculty. We have also paid attention to the needs of our hires and their families. One spouse will be teaching as a lecturer in the science education program. Two other spouses have teaching/counseling positions at a middle school in the area.

New instructors are evaluated during their first-midterm with an online evaluation. Those results are sent to the Director of the School of Education and the educational administration program coordinator. New faculty members who are tenure-track have three-year contracts and are reviewed during their third year to ensure they are making satisfactory progress.

Concern #6: 79.12(5) The Team requires the unit to develop and document a plan to assure all faculty preparing candidates meet the requirements in 79.12(6).

Action Plan:

As indicated in the Institutional Report, there is a very clear definition of who is to complete the required collaborative teaching experience hours. The following process will be used to remind appropriate faculty they are to complete the requisite hours:

- The EPCC meets each fall prior to the beginning of the academic year. Beginning in the fall of 2014, program coordinators will be given a list of faculty in their area who must complete the collaborative teaching experience. The list will include when the person started at ISU, the number of collaborative teaching hours and the number of supervision hours, and the area in which they are teaching or supervising.
- Coordinators will be asked to disseminate the information to their colleagues and to send an updated list and any changes to the Teacher Education Services office by the end of September.
- Faculty and supervisors will update their hours on a regular basis (minimum once per year). Once the data management system is functioning, a process for updating hours will be designed and communicated to all program coordinators and faculty.

Some program areas require collaborative teaching experiences be included in the faculty member's annual evaluation report and be mentioned in the Position Responsibility Statement. EPCC will discuss doing this during the fall semester and make a recommendation prior to the end of the semester. While EPCC can form policy related to the Educator Preparation Program, it cannot usurp nor dictate departmental or unit policies.

A similar process will be put into place for university supervisors. Data collection will occur in a manner aligned to the data collection procedures outlined for faculty above.

Faculty

Items in Need of Clarification

4. 79.12(5) The team did not have the opportunity to meet with graduate students assigned to teach courses. However, conversations with lecturers raised potential concerns about the preparation of graduate students to teach, especially if they had no previous PreK-12 teaching experience and were then assigned to teach methods courses. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers reported that in some departments or programs they were regarded as faculty, were supported in professional development and travel. Unfortunately, in other programs, the lecturers reported that their status was not as strongly supported. The team recommends the SOE systematically consider the definition, functions and work supported of all faculty members.

The School of Education and its programs are only one “member” of the EPP unit. The issue discussed here is larger than the School of Education. Therefore, the EPP should systematically consider the definition, functions, and work supported of all faculty members. Program coordinators for each area should present this issue to their department chair or school director. If any of these individuals have questions related to this issue, they need to contact the Associate Director of Educator Preparation in the School of Education, who serves as the EPCC chair.

Faculty Additional Information
--

The School of Education hired 14 tenured, tenure-track, or lecturers for the 2014-2015 academic year. Eleven of those hired will be involved in the EPP.

- Two assistant professors in elementary/secondary math education.
- One assistant professor in early literacy education (shared with the ISU Extension program)
- One assistant professor in elementary science education and one lecturer in secondary science education
- One assistant professor in elementary social studies education
- One associate professor in multicultural education
- Three assistant professors and one lecturer in educational leadership

The search for a Director of the School of Education was started in the spring of 2014. It is anticipated on-campus interviews will be conducted during the fall of 2014.

There will be two searches restarted in the fall of 2014.

- The Associate Director for Educator Preparation for the School of Education
- Harmon Endowed Professor in dual immersion and literacy

Additional faculty positions in the SOE have been approved for the 2015-2016 academic year that will also impact the EPP.

- One assistant professor in foundations
- One assistant/associate professor in math education (secondary)
- One assistant/associate professor in instructional technology

In addition, two Professional and Scientific (P&S) positions will be added and it is anticipated these positions will be filled during the 2015-2016 academic year.

- Coordinator of Educational Assessment and Program Evaluation
- Program Assistant for EPP Data Management

The Teacher Education Services office also has received permission to search for two P&S positions that will impact EPP.

- One elementary education academic advisor
- One clinical experiences coordinator

The Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences has approved two positions beginning in the fall of 2015:

- Tenure-track faculty position in History education (Department of History)
- Tenure-track faculty position in Music (choral music) education (Department of Music)

The Dean of the College of Design approved the hiring of a lecturer beginning in the fall of 2014 to teach the related methods course in art for students in the elementary education major.

ASSESSMENT

(Initial Finding: Met with Pending Conditions Noted)

Concern #1: 79.13(1)a. The team requires the unit to develop, document, and implement a plan for a coherent assessment system for all programs, undergraduate and graduate.

Action Plan:

Iowa State University's Educator Preparation Program (EPP) identified a need in the Assessment Standard during its self-evaluation and while writing the Institutional Report during the review process. The EPP began to take immediate steps to address this concern. The EPCC Assessment Subcommittee was reconstituted and began to meet regularly even before the accreditation visit. The subcommittee consisted of the following positions – Associate Director of Educator Preparation; Director of Teacher Education Services; ECE representative; Elementary Education representative; Secondary Education representative; ELP representative; and Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE) representative.

The subcommittee identified four outcomes for its work:

- *Develop Unit goals and outcomes*
- *Develop an assessment matrix around the Unit's outcomes*
- *Identify a new data management system and implement procedures to purchase this system*
- *Create a position description for a Coordinator of Educational Assessment and Program Evaluation*

In order to meet these outcomes, the subcommittee met once a month in the fall. During second semester, the subcommittee met at least twice a month. The subcommittee made significant progress towards the identified outcomes.

Develop Unit goals and outcomes: *The EPCC Assessment Subcommittee identified two unit goals and several outcomes for each of the goals. These were shared with EPCC at the May meeting and will be voted on in a meeting fall semester 2014.*

Develop an assessment matrix around the Unit's outcomes. *An initial draft of the assessment matrix has been developed. Additional details will be added in Fall 2014. The assessment matrix identifies the data sources for each outcome, who collects the data, the frequency of data collection, and, in some instances, how the data will be used.*

Identify a new data management system: *The EPCC Assessment Subcommittee researched data management systems used by other institutions. Additional research was done at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) Annual Meeting. The goal was to identify a data management system for use throughout the EPP that could do the following:*

- *Collect demographic data*
- *Collect e-portfolio data*
- *Collect field experience data, including student evaluations*

- Collect course assessment data
- Collect assessment data on student performance on the ISU Teaching Standards (*InTASC*) both formative and summative
- Collect assessment data for the Unit's goals and outcomes (including survey data, longitudinal data, and needed additional data)
- Organize data in a useful way for the following purposes:
 - Individual student formative assessment
 - Individual student summative assessment
 - Individual program evaluation
 - Unit program evaluation

Two potential data management systems were identified. Both companies made a campus visit to present the systems in April. Members of the EPCC Assessment Subcommittee, along with any other interested stakeholders, were invited to attend these sessions. The EPCC Assessment Subcommittee recommended the purchase of the TK20 (www.TK20.com) to the Director of the School of Education and the Dean of the College of Human Sciences. Approval for the purchase was given and the contract with TK20 was signed on July 25, 2014. A representative from TK20 has been assigned to work with the EPP to start implementing the program. An initial informational meeting was held with TK20 representatives and ISU personnel in early August to begin initiating this process. The EPCC sub-committee members and the EPPC will be working closely to implement this system throughout the Unit. The data management program will support students in both the TEP and ELP. It will realistically take 12-18 months to implement the entire system in terms of data collection and assessment for the entire Unit.

Create a position description for the Coordinator of Educational Assessment and Program Evaluation: The EPCC Assessment Subcommittee established a need for this position that was supported by the Review Team's final report and the structures at the other two Regent institutions. After establishing this need, a position description was developed that reflect the requirements in 79.13(256) (Assessment system and unit evaluation standard). The College of Human Sciences (70%) and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (30%) will fund the position. It is anticipated the position will be filled by the start of spring semester 2015.

With the EPCC's Assessment Subcommittee's initial outcomes addressed, an implementation plan is now being developed for both TEP and ELP. When possible the TEP and ELP will align their assessment measures. The proposed assessment plan for each program will be described.

Teacher Education Preparation

Assessment outcomes and an implementation plan are as follows:

Outcome	Timeline	Notes
Develop a data management system implementation plan	Fall 2014	Pilot the licensure components for those individuals in the TEP who are student teaching in FY 2014. The plan will need to include timeline for implementing various components, developing data entry/student sign-up procedures, training of faculty and staff, expectations of faculty and staff, training of students, identification of pilot groups, etc.

Develop an assessment timeline for students	Fall 2014	What unit assessments/data collection will a single student participate in throughout their program?
Develop curriculum maps for the professional core courses taught in the School of Education and the Elementary Education program.	2014-2015	This outcome was initiated by the Undergraduate Studies Committee in the School of Education. This model will be shared across the other programs in the EPP.
Develop data collection tools	2014-2015	Create/gather the data collection instruments and tools identified in the assessment matrix. These instruments will be aligned to unit outcomes. Pilot the instrument and tools Review and revise the instruments and tools
Develop an implementation plan for the Assessment Matrix	2014-2015	Timeline Training Inter-rater reliability work
Crosswalk the Assessment Outcomes to curriculum maps and syllabi	Spring/Summer 2015 – Fall 2016	

Educational Leadership Program:

With advice from Matt Ludwig, the ELP faculty adapted a model developed by Liz Hollingworth (University of Iowa) assessing candidates, faculty, and the program.

Each of these areas works together. For example, assessment of candidate field experience notebooks revealed that a number of people in one cohort from spring 2014 completed extra field experience hours because they were unsure what “counted.” We have already revised our curriculum to break the six credits of field experience coursework into three, two-hour blocks instead of two three-hour blocks, which means that a clinical faculty member will meet with students at the mid-point of the program as well as at the beginning and end points.

Candidate Assessment

Faculty assess our candidates with both formal and informal tools. For example, candidates are assessed formally during admission. Candidates are assessed informally in courses throughout the program. They are assessed again at the end of the program by both clinical faculty (field experiences) and research faculty (portfolios).

The faculty will link the tools outlined in the table with the data management system purchased by the EPP, piloting the tools with the new cohorts of principalship students which start in October of 2014. If the data management system implementation is not ready for this phase of implementation, it will be piloted with the spring 2015 cohort of students.

Once the ELP has baseline data, the program faculty will be able to track students over time and use data to inform our program decision-making.

Revision example: Field Experience Improvement

Three cohorts of principal candidates graduated in spring and summer of 2014. They offered feedback on ways we could improve the final portfolio and field experience notebook process. We will implement those suggestions as soon as possible. For example, as mentioned above, we are redistributing the six credits of field experience so that rather than taking three credits each at the beginning and end of the program, students in the fall 2014 cohorts will take two credits of field experience at the beginning, two in the middle of their program, and two at the end. A clinical supervisor will also check in with students and mentors at that mid-point of their program.

Faculty Assessment

Faculty Assessment is largely formal via hiring processes determined by the University and annual review documents determined by the School of Education. Teaching is assessed via electronic course evaluations at the end of each course, and results are released to and reviewed by instructors and the Director of the School of Education.

Teaching is also assessed informally, as instructors implement informal ways of assessing whether their teaching has been effective, such as using “a ticket out the door” asking students at the end of each class for one thing they learned or one question they have. Instructors can also provide informal mid-term assessments, such as a “Plus Delta,” which asks students to reflect upon their own learning as a student as well as the teaching of the instructor.

Adjunct instructors are selected from a pool of applicants. Like other instructors, they must hold a Ph.D. They have a formal midterm course evaluation their first semester. Those results are sent to the instructor, the program coordinator, and the Director of the School of Education, who follow up as needed. Adjunct instructors who do not receive largely positive evaluations are not asked to adjunct again.

Program Assessment

ELP assessment depends partly upon the use of data from formal data collection systems, which the program has not had up to this point. Faculty intend to use the data management system to track students so that they can be surveyed regularly during the program and after they graduate. Faculty will also survey students’ employers. These surveys will occur every other year, with the alumni survey alternating with the employer survey. Regularly collecting that data can help faculty know where the gaps in our field experiences exist.

Currently the program relies on informal systems such as informal exit interviews with recent graduates. The faculty wants and needs to assess the program more systematically.

Educational administration as a program has a strong process in place for meeting regularly as a faculty. Faculty meet at the beginning of the semester for a day-long retreat and twice a month during the school year. One task for the 2014-2015 school year is to review curriculum. A review of ISSL standards listed in existing syllabi in both the principalship and superintendency programs was conducted by a graduate assistant in the spring of 2014. As new faculty enter the program, it is important to review that crosswalk of the ISSL standards to determine whether the crosswalk seems accurate, where the gaps are, and how syllabi should be modified in response. This information will be used in conjunction with candidates’ performance on portfolios or field experiences so that the faculty can determine how the curriculum might be modified going forward.

There are many tools available at a national level for assessing educator preparation programs. The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) has program criteria which can be used to launch discussion. One of the new faculty members has expertise in UW-Madison's CALL (Comprehensive Assessment of Leadership for Learning).

This assessment work for both TEP and ELP will continue to be facilitated by the Associate Director of Educator Preparation in the School of Education. The initial work will be led by the EPCC Assessment Subcommittee and tasks will be assigned to program coordinators/areas and shared with EPCC for feedback, input, and an eventual vote. The information will then be taken to the EPP faculty and staff to implement this robust assessment plan.

ASSESSMENT

Additional Concern/Recommendations Addressed

2. 79.13(1)b. The unit has a goal to align the assessment system with the unit's framework, but the lack of consistency among the programs (and schools) in the unit in regard to the use and application of standards in assessing candidates precludes this requirement from being met.

The current standards used by TEP are the 'old' InTASC standards. An EPCC Standards Ad Hoc Committee was formed Spring 2014 and is recommending that the EPCC adopt the current InTASC standards with a little modification. EPCC will review and vote on this recommendation early fall semester 2014. This appears to be a good time to revisit the current assessment system and make changes that not only document student proficiency on the standards, but also help allow continuous program improvement based on current data.

During the 2013-2014 academic year, two programs, the Elementary Education program and the Early Childhood Education-Unified program, petitioned EPCC to pilot different ways to use the current e-portfolio system; both proposals were approved.

- *The Elementary Education pilot started in January 2014 and will run through May 2015. Students will upload 12 approved stand-alone artifacts prior to applying for student teaching. During student teaching, the students may upload a minimum of four pieces of evidence to show they are competent in the 12 ISU standards. This change allows students to use a single piece of evidence to show proficiency in more than one standard. Students must explain which standards are met with each piece of evidence. In addition, the Director of Teacher Education Services worked with three student teaching supervisors to design training that would help all supervisors mentor and coach student teachers during their experiences and relate them to the standards. Toward the end of their experience, student teachers turned in two documents. One was a synthesis of evidence where they explained their growth in understanding and using the standards while teaching, their areas of strength, and areas where they would like additional professional development. The second document was an evaluation of the Elementary Education program, including strengths and weaknesses.*

- *The ECE-U pilot will be conducted during the 2014-2015 academic year. Artifacts will be replaced with faculty reporting which students have met the standards' assessments in required courses in the program. Students will be required to complete a three to five page paper or synthesis that reflects on the skills they have acquired related to the standards. The students will focus on four broad areas (the learner and learning, content knowledge, instructional practice, and professional responsibility). More details will be provided to EPCC this fall.*

A summary of the results for each pilot will be shared with EPCC in the spring of 2015. Discussions about changes to the e-portfolio will continue throughout the 2014-2015 academic year, with the goal of a unified assessment system being in place beginning fall of 2016.

TEACHER EDUCATION CLINICAL

(Initial Finding: Met with Pending Conditions Noted)

Concern #4: 79.14(10) The team requires the unit to develop and document a plan to assure all teacher education candidates receive adequate information about expectations in ethical behavior as required in 79.14(10)d.

Action Plan:

The information presented and shared with students in the Early Childhood Education-Unified and Elementary Education programs at the student teaching workshops will now be provided during the Student Teaching Placement Meeting. Students from all programs (ECE-U, Elementary Education, PK-12 programs, and secondary programs) are required to attend this meeting, regardless of placement assignments, the semester prior to student teaching.

In addition, the EPCC Selection and Retention Subcommittee made a recommendation to the SOE Undergraduate Studies Committee to include ethical practices as part of its curriculum mapping process for the professional core. The recommendation included backwards mapping from the final presentation mentioned above to include on-going learning opportunities around ethical behavior. These will include such initiatives as presentations from Joanne Tubbs from the Iowa BOEE.

TEACHER EDUCATION CLINICAL

Additional Concern/Recommendations Addressed

1. 79.14(1) The team finds evidence of inconsistent assignment/placement of diverse experiences for candidates across the different programs. There is not consistent tracking of placements among all programs. Several programs make their own placements (Master of Arts in Teaching Science, Agriculture Education, Music Education, Early Childhood Education), while the Placement Office manages and coordinates others. The management of placements in the Placement Office is consistent and provides varied experiences. The team recommends the unit consider using the Placement Office (or at least incorporate their model) to make and track placements for all programs.

A new data management system (TK20) has been purchased for the unit and will be used to track placements for all students in the Teacher Education Program. The program that manages the placement will enter the data. Once the new data system is in place, procedures will be designed and approved through EPCC in regard to entering and using placement data. Training will be provided to the staff and faculty who place students and need to track this information. Once these data are in place, reports of placements will be run and shared with EPCC at least once a semester to ensure students experience a variety of settings. Current policies and practices will be examined and discussed within the context of these data.

2. 79.14(1) The team found evidence that some teacher candidates use the same settings for supervised practicum and student teaching. While this concern does not necessarily cause this standard to be considered not met, the team recommends the unit work to consistently apply varied clinical experiences for all candidates.

When the new data management system is in place, a proposal of procedures and protocols in identifying and placing students will be approved through EPCC. The data system can be used to monitor implementation of this expectation.

3. 79.14(8) The team did not find evidence that teacher candidates in all programs demonstrate the ability to use assessment data in developing and modifying lessons.

A new clinical experience evaluation tool is currently being developed. This evaluation includes a section on Assessment, including the use of assessment data to plan and modify lessons. Teacher candidates will self-assess using this tool, cooperating teachers will evaluate teacher candidates using this tool, and supervisors will evaluate teacher candidates using this tool. As these data are collected and analyzed, teacher candidates' competency in this area will be systematically evaluated and curriculum and coursework will be modified as needed.

TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM

(Initial Finding: Met or Met with Strength)

TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM

Additional Concern/Recommendations Addressed

2. 79.15(6) The description of practices in the IR and examination of syllabi did not provide clear evidence of the integration of reading strategies into the secondary content areas of agriculture, health, and music. The team heard some discussion of the development of a new course for teaching reading in the content areas for secondary majors, which is a good potential strategy for these areas, however, the further development or exploration of such a course should occur in collaboration with content-area faculty and should be responsive to their concerns about length, focus, and scheduling. The team recommends the unit establish a consistent way to assure all teacher preparation candidates learn how to integrate reading strategies in their programs.

As curriculum mapping occurs, and the new assessment plan is implemented, this has the potential to change the curriculum requirements for these content areas and others. We will continue to monitor how the teaching of reading in the content areas for secondary majors is met and continue to improve and document the progress.

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP CLINICAL

(Initial Finding: Met with Pending Conditions Noted)

Concern: Item #5 must be addressed before consideration for accreditation by the State Board. Since the assessment program is unit wide, it is addressed in the Assessment section (79.13) and not specifically in this section. The assessment concern in 79.13 must be adequately addressed for the PreLEAD and CAS programs for this standard to be considered met.

79.16(6), (8). Assessment and data collection from the various clinical experiences appear to be subjective. The development and utilization of standardized rubrics will benefit program assessment, improve communication among all interested parties, improve clinical experiences and support continuous improvement of the candidate's performance. The team requires the unit to develop strategies for assessment as a component of an assessment management system. This concern is addressed as a requirement in the assessment section.

Action Plan:

See response to section IV Assessment - Concern #4. The Educational Administration Program will also use the data management system to track and use the assessment and evaluation data.

Examples of standardized assessment tools are described below.

1. *PreLEAD ISSL Self-Assessment*

Principalship students assess themselves using an ISSL Self-Assessment rubric at three points in the program: first, fourth, and final semesters. Currently, students analyze their growth throughout the program using those assessments and write a brief reflection in their final portfolio. The new assessment software, TK20, should be able to email our students during the semesters identified. The self-assessments could be used at the candidate level when meeting with advisors and mentors to design field experiences that would be helpful in addressing gaps. Compiled self-assessments from all candidates could be used to inform the program of where there are curricular or field experience gaps in particular standards.

2. *PreLEAD Mentoring Meeting with Student's ISU Advisor*

Meetings with mentors include using the ISSL self-assessment to set goals for field experiences and identify areas of growth in both field experiences and coursework. Together with the mentor, the ISU clinical faculty member and the student generate ideas for field experiences tailored to their particular strengths and areas for growth.

3. *Signed Mentor Agreement*

Expectations of mentors are listed in the mentor agreement. The mentor agreement is part of the agenda at the mentoring meeting. Copies of these agreements will be entered into the new assessment program.

4. *Field Experience Notebook Checklist*

The field experience checklist is used by the clinical faculty member supervising field experiences to evaluate the field experience notebook. The notebook provides evidence that the candidate has completed 400 hours of field experiences. It is associated with six credit hours of coursework. Candidates must complete the field experience notebook successfully in order to receive licensure.

5. *E-Portfolio Rubric*

Students develop a final portfolio based on ISSL standards. Portfolios are evaluated by one tenured or tenure-track faculty member and one clinical faculty member. Each reviews the portfolio independently and the clinical faculty member compiles comments from both evaluators to the student. Currently each standard is marked either as "proficient" or "rewrite." We do not submit anyone for licensure until all standards are deemed proficient by both faculty members. With the addition of new ELP faculty and assessment personnel positions in the SOE, assessment will continue to be a regular discussion item during ELP meetings.

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP CURRICULUM

(Initial Finding: Met with Pending Conditions Noted)

Concern: The team requires the unit to develop and document a plan to ensure administration candidates are adequately prepared to meet the learning needs of all students. This plan must be provided to the team before accreditation approval is sought from the State Board.

Action Plan:

The needs of diverse learners are infused throughout our coursework. There are two courses in the principalship program which specifically address the needs of diverse learners: Educational Administration (Ed Adm) 556 and Educational Administration (Ed Adm) 558.

Ed Adm 556 requires students to complete equity audits, which collect and analyze data on English language learners, gifted and talented learners, and at-risk learners. Students reflect on each domain of the audits throughout the course. They use the audits to identify three to five goals for their schools, with an implementation plan. Students complete the course with a five-page reflection paper on what they have learned.

One of the SOE semester course evaluation questions is an open-ended question: "What aspect of this course enhanced your learning experience the most?" When Ed Adm 556 was taught in Spring 2014, 8 out of the 11 student responses received specifically mentioned the equity audits as a valuable part of their learning.

In the last two years, we have been told informally by many of our graduates that they wished they knew more about special education. We asked Dr. Carl Smith, who has extensive experience in special education as a researcher, consultant, and service provider to the state of Iowa, to teach Ed Adm 558 in the summer of 2014.

Within the superintendency preparation program, the student achievement modules taught in the fall and spring terms will more directly address these subgroups. We will provide a syllabus after those courses are developed during the 2014-2015 school year. Course readings and assignments will be evaluated and modified to ensure that these groups are specifically discussed.