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I. Overview and Conceptual Framework

I.1 Historical Context and Unique Characteristics

Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, one of 14 public universities that comprise the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE), originated as an academy and literary institute for the education of teachers in 1839 (http://www.bloomu.edu/about/history). The school continued in this function until 1916 when it was purchased by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and named Bloomsburg State Normal School. During the last century, the university has broadened its mission as a coeducational institution which serves students of diverse backgrounds from Pennsylvania, neighboring states, and foreign countries. The University is accessible and attractive, located along the Susquehanna River in rural central Pennsylvania. To its community and region, the university is a valued educational, artistic and economic resource that supports a broad range of needs in education, government, health care, business, technology and culture. The University has approximately 10,000 undergraduate and graduate students. Bloomsburg University offers an array of undergraduate degrees in education, liberal arts, business, science and technology. There are 17 graduate programs leading to master’s degrees, a clinical doctoral degree, and administrative certificate programs for professional educators. The student body is composed largely of full-time residential students (93%), many of whom are first-generation post-secondary school enrollees. Approximately 73% of the undergraduate students receive some form of financial assistance to help meet educational costs. Bloomsburg University promotes a thorough liberal arts preparation at the core of professional preparation in education, business, health care and the sciences. It promotes intellectual growth, interpersonal development and social responsibility through integrated academic programs, cultural activities and co-curricular experiences. The University community is committed to the principles of personal and academic freedom within a framework of ethical responsibility. In addition, the University is committed to the provision of access to higher education through programs that support students who might not otherwise realize the opportunity. Bloomsburg University President David L. Soltz assembled students, faculty, staff, alumni and community members in fall 2009 to embark on a long-range strategic planning process. The Strategic Planning and Resource Council (SPARC) began to develop and compose new mission, vision and value statements that reflect the future direction of this University. The outcome of this process was a document entitled Impact 2015: Building on the Past, Leading for the Future.

I.2 Institutional Mission

Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania is an inclusive comprehensive public university that prepares students for personal and professional success in an increasingly complex global environment. Bloomsburg University aspires to be a premier public comprehensive university, recognized as a center of thinking, learning and academic excellence. As the needs of the Commonwealth evolve the university will reflect a diverse educational community that produces positive change and opportunities for success. The University values its responsibility to be a good steward of resources and the environment, and develop individuals to be contributing citizens. Bloomsburg University embraces the general mission of the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education to assure excellence in higher education at an affordable cost.

I.3 The Professional Education Unit

The Professional Education Unit at Bloomsburg University is comprised of teacher education programs offered within the College of Education and select programs in the College of Liberal Arts (Music Education), College of Science and Technology (Instructional Technology) and College of Business (Business Education). The following professional Initial Certification programs are offered in the Unit:

- Early Childhood Education, Grades PK-4 (Bachelor of Science in Education)
- Elementary Education, Grades K-6 (Bachelor of Science in Education)
- Middle Level Education, Grades 4-8 (Bachelor of Science in Education)
  - Mathematics, Social Studies, Language Arts and Science
- Special Education PK-8/Early Childhood Education PK-4 (Bachelor of Science in Education)
  Dual Certification Program
- Special Education N-12/Elementary Education K-6 (Bachelor of Science in Education)
  Dual Certification Program
- Secondary Education, Grades 7-12 (Bachelor of Science in Education)
  - English, Mathematics, General Science, Citizenship and Foreign Language
- Music Education, Grades K-12 (Bachelor of Science in Education)
- Business Education, Grades 7-12 (Bachelor of Science in Education)

The following professional Advanced Certification programs are offered in the Unit:
- Early Childhood Education PK-4 (Master of Education) – Approval pending
- Mid-level Education (Master of Education) – Approval pending
- Elementary Education (Master of Education)
- Reading (Master of Education)
- Instructional Technology K-12 (Master of Science/Education Specialist)
- Education of the Deaf/Hard of Hearing (Master of Science)
- Special Education (Master of Science)
- Special Education (Master of Education)
- Elementary School Counseling (Master of Education)
- Secondary School Counseling (Master of Education)
- Curriculum and Instruction (Master of Education)
- Education Leadership, K-12 School Administration (Supervisory/Principal Certification)
- Special Education Supervision (Supervisory Certification)

The Professional Education Unit partners with faculty and administration from other Units (colleges/offices) from across campus to coordinate teacher preparation programs. Policy 1.7 of the College of Education Policy Handbook (pp. 23-26) establishes the Teacher Education Council (TEC) as the body charged with the cross-Unit organization of the educator preparation programs in the Professional Education Unit. It does this by reviewing all aspects of the Unit’s educator preparation programs. The TEC functions as a communication conduit between the individual programs within the Unit and those who partner in the preparation of teacher candidates. The charge of the TEC includes such activities as reviewing relevant proposals that impact relationships within teacher preparation and providing recommendations to the COE leadership team. The TEC is comprised of the faculty leaders who are nominated by their respective Dean and Department Chair. Education faculty and faculty representatives meet each semester. During the summer of 2011 many of the TEC members assisted faculty in the development of program reports for submission to professional associations. In addition, Unit representatives appear before each college at their scheduled college-wide meeting each semester. Within this open forum, data and other forms of information are exchanged with subsequent discussion and action plans formulated. Additional structured communications occur frequently through COE subcommittee meetings which occur on a scheduled basis throughout each academic year (Advanced Programs Committee, Field Experience Committee, Technology Committee and Assessment Committee).

Significant changes have occurred at this institution and within the College of Education since the NCATE Focused Visit in 2008. Many of the actions and initiatives have taken place in response to the recommendations from that report and have emphasized strengthening the infra-structure of the Professional Education Unit and teacher preparation programs at Bloomsburg University.
In the spring of 2009, the University hired Dr. Richard Schwab to complete an organizational analysis of the College of Professional Studies, report findings and recommend actions to address organizational deficiencies. This report came on the heels of the results of a 2008 NCATE Accreditation Focus Visit in which the accreditation of Advanced Programs was revoked.

On May 25, 2009, Dr. Elizabeth K. Mauch was appointed as Interim Dean of the College of Professional Studies (soon to become the College of Education).

On July 1, 2009, Bloomsburg University was reorganized to create the College of Education. Previously, the College of Professional Studies had housed the School of Education and the School of Health Sciences. The College of Education is now comprised of three academic departments engaged in educator preparation (Early Childhood and Adolescent Education, Educational Studies and Secondary Education, and Exceptionality Programs). This restructuring has allowed for a more targeted focus on the unique needs, resource demands and strategic direction of educator preparation programs at the initial and advanced levels.

On October 6, 2009, the Interim Dean of the College of Education issued the charge for the redesign of the Unit’s mission and Conceptual Framework. A Conceptual Framework Committee was established to coordinate this effort. This document was approved on April 29, 2010.

On July 22, 2010, the College of Education Chairperson Council approved a revision of COE Policy 1.3: Committee Structure and Responsibilities. This action created working committees, including the Assessment Committee, Advanced Programs Committee, Field Experience Committee, Technology Committee, Curriculum Committee and the Dean’s Advisory Council.

During the fall semester of 2011, the Professional Education Unit went live with a newly designed assessment system. The secure web-based system for data collection and analysis is known as the Assessment System for Informed Practice (ASIP). It replaced the Waypoint Outcomes system, previously administered through the BU Office of Planning and Assessment. This transition occurred to ensure assessment practices were owned by the COE and managed internally within a system for ease, flexibility and function.

During the fall semester of 2011, Provost Dr. Ira Blake approved the appointment of Graduate Coordinators within each department in the College of Education. Faculty members are provided with reassigned time each semester for student advisement and the coordination of activities in Initial and Advanced Graduate Programs.

On February 10, 2012, the University announced a $2 million donation by philanthropist Susan McDowell. The gift was provided in support of the College of Education to establish the McDowell Institute for Teacher Excellence in Positive Behavior Support. The McDowell Institute is designed to equip educators with strategies, practices and experiences to effectively support the academic, social and emotional growth of all students.

In the spring of 2012, the College of Education Chairperson Council completed the development of a Unit-wide Strategic Plan. This plan was developed collaboratively with faculty from each department having input into the process. The year-long process establishes the Unit’s strategic direction and initiatives for the next three-year timespan.

Since the last NCATE visit, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) has provided Chapter 49.2: Initial Program Approval to Early Childhood Education (PK-4), Mid-Level Education (4-8) and Special Education (PK-8). Approved revisions have also occurred within all Secondary Education programs. The Initial Program Approval of Post-Baccalaureate Program across the Unit is currently in process.

I.4 The Conceptual Framework
In 1999, the Professional Education Unit adopted a conceptual framework based upon Charlotte Danielson’s Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching. A decade later, a committee comprised of faculty from the Unit was charged with the redesign of this conceptual framework. The new framework clarifies alignment with professional standards (INTASC, NCATE), PDE General Standards,
research-based effective practices, and the individual vision of educator preparation faculty at this institution. The Conceptual Framework of the Unit establishes an integrated vision for teaching, learning, professionalism and educator preparation at Bloomsburg University. It provides the foundation for the institution’s philosophical underpinnings, beliefs and values as well as outlines the proficiencies and professional dispositions we emphasize in the preparation of effective education professionals. Additionally, the Conceptual Framework guides the planning, development, and implementation of programs and ensures connections between coursework, field experiences, student teaching and Unit-wide assessment practices. All initial teacher education programs focus on the development of the required knowledge, skills and professional dispositions to ensure candidates are prepared to meet all Unit, state and professional standards at the completion of their program.

The faculty members of the Unit have identified the core candidate proficiencies related to the expected knowledge, skills and dispositions for effective practice. Unit-wide faculty members have also identified the values that educators must possess to effectively support students, families, colleagues and communities. Our emphasis on professional dispositions reflects the critical importance of professional behaviors and the high degree of value placed on developing positive professional attitudes, values and beliefs. The Conceptual Framework and a description of its central components are available for review in Exhibit I.5.c.

In 2010, faculty members within the Advanced Programs of the Professional Education Unit reviewed the Unit’s Conceptual Framework to more coherently connect the identified values, beliefs, skills and professional dispositions to the Advanced Programs. Like the Initial Programs, the Advanced Programs at Bloomsburg University are designed with the expectation that candidates must develop and apply knowledge, skills and professional dispositions to serve as effective educational professionals. The Unit’s Conceptual Framework includes core expectations and competencies for all candidates in the College of Education Professional Beliefs and Dispositions. For Advanced Programs, the Conceptual Framework is extended to include key elements from the Rigor and Relevance Framework (Exhibit I.5.c). This extension establishes a focus on the acquisition of knowledge, the application of knowledge in educational settings, the assimilation of new ideas, and the adaptation of knowledge for creative problem solving in educational settings. The desired outcomes are the development of educational professionals who are experts in teaching and learning, capable of improving teaching and learning, and equipped to serve as educational leaders in the 21st century. The elements from the Rigor and Relevance Framework are addressed and are reflected throughout each course, field experience and program within the Advanced Programs in the teacher education Unit. Candidates are expected to demonstrate professional growth as they progress through targeted transition points within their program of study.

I.5 Exhibits

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.5.a</td>
<td>Links to Unit catalogs and other printed documents describing general education, specialty/content studies, and professional studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.5.b</td>
<td>Syllabi for professional education courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.5.c</td>
<td>Conceptual framework(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.5.d</td>
<td>Findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, APA, CACREP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.5.e</td>
<td>Updated institutional, program, and faculty information under institutional work space in AIMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Unit Standards

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

In September of 2011, ten programs within the Professional Education Unit submitted reports to their professional association on AIMS. For the first time, several of our programs achieved national recognition. This outcome is reflective of both our commitment to addressing the accreditation demands of NCATE, and further developing an infrastructure to ensure that all candidates in Initial and Advanced Programs meet professional, state and institutional standards. Candidates enrolled in Initial and Advanced Educator Preparation Programs at Bloomsburg University possess the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions to effectively fulfill their varied roles within educational settings.

The Professional Education Unit has developed a system of Unit-wide assessment that utilizes varied sources to measure candidate effectiveness through the use of grade point average (GPA), national licensure exams, professional disposition assessments, candidate self-reflections, lesson/unit planning, and performance during clinical experience (Exhibit 2.3.a). Measures of programmatic effectiveness are provided by varied stakeholders, including candidates, cooperating teachers, administrators, employers, and university alumni (Exhibit 2.3.a). All undergraduate and graduate candidates enrolled in Initial Programs are assessed in a consistent and coherent manner at the targeted transition points. The key assessments are aligned at each transition point with the Unit’s Conceptual Framework, the Pennsylvania Department of Education Chapter 49.2 competencies, Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium standards and the standards of the applicable Specialized Professional Association (SPA). The Assessment Chart – Initial Programs (Exhibit 2.3.a) provides a clear visual representation of our assessment design. There are four transition points or “gates” for student progression to licensure which provide relevant benchmarks for both the application of key assessment procedures and established criteria for continued participation in a teacher preparation program. The transition points in Initial Programs include:

I – Admission to Teacher Education (Entry)
II – Pre-Student Teaching Admission (Pre-Capstone)
III – Student Teaching (Capstone)
IV – Follow-up

All candidates enrolled in Advanced Programs are assessed in a consistent and coherent manner at targeted transition points that are common to all advanced educator preparation programs. The key assessments are aligned at each transition point with the Unit’s Conceptual Framework (expanded Rigor and Relevance Framework), the Pennsylvania Department of Education Chapter 49.2 competencies, Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium standards and the standards of the applicable Specialized Professional Association (SPA). The transition points, common key assessments, assessment level, Conceptual Framework crosswalk, and data collection points are available for review in the Assessment Chart – Advanced Programs (Exhibit 2.3.a). Unique program assessments have been developed within programs to reflect the diversity and needs of each Advanced Program. There are four targeted transition points or “gates” for student progression through completion of an Advanced Program. The gates provide a series of benchmarks for both the application of key assessment procedures and established criteria for continued participation in a teacher preparation program. The transition points in Advanced Programs include:

I – Admission to Graduate School (Entry)
II – Pre-Capstone
III – Capstone
IV – Exit
1.1.a Content Knowledge
Candidates enrolled in Initial Educator Preparation Programs at Bloomsburg University demonstrate a thorough knowledge of content which they plan to teach as described in professional, state and institutional standards. Candidate knowledge of content is documented by pass rates on PRAXIS II assessments. In 2010-2011, the Unit had an overall average institutional pass rate for program completers of 89% with scores of 100% earned within five Praxis II content areas (Exhibit 1.3.b). Unit-wide pass rates were greatly impacted by the results from the Elementary Education: Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction test which had an 83% overall pass rate (216/260). Faculty members within that department have reviewed the data for the development of an action plan to address this concern. Each program of study provides coursework in which candidates must demonstrate content knowledge through completion of course content and mastery of course objectives. These objectives are closely aligned with PA Chapter 49.2 competencies for beginning educators. Candidates must complete each course with a grade of “C” or better and maintain a minimum quality point average (QPA) of 3.0 within their major to demonstrate content knowledge. All program completers earned a minimum QPA of 3.0 QPA to apply for Pennsylvania teacher certification. The composite average GPA of all program completers is 3.68/4.0. This compares favorably to composite GPA score of students prior to admission to teacher education (3.15/4.0).

Candidates enrolled in Advanced Programs at Bloomsburg University enter the Graduate School by presenting expertise in their discipline through a rigorous admissions process. Admission to Advanced Programs is overseen by a Graduate Coordinator and Office of Graduate Studies. Advanced Program candidates must possess a BS/BA degree to be admitted. This requirement ensures their understanding of content knowledge within their discipline. The requirements for admission, retention and exit from Advanced Programs are available for review in COE Policy 3.1 (Exhibit 2.3.b). This policy also outlines the specific transition points for assessing candidate knowledge, skills and professional dispositions. Each Advanced Program has transition points and benchmarks at which candidates’ content knowledge is assessed. Candidate knowledge of content is documented by PRAXIS II assessments in many programs. Aggregate candidate scores (median and performance range) for those enrolled in Advanced Programs are analyzed in comparison to similar state-wide scores (Exhibit 1.3.d). In 2010-2011, Advanced Programs within the Unit compared favorably to all test-takers in Pennsylvania in relevant Praxis II exam categories. Each program of study provides coursework in which candidates must demonstrate content knowledge through completion of course content and mastery of course objectives. Candidates must complete each course with a grade that meets specific program requirements (which vary across programs) and maintain at least a minimum quality point average (QPA) of 3.0 within their graduate coursework. The composite average GPA of all program completers is 3.89/4.0. This compares favorably to composite GPA score of students prior to admission to professional education (3.84/4.0).

1.1.b Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates
Initial Programs at Bloomsburg University provide candidates with an understanding of the relationship between content and content-specific pedagogy through proficiency-based coursework and sequential field experiences. Candidates demonstrate this through performance of competencies identified within PA Chapter 49.2 and those specified within the Unit’s Conceptual Framework. The assessments described in various program reports (Lesson Plans, Unit Plans, Student Teaching Evaluations) demonstrate candidates’ understanding of the relationship between content they teach and content specific pedagogical methodologies used to ensure that all K-12 students learn (see AIMS). Select items in the Student Teacher Evaluation Form (Final) completed by the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor provide further evidence that candidates possess an understanding of content and pedagogy, differentiated instruction, knowledge of resources and use varied methods and activities, and communicated relevance of the content. The expectations for candidate performance are identified in Conceptual Framework, as well as linked to professional standards and assessed through multiple measures.
Candidates enrolled in Advanced Programs demonstrate, expand and share expertise in pedagogical content knowledge through a variety of curricular and field-based opportunities. This occurs within coursework and classroom-based activities such as the Problem-based Learning Experience (Exhibit 2.3.a). Candidates must also engage in on-campus presentations, conference and institute attendance, and other public forums to develop pedagogical content knowledge. Coursework provides opportunities to critically examine research related to pedagogy. Capstone experience evaluations provide evidence of applied content knowledge by assessing candidate planning, critical thinking, data-based decision making, judgment and effectiveness of interventions (Exhibit 1.3.d).

1.1.c Professional and Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills for Candidates
Candidates enrolled in Initial Programs design effective lessons, develop units of study, and demonstrate effective instructional practices to facilitate the learning of all students. Candidates coherently plan appropriate learning experiences and reflect on their teaching. Further, candidates assess their impact on student learning during the provision of their Unit Plan during student teaching. This assessment, which requires a pre/post assessment of student performance and reflection on student impact, is included within Program Reports and may be viewed at http://www.bloomu.edu/coe/assessment_instruments. Candidates engaged in student teaching apply their professional and pedagogical content knowledge in their preparation and planning, instruction and professionalism (see Exhibit 1.3.c). Candidates must identify how each instructional experience addresses PA Standards and Anchors as well as specifying how instruction is differentiated to meet the learning needs of all students. During capstone or student teaching experiences, composite candidate data from spring 2011 evaluations completed by University Supervisors indicates that 99% of students demonstrate competency in their content and pedagogical application on a highly consistent basis (scored as always or very often). A measure of candidate ability to communicate content with clarity provides similar results (99%). Coordinating Teachers utilizing the same measure of content knowledge, indicate that 96% of candidates demonstrate appropriate content knowledge at parallel levels. Data from the fall of 2011 is consistent with spring 2011 data. These data correlate with that provided via assessment employing the PDE 430 – Instructional Delivery measure which indicates that 100% of candidates in the unit were viewed (at a minimum) as satisfactory in their ability to instruct their content (Exhibit 1.3.c).

Candidates enrolled in Advanced Programs engage in professional activities that require their reflection on practice and understanding of the varied contexts in which they work. In past years, teacher preparation candidates completed a Pre/Post Exit Survey. The results of this survey (Exhibit 1.3.d) are quite positive in regard to student impact, professionalism, technology integration and use of differentiated instruction. Advanced Program candidates also demonstrate effective analysis of educational research and policy related to teaching, learning and best practices during the required research course. Within this particular research course, the Advanced Program Research Rubric is used to provide a detailed analysis of the candidate’s topical research review. The scoring rubric addresses six elements of effective research and professional writing. Advanced Program candidates’ aggregate scores (Exhibit 1.3.d) indicated their performance was strongest in Critique Analysis (2.89/3.0) and Review of Literature (2.87/3.0). Beginning in the spring of 2012, pre-capstone experiences in the Problem-Based Learning Experience assessment, the Research Rubric and the Advanced Program Exit Survey will be used to assess pedagogical skills and knowledge for advanced candidates.

1.1.d Student Learning
Candidates enrolled in Initial Programs analyze their impact on student learning within the design of the Lesson/Unit Plan assessments. Early course-embedded assessments are provided as a baseline within pre-capstone methods coursework. The same assessment is utilized during capstone or student teaching to assure mastery of this competency. Pre-capstone coursework provides extensive opportunities to learn and demonstrate effective use of summative and formative assessment to measure student learning and provide for data-based instructional decision making. An example exists in Secondary English where
faculty recently co-authored a grant to create a Student Work Archive Project (SWAP) in order to analyze student work and teacher feedback for course integration. Throughout the student teaching experience teacher candidates are required to conduct pre/post assessments and to reflect upon the resultant data. This analysis is used to ensure that all students are learning. Lesson Plan assessments provided for the fall of 2011 provide strong evidence candidates utilized formative assessment procedures (unit-wide composite 98%), and were proficient on their reflection germane to student impact (94%). Unit Plan assessments for the fall of 2011 reflect consistent results that support the notion candidates utilized pre-assessment procedures (unit-wide composite 94%), post-assessment (unit-wide composite 97%), and were proficient on their reflection on student impact (94%). This data is available in Exhibit 1.3.d

Candidates enrolled in Advanced Programs have a thorough understanding of major concepts related to student learning and apply this same understanding to inform practice. Candidates ability to collect, analyze and use data to improve teaching and learning is assessed during their Intern/Practicum experience (Exhibit 1.3.d). Results of the Pre/Post Exit Survey are quite positive, as reflected in items 26-31 on the survey. Significant growth is reported in the areas of differentiation and improved ability to reflect on student learning. Beginning in the spring of 2012, pre-capstone experiences in the PBLE assessment and the Advanced Program Intern, Practicum and Student Teaching Evaluation will be used measure impact on student learning.

1.1.e Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals
Candidates enrolled in Advanced Programs for Elementary/Secondary School Counselors, K-12 Principalship and Special Education Supervision develop an understanding of discipline-specific knowledge within the context of their institution, community and profession. Evidence for the Principalship program is available on AIMS within the approved program report. Candidates take the following PRAXIS II tests:
  - Elementary and Secondary School Counselor - School Counselor Test 0420
  - Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction K-12 – Educ. Leadership: Admin and Supv. Test 0411
  - Supervisor of Special Education N-12 – Educ. Leadership: Admin and Supv. Test 0411
  - Principal K-12 – Educational Leadership: Admin and Supv. Test 0411
PRAXIS II test scores (median and average performance range) are comparable to state and national averages. Unique program assessments for School Counselors and Technology Specialists in tandem with the capstone assessment identify candidate ability to demonstrate content knowledge, knowledge of schools/families, use of technology and research applications. During the fall semester of 2011, Unit-wide procedures were established for assessment purposes (Exhibit 1.3.c). The results from the Advanced Program Intern Evaluation point to candidate strengths in the areas of teamwork, oral communication and professionalism. The area of greatest concern is the use of data for the improvement of teaching and learning (Exhibit 1.3.d). Advanced Program Exit Survey results point to the same concern, as well the use of professional judgment, written communication and the application of appropriate interventions (Exhibit 1.3.d)

1.1.f Student Learning for Other School Professionals
Candidates enrolled in Advanced Programs for Elementary/Secondary School Counselors, K-12 Principalship and Instructional Technology Specialists create positive environments for student learning. Evidence of meeting this standard is available within the Internship/Practicum Evaluation, Advanced Program Exit Survey and Employer Survey. All candidates scored “Excellent” or “Good” on the measures of student and school impact. On the Exit Survey, areas for improvement include the use of data for the improvement of teaching and learning, and school-wide improvement and management (Exhibit 1.3.d). The results of the Internship Survey in the area of data usage for decision making support the results of the Exit Survey. The Employer Survey provides generic on all candidates. Items 23-30 on the survey support the positive impact of all graduates of Initial and Advanced Programs (Exhibit 1.3.d).
1.1.g  Professional Dispositions for All Candidates
Candidates enrolled in Initial Programs are expected to demonstrate professional dispositions as reflected in professional, state and institutional standards. The Unit’s Conceptual Framework and aligned assessments highlight an emphasis on fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Dispositions are assessed at entry into programs through administration of the Haberman Star Teacher Prescreener and Teacher Disposition Checklist. An Intervention Protocol has been established for use when candidate scores suggest unprofessional dispositions or when concerns arise in classes or field experience placements (Exhibit 1.3.e). In addition, the Teacher Disposition Checklist is applied during the capstone or student teaching experience. The University Supervisor utilizes the 21-item Disposition Checklist prior to exit to identify the presence of attitudes, ethics, and behaviors that may cause concern (Exhibit 1.3.e). Ongoing assessment of candidate dispositions during student teaching is addressed by the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor within the Mid-point and Final Student Teaching Evaluations. Composite data from the Disposition Checklist completed during student teaching indicate that candidates display the identified dispositions on a consistent basis (76% - Always; 15% - Very Often). Areas of relative need for improvement include reflection of teaching practice, maintaining professional communications, and seeking new ideas and instructional practices (Exhibit 1.3.f).

Candidates enrolled in Advanced Programs are expected to demonstrate professional dispositions as reflected in professional, state and institutional standards. The Unit’s Conceptual Framework and Advanced Programs extension and aligned assessments highlight an emphasis on fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Professional dispositions are currently assessed at entry into programs by administration of the Haberman Star Teacher Prescreener. Other assessments are embedded within required coursework, activities or administered by the Graduate Coordinator. Beginning in the spring of 2012, a dispositional evaluation occurred during the capstone or student teaching experience. The University Supervisor will utilize the 25-item Professional Disposition Checklist prior to exit to identify any attitudes, ethics and behaviors that may cause concern (Exhibit 1.3.e). An early disposition assessment will also occur at entry during the Graduate Professional Seminar. Professional disposition assessment occurred during the PBLE activities during the previous two semesters. Composite candidate strengths identified on the PBLE Rubric included professionalism, reflectiveness, ability to work with diverse peers, and communication. Improvement is necessary in product completion, teamwork and utilization of data for decision making (Exhibit 1.3.f).

1.2.b  Continuous Improvement
Since the NCATE Focused Visit in 2008, a number of data-based activities and changes have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality within the Professional Education Unit. Prior to that visit, the Unit had been in an extended period of transition plans and false starts. Leadership was inconsistent, attention misdirected, and a Unit-wide culture supporting assessment and accountability suffered as a result. Deficits existed in the assessment of candidate knowledge, skills and professional dispositions as well as general deficits in most areas of Advanced Programs. In response to these problems the following actions occurred:

1) On July 1, 2009, Bloomsburg University was reorganized to create the College of Education. This restructuring has allowed for a more targeted focus on the unique needs, resource demands and future directions of educator preparation programs at the Initial and Advanced levels. A functional committee structure was established for the purpose of fostering compliance with state/national accreditation demands and providing programmatic quality assurance. The committee structure and relevant charges are described in Policy 1.3 of the College of Education Policy Handbook (pp. 9-17).

2) New programs were developed and received Initial Program Approval addressing competencies outlined in PA Chapter 49.2 revisions. New programs included Early Childhood Education (PK-4), Special Education (PK-8) and Middle-level Education (4-8). Chapter 49-2 outlines specific competencies for beginning teachers in each program area and
grade band. Additionally, all teacher preparation programs documented the inclusion of specific competencies for field experiences and accommodations/adaptations for individuals with disabilities/English Language Learners.

3) An in-depth analysis of the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions of candidates occurred individually within individual program reports (SPAs). Five program reports were recognized nationally with conditions. Five programs reports are still in development and will be resubmitted during the summer of 2012 with several additional reports for Advanced Programs.

4) An extensive revision of the Unit’s Conceptual Framework occurred to define and operationalize Unit-wide expectations for candidate knowledge, skills and professional dispositions. This provided the foundation for the Unit’s assessment system.

5) An extensive revision of all assessment instruments and rubrics was undertaken to align with state, professional and institutional standards.

6) A detailed definition and set of professional dispositions were developed. New assessments of candidate dispositions evident across transition points were developed. A consistent Unit-wide Student Intervention Protocol was established and utilized for candidates whose performance necessitated intervention.

7) The Advanced Programs Committee was established and charged with the redesign of Advanced Programs within the Unit. Policies were developed, a Conceptual Framework extension designed, diversity experiences embedded, assessment system established and unique collaborative endeavors undertaken. Tremendous strides were made in the restructuring of the Advanced Programs. Resources were provided to establish Graduate Coordinator positions within each department. A Graduate Professional Seminar was developed for implementation commencing in the fall of 2012. We believe this program will be a model for establishing a graduate culture and framework for Advanced education preparation programs nationally.

8) Programs for Other School Professionals were expanded. The Educational Leadership program was revised to meet Pennsylvania guidelines and the Central Pennsylvania Leadership Academy was developed to serve practicing school administrators. A K-12 School Counseling program was established in partnership with a Higher Education Student Services program.

9) The Office of Teacher Education Admissions and the Office of Student Teaching Placement within the Professional Education Unit were established. The offices work in concert with faculty, Department Chairpersons and the Dean’s Office to support student matriculation and field experience eligibility.

Plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement in Unit Standard 1 will involve:

1) Extending current directions in assessing knowledge, skills and professional dispositions. On April 2, 2012, Pennsylvania will replace the basic content knowledge assessment (Praxis I) with the Pre-service Academic Performance Assessment Series (PAPA). Current methods of student/candidate support, including workshops, PLATO and course-embedded content will be redesigned. The Unit will monitor changes in candidate performance and data intently.

2) Individual programs that submitted NCATE Program reports will address conditions and recommendations prior to resubmission. It is critical that the assessments consistently measure the more “generic” knowledge, skills and dispositions of all the candidates in the Unit, as well as be adapted to address the specific requirements within each discipline.

3) Low performing programs in the area of content knowledge will develop a specific plan for program improvement with oversight from the College of Education and University Office of
Planning and Assessment. Those programs which cannot meet the 80% pass rate for exit examinations will be placed in moratorium or discontinued.

4) Initial and Advanced Program candidates will be instructed in the use of a broad range of new technologies to improve K-12 student achievement. This will occur through an expansion of access to current technology applications within the Department of Educational Studies/Secondary Education and Department of Exceptionality Programs. Technology supports across campus will assist in the provision of these services through technical assistance and training of faculty.

5) With the documented success of the Education Leadership Program and Leadership Academy, expansion and design of a Superintendents’ Letter of Eligibility program will occur. The program received recognition through their professional association for the first time this year.

6) Data indicates candidates are increasingly in need of improved competency in classroom management, as it relates to supporting PK-12 student achievement. In response to this challenge, Bloomsburg University has established the McDowell Institute for Teacher Excellence in Positive Behavior Support to add further value to its teacher preparatory programs and to enhance application of Positive Behavior Support in classrooms and school systems. The McDowell Institute will provide pre-service and practicing educators with strategies, methods and experiences to effectively support the academic, social and emotional growth of K-16 students. Instruction in positive behavior support will be incorporated into the teacher preparatory curriculum at Bloomsburg University beginning with freshman-year introductory courses and carrying through to student teaching. Advanced Programs will access training and resources to support school leadership efforts. The focal point of the McDowell Institute will be on the translation of research in to practice in positive behavior support.

7) The Advanced Programs assessment structure is still in a relatively early stage of development. We expect some revision to the various assessment instruments over time. A greater depth in the analysis of data will occur in congruence with eventual departmental actions. The current financial strains and reduced state funding to PASSHE schools as a result of the economic climate, further magnifies the need to use data to plan and guide Unit-wide decisions.

1.3 Exhibits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.a</td>
<td>State program review documents and state findings (Some of these documents may be available in AIMS.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.b</td>
<td>Title II reports submitted to the state for the previous three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.c</td>
<td>Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing candidate learning against standards and proficiencies identified in the Unit’s conceptual framework (Some of this information may be accessible for nationally recognized programs in AIMS. Cross reference as appropriate.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.d</td>
<td>Data and summaries of results 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.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.e</td>
<td>Key assessments and scoring guides used for assessing professional dispositions, including fairness and the belief that all students can learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.f</td>
<td>Data and summaries of results on key assessments of candidates’ professional dispositions (Data should be disaggregated by program, and for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.g</td>
<td>Examples of candidates’ assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.h</td>
<td>Samples of candidates’ work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels) from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.i</td>
<td>Follow-up studies of graduates and summaries of the results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.j</td>
<td>Employer feedback on graduates and summaries of the results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.k</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

**2.1.a Description of the Assessment System**

The Unit has converted from Waypoint Outcomes to a secure web-based system for the collection, maintenance and utilization of data germane to key assessments in the Initial and Advanced Programs. The Assessment System for Informed Practice (ASIP) is an in-house system developed and managed by the College of Education Dean’s Office. The system is linked to the COE website and accessed by faculty, staff, cooperating teachers and candidates for submission of data on key programmatic and Unit-wide assessments. Data is submitted, organized, stored and returned to programs and the Unit in a functional format to facilitate planning and decision making. PRAXIS exam scores are received from the Educational Testing Service and maintained by the College of Education Licensure Office. The COE Licensure Office makes this information available to Initial and Advanced Programs by sending scores to the program faculty for review, analysis and action planning. Additionally, the Unit collaborates with the University Office of Planning and Assessment for the management of select web-based and culminating assessments.

Within this Institutional Report, data is presented from the spring of 2011 (in Waypoint) and the fall of 2011 (in ASIP). Prior to the conversion to the new system, NCATE staff was consulted and recommended the Unit move forward with this action. The presentation of data from two systems in this report is less cohesive than desired, but will benefit the Unit’s desire for a functional and quality assessment system managed within the Unit.

Faculty members use Desire2Learn (BOLT) in their courses to post course information and to hold interactive discussions with the candidates. Faculty members use the ISIS System to obtain course enrollment information and to post course grades. Faculty members can view candidates’ transcripts, schedules, profiles, teacher education program status as well as other pertinent information. All candidates have the ability to monitor their academic progress through ISIS and are encouraged to use this access to actively participate in the advisement process. Using the newly designed degree audit tool, candidates can view the status of their matriculation from entry to completion of their degree program. Departments hold mandatory group and individual advisement sessions each semester and faculty advisors are available to meet with students during their assigned office hours (a minimum of five hours) each week. The Professional Education Unit has identified transition points that are common to all Initial and Advanced Programs. Faculty members have also identified key assessments that are embedded within all Initial and Advanced Programs. The targeted transition points, common key assessments, assessment levels, and Conceptual Framework crosswalk and data collection points are identified in table format in Exhibit 2.3.a. Data from all key assessments (except the PRAXIS scores/GPA) are collected each semester and are entered into ASIP by the individual designated to complete the assessment form. The COE Assessment Office provides data reports to each program germane to the key assessments to inform program decision making.

**2.1.b Data Collection, Analysis and Evaluation**

The Professional Education Unit has developed key assessments and identified consistent transition points to assess candidate performance in all Initial and Advanced Programs. The targeted transition points, common key assessments, assessment levels, and Conceptual Framework crosswalk and data collection points are identified in table format in Exhibit 2.3.a. Data from all key assessments (except the PRAXIS scores/GPA) are collected each semester and are entered into ASIP by the individual designated to complete the assessment form. The COE Assessment Office provides data reports to each program germane to the key assessments to inform program decision making.
points, key assessments, assessment levels, and Conceptual Framework crosswalk and data collection points are identified in tables in Exhibit 2.3.a. The assessment of candidate performance includes:

- The monitoring of student overall GPA and GPA within their identified major program of study (Initial and Advanced Programs).
- Completion of the Teacher Disposition Checklist (Self-assessment) at entry into the program. Candidates enrolled in Advanced Programs complete the Professional Disposition Checklist (Self-assessment) at entry. The same assessment is utilized by the University Supervisor to assess candidate professional dispositions during their capstone experience (Initial and Advanced Programs).
- Successful completion of PRAXIS I (PPSTs) exams at entry. PRAXIS II exam results are monitored to reflect candidate subject matter competency upon completion, but are not required to be passed prior to exit (Initial and Advanced Programs).
- Diversity assessments for field experience, workshop completion and Haberman Teacher Pre screener (Initial and Advanced Programs).
- An assessment of Lesson Planning occurs during pre-capstone methods coursework and during the Student Teaching experience (Initial Programs).
- An assessment of Unit Planning occurs during the Student Teaching experience. This includes a component that addresses each candidate’s impact on student learning (Initial Programs).
- An assessment of Student Teaching competency by the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor at mid-point and the end of each placement. Evaluators are asked to assess knowledge, skills and professional dispositions connected to the Unit’s Conceptual Framework (Initial Programs). The Internship, Student Teaching or Practicum Evaluation is completed by the University Supervisor for those candidates enrolled in Advanced Programs.
- An assessment of Student Teaching competency by the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor at the end of each placement using the PDE 430, a state-required licensure requirement (Initial Programs).
- An assessment of a research project is completed relevant to all candidates enrolled in Advanced Programs.

**Assessment of Program Quality**

The Professional Education Unit has developed key assessments and identified consistent transition points to assess program quality throughout the Unit. The transition points, key assessments, assessment levels, and Conceptual Framework crosswalk and data collection points are provided in Exhibit 2.3.a. The assessment of Initial Program quality includes:

- A candidate assessment at the beginning and end of their Student Teaching/Capstone experience on the Pre/Post Exit Student Teaching Survey (Initial Programs). An Advanced Programs Exit Survey is completed by those enrolled in Advanced Programs.
- A Cooperating Teacher assessment at the end of the semester in which they have served the University on the Cooperating Teacher Program/Placement Evaluation Survey. Cooperating Teachers are asked to assess University supports, training, supervisory interactions, resources, procedures, candidate requirements, and overall quality of the program (Initial Programs).
- An Alumni Follow-up Survey to acquire data on program quality by program completers. This survey has been mailed to alumni in the past. Due to historical low rates of return, the assessment office is piloting an on-line alumni survey with Facebook reminders. Response to this new technology has been strong (Initial and Advanced Programs).
- An Employer Survey to acquire data on program quality by those who employ our program completers. This survey has been mailed to employers in the past. Due to historical low rates of return, an on-line Employer Survey with Facebook reminders was piloted during the spring semester of 2012 (Initial and Advanced Programs).
• A Career Development Center Follow-up Survey to acquire data on program quality and job placement (Initial and Advanced Programs).

Assessment of Unit Operations
The Professional Education Unit has developed key assessments and identified consistent transition points to assess Unit operations. The transition points, key assessments, assessment levels, and Conceptual Framework crosswalk and data collection points are identified in Exhibit 2.3.a. The assessment of Unit operations includes:

• Completion of the Pre/Post Exit Student Teaching Survey by students in Initial Programs at the end of their Student Teaching/Capstone experience.
• Completion of the Cooperating Teacher Program/Placement Evaluation Survey by the Cooperating Teacher at the end of the semester in which they have served the University. Cooperating Teachers are asked to assess University supports, training, supervisory interactions, resources, procedures, candidate requirements and overall quality of the Unit.
• Each tenure-track and adjunct faculty member at Bloomsburg University is evaluated by students/candidates enrolled in each course each semester. The evaluations are processed by the Office of Institutional Research and included in the yearly performance review of faculty.
• The Dean of the COE has the responsibility to effectively manage, coordinate, and oversee the governance, planning, budget, personnel and facilities of the Unit. The Dean’s performance is evaluated yearly by the University President.

2.1.c Use of Data for Program Improvement
Each year, departmental and Unit-wide faculty meetings occur for the purpose of the review, analysis and action planning concerning data and related assessment issues within the COE. Faculty members meet by department and program area leading up to this larger COE meeting to analyze relevant data from the key assessments collected during the previous academic year. A Program Assessment Report is submitted after review relevant to each key assessment by each department. The two primary components of the Program Assessment Report are an analysis of the data and a description of how the assessment results will be used for continuous program improvement. In previous years, department analysis of assessment data was documented within department minutes with varying degrees of consistency across departments. In the spring of 2012, a new process for review was established for departments to systematically utilize the “Program Assessment Report” format during a yearly program retreat. The Unit reviews the program reports which serve to facilitate discussion at the larger COE faculty meeting (Exhibit 2.3.h). Assessment of Professional Education Unit operations are consistently undertaken by the Unit in relation to its governance, planning, budget, personnel, facilities, services and policies/procedures, and resources that support the Unit’s mission. This occurs across many venues including the COE faculty retreat, monthly COE Chairperson Council, and University Deans’ and Directors’ Council (Exhibit 2.3.h).

2.2.b Continuous Improvement
At the time of the 2008 NCATE Accreditation Focused Visit, Standard 2 - Assessment System and Unit Evaluation was cited as an area for improvement (API) for the Professional Education Unit. Initial and Advanced Programs provided no evidence of systematic data collection, analysis and synthesis to inform programmatic changes and improvement. Additionally, no evidence was provided regarding an internal mechanism for identifying how candidates achieve PDE standards for performance. This report provided the impetus for the design of a thorough and coherent assessment system within all Initial and Advanced Programs in the Professional Education Unit. In the spring of 2009, a committee comprised of faculty from the Professional Education Unit was charged with the task of revising the Conceptual Framework (CF). When completed, the Unit’s Assessment Committee was restructured with the goal of revising the Unit’s structure for systematic data collection, synthesis and analysis. Initial actions involved a thorough “self-assessment” of our own assessment system. Existing individual programmatic assessments and
common Unit assessments were reviewed and documented as a result of this self-assessment. Numerous inconsistencies in the Unit’s structure or application of the assessment instruments were apparent. The ultimate outcome of the self-assessment was a shift from the goal of revising the assessment system to what could be best described as fundamentally developing a new assessment system.

The Assessment Committee set about developing common transition points and assessments that would address the revised Conceptual Framework (CF), NCATE standards and PDE competencies. Due to the emphasis on professional dispositions established in the CF, the committee began with the development of assessments to measure candidate professional dispositions. A Teacher Disposition Checklist was developed and piloted for use as a self-assessment during a student’s first year of study and for application during a candidate’s capstone experience. The Haberman-Star Teacher Prescreener was selected for use to screen for candidate attitudes toward teaching diverse and low-income student populations. Lesson planning and Unit planning requirements, assessments and rubrics were developed for universal adoption and use by all Initial Programs throughout the Unit. In addition to this, common assessments for evaluating student teachers were developed. The Student Teaching Evaluation Form was designed to link student teacher performance to the CF. Since its initial development, additional adaptations to its structure, rubric and submission have occurred to improve the quality of data gathered and analyzed. The Assessment Committee committed a great deal of attention to the design of the Pre-Post Student Teaching Evaluation Survey and formative/summative assessment of the candidate’s beliefs regarding the quality of preparation they have received. Equal attention was directed to the development of a Cooperating Teacher Student Teaching Evaluation. These assessments would provide valuable data on the quality of programs within the Professional Education Unit from our stakeholders. Finally, Alumni and Employer Surveys were designed to gather follow-up data on candidate performance. Alternative means for improving survey return rates have been developed through web-based structures and social media. The yearly analysis of assessment data at the department and program level has typically involved a review of the assessment data at department meetings and the Unit-wide COE Faculty meeting. Recommendations have been outlined in meeting minutes for external review. A new reporting form was employed to explicitly connect analysis to actions and outcomes. Departments are required to establish goals and timelines for acting on data they see as relevant to improving candidate/program performance.

In an effort that mirrored that of the Assessment Committee, the Unit’s Advanced Programs Committee (APC) was charged with restructuring the design of a thorough and coherent assessment system within all Advanced Programs in the Professional Education Unit. The Advanced Programs Committee will also function as a collaborative work-group for the design of policy, programs and accreditation structures. The outcomes of the APC during the past two years are grounded in the assessment of candidate and program outcomes and include:

1) The development and implementation of specific Advanced Programs Transition Points and Assessment System.
2) The creation of the Advanced Programs extension of the Unit’s Conceptual Framework.
3) The design, implementation and data-based analysis of the Advanced Programs Problem-Based Learning Experience.
4) The creation and pilot implementation of a common assessment for Advanced Programs internships, practicum and student teaching completed by Site and University Supervisors.
5) The creation of an Advanced Programs interdisciplinary conference and experience in diversity in collaboration with the Jones Summer Institute for Teacher Excellence.
6) The design of College of Education Policy 3.1 - Admission, Retention and Exit Procedures for Advanced Programs in the Professional Education Unit. This may be viewed in the College of Education Policy Handbook (pp. 41-45).
7) The development of a Graduate Coordinator position description to support high enrolled Advanced Programs in the Professional Education Unit.
8) The design of the Graduate Professional Seminar (GPS) for all incoming students in Advanced Programs (implementation August 2012). The GPS will prepare the next generation of educators and school leaders in developing an understanding of core programmatic requirements, scholarly demands and competency expectations (collaborative abilities, critical-thinking skills, rigor/relevance integration, etc.). This seminar is designed to build a foundation for the candidate's graduate experience and future professional career. GPS is a non-credit “pathway” course to be completed by all candidates at entrance to graduate programs in the Unit.

9) The review and analysis of data for designing long-term action plans.

10) The design of programs and assessments for the provision of experiences with diverse faculty, peers and PK-12 students.

Plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement in Unit Standard II will involve:

1) Expand the design of strategies to ensure fairness, accuracy, consistency and elimination of bias throughout its assessment system.

2) Revisit the content of all rubrics and assessment instruments to ensure alignment with standards and PDE competencies. Expand candidate awareness of the proficiencies upon which they will be assessed, faculty expectations and how this information will be reported.

3) Work with Student Teaching Supervisors (tenure track and adjunct) to ensure assessment results are reliable measures of candidate performance and reflective of the desired competency of the Unit and each program.

4) Initiate a process to tailor Unit-wide assessments to meet the specific requirements of each professional association.

5) Develop a reserve of candidate work samples that represent varying degrees of competency. This public depository will serve as a reference point for candidates and faculty wishing to view model products that reflect the expectations at each level of performance.

6) Expand stakeholder knowledge and awareness of assessment procedures and benefits to their ongoing support and participation in submission/analysis.

7) Continue to expand and refine the Unit’s Assessment Handbook as a functional resource to candidates, faculty and partners in teacher preparation.

8) Develop an infrastructure to support candidates and faculty with the shift from the Praxis Series to the PECT Series recently adopted in Pennsylvania and used for our measure of content knowledge.

9) To enhance the performance of the data management process within the Professional Education Unit, we will begin the process of integrating the ASIP website within the faculty information or BOLT System. This will allow for greater ease of use, access and technical support within an existing system at Bloomsburg University. We will work with the Office of Technology and Support on campus to structure the linkage.

10) Continue to fine-tune assessment instruments and analysis across the Advanced Programs. Integrate common assessments into Graduate Professional Seminar during the fall of 2012. This will serve as the common entry touch point for several disposition assessments and diversity experiences.

### 2.3 Exhibits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3.a</th>
<th>Description of the Unit’s assessment system in detail including the requirements and key assessments used at transition points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.b</td>
<td>Admission criteria and data from key assessments used for entry to programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.c</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.d</td>
<td>Policies, procedures and practices for ensuring that data are regularly collected, compiled, and used for continuous improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 3: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

3.1.a Collaboration between Unit and School Partners
A central component of all Initial and Advanced Programs at Bloomsburg University is the provision of quality field experiences. Positive and collaborative relationships with school partners are the cornerstone of effective experiences that develop the necessary knowledge, skills and dispositions in all teacher candidates. These experiences are meant to broaden a candidate’s understanding of effective classroom instruction and establish a mechanism for the transfer of theory and translation of research into practice. These experiences directly support and connect to University coursework. Bloomsburg University candidates are placed in schools and education-related settings where they obtain relevant field experiences under the supervision of model educators and experienced University faculty. They interact with a diverse PK-12 student population as they develop the knowledge, skills and professional dispositions to become effective teachers and education professionals. In addition to our targeted work with teacher candidates and other school personnel, Bloomsburg University remains committed to supporting its public school partners and the achievement of all students in PK-12 schools. Bloomsburg University teacher candidates and other school personnel working in field and clinical settings often serve as an important resource to schools across the region. In order to evaluate the field experience component of our program, the Unit has developed a system for ongoing assessment. The data collected from the assessment system is used by each department in the Unit to refine and improve its field and clinical placements and subsequent experiences. The Unit is committed to ongoing assessment as a process for developing new field sites and enhancing existing field-based experiences for teacher candidates.

3.1.b Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practices
The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) has identified a specific structure for completion of all field experience requirements in Chapter 49.2 of the Pennsylvania School Code (Title 22). All teacher certification programs must include four stages of sequenced field work. Each stage possesses specific competencies that were outlined in March 2012. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania requires verification that each candidate has met the Chapter 49.2 field experience requirements before it will grant teacher certification or program approval. All professional educator programs in Pennsylvania must include the components of field experiences and student teaching into program design. As regulated by Chapter 354 of the Pennsylvania Code (Title 22), planned and sequential field experiences may begin as early as the initial semester of college enrollment prior to the required minimum 12 week full-time student teaching experience (§354.25(d)&(f)). These field experiences are to benefit the preparation of candidates by providing opportunities to apply principles that are grounded in theory and reflective of research from the program to actual practice in the classroom as well as to provide practice with diverse populations, ages and school settings (§354.25(d)(1-2). The Unit’s Field Experience Committee has met to analyze the current status of field experiences across programs and establish consistent structures and expectations within the Unit. Advanced Programs meet the specific requirements identified within their
licensure guidelines for clinical experience. The structure and depth of their field experiences are determined by individual disciplines.

Professional education programs within the Unit provide evidence of the candidate’s participation in developmental field experiences and student teaching under the supervision of college personnel and cooperating teachers who are well trained, highly qualified and who demonstrate competence in teaching and mentoring in the field of education. Each program provides evidence, through Unit-wide and unique program assessment processes, that the criteria and competencies required for exit from the certification program is assessed through coursework, field experiences and student teaching. Each candidate demonstrates their knowledge and competence in fostering student learning and child well-being in addition to incorporating a self-reflective emphasis. There are four stages of field experience and student teaching in Initial Programs. Each stage requires the candidate to assume more responsibility within the educational setting gradually. The experiences should take place in collaborative settings to give candidates exposure to the values, culture and working styles of diverse learning environments. This includes learning about the socio-emotional and academic traits of all students and gaining experience with the collaborative approaches to teaching through direct observation and participation in teaching and co-teaching models.

Each candidate must participate in field experiences prior to student teaching that provide for the demonstration of competencies identified in Chapter 49.2. These requirements vary depending upon the certification requirements within each teacher certification program. Four stages of field experience are required for all certificate areas. A description of each stage is included within the Field Experience Overview in Exhibit 3.3.e. Field experiences for candidates enrolled in Advance Programs are embedded within each program as a capstone experience.

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

Within the Professional Education Unit, the emphasis on sequential field experiences is evidenced within the Conceptual Framework, Strategic Plan and program design documentation. Early field experiences allow students to explore teaching careers and diverse educational environments prior to candidacy. As candidates proceed through the professional education program, they experience increasingly more sophisticated instructional tasks including supporting individual students and small groups of students, tutoring students, assessing student progress, co-teaching, large group instruction and other classroom/school functions. All candidates are expected to complete the field requirements identified by the Unit and their chosen program of study commencing in the freshman year and extending throughout the teacher education program. In February 2012, the Pennsylvania Department of Education established field competencies for integration into all teacher preparation programs. These competencies are currently being integrated into field experiences by individual departments within the Unit to ensure compliance. At present time, field experiences are sequenced throughout the programs. Early field requirements are fairly consistent across programs. Pre-capstone field experiences occur in stand-alone practicum, integrated into courses or blocked. Candidates are able to observe and participate in the instructional practices within the classroom. Lesson plans, Unit plans and Student Teaching Evaluations measure candidates’ development and demonstration of knowledge, skills and professional dispositions to help all students learn. Program level assessments and available data may be viewed on AIMS. Additionally, supervisors complete the state required PDE 430 (http://www.bloomu.edu/documents/coe/PDE430Evaluation.pdf) at the end of each placement. Candidates at the student teaching level are expected to demonstrate competency on all institutional and professional standards before completing the education program and being recommended for licensure.
All Initial and Advanced Programs have a responsibility to establish, model and encourage the development of positive standards of professional conduct. All programs within the Unit also maintain screening and assessment procedures to assure that teacher candidates with dispositions at odds with professional standards are either not permitted to enter or not allowed to continue in teacher education programs. A COE Intervention Protocol is in place to assure that the process is consistent. In the instance a candidate is found to be acting in a way that endangers children, is in violation of school or University policies, is in violation of the law, or shows disrespect and insubordination towards local school or University personnel, s/he may be removed from field experiences at the discretion of the University. Conditions and a process for denial of access or the removal of a candidate from a teacher education program have been established in http://www.bloomu.edu/policies_procedures/3810. Appeal processes are also outlined in the College of Education Policy Handbook in COE Policy 1.15 (pp. 26-29).

3.2.b Continuous Improvement
Activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality include:

1) The Professional Education Unit has established a field experience model that engages candidates in curricular experiences reflective of today’s schools by transitioning candidates from introductory pedagogical experiences in Initial field experiences to a broad and demanding experience during their Student Teaching capstone experience.

2) Enhanced assessment practices by supervising faculty during student teaching in conjunction with the Cooperating Teacher evaluations of our candidates indicate candidates possess the knowledge, skills and dispositions to be effective beginning teachers.

3) The Field Experience Committee within the Unit has updated the policies and procedures for field experiences. The policy forms the procedural foundation for program requirements throughout the Unit.

4) Since the time of the 2008 NCATE visit, the Unit has developed processes to ensure all candidates complete an approved diversity experience prior to student teaching. Candidates are required to complete 30 hours in field placements with diverse student populations prior to student teaching. An assessment of the impact of the field work on candidates is included in a narrative reflection they complete.

5) Changes to the assessment system have clarified expectations for candidate performance to field supervisors in Initial and Advanced Programs. At the time of the last visit, no coherent system existed for assessing candidate and programmatic performance. All University Supervisors have been provided with training, resources and the ability to provide input on assessment practices during fieldwork.

6) The Clearance Infractions Process has provided for an improved structure of communication with partner schools and all candidates in relation to clearance assurance and eligibility to participate in field experiences. This system documents candidate infractions and the process by which they are counseled on the potential impact of their infraction on field experiences. The policy may be viewed in COE Policy 2.5 of the College of Education Policy Handbook (pp. 38-40).

7) The Student Teaching Handbook was redesigned to include connections to the Conceptual Framework and Unit expectations. The assessment structure of this document was provided to candidates for greater clarity of expectations.

8) The Advanced Programs Committee worked diligently to identify consistent field requirements and assessments across programs. COE Policy 3.1 of the College of Education Policy Handbook (pp. 41-45) describes the requirements for eligibility for fieldwork at each transition point. Assessments were developed for candidate performance and programmatic effectiveness.

9) Faculty members within the Unit have been provided with reassigned time for the purpose of coordinating student teaching placement and support. This has provided a point of contact for the Unit, candidates and school partners.
Plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in Unit Standard 3 include:

1) The Unit will continue to explore enhanced methods of assuring the validity and reliability of assessment practices by supervising faculty and cooperating teachers. This will begin during the summer of 2012 in a collaborative effort of the Assessment Committee and Field Experience Committee.

2) In 2012-13, the Field Experience Committee within the Unit will enhance consistent practices and expectations early field and pre-capstone field requirements. Curricular shifts at the state, PASSHE and university levels will be integrated into the design of field experiences for candidates in Initial and Advanced Programs.

3) The Field Experience Committee is revisiting the structure of the diversity experience and related assessment processes. Guidelines for completing an approved diversity experience and related assessments are in place. An assessment of the impact of the field work on candidates is included in a narrative reflection they complete. Restructuring the experience and assessment for functionality will occur during the 2012-13 academic year.

4) In March 2012, the PDE established competencies that must be addressed during each stage of field experience. The competencies replaced field experience hourly requirements. The Field Experience Committee is considering processes for the alignment of current field experiences with the new field competencies and grade bands identified in Chapter 49.2. An updated alignment of field requirements with the Conceptual Framework is also necessary.

5) The Field Experience Committee is in the process of developing an Early Field Experience (EFE) Handbook that is aligned with the Student Teaching Handbook. The new EFE is targeted for implementation in 2012-13.

6) The Unit is seeking approval for a full-time Director of Field Experiences to coordinate all aspects of Field Experiences in Initial Programs. Coordination of field experiences for Advanced Programs candidates will be the responsibility of Graduate Coordinators.

### Exhibits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3.a</th>
<th>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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.b</td>
<td>Policies, practices, and data on candidate placement in field experiences and clinical practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.c</td>
<td>Criteria for the selection of clinical faculty, which includes both higher education and P-12 school faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.d</td>
<td>Examples of support and evaluation of clinical faculty across programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.e</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.f</td>
<td>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.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.g</td>
<td>Performance 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.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 4: Diversity

The Unit prepares candidates to work effectively with all students by integrating this core concept into all aspects of our teacher preparation programs at the Initial and Advanced levels. NCATE requirements are met via the provision of curriculum and experiences, opportunities to interact with diverse faculty, opportunities to interact with diverse peers, and opportunities to participate in field/clinical experiences with diverse student populations. This begins by establishing this imperative within our Conceptual Framework, mission, curriculum, system of assessment and field experience structure. The specific proficiencies related to educating diverse student populations are clearly presented to candidates, assessed and acted upon for quality assurance. The expectations are present so all candidates may apply their knowledge, skills and dispositions to create inclusive environments conducive to optimal learning.

Assessment procedures related to diversity are used to screen and establish an awareness of dispositions/beliefs of students prior to admission to candidacy. Curricular experiences, diversity workshops and field work on diverse settings are used prior to capstone experiences to develop and assess candidate perspectives. During student teaching, candidates are measured on their ability to demonstrate competency and professional dispositions related to teaching diverse student populations. Upon exit, candidates are asked about the quality of their programmatic experiences related to teaching diverse students. University faculty, cooperating teachers and field experience mentors monitor candidates through direct observations along with direct measures during field experiences and student teaching. There are multiple assessments that provide feedback to candidates during student teaching: The Student Teacher Evaluation Form (Supervisor and Cooperating Teachers submit this), the PDE 430, and the Teacher Disposition Checklist address competencies related to the candidates’ ability to effectively educate diverse student groups.

In Initial and Advanced Programs, candidates are assessed at the entry point of their program. All candidates complete the Haberman Star Teacher Prescreener to establish their awareness of necessary competencies for educating all students and to provide the Unit with a method for early identification of candidates who may not possess the necessary dispositions. The Teacher Disposition Checklist (Initial candidates) or the Professional Disposition Checklist (Advanced candidates) is also completed as an early screen related to diversity and disposition expectations. Candidates are provided with stand-alone and integrated course content to address critical concepts, research and strategies for educating diverse student groups. Initial Program candidates are required to participate in the COE Professional Development Workshop on Diversity in concert with their enrollment in the Multicultural Education course. Prior to student teaching, Initial Program candidates are required to complete a diversity field experience and reflection. Other opportunities are available for candidates to access experiences through unique practicums in urban settings (Hazelton, Easton and Harrisburg) and inclusive (Danville, Central Columbia and the BU Migrant Education Project).

Within Advanced Programs that provide certification, candidates have core requirements which include the options to take Studies in Diversity or Multicultural Education. Also, depending on the major, Introduction to Exceptional Individuals or Valuing Diversity in Business is required. Advanced Programs provide stand-alone and integrated graduate course content on serving diverse student populations. Attitudes toward diverse populations are assessed through use of the Haberman Star Teacher Prescreener and Professional Disposition Checklist, as well as performance during capstone experiences. Diversity Field Experience and Unique Program Experiences such as the Jones Summer Institute Diversity Speaker Strand and Problem-Based Learning Experience (PBLE) are provided. Data is collected and analyzed to measure the impact of each of these experiences. All candidates enrolled in Advanced Programs are required to participate in BU Diversity Initiatives during their time of enrollment at the University.
4.1a The Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences
Candidates enrolled in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs are provided with clear expectations and proficiencies related to diversity within the Unit’s Conceptual Framework. Curriculum and field experiences are provided throughout a candidate’s progression through each transition point. The Pennsylvania Department of Education has established specific guidelines related to educating diverse student populations in public school settings. Pennsylvania’s teacher preparation programs must include the competencies and skills to equip teachers to accommodate and adapt instruction for students with disabilities in an inclusive setting and to assist English Language Learners (ELLs). All educator preparation programs provide at least nine credits/270 hours regarding accommodations and adaptations for students with disabilities in an inclusive setting (instruction in literacy skills development and cognitive skill development for students with disabilities must be included) and at least three credits/90 hours addressing the instructional needs of ELLs. Candidates are required to complete the course Introduction to Exceptional Individuals (SPECED 101), Linking Assessment and Instruction for Individuals with Disabilities (SPECED 275), Methods of Instruction for Individuals with Disabilities (SPECED 358) and ESL Strategies/Methods (79.494). All candidates also complete the course Multicultural Education (60.406/506).

In Initial Programs, required coursework and field experiences equip teacher candidates with proficiencies that develop an awareness of the importance of diversity in teaching and learning and the knowledge, skills and dispositions to adapt instruction and/or services to diverse populations. All candidates seeking initial certification are required in PRP 3612 to complete the Cultural Diversity Requirement of the general education program (http://www.bloomu.edu/policies_procedures/3612). Candidates must complete six credits (two courses from different departments) from an approved list of diversity focused courses. Diversity courses focus on topics related to gender, race, ethnicity, religion, language and/or global perspectives that provide an in-depth knowledge and understanding of cultural diversity. The newly designed general education format at the University will require all students to earn approved general education points in two goal areas that emphasize the application of knowledge to analyze diversity, cultures, human experiences and basic communication.

4.1b Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty
Several specific initiatives within the College of Education and Professional Education Unit have evolved that demonstrate the commitment of the Unit to expanding candidate contact with diverse faculty. The University employs recruitment teams to participate in diversity conferences, i.e., Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Conference and National Black Graduate Conference. All faculty searches are overseen by a College Dean who participates in search briefing meetings to emphasize a commitment to diversity as an important criterion for selection. A text entitled, “Diversifying the Faculty” is provided to all committee members at the search briefing meeting. The University continues to create opportunities for historically underrepresented individuals to apply for the Frederick Douglass Teaching Scholars Program at the University. The Unit uses various strategies to aggressively recruit a diverse faculty. The Office of Social Equity conducts orientation meetings each semester to review the University search and screen guidelines. At these meetings, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs discuss ways that search committees can attract diverse pools of applicants.

4.1c Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates
Paralleling faculty recruitment initiatives, the University and the Unit maintain a focused approach to the recruitment and retention of diverse candidates. As with the entire region of Central Pennsylvania, ethnic and racial diversity at this University is currently developing. The Unit is an active participant in a number of programs designed to increase engagement of diverse candidates within our Departments, College, and University. To assist in recruitment of diverse students, our faculty works with the Office of Admissions to ensure the recruitment of diverse teacher candidates. Recruitment and retention initiatives
include regularly scheduled visits to high schools in urban areas with a high density population of minority students, specially designed recruitment materials and targeted student advisement. Recruitment occurs in Philadelphia, Allentown, Harrisburg and New Jersey to recruit diverse students. This effort is supported by Act 101, a state-wide initiative to fund under-represented students. Additionally, the Coordinator of Minority Recruitment has increased the guidance counselor relations for referrals of minority students to Bloomsburg University. Our ability to attract and retain diverse students to our University will continue to be a major priority of the Unit.

4.1.d Experience Working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools
Central Pennsylvania possesses varying and increasing degrees of diversity within the professional work force in schools. Diversity exists not only in the form of disability and ethnicity, but also in the form of socio-economic status and geographical area, religion and sexual orientation. Candidates have numerous opportunities within their program to interact with a variety of people from school systems – both public and private. During field experiences, practicum and student teaching candidates meet and work with teachers who reflect these varying degrees of diversity in the local school districts. Faculty members possess teaching and leadership experiences in urban and/or rural situations, including areas outside of the U.S. Many were school administrators or classroom teachers who served students with disabilities. Several faculty members have studied abroad in locations such as Europe, China, Italy and Russia. While many of the faculty members have attended some type of diversity training at Bloomsburg University, others have also attended workshops at other campuses as well. Topics of these workshops have included working with disadvantaged students, multicultural literature, cultural competence and diversity and sensitivity training. Faculty members, especially those with K-12 experiences, have worked in diverse school settings with both racially diverse and students whose families are from low socioeconomic backgrounds.

In addition to diversity field experience requirements, the Unit has instituted an additional requirement relative to diversity. Specifically, all candidates pursuing teaching certification must participate in the COE Professional Development Workshop on Diversity prior to the student teaching placement. Participation in this COE Professional Development Workshop on Diversity will be embedded as a required component of the course entitled Multi-Cultural Education. BU students are awarded a certificate of attendance after completion of this requirement. As such, and to provide documentation of completion of this additional requirement for advisement purposes, the BU student is responsible to submit a copy of their certificate of participation to their advisor (Exhibit 4.3.b).

4.2.b Continuous Improvement
Since the focused visit in 2008, the Unit has taken several steps to address deficiencies in this area. This had significant impact on the Unit’s assessment practices, instructional content and field experiences within Initial and Advanced Programs. Efforts continue to demonstrate a commitment to the enhancement of diversity within the faculty ranks. Participation in the Frederick Douglass Scholars program occurs. Attendance and representation at minority recruitment fairs occur yearly. The Unit continues to emphasize the continued professional development of faculty to address this standard. The Teaching and Learning Enhancement Center (TALE) recently sponsored a seminar designed to enhance faculty understanding and engagement with diversity, entitled, “Four Strategies to Engage the Multicultural Classroom.” The seminar serves to guide faculty through a framework for creating and sustaining an inclusive classroom, including appropriate techniques for discussion in a multicultural classroom and teaching strategies to promote diversity.

At the request of University Trustees and the President, the Unit Head was recently asked to collaborate with the Office of Social Equity on a presentation related to diversity initiatives in the Professional Education Unit. Several programs were highlighted and benefits cited, including developing knowledge, skills and dispositions for increasingly diverse classrooms, helping all students achieve, collaborating
within a diverse workforce, establishing a framework for fairness and equity, and expanding our understanding of the influence of culture on education. The Office of Social Equity highlighted the partnership with the College of Education by describing several “Inclusion Initiatives” including the adoption of a five-year University Diversity and Inclusion Plan which cites a goal of improved recruitment and retention for a diverse administration, faculty and staff.

Curriculum revision also occurred. As indicated above, the Unit has redesigned our Early Childhood Education Program (PK-4), Middle Level Education Content Program (4-8), Special Education/Early Childhood Education Dual Certification Program (PK-8/PK-4), Secondary Education programs and several Post-bacc Programs. All included coursework on teaching students with disabilities and ELLs (Exhibit 4.3.b). In addition to this, the state required by 2011, all Advanced Candidates receive six credits in standards Aligned Instruction or Inclusive Classrooms. The Unit identified courses to ensure that this requirement was addressed effectively.

The University has initiated the Diversity and Inclusion Five-Year Strategic Plan in order to create an inclusive community that prepares all who come to the University to recognize and draw on the challenges and richness of diversity. This plan guides all Units on campus and all aspects of campus life, including recruitment, teaching, scholarship, learning in and out of the classroom, and with external constituencies. Bloomsburg University shares PASSHE’s commitment to diversity and is committed to principles of excellence. In order to achieve these goals, the University must interweave diversity into all areas of the institution: the recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, students and administration, a curriculum that reflects the dynamic, diversity of our world, a supportive, and an inclusive environment that promotes the growth of all of its constituencies. This University-wide effort is fostered by developing programs to facilitate the professional advancement of individuals from historically underrepresented groups, increasing the diversity of applicants for all faculty positions, and increasing multicultural programming and support services. The diversity plan may be viewed at http://www.bloomu.edu/documents/soc_equity/DiversityInclusion.pdf.

Plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in Unit Standard 4.

1) Issues related to diversity continue to be a focused priority within the Unit and individual programs. The Unit’s diversity plan, which will be updated to address new strategic initiatives in the University’s Impact 2015 Plan, will continue to be utilized as a guide to meeting identified goals.

2) The Unit will continue to expand upon formal relationships with institutions with large numbers of underrepresented doctoral candidates. The University has developed partnerships in the past with Fisk University and Gallaudet University.

3) Continue to work with the Frederick Douglass Scholars Program and the Office of Social Equity to identify and recruit qualified candidates from underrepresented groups. The University has actively participated in several initiatives to recruit from underrepresented populations by sending campus teams to annual Historically Underrepresented Individual (HUI) meetings and graduate schools to advertise position openings at Bloomsburg University and recruit HUI faculty and staff members.

4) Expand the use of the Compact for Faculty Diversity On-line Scholar Directory and other sources for the recruitment of diverse faculty. The Director of Social Equity provides information on access and use of this electronic directory.

5) Participate in programs that focus on diversity, conflict resolution and search and screen guidelines that are provided by Director of Social Equity. Two new workshops are being planned with direct leadership from within the Unit. One program will provide training to faculty across
campus on appropriate accommodations for University students with disabilities. Another will provide training which will emphasize the use of ASL interpreters in the University classroom.

6) Access resources and support the efforts of University services for the retention/graduation of historically underrepresented students. Continue the Unit’s intensive advisement partnership with the Office of Accommodative Services.

7) Actively promote and participate in the BU Campus Climate Study. The ideals and information derived from this survey will enable the Unit to stay current on the perceptions and needs of diverse students, faculty and staff on campus.

8) Collaborate with the Office of Admissions to support the recruitment of quality students from underrepresented groups.

9) Maintain and expand upon the existing urban field experiences. There are several diverse field experiences developed within the Unit. Some of these sites currently exist in Bethlehem, Harrisburg, Hazelton and Williamsport.

10) Maintain and expand upon the existing international and overseas practicum experiences. There are several diverse field experiences developed within the Unit. A site currently exists in Bueu, Africa. Planning has begun for expansion to Italy for an early childhood practicum.

11) Participate in campus diversity initiatives, as articulated in the Bloomsburg University Diversity and Inclusion Five-Year Strategic Plan.

4.3 Exhibits

| 4.3.a | Proficiencies related to diversity that candidates are expected to demonstrate through working with students from diverse groups in classrooms and schools |
| 4.3.b | Curriculum components and experiences that address diversity proficiencies (This might be a matrix that shows diversity components in required courses.) |
| 4.3.c | Assessment instruments, scoring guides, and data related to candidates meeting diversity proficiencies, including impact on student learning (These assessments may be included in program review documents or the exhibits for Standard 1. Cross reference as appropriate.) |
| 4.3.d | Data table on faculty demographics (see Appendix A for an example) |
| 4.3.e | Data table on candidates demographics (see Appendix B for an example) |
| 4.3.f | Data table on demographics of P-12 students in schools used for clinical practice (see Appendix C for an example) |
| 4.3.g | Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty |
| 4.3.h | Policies and practices, including good faith efforts, for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates |
| 4.3.i | Policies, procedures, and practices that support candidates working with P-12 students from diverse groups |

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

5.1.a Qualified Faculty

Professional education faculty within Initial and Advanced Programs in the Unit have earned doctorates or exceptional expertise that qualifies them for their assignments. They possess current professional experiences in school settings at the grade band and content area in which they supervise. All faculty are meaningfully engaged in related research and scholarly work within their discipline. Faculty members either hold certification from the Pennsylvania Department of Education and/or their professional organizations in their discipline. There are currently 41 full-time tenure-track faculty members within the Unit, of which 41 possess their doctoral degrees. The faculty data table (Appendix D) provides evidence
that most tenured and tenure-track faculty have a terminal degree. All faculty are certified in the professional area that they teach. Faculty vitae outlining each faculty member’s qualifications can be found in AIMS.

Faculty are engaged in current professional experiences in school settings through their involvement in the Professional Development Schools, supervision of practicum, student teaching and course-embedded field experiences. Many faculty serve as consultants in schools and professional organizations providing training for in-service educators. These experiences are detailed in the Exhibit 5.3.a. Adjunct faculty members possess a minimum of a master’s degree in their fields. These faculty members without terminal degrees have in-depth practical experience in their discipline. All graduate faculty must have an earned doctorate and an appropriate degree of scholarly work to achieve Graduate Faculty Status (http://www.bloomu.edu/policies_procedures/3870).

The Unit must follow criteria determined by the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) to select school-based Cooperating Teachers for student teaching supervision (Student Teaching Handbook, p. 24). Cooperating Teachers in Pennsylvania must also maintain their certifications by earning continuing education credits every five years through the ACT 48 legislation (http://www.pde.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/act48_continuing_professional_education/8622).

**Standard 5.1.b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching**

Faculty members in Initial and Advanced Programs have a thorough understanding of the content they teach. Teaching by professional education faculty reflects the Unit’s Conceptual Framework and meets the requirements for faculty qualification in PDE Chapter 49.2 Guidelines. Faculty members value their continuing professional development as life-long learners and model this for candidates. Professors exhibit documented academic achievement and encourage candidates to develop ability to reflect, think critically, problem solve and act professionally. Faculty in the Professional Education Unit model effective instruction practices by:

1) Reflecting on varied performance feedback, including student evaluations, peer and chairperson observation, Pre/Post Student Teaching Surveys, Cooperating Teacher Program Placement Surveys, Alumni Surveys and Employer Surveys. These instruments provide faculty with data to assess their effectiveness and the effectiveness of their program on candidates’ learning.

2) Communicating clear expectations and connections to the Unit’s Conceptual Framework in each course outline developed by faculty. Measurable goals, instructional methods and the process to assess candidate performance are included as well. A bibliography is attached to each syllabus reflecting the use of current research and resources.

3) Valuing the application of quality research and data-based decision making. Faculty emphasize the importance of integrating research and practice.

4) Emphasizing the tenets of the Conceptual Framework and the development of professional dispositions via course expectations and ongoing class and programmatic performance.

5) Incorporating content into instruction related to educating all students effectively. Educating diverse student populations is imbedded throughout the curriculum.

6) Integrating current technology applications during instruction. Faculty commonly use the Instructional Media Presentation Systems (IMPS) Station located in each classroom, software, web resources, blogs, wikis, clickers and iPads.

**5.1.c Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship**

Faculty members within the Professional Education Unit demonstrate extensive scholarly work in their fields of specialization. Faculty members in tenure-track positions conduct research that covers a wide range of topics and areas of interest. Faculty vitae include a complete list of faculty scholarly activities, such as publications, books, presentations, grants, in-service training, consultations and special projects.
Faculty members are particularly active in the presentation of their works at international, national, regional, and state conferences. Several faculty hold leadership positions within their professional associations. Since the 2008 NCATE visit, faculty members have been particularly engaged in the design of new courses and programs. Pennsylvania overhauled many teacher certification structures in Chapter 49.2. Initial and Advance Programs have been developed to address these requirements. The Educational Leadership Program and K-12 School Counselors program have been designed/redesigned by faculty as well.

5.1.d Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service
Faculty members in the Professional Education Unit actively support the mission of the University and College of Education in their outstanding service to the region. This focus demands the commitment of great time and energy from the Unit and individual faculty. This includes service on University, College, and Department committees; development of new courses or programs; service on task forces; participation in governance of the University: service to schools, agencies, organizations and the community in general; voluntary membership in professionally oriented, community-based organizations; participation on boards and professional memberships; lectures and consultations; and collaboration with public and private schools, business, and human service organizations. Faculty members within the Unit are routinely engaged in collaborative endeavors with various organizations and P-16 schools. These endeavors may include program development, student support, curriculum study, action research and in-service training. Unit faculty serve as a resource to the University community with their preparation of professional development sessions for staff, peers and teacher candidates. Support of the Bloomsburg University Teaching and Learning Enhancement Center (TALE) and induction program is commonplace. Faculty also serve as a resource to children and families in need of assistance. They provide leadership in the profession, schools and professional associations at the state, national and international levels.

Faculty members offer service to the college and the community by assuming advisory roles for service and social organizations across campus. Examples include the Education Living-learning Community, Student Council for Exceptional Children, Pennsylvania Student Education Association (PSEA), Kappa Delta Pi, Best Buddies, Trinity Learning Community, Phi Kappa Phi, Students Learning about the Education of the Deaf (SLED), and Association of Childhood Education International (ACEI). Additionally, faculty serve on a variety of University, College and Departmental committees. This service includes the University Forum, Curriculum Committee, Planning and Budget, Graduate Council, Promotion and Tenure Committees, Institutional Review, Sabbatical Committee and many ad hoc committees. Service within the College of Education and Professional Education Unit is quite extensive. This includes an active committee structure, which includes Curriculum, Assessment, Advanced Programs, Technology and Field Experience committees. Departmental committee service includes assessment, curriculum, evaluation, promotion and tenure, and search committees.

5.1.e Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance
The process for faculty evaluation is outlined in Article 12 of the Agreement between The Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties (APSCUF) and the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (SSHE) July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2011 (http://www.apscuf.com/PDFs/Contracts/members.faculty_contract.0711.pdf). This system of formally evaluating faculty performance is mandated by the collective bargaining agreement (CBA). Faculty receive feedback on their teaching from candidates via the Faculty and Course Evaluation Form. Candidates also provide written narrative feedback that is shared only with the instructor. A schedule for regular peer and chairperson observation and performance review is also provided for ongoing assessment of faculty performance. This data is included as a component of tenure applications, promotion applications, and five-year performance reviews. Non-tenured and adjunct faculty are required to have student evaluations each semester. The CBA also requires the completion of two peer evaluations each semester as well as one chair evaluation in the academic year for these individuals. After tenure is
achieved, tenured faculty are evaluated every five years or upon request. All evaluations are reviewed by the Department Evaluation Committee and the Department Chairperson for inclusion in a report submitted to the College Dean. Faculty performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service are evaluated; areas of strength and areas needing improvement are detailed by the departmental review committee and shared with the faculty member and the College Dean. Commendations and recommendations for improved performance are included within these reports.

5.1.f Unit Facilitation of Professional Development
There are a number of professional development opportunities for faculty. Each Unit receives Faculty Professional Development Travel Funds. The COE Dean’s Office has established an equitable process to support faculty research and conference presentations through distribution of monies. Faculty may request funds awarded by the College of Education Chairperson Council. All tenure-track faculty presenting at a national conference or who hold an office in a national organization may receive an award. Funded activities are intended to support the mission and goals of the Unit and University. Awards for the past academic year are included in Exhibit 5.3.g. Other sources of funds for faculty professional development are available through the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (http://www.bloomu.edu/research_programs). To answer a Unit-wide request for funding streams, this year a Special Initiatives Grant process was established within the Professional Education Unit to support faculty growth and programmatic development within the Unit. Exhibit 5.3.g provides guidelines for project submission and samples of funded projects.

The Teaching and Learning Enhancement Center (TALE) provides additional opportunities for faculty professional development. The primary purpose of the TALE Center is to facilitate the involvement of faculty in a dialogue regarding the art and science of University teaching. Programs and services are designed to encourage discussion and exchange of ideas, disseminate information, develop projects and conduct inquiries that enhance the knowledge and practice of University instruction, stimulate and enable the development of strategies and technologies, provide new faculty with information and support, respond to faculty needs and promote a commitment to teaching excellence. Information on the resources available through the TALE Center can be found at http://orgs.bloomu.edu/tale/.

5.2.b Continuous Improvement
Activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality include:

1) The University and Unit continue to demonstrate a commitment to developing qualified faculty through the recruitment and retention of a diverse workforce. Recruitment has included outreach through SREB, minority publications and direct contact at minority recruitment venues. The Unit operates under the direction of the University’s Five-year Diversity Plan. At this time, we are participating in a cross-campus Climate Survey to assess the perspectives and experiences of all faculty/staff on campus. As faculty, we continue to aspire to exhibit and model cultural responsiveness to individual differences and diversity. The Office of Social Equity and Accommodative Services (http://www.bloomu.edu/social_equity/accommodative_services) has developed many programs and policies to further demonstrate this commitment.

2) The Teaching and Learning Enhancement Center (http://orgs.bloomu.edu/tale/) continues to provide high-quality support and training in issues related to the pedagogy of higher education. The Office of Instructional Media and Design (http://departments.bloomu.edu/imdc/) provides technical support and expertise in technology applications for higher education faculty. Faculty will continue to use their assistance as classroom technology applications expand and more “smart” classrooms are developed.

3) The University and Unit continue to possess high expectations for faculty performance. Faculty must demonstrate continuous growth in teaching, scholarship and service. Areas of strength and areas needing improvement are detailed through a multi-tiered evaluation process and shared with
the candidate. If recommendations for improvement exist, there must be evidence of achievement prior to the next periodic review. However, if there are suggestions for improvement or there are conditions of employment imposed such as the achievement of a terminal degree or the requirement to publish, faculty may be dismissed for lack of these achievements during their next periodic review. Seventeen faculty members from the Unit have been awarded tenure since the last NCATE visit. Promotion is extraordinarily competitive. Since the 2008 NCATE visit, ten faculty members in the Unit have been promoted. Faculty complete a “Snyder Report” required by federal law through the Office of Institutional Research each semester to document the time dedicated to teaching, scholarly activities and service.

4) The Office of Academic Affairs recently instituted the Provost’s Research and Scholarship Award. Each year, one faculty member from the Unit is recognized for their scholarly contributions to their discipline. A synopsis of the award criteria is included in Exhibit 5.3.g.

5) The Unit continues to develop a strong and vibrant faculty who are dedicated to quality teacher preparation of our teacher candidates. The Unit possesses a strong sense of collegiality, collaboration and professionalism within BU and the extended community.

Plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in Unit Standard 5 include:

1) The University has requested each Unit expand on-line course offerings during the next two years. Faculty within the Unit will participate in Quality Matters Training to assist with the design and quality control of on-line course delivery.

2) Significant reductions in state funding of public higher education have occurred since the 2008 NCATE visit. The hiring of tenure-track faculty was limited during a two-year period from 2009-2011. To address this need, five additional full time tenure-track faculty were hired for the 2012-13 academic year. The searches to fill those faculty positions are currently concluding. Additional faculty complements will be requested next year.

3) The Unit will continue to seek additional staff for assessment support and data management duties to assist with this critical task.

4) The Unit will continue to explore resources and partnerships with support venues on campus, including the Teaching and Learning Enhancement Center, The Instructional Media Design Center, and the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. Each office provides a broad range of available professional development support to Unit faculty members.

5.3 Exhibits

| 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 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, expectations, and samples of faculty scholarly activities |
| 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 |
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

6.1.a Unit Leadership and Authority
The Unit provides the leadership for effectively coordinating Initial and Advanced Educator Preparation Programs to work in P-16 schools. The Dean of the College of Education is the Head of the Unit. That individual is supported by the Interim Assistant Dean of the College of Education. Each of the departments within the Unit is directed by a Department Chairperson, responsible for the planning, operation, organization and assignment of duties. Departments with a large graduate student enrollment are provided with Graduate Coordinators (1/4-time reassignment) to oversee student recruitment, advisement, retention and programmatic development. This Unit structure naturally provides for collaboration across programs, departments and the University. Programs and departments share common coursework, reassigned faculty and resources. The Unit stretches beyond the College of Education, as it includes departments from other academic Units on campus. Educator preparation is a shared responsibility across the University.

A range of resources and support services are provided to candidates through the combined effort of the Academic and Student Life Divisions of the University. Candidates are provided with academic calendars, catalogs, schedules, policies/procedures, and publications, through on-line and direct staff support. The University provides tutorial services, academic/personal counseling, advisement, financial aid, career development and health services (http://www.bloomu.edu/students). The University provides support services for students with disabilities thorough the Office of Social Equity and Accommodative Services. All candidates are assigned to an advisor within their academic department. Candidates enrolled in Initial Programs may also receive assistance on completion of teacher education requirements through the Coordinator of Teacher Education Packets in the COE Dean’s office. Advanced Programs candidates receive resources and assistance through the Office of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Coordinator/Advisor assigned to their department.

6.1.b Unit Budget
The Unit provides budgetary allocations which permit teaching, scholarship and service to extend beyond the Unit to schools and other programs. Bloomsburg University conducts extensive annual planning and budgeting activities. At the beginning of each academic year, the budget office prepares a Planning and Resource Allocation Process manual that summarizes the institution’s approach to meeting the needs of programs, faculty and students within each Unit (Exhibit 6.3.a). That manual is a comprehensive guide which details the University’s strategic planning process, complete with a detailed multi-year timeline. The table on the following page provides some key financial data from the last several audited financial statements. The budget adequately supports operating expenses, including travel budget for student teaching, technology, and academic equipment.

Standard 6.1.c Personnel
Workload policies and practices permit and encourage faculty to be engaged in professional activities and contribute professionally to the greater community. Article 23 (pp. 73-81) of the Agreement between The Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties (APSCUF) and The Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (State System) July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2011 (http://www.apscuf.com/PDFs/Contracts/members.faculty.contract.0711.pdf) outlines the workload requirements for the faculty. Faculty workload is based upon an undergraduate teaching assignment of 12 credits per semester. A standard graduate teaching assignment is nine credits per semester. On-line instruction is considered within faculty load (Article 42: Distance Education). A stipend is provided for
development and delivery of instruction through this medium. Faculty members are contractually required to take part in professional activities, such as teaching, scholarship, advisement and service. Faculty may apply for yearly reassigned time through a variety of programs on campus. Faculty members responsible for supervising clinical sites possess all the rights and responsibilities of other faculty and are included in the Unit as valued colleagues. Information related to PASSHE, University and Unit support of faculty professional development may be accessed at [http://www.bloomu.edu/facstaff](http://www.bloomu.edu/facstaff).

6.1.d Unit Facilities
The programs within the Unit have excellent facilities to achieve their mission. Quality instructional environments for large group instruction, methods instruction and interactive seminars are provided for teaching and learning. University classrooms are equipped with current instructional technology tools. This allows faculty members to model cutting edge strategies involving technology to achieve instructional objectives. The buildings that house programs within the Unit are located central to campus with immediate access to the library, support services and the College of Liberal Arts.

6.1.e Unit Resources Including Technology
The Unit has secured the financial and technical resources, as well as personnel, to support high-quality and exemplary programs. A student fee structure provides funding for targeted purposes. The Academic Enhancement Fee supports equipment, personnel and materials that promote University-wide curricular and co-curricular programs and services. Set annually by the Bloomsburg University Council of Trustees, the fee is used to enhance the technical and living/learning experiences for students, faculty and staff. The Technology Tuition Fee, established by the State System Board of Governors, provides direct support to technology infrastructure on the Bloomsburg University campus. The campus network, student labs, classroom presentation systems and other technologies used by faculty and students are supported by this fee. All expenditures, including those funded with technology fees, are reviewed and approved through academic technology plans ([Exhibit 6.3.i](#)). The Office of Technology oversees this process and is composed of Technological Support Services, Network Systems, Applications Development and Operations, and Telecommunications. All faculty members have computers in their offices with a four-year rotation system for replacement. The Office of Instructional Media provides instructional assistance for on-line courses and follow-up assistance as course teaching is started. All candidates have e-mail accounts and internet access on campus with a variety of support technology labs and personnel. Candidates have web access to registration, grade reports and financial aid information. Teacher candidates are expected to become technologically proficient in their use of the BOLT course management system and in their ability to complete web-based assignments. This system provides technical resources to support traditional, hybrid and online instructional formats. Computer labs are available for all students and are strategically located throughout the campus.

6.2 The Unit is moving to the target level on this standard.
The Unit is currently performing at the target level within each element of Standard VI. This narrative describes each element and summarizes activities and achievements in relation to impact on candidate performance and program quality:

6.2.a Unit Leadership and Authority
1) Since the 2008 NCATE visit, the Unit has acted aggressively to address deficiencies in its organizational structure. The organizational analysis completed by consultant, Dr. Richard Schwab, provided the framework for the actions taken. Bloomsburg University was reorganized to create the College of Education. The Unit previously existed within the College of Professional Studies (comprised of the School of Education and the School of Health Sciences). The College of Education is now comprised of three academic departments (Early Childhood and Adolescent Education, Educational Studies and Secondary Education, and Exceptionality Programs) engaged in educator preparation. This restructuring has allowed for a more targeted
focus on the unique needs, resource demands and future directions of educator preparation programs at the Initial and Advanced levels. A sense of clarity regarding mission, Conceptual Framework and Unit infra-structure is now present.

2) Unit faculty members collaborate with those in the College of Liberal Arts, College of Business, and the College of Science and Technology to design, deliver and evaluate programs. Faculty members have been deeply engaged in the curricular revision process with changes to Chapter 49.2 and redesign of the General Education requirements at the University. All curricular initiatives (e.g. new programs, revision of programs, new courses) begin at the faculty and department level, progress to the College of Education Curriculum Committee, Dean, Graduate Council and Graduate Dean (for graduate programs, courses, and policies), Bloomsburg University Curriculum Committee and the Provost. Faculty input, statement of impact and review/evaluation are required prior to any curricular approval. The Unit also seeks to collaborate with other Units through the Teacher Education Council. Faculty representatives from all colleges are members of this body. Additionally, Graduate Council, Bloomsburg University Curriculum Committee and newly structured General Education Committee possess cross-departmental membership. This provides a structured and ongoing mechanism to keep the University community informed and involved with the operation of teacher education. The level of interaction and depth of curricular revision have engaged the entire university in teacher preparation. Many faculty across campus now possess an understanding of the challenges facing educator preparation and their role in supporting candidates.

3) Practitioners in the field and other members of the professional community have opportunities to provide input into the Unit’s programs through formal and informal dialogue with the faculty. Due to historically low rates of return, this survey has been added to a link on our college website. Periodic notices are mailed to students and alumni through various social media sites. An immediate increase in participation has been noted. During 2010-11, an outgrowth of the PK-12 Education Council was the development of the Bloomsburg University Heartland Education Conference. This collaborative professional development experience for schools across the region was in the final stages of planning in the fall of 2011 when a devastating flood from Tropical Storm Lee struck the region. Due to school closings, PK-12 Education Council activities were suspended and the conference postponed for 2012.

4) Faculty members in the Unit provide professional development on effective instruction through sessions offered through the Teaching and Learning Enhancement Center and periodic summer workshops (http://orgs.bloomu.edu/tale/). Several faculty served as keynote presenters at the PASSHE Summer Academy for the Advancement of Teaching for system-wide faculty. Preliminary plans are in place to offer instructional supports to newer faculty through the University’s Induction Program. This has been identified as an annual goal on the COE Strategic Planning document (Exhibit 6.3.a).

6.2.b Budget

1) Historically, the Unit’s departments have been funded for normal operating expenses through a departmental budget account. The chairperson of each department had control (with the Dean’s oversight) of expenditures for dues, office supplies (chemicals, maintenance supplies), administrative travel, faculty teaching travel, conference registration, postage, duplicating, educational supplies, printing and food services. There was an external competitive process for funding “equipment.” This process would commence in February and end with the receipt of equipment in 10 months. This process was cumbersome and did not meet the needs of teacher preparation programs. Beginning in the 2011-2012 academic year, the Unit restructured departmental budgets to allow for greater flexibility in spending while providing the University with a better understanding of actual costs of operation. Monies for equipment requests were moved to departmental budgets for direct order and access to instructional supplies. Student teaching travel was moved into the COE Dean’s budget for greater flexibility in supervisor
placement. Additionally, several competitive processes were implemented for faculty scholarship such as a Special Initiatives grant competition (college level), Academic Enhancement Project Requests (University level), and Presidential Strategic Planning Grants (University level). Programs will have more immediate local control over funds that directly support program quality and student learning outcomes.

2) Unit budget levels have continued to increase the support of faculty teaching, scholarship and service within the University, Unit, and with P-12 schools, in spite of reductions to state allocations to PASSHE and Bloomsburg University. This has required efficiency measures, reductions and reallocation of existing resources within the Unit and across the university. Alternative sources of revenue have been developed with some success. The Unit recently received a donation of $2 million from Ms. Susan McDowell, a local philanthropist, to establish the McDowell Institute for Teacher Excellence and Positive Behavior Support. This funding will support ongoing program development, research, candidate preparation and PK-16 supports. An opportunity of this magnitude has never been presented to a public educator preparation program in Pennsylvania. A narrative description of the institute, goals, outcomes and timelines is available in Exhibit 6.3.i.

3) The Unit budget supports high-quality work within the Unit and its school partners through the provision of additional faculty/staff and instructional resources that support collaborative endeavors. Additional staffing and administrative supports have enabled faculty to focus on the teaching and direct service responsibilities in field partnerships. Additional advisement supports and oversight of teacher education requirements through the Teacher Certification Coordinator allow faculty time to engage in partnership endeavors. Students receive direct assistance in their quest for candidacy and licensure. Faculty reassigned time has been generously provided through several funding streams within the University and Unit (Exhibit 6.3.f).

6.2.c Personnel

1) The University was required to be part of a system-wide hiring freeze from 2009 to 2010. Even with the existence of continued budget challenges, the Unit has been provided with the resources to hire faculty for tenure-track positions. Five faculty searches are currently underway within the Unit. All hires address the strategic vision and new initiatives identified within departments and reflected in the Unit’s Strategic Plan (Exhibit 6.3.i).

2) The Unit employs adjunct faculty on a full-time and part-time basis, as described in the Article 11 F-J of the CBA (Exhibit 6.3.h). All adjunct faculty members meet the requirements for Expertise in PA Chapter 49.2 and serve as a valued resource to their department. All adjuncts possess current expertise and practical experience for application to curricular and field experiences. Several Initial/Advanced Programs are required by Pennsylvania guidelines to hire practitioners to assure candidate connections to current practice. The use of adjunct faculty has also decreased the need for tenure-track faculty overload.

3) Unit support personnel enhance the effectiveness of faculty members. The Unit employs and supervises seven secretaries/administrative assistants. They provide clerical assistance, communications assistance, scheduling, reception and general office services. The Provost provides funding to the Unit for undergraduate student workers and for Graduate Assistants. These monies provide direct assistance to departments and faculty members. Student workers are primarily employed by departments for clerical duties. Graduate assistants support both department initiatives and assist faculty members with research and instructional preparation. Graduate assistants are not to teach coursework, but may support the instructional efforts of their supervising faculty.

4) At the time of the 2008 NCATE visit, the Unit was cited with an AFI in this area due to overload teaching levels. Overloads have been nearly eliminated from 2008 levels (Exhibit 6.3.h). This has allowed faculty to increase their focus on scholarship and service to the University.
6.2.d Unit Facilities

1) The University is in the midst of an extended planned period of improvement to its physical plant. A master facilities plan summary highlights the current status of facility improvements impacting the Unit and may be viewed in Exhibit 6.3.i. Navy Hall, which houses a number of teacher preparation programs, completed an extensive renovation in 2008. Sutliff Hall and Haas Auditorium, which house Business Education, Technology Specialist and Music Education have completed renovations within the last year. An addition to McCormick Hall, home to the office of the Unit Head and several teacher preparation programs, was completed in 2010. Additional renovations were scheduled to begin in 2014, but have been delayed until 2018 due to budget cuts at the state level. The renovations have allowed programs to better meet their mission and the needs of teacher candidates. Technology improvements have been a central component of all facility renovations.

2) The Unit has begun planning the construction and development of an Early Childhood Learning Center that will serve as a model for the training and preparation of Early Childhood Education teachers. A leadership team within the Unit has been established to explore programmatic and facility options. Exhibit 6.3.i highlights the status of this impactful project.

6.2.e Unit Resources including Technology

1) The Unit collaborates with the Bloomsburg University Foundation to raise and distribute private philanthropic funds on behalf of Bloomsburg University. In relation to the Unit, the Foundation’s fundraising efforts are targeted to the mission, strategic plan, and needs of educator preparation programs. An outcome of their partnership, in concert with philanthropist Ms. Susan McDowell, was the recent creation of the McDowell Institute for Teacher Excellence and Positive Behavior Support.

2) The design and implementation of the Unit’s assessment system has been well supported. The University has been committed to the provision of these resources since the 2008 NCATE visit. Resources and staff support are available through the Unit and the Office of Planning and Assessment. Faculty reassigned time ($30,000) was provided in the summer of 2011. Ongoing consultancy contracts, student workers, technical support through contractors, and professional development have been provided. The new position of Interim Assistant Dean was created to support assessment needs within the Unit.

3) Faculty and candidates have access to a bounty of library resources. The Andruss Library provides hard copy and electronic access to a broad range of professional materials for candidates and faculty members. The Unit is assigned a Library Liaison (Ms. Darla Bressler) to coordinate resources and services. A summary of these resources may be viewed in Exhibit 6.3.i.

Plans and timelines for obtaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in the rubrics of Unit Standard 6 include:

6.2.a Unit Leadership and Authority

1) In May 2012, the Unit will conclude its search for a permanent Dean of the College of Education. Much progress has been made during the past three years under the leadership of the Interim Dean, Elizabeth K. Mauch, Ph.D.

2) In September 2012, the College of Education Chairperson Council will approve new faculty committee appointments for the Assessment Committee, Advanced Programs Committee, Field Experience Committee, Technology Committee, Curriculum Committee and the Dean’s Advisory Council.

3) During the Fall of 2012, the Field Experience Committee will be charged with engaging PK-16 practitioners to provide feedback on the design of the new Early Field Experience model and pre-capstone experiences.
4) During the summer of 2012, faculty leaders who submitted SPA reports will be contracted with to address conditions and continued development of program reports. Amendments to Unit-wide assessments will occur to provide more specific programmatic data. Outreach to faculty in academic departments outside the Unit is central to this task.

5) In September 2012, the Unit will commence the process for addressing Strategic Goal # 6: Partner with BU Faculty Induction Program to provide resources on effective teaching. Mentors and modules will be developed to provide new faculty upon request/assignment by relevant Dean.

6.2.b Budget
1) Continue to collect data to support extraordinary needs for funding to support faculty research efforts and unique field experiences. Continue to broaden faculty/student research efforts beyond current funding.
2) In 2012-13, develop a coherent enrollment management plan to ensure enrollment and budgetary resources are consistent. This will allow for greater program quality control and connect resources to needs.
3) From 2012 forward, we will continue to seek alternative funding sources for Centers of Excellence in PBS, Literacy, Community Outreach and Leadership. Collaborative activities with the BU Foundation and Alumni Association will facilitate the development of additional funding structures. Community Outreach funding will support field and PK-16 partnership activities.

6.2.c Personnel
1) In 2012, monitor progress of CBA negotiations to determine impact on faculty workload policies and practices.
2) In 2013, faculty will explore creative use of adjunct faculty to support department operations beyond instructional duties. This will provide balance to the distribution of non-instructional tasks for tenure-track faculty.
3) In 2013, use the Centers of Excellence as conduits for faculty dialogue and skill development. Immediate resources will be available for this purpose through the McDowell Institute.
4) Ongoing and continued pursuit of budgetary support for an Office of Field Studies within the Unit. This will expand programmatic quality and improve student outcomes through a coordinated emphasis on impactful field experiences for all candidates.

6.2.d Unit Facilities
1) From 2012-2016, explore opportunities to establish the Early Childhood Learning Center on campus. This will expand instructional, programmatic and applied research opportunities, as well as community outreach.
2) From 2012 forward, explore the development/expansion of field-based facilities for technology and instructional training through Educational Leadership Program and Heartland Coalition.

6.2.e Unit Resources including Technology
1) From 2012 forward, structure and distribute resources through the McDowell Institute for Teacher Excellence and Positive Behavior Support.
2) In 2012-2014, partner with the Office of Technology Support to integrate the Unit’s assessment system within BOLT for expansion and development as an instructional tool. Continue support of new assessment directions through consultancy contracts, technical support, and faculty professional development.
3) Explore the creation of a permanent position of Assistant Dean within the Unit, to support assessment, program development and accreditation demands.
## 6.3 Exhibits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.3.a</th>
<th>Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3.b</td>
<td>Organizational chart and/or description of the Unit governance structure and its relationship to institutional governance structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.c</td>
<td>Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate services such as counseling and advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.d</td>
<td>Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate recruitment and admission, and accessibility to candidates and the education community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.e</td>
<td>Academic calendars, catalogs, Unit publications, grading policies, and Unit advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.f</td>
<td>Unit budget, with provisions for assessment, technology, professional development, and support for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs when applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.g</td>
<td>Budgets of comparable Units with clinical components on campus or similar Units at other campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.h</td>
<td>Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty workload and summary of faculty workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.i</td>
<td>Candidates’ access to physical and/or virtual classrooms, computer labs, curriculum resources, and library resources that support teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.j</td>
<td>Candidates’ access to distance learning including support services and resources, if applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Diversity of Professional Education Faculty
### Standard 4, Element 2
#### Fall 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)</th>
<th>Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach Only in Advanced Preparation Programs n (%)</th>
<th>Prof. Ed. Faculty Who Teach in Both Initial Teacher Preparation &amp; Advanced Preparation Programs n (%)</th>
<th>All Faculty in the Institution n (%)</th>
<th>School-based Faculty n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Indian or Alaska Native</strong></td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td>2 (2.56%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>26 (5.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black or African American</strong></td>
<td>1 (1.28%)</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>14 (2.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</strong></td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic or Latino</strong></td>
<td>1 (1.28%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>9 (1.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>72 (92.3%)</td>
<td>16 (89.9%)</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>455 (87.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two or more races</strong></td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.56%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (0.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity Unknown</strong></td>
<td>0 (0.00%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonresident Alien</strong></td>
<td>2 (2.56%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>14 (2.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>78 (100.0%)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>523 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>35 (44.87%)</td>
<td>10 (55.56%)</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
<td>278 (53.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>43 (55.13%)</td>
<td>8 (44.44%)</td>
<td>6 (75.0%)</td>
<td>245 (46.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>78 (100.0%)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>523 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenured</strong></td>
<td>33 (42.31%)</td>
<td>3 (16.67%)</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>254 (48.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Tenure Track</strong></td>
<td>16 (20.51%)</td>
<td>1 (5.55%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
<td>92 (17.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not on Tenure-Track</strong></td>
<td>29 (37.18%)</td>
<td>14 (77.78%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
<td>177 (33.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>78 (100.0%)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>523 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Diversity of Candidates in Professional Education
Standard 4, Element c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Candidates in Initial Teacher Preparation Programs n (%)</th>
<th>Candidates in Advanced Preparation Programs n (%)</th>
<th>All Students in the Institution n (%)</th>
<th>Diversity of Geographical Area Served by Institution %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino of any race</td>
<td>14 (2.6%)</td>
<td>3 (1.579%)</td>
<td>343 (3.8%)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For individuals who are non-Hispanic/Latino only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (.1%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1 (.2%)</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>93 (1%)</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>4 (.7%)</td>
<td>10 (5.3%)</td>
<td>636 (7.1%)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (.1%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>485 (90.8%)</td>
<td>169 (88.9%)</td>
<td>7471 (82.8%)</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>4 (.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>97 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>26 (4.9%)</td>
<td>7 (3.7%)</td>
<td>364 (4%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>9020</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>99 (18.5%)</td>
<td>66 (34.7%)</td>
<td>3929 (43%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>435 (81.5%)</td>
<td>124 (65.3%)</td>
<td>5213 (57%)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>534</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>9142</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C

Diversity of P-12 Students in Clinical Practice Sites for Initial Teacher Preparation and Advanced Preparation Programs*

### Standard 4, Element d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School*</th>
<th>Hispanic/ Latino of any race</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>Race/ Ethnicity Unknown</th>
<th>Students Receiving Free/ Reduced Price Lunch</th>
<th>English Language Learners</th>
<th>Students with Disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18.58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomsburg</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>15.99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Columbia</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>14.85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisburg</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millville</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Carmel</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>12.94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>21.49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Schuylkill</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>17.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18.16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selinsgrove</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10.78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamokin</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>18.19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shikellamy</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Columbia</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>19.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrior Run</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes Barre</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsport</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Unit uses more than 20 schools for clinical practice. School district data has been substituted for school data in the table.
Appendix D

Professional Education Faculty Qualifications and Experiences*
Standard 5, Element a

** This information may be viewed in Exhibit 5.3.a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Highest Degree, Field, &amp; University</th>
<th>Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Tenure Track</th>
<th>Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Association, &amp; Service: List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years</th>
<th>Teaching or Other Professional Experience in P-12 Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Professional Education Faculty information compiled by AIMS from earlier reports submitted for the national review of programs and updated by your institution (see Manage Faculty Information page in your AIMS workspace) can be imported into this table in the Online Institutional Report (IR). For further guidance on completing this table, see the directions on pp. 9-11 in the following document on our website: http://www.ncate.org/documents/accreditation/Guidelines_for_Tables_in_IR.doc.